



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

36 COM

WHC-12/36.COM.INF.19

Original: English/French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirty-sixth session

**Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation
24 June – 6 July 2012**

SUMMARY RECORD

RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

Sunday, 24 June 2012
OPENING OF THE SESSION

7 p.m – 8 p.m

Chairperson : H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: *WHC-12/36.COM/INF.2*

The 36th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened on Sunday 24 June 2012 in Saint-Petersburg, by **H.E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova**, Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO and Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

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

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

The following **97 States Parties** to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers: Albania, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Congo (the Democratic Republic of), Congo (Republic of), Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Greece, Holy See (Vatican City State), Honduras, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Korea (Republic of), Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Montenegro, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Palestine, Panama, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint-Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Tanzania (United Republic of), The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Singapore, Member State of UNESCO and Non State Party, also attended the session.

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

The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, H.E Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova welcomed the participants and delivered her address by which she indicated that the Committee will have to examine many critical and complex issues. She indicated that the decisions and actions will then have to further favour

intercultural dialogue, promote appropriate educational approaches and advance a culture of peace in the service of the properties of outstanding universal value, which transcend time and borders. She underlined that, since its adoption in 1972, the Convention initiated a global response to the fundamental need to preserve the balance in the interaction between the conservation of nature and of cultural properties.

The Chairperson mentioned that the celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention going through this year 2012 puts special emphasis on the close linkage between the World Heritage and Sustainable Development, and the role of Local Communities in this interface.

She also indicated that part of the Committee's responsibility was to help prepare the decision-makers of tomorrow, to take over responsibilities for the long-term conservation of heritage sites. It is in consideration of this mission that she extended a particular welcome to the participants of the three parallel international youth events organized in the framework of this session.

She mentioned that the Committee session will also be held for the first time in public, with the specific media-coverage and live transmission of debates through on-line and screening facilities.

The Chairperson wished the participants a fruitful and inspiring session. (The entire text of this intervention is contained in Annex I).

H.E Mr Vladimir Medinsky, Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation; indicated that it was a great honour for Saint-Petersburg to host the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee at the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention. He underlined that this Committee session was a unique opportunity to present the city of Saint-Petersburg, inscribed in 1990 as the "Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments" on the World Heritage List, but above all to consider the crucial question on how to conciliate heritage conservation with urban development. He insisted on the fact that the outdated infrastructure of many areas in the historic center including insufficient sanitary installations had become a most pressing issue for the 5 million residents and the Russian Federation administration.

The Minister underlined that Saint-Petersburg was a pioneer in elaborating an urban strategy concerning the conservation of cultural heritage based on the principles of the World Heritage Convention named "Conservation through development and development through conservation." He mentioned that a special rehabilitation program 2013-2018 was being elaborated and that the valuable advice from the World Heritage Committee, based on best practices around the world, was very much welcome. He underlined that efforts were ongoing and that, in the past year, 11 billion rubles have been spent from the Federal and Municipal budgets for the rehabilitation of the historic centre and its monuments. The legal framework concerning urban zoning was recently redefined. The Minister informed that, a few months ago a moratorium on the destruction of buildings in the Historic Centre of Saint-Petersburg was declared which was supported by the majority of the residents who consider the conservation of the Historic Centre as one of the main priorities for the future of the city. He mentioned that he hoped the World Heritage Committee will find the most appropriate solutions to enhance the urban space and conserve our heritage for the future generations.

S.Exc. M. Georgy Poltavchenko, Gouverneur de Saint-Petersbourg, indique que la session du Comité du patrimoine mondial se tient à Saint-Pétersbourg et que plusieurs siècles d'histoire et de culture de son pays sont reflétés dans l'image unique de cette ville. Il souligne que nous vivons dans un monde complexe et que nous assistons à l'effondrement des valeurs traditionnelles. Le monde qui paraît être réuni grâce à des nouvelles technologies reste cependant divisé. Le Gouverneur insiste sur le rôle très important que l'UNESCO joue dans l'abolition des barrières, et notamment des barrières interculturelles.

Il souligne que les travaux du Comité du patrimoine mondial sont extrêmement importants et que le destin des monuments historiques et culturels nécessite d'une attention toute particulière, notamment pour prévenir leur destruction et disparition. Le dialogue sincère, des bonnes intentions, une meilleure connaissance des problèmes et une compréhension mutuelle sont des outils dont nous avons besoin pour faire face aux difficultés. Il indique également que le grand défi de préservation du patrimoine spirituel de nos peuples est devant nous et qu'ensemble, nous pouvons effectuer cette mission.

Mrs Irina Bokova Director-General of UNESCO delivered her address by which she expressed her appreciation to the Russian Federation authorities for hosting the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. She underlined that this country adhered to the World Heritage Convention more than 20 years ago and now boasts 24 sites on the famous World Heritage List, including St Petersburg -- this "Venice of the North" which embodies the values and the concepts underpinning the World Heritage Convention.

The Director-General noted that over 40 years, 189 States have ratified the *World Heritage Convention* making it one of the most universally ratified legal instruments. She however mentioned that, on its 40th birthday, the *World Heritage Convention* faces numerous threats, and also a more fundamental challenge -- that of its credibility and its future.

She underlined that, in recent years, some developments within the inscription process have weakened the principles of scientific excellence and impartiality that are at the heart of the Convention. The Director-General reaffirmed that the credibility of the inscription process must be absolute at all stages of the proceedings. She indicated that today, criticism is growing, and that she was deeply concerned about this matter. She noted that we are at the crossroads, and that a clear choice should be made whether it is adding more sites to the list, adhering less and less strictly to the World Heritage Convention criteria. Or, on the other hand, to act and think as visionaries, to rejuvenate the *World Heritage Convention* and to confront the challenges of the 21st century.

The Director-General reaffirmed that World Heritage could be an instrument of sustainable development in the 21st century. She underlined that the 40th anniversary celebrations showcase the dynamism of local communities and that a strategic vision and plan of action for the next ten years exists. She indicated that she has created an Emergency Fund to face the current financial situation, and states are also mobilizing support through direct financing and contributions.

The Director-General finally reiterated the need to give a new youth to world heritage. (The entire text of this intervention is contained in Annex II).

H.E. Ms Alissandra Cummins, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO delivered her address by which she thanked the Government of the Russian Federation for hosting this session of the Committee in Saint Petersburg.

She indicated that the Committee will be considering a number of items that will impact the operationalization of the World Heritage Convention in the coming years, one of which concerns sustainable development. On this topic, she noted with great interest the initial outcomes from the various conferences and events which have taken place around the world so far on the occasion of the 40th anniversary. The Chairperson of the Executive Board took this opportunity to reiterate the importance of world heritage sites and the role of culture in the sustainable development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

She also recalled that, during the 35th Session of the Committee, a discussion was held with States Parties on using the World Heritage mechanism to highlight the Slave Route and to reflect the slave trade's unquestionable effect on human development on the World Heritage List. This is an important step; as the slave trade, slavery and freedom are a fundamental part of several World Heritage narratives which must be discussed in the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value of these sites.

She indicated that another item of interest on the agenda was the progress made on the 10 pilot projects to explore creative approaches and new forms of guidance to States Parties in the primary stages of preparing a nomination.

Finally, she indicated that, as Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO, she followed the debates on budgetary constraints very closely. She congratulated the Director-General for having been very responsive in this regard.

Finally she indicated to be very pleased to see the progress made in finally opening up and making accessible the proceedings of the World Heritage Committee through live streaming of these events on the Internet.

The Chairperson of the Executive Board wished everybody a successful meeting and fruitful deliberations. (The entire text of this intervention is contained in Annex III).

The **Chairperson** of the World Heritage Committee thanked the speakers for their kind words and closed the opening session of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee.

FIRST DAY – Monday, 25 June 2012

FIRST MEETING

10.00 a.m. –1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 2 ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

Document: WHC-12/36.COM.2
WHC-12/36.COM.INF.2

Decision: **36 COM 2**

The **Chairperson**, before presenting Item 2 of the agenda, announced that the session would be live streamed for the first time over the web. The meeting would also be open to accredited journalists. The interventions would be reflected in French or English in the Summary Records. The Chairperson thanked Qatar and the Russian Federation for the financial support provided for Arabic, Spanish and Russian interpretation. She pointed out that Arabic, Spanish and Russian speaking delegations should express in their first intervention in which language (English or French) they would wish to be recorded.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 2** was adopted.

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

ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

3A. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3B. ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/3A
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.3A
WHC-12/36.COM/3B

Decisions: **36 COM 3A**
36 COM 3B

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to introduce the items.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented documents: 3A, INF.3A as well as 3B, entailing two Decisions. He announced that the Bureau meeting would start the 26th of June at 9.30 am and that the discussion on the State of Conservation (SOC) reports was foreseen until 28th June and that the discussion on nominations would follow on 29th June. No evening sessions were foreseen for this session.

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

The Draft Decisions **36 COM 3A** and **36 COM 3B** were adopted.

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

**ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 35th SESSION OF THE
WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (UNESCO Headquarters, 2011)**

Le Rapporteur de la 35e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, M Ali Ould Sidi (Mali) mentionne qu'il a eu le privilège en tant que Rapporteur de la 35eme session du Comité de travailler avec tous les membres du Comité.

Il souligne le rôle efficace du Secrétariat qui lui a fourni un appui professionnel dans cette tâche, en particulier la diligence dans le traitement des Décisions et leur intégration au sein des Projets de décisions préparés à l'avance.

Il explique la méthodologie qui a été suivie notamment concernant le traitement des amendements des Décisions et a indiqué qu'au cours de cette session qui aura duré onze jours avec parfois des séances de nuit, le comité a examiné environ 263 Décisions, y compris celles provenant des deux groupes de travail sur l'avenir de la Convention et le Budget.

Le Rapporteur souligne que la 35ème session du Comité du patrimoine mondial a enregistré des avancées significatives comme en attestent les résultats tangibles obtenus traduisant à la fois l'engouement et l'engagement des Etats parties à mieux préserver leur patrimoine. Il indique ainsi que la Liste du patrimoine mondial s'est enrichie à travers l'inscription de 25 nouveaux sites.

Le Rapporteur mentionne avoir personnellement signé toutes les révisions adoptées au cours de cette session ; ce qui a permis la publication finale des Décisions adoptées à la 35e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial dans le délai imparti.

Pour terminer, le Rapporteur adresse une mention spéciale au Secrétariat, aux Organisations Consultatives, aux Membres du Comité, aux Etats parties, aux observateurs, aux partenaires, aux ONG et à tous qui ont contribué à la réussite de la 35ème session du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

Le Rapporteur félicite finalement et souhaite bonne chance à Mme Beatriz Hernández Narváez ayant accepté d'assumer la tâche de Rapporteur et l'a assurée de tout son soutien dans sa fonction.

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

ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

9A IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THE PACT INITIATIVE

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/9A
Decision: **36 COM 9A**

The **Chairperson** mentioned that, as indicated in the timetable, it was foreseen to propose to open **Item 9A** concerning the Progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative regarding notably eventual meetings of the open-ended working group which initiated the reflection on this matter last 15 and 16 May in UNESCO Headquarters. She mentioned that the open-ended working group decided not to meet during the 36th session, but on January 2013 to pursue with its work in order to be able to report to the 19th session of the General Assembly in 2013.

ITEM 13 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/13
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.13
Decision: **36 COM 13**

The **Chairperson** addressed the establishment of a working group in conformity with Decision **35 COM 13** (point 8) by which the Committee decided to “*establish an open-ended working group on the Operational Guidelines at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012 to consider the proposals made by Jordan on paragraph 68 and reflect on other elements of the Operational Guidelines as may be proposed by other States Parties*”.

She recalled that such a working group may be established in accordance with **Rule 20** of the *Rules of Procedure*, acting as a **Consultative Body** of the Committee, open to the participation of all States Parties wishing to take part, including States Parties non members of the Committee. She underlined that such a working group on the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* was already established at its 34th session by the Committee and that it will be established for the duration of the 36th session and will report back to the Committee at its plenary session.

She indicated that the working group shall elect its own Chairperson, but that she would like to propose that it be chaired by **His Excellency Ambassador Rodolphe Imhoof from Switzerland**, underlining that Ambassador Imhoof did an excellent job during the last meeting of the working group.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the proposal.

The Delegation of **Germany** objected that it should be the working group itself to discuss the question of its Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** proposed therefore that the decision on the Chair would be taken by the working group.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that the working group would start its work on 26th of June and would meet from 8.30 am until 9.30 am.

ITEM 15 PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2010-2011, THE INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND THE STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET.

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/15.Rev

Decision: **36 COM 15**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented document WHC-12/36.COM/15.Rev.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee established at its last session, by Decision 35 COM 12B, paragraph 13, a standing consultative body for review of the Committee's biennial budget. She indicated that, during the last session, the working group on the Budget has worked under the presidency of Mrs Beatriz Hernández Narváez, who is now the Rapporteur of the 36th session. She therefore called upon Committee members for any proposal with regard to the Chairmanship of this working group.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed Mr Marthinus Van Schalkwyk from South Africa to act as chair of the budget working group.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient cette proposition.

The **Chairperson** took note of this proposal and suggested that it be submitted to the working group at its first meeting.

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

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

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/5A.1

WHC-12/36.COM/INF.5A.1

WHC-12/36.COM/5A.2

WHC-12/36.COM/INF.5A.2

WHC-12/36.COM/INF.5A.3

Decisions: **36 COM 5A.1**

36 COM 5A.2

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the report of the World Heritage Centre and the information documents INF.5A.1 that contained an update on the relationships between the 1972 Convention and the other UNESCO conventions in the field of culture. INF.5A.2 contained the report on partnerships and on the use of the emblem. INF.5A.3 contained the report on the implementation of the recommendations by the External Auditor in 2009. The main document provided the report on the activities of the Secretariat.

The Director of the Centre made a clarification regarding documents in general. He informed that documents were issued by the statutory deadline with exception of those documents where reports had been handed in late their reports. The summary records were slightly delayed due to the lack of resources.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out that the report on the activities of the Secretariat was not exhaustive and that some activities could be found in the regional reports. With the ratification of Singapore, Brunei Darussalam and Palestine, the number of States Parties had risen to 190 and the Convention had become almost universal.

The Secretariat underlined that due to the lack of resources the programme could only be implemented thanks to additional funds received by States Parties as well as offers to host important events.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** congratulated the Secretariat for their work in times of lack of resources and staff.

The Delegation of **India** complimented the Secretariat on their report and underlined that transparency of processes had to be ensured. The dialogue between Member States and the Secretariat should not be diluted.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 5A.1** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the Secretariat to present document 5A.2 concerning the Draft of the new Partnerships for Conservation Initiative Strategy (PACT).

The **Secretariat** introduced the document indicating that the new Strategy is based on the results of the Evaluation of the External Auditor of the PACT Initiative, as well as on the lessons learnt from the Centre's partnerships work since the creation of PACT in 2002. It has been elaborated in the context of the current reflection within UNESCO about partnerships policies and strategies.

The Secretariat indicated that the working document also presented the current status of the partnerships work at the UNESCO level, gave a brief summary of the recommendations of the external evaluation and, finally, proposed the principles of the new PACT strategy. Document INF.5A.2 provided a report on existing and envisaged partnerships.

The Secretariat underlined that UNESCO was developing a Partnership Policy Framework which would be finalized for examination by the 190th session of the Executive Board in October 2012, thus the PACT Strategy needed to be considered within this broader organizational context.

As per Resolution 8 of the 18th General Assembly in 2011, PACT's Strategy has been drafted with the aim to improve the traceability of contributions, transparency and monitoring, concordance of partnerships with the goals and objectives of the Convention, and as well as to ensure an increase of the World Heritage Fund.

The Secretariat also noted that PACT would focus on the improvement of working procedures and practices to ensure efficiency in following-up partnership development and implementation. Consultations with National Commissions were diligently undertaken prior to signature of every new partnership.

However, given the limited financial resources, financial and in-kind contributions from the private sector are crucial to ensure that Communication, Education and Partnership work can be fulfilled.

The Secretariat underlined that the use of the emblem follows the principles in the Operational Guidelines and is strictly regulated according to the terms of each signed agreement. Finally, PACT will seek to develop long-term strategic partnerships whose sustainability will depend on quality programmes.

The Delegation of Mexico thanked the Secretariat for its work. However, it noted that the open-ended group on the follow-up to the audit will meet only in January 2013 and that UNESCO is currently developing a Partnership Policy Framework which would be presented to the next session of the Executive Board, thus she agreed with the Secretariat that the PACT Strategy needs to be considered within this broader context. Therefore, the delegation proposed that a revised PACT Initiative strategy be presented at the 37th session of the Committee. During their interventions, the Delegations of **South-Africa, Switzerland and France** supported the proposal of Mexico.

The Chairperson decided to pass to the examination of the next item of the Agenda to allow delegations to have time to examine the amendments proposed by Mexico to Draft decision 5A.2.

5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/5B

Decision: **36 COM 5B**

The **Chairperson** announced that she would give the floor to each of the Advisory Bodies to present this document. She gave first the floor to IUCN.

The Representative of IUCN thanked the Russian authorities for their welcome and the excellent support provided to organise the Committee meeting.

He indicated that IUCN was revising and extending its programme on World Heritage, with a focus on extending its regional network, strengthening its work on monitoring, and supporting the upstream process. In this regard, he acknowledged the support of the MAVA Foundation, the Swiss Government, as well as the States Parties of Germany, the Republic of Korea, and Australia who are cooperating and providing funding for activities.

The Representative of IUCN paid tribute to the partnership with the African World Heritage Fund, ICOMOS Norway, ICCROM and the World Heritage Centre in developing additional work on a range of initiatives including work focused on communities and human rights, capacity development, African natural heritage and work on marine conservation. He mentioned that, this year, around 1000 different people in IUCN were involved directly in evaluation, monitoring and in implementing work on the ground at sites, through training and support to possible nominations.

Secondly, he indicated that this growing contribution, including significant volunteer efforts of many experts in the commission on Protected Areas and wider network amounts to around one million USD annually. This is a commitment IUCN is making, with its partners, to the Convention in the belief that it represents, and will continue to

represent, the highest international standards of performance and leadership in heritage. He underlined that IUCN looks to the Committee to guard jealously that reputation for excellence and quality, and echoes strongly the concerns and alarm raised by the Director General of UNESCO. The Convention's weakened technical standards, and non-observation of its own Operational Guidelines are now starting to attract wider and wider comment and criticism. He indicated that, based on the feedback received, it is clear that the Convention has had two difficult years for credibility, and it is of the highest importance that the 36th session restores its good reputation.

Lastly, the representative of IUCN presented a brief update on IUCN's World Conservation Congress, planned in September 2012, which will bring together around 8,000 delegates.

La Délégation du **Mali** demande si les Organisations consultatives ont un programme commun en ce qui concerne la célébration du 40^{ème} anniversaire.

The Delegation of **India** thanked IUCN for its concise report. It highlighted the quality of the technical assistance and the role of the Advisory Bodies and noted issues that confront the World Heritage Centre. However, he underlined that very critical issues went through the text. It suggested the setting up of a working group to make explicit the role of the Advisory Bodies and the implications in terms of time and financial resources of all the roles that the Advisory Bodies are called upon.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie l'UICN pour son rapport et la qualité de son travail. Elle note qu'il est important de relever les insuffisances dans les dossiers. Toutefois, elle suggère que l'UICN devrait donner des indications concernant les directions à suivre, avec une estimation de temps et d'argent.

The Delegation of **Mexico** called for a more respectful approach between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties. It also called for a more proactive analysis when new types of nominations are submitted, in line with the Global Strategy for a more balanced and representative World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported Mexico and India.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked IUCN and underlined the latter's difficult role in defending the protection of non-human beings and nature. It called for more flexibility.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the Upstream Process as an enhanced way of cooperation between State Parties and the Advisory Bodies and thanked the Advisory Bodies for their work.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported Mexico and India, and called for more transparency in the evaluation process, especially concerning the most innovative nominations. The State Party underlined the importance of the Upstream process in LAC Region.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated that the targets are changing and it is needed to adapt to new circumstances. It thanked IUCN for its work concerning climate change and biodiversity and claimed for more transparency and better communication.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked IUCN for advices provided and called for a closer approach to sustainable development.

The Chairperson stated that the relationship between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties was a recurrent problem. She added that something is going wrong. She proposed that at the end of the session an open-ended working group should be established to deal with those problems, in particular in relation to the Decision of Item 12C on progress report of the Upstream Process.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS who expressed appreciation to the Russian Federation for the organization of the 36th Committee meeting and the warm welcome extended to all.

ICOMOS also extended its warmest congratulations to the World Heritage Centre, the distinguished members of the Committee and to the States Parties delegations who have worked for the success of the World Heritage Convention at its 40th Anniversary.

It indicated that over the past four decades ICOMOS has supported the work of the World Heritage Committee by providing with the best professional advice by deploying the vast multi-disciplinary and multicultural intellectual and experiential resources that are unique to ICOMOS.

Regarding Item 5B, Report of the Advisory Bodies, ICOMOS underlined that it is constantly refining its procedures to ensure that its recommendations are based on rigorous professional principles, and that the participation of its members adheres to the strictest ethical principles.

ICOMOS also indicated that it is aware of what lies behind each nomination and that it understood the deep disappointment and frustration that can come from a negative recommendation regarding inscription, or even delays in doing so.

ICOMOS noted that, in the past few Committee meetings, there has been a noticeable increase in the Committee's decisions to override Advisory Bodies recommendations. While its professional recommendations must adhere to the procedures that are carefully detailed in the Operational Guidelines, ICOMOS acknowledged that the members of the Committee have the privilege to make different decisions.

ICOMOS expressed his deep concern for certain sites where it has seen that their unsuccessful bid for inscription has led to a significant decline in their protective structure. ICOMOS indicated that all properties nominated to the World Heritage List possess great cultural significance and all are meritorious of the highest protection, notwithstanding whether they get inscribed on the List or not.

ICOMOS indicated that it supports the further exploration to find more effective means of upstream cooperation with States Parties on both the nomination process and on inscribed properties whose state of conservation may need improvement. ICOMOS also welcomes other initiatives to assess how the nomination process could be streamlined to avoid in the future unnecessary expenditures and disappointments on the part of States Parties and especially local communities and stakeholders.

ICOMOS reiterated that it was looking forward to present best judgments over the coming days.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** a souligné l'importance des missions de conseil des Organisations consultatives, ainsi que des activités de renforcement des capacités, et de l'Assistance internationale.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with Senegal, and expressed concern about such categorical statements of Advisory Bodies and the impolite way of treating States Parties and declared that this is a problem to be addressed to avoid the centralism in the process of evaluation. He called for more transparency and dialogue and for a clarification of the advisory role. He underlined that evaluators should be familiar with the region and skilled in the field of evaluations and in the same line he called for an update of the Global Strategy, which since 2004 remained unchanged.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle que les Organisations consultatives sont parties prenantes à la *Convention*. Elles sont un élément stabilisateur, tandis que les membres du Comité changent tous les deux ans. Elles ne doivent pas se substituer au Comité. Le fait que deux tiers de votes sont requis en cas de décision différente des recommandations des Organisations consultatives, démontre le poids de ces dernières. Par ailleurs, la Délégation de la Suisse indique qu'il existe un problème de dialogue et de transparence, et souligne l'importance de la procédure en amont. Elle souligne qu'un dialogue structuré au sein d'une enceinte, laquelle reste à élaborer, est essentiel. Elle indique que « la faute est souvent des deux côtés ».

The Delegation of **Colombia** regretted that some of the experts who undertake evaluation missions do not speak the language of the country concerned and requested to invite experts from within the region. He also underlined that experts from LAC region were not well represented among evaluators.

The Delegation of **Mexico** declared that some reports included impartialities and disqualifications of the State Parties' reports and this attitude could damage the sense of confidence.

La Délégation de la **France** appelle à une plus grande transparence dans le choix des experts par le Centre du patrimoine mondial [*sic*].

The Delegation of **Estonia** paid tribute to the role and work delivered by the Advisory Bodies.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appelle à une réflexion sur les méthodes, moyens et programmes, surtout à la lumière de la situation actuelle dans laquelle se trouve l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that more transparency could result in more credibility.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported India. It mentioned that some difficulties concern natural sites.

The **Chairperson** summarized that there were two possibilities: establish a working group which would work after the 36th session or to include recommendations in the Decision 36 COM 12C.

The Director-General of **ICCROM** thanked the Russian Federation for the great hospitality in organizing this event. He hoped to be able to repay the kindness of Russian Federation with a visit to ICCROM in Rome sometime in the near future. He

stated that this was the first time that he had the opportunity to address this Committee since taking over as the Director-General of ICCROM in January 2012. He mentioned that all the States Parties know very well his predecessor Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, who remains a member of ICCROM Delegation, in the capacity of Special Advisor. He added that everyone was aware of Mounir's commitment, and indeed ICCROM's since the beginning of the Convention, to their role as Advisory Body to this Committee, and he pledged ICCROM's continued commitment to that role. He further mentioned that the ICCROM General Assembly had approved in November 2011 a new programme on using the World Heritage Convention to enhance conservation practices worldwide. He expressed his conviction that World Heritage should not be an end in itself, but rather a means for all to call a greater attention to the safeguarding of our common heritage. He further declared that the work of this Committee is of the utmost importance not just for the 936 properties on the List, but for the thousands of cultural and natural heritage sites in all countries of the world. He added that the report of ICOMOS in Document 5B laid out the work that ICCROM has carried out in the past year. He highlighted that ICCROM, in cooperation with the other Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, and with support from the Government of Switzerland, has developed a new capacity building programme for World Heritage, as referred in the report in Item 9B.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed concern about the state of conservation reports on natural sites.

IUCN underlined that its advisory role is defined in the Operational Guidelines. It also recalled that the point on the Upstream process shall be discussed later. It underlined that transparency is indeed important, and asked the Committee members to clarify specific points of their concern in this regard. It highlighted the importance of contributions of indigenous people, in particular from the point of view of the relationship between nature and culture.

The **Chairperson** suggested to the delegations which proposed amendments to finalize a revised Draft Decision during lunch time, and present it to the plenary at 3 p.m.

5A REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS ACTIVITIES AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE DECISIONS *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** turned to the examination of Draft Decision 5A.2 and noted that an additional paragraph was proposed by Germany.

The Rapporteur read out the amendments proposed to the Draft

After interventions of **Switzerland, Mexico, Serbia, Colombia** and **Malaysia**, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Secretariat** which clarified that actions can be implemented according to the decision of the General Assembly.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 5A.2** was adopted as amended.

Before the closure of the morning session, the Delegation of **Germany** announced its invitation to host the session of the World Heritage Committee in Berlin, Germany, in 2015.

The **Chairperson** requested that the candidature be submitted by official letter.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

FIRST DAY – Monday, 25 June 2012

SECOND MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES (*continuation*)

The **Chairperson** invited participants to resume their consideration of item 5B, and more specifically paragraph 7.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'une discussion a eu lieu mais que les délibérations n'étaient pas encore closes.

The **Chairperson** indicated that therefore this item remains open.

5C. WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/5C

Decision: **36 COM 5C**

The **Secretariat** presented a summary of progress made in the implementation of the Action Plan agreed in Paraty, where a first Meeting on this topic was held in 2010. It provided information on other developments relevant to the issue of sustainable development, including a description of the outcome of the Consultative Expert Meeting on World Heritage and Sustainable Development that had been requested by the Committee and which was organized in Ouro Preto, Brazil, with the generous support of the Brazilian Government.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to deliver a joint statement on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN.

The Advisory Bodies reported that they contributed to the initiatives undertaken on the theme of World Heritage and sustainable development throughout this year, building on the very principles of sustainable development and many discussions held in the previous years. They explained that they had participated in different expert meetings and workshops, such as the ones carried out in Brazil and South Africa and were actively contributing to the work being led by Japan to plan the final celebrations to mark the 40th anniversary of the Convention around the theme of sustainable development and the role of local communities. At its 17th General Assembly, ICOMOS reported having adopted the Paris Declaration on Heritage as a driver of development. This declaration examines the relationship between heritage and development and provides recommendations to the heritage community, including States Parties, local authorities, heritage agencies and practitioners, to promote development processes that incorporate tangible and intangible cultural heritage as vital aspect of sustainability. IUCN has been for many years at the forefront of the global debate on sustainable development and the conservation of the world's natural heritage. ICCROM, in developing the World Heritage Capacity

Building Strategy, has included sustainable development as a key element and has come up with various action points. For the first time, ICCROM developed and implemented a week long module on World Heritage and sustainable development with funding support from the World Heritage Fund and this is now available as a module to be used for those interested. The Advisory Bodies considered that in the context of World Heritage, a fundamental principle is that sustainable development is not to be seen as an alternative to the conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value, but rather as a means to further build on our overarching mandate. A participatory and integrated approach is necessary in order to find the best available options and increase the support of and benefits to local communities arising from preservation. In this regard, we need hardly to emphasise the need for capacity building. The Advisory Bodies informed that they will be pleased to take part in the working group to develop a policy of integrating sustainable development into the processes of the World Heritage Convention, keeping in mind that the basis for its work should be safeguarding the OUV of World Heritage properties.

The **Chairperson** asked the participants if there were any comments on item 5C.

The Delegation of **Japan** encouraged moving from theory to practice, and highlighted the experience gained in Japan in doing so. It announced an expert meeting in Toyama, which will look into capacity building on this issue and that it would report back on results at the Kyoto 40th anniversary meeting in November this year.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the Committee that a lot of thought had already been given to the theme of sustainable development and commended the work of the the drafters of the recommendations of the Ouro Preto meeting in Brazil, noting that their expert had also participated. The Delegation underlined that further work was needed, especially concerning the practical implementation of these concepts. In particular the Delegation stressed the further need to work on integrated plans for sustainability in the management of World Heritage properties. The Delegation also expressed the wish to raise a point concerning paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, but proposed to address this at the time of the discussion of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** agreed that it would be more adequate to address it at that time.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its conviction on the pertinence of UNESCO to make a contribution to the issue, explaining that the organization was well placed to engage member states, the private sector and civil society over this issue. It added that despite the current economic crisis, UNESCO had a responsibility to undertake its mandate – as it represented the consciousness and the memory of mankind. For this reason, the Russian Federation considered that the aims of the World Heritage Convention and sustainable development went hand in hand. It noted that it was essential to safeguard and preserve natural areas and that the human factor in all aspects of the Convention needed to be taken into consideration. The Russian Federation explained that it had long standing experience in matters of sustainable development.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note qu'elle avait récemment organisé une réflexion sur le développement durable et explique que le concept a une signification différente dans des différentes communautés, et qu'il faudrait s'assurer à ce que le concept, tel qu'appliqué dans le cadre de la convention, soit traduisible à cet égard.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that it had also participated in the Ouro Preto

meeting. It stated that the Draft Decision didn't make reference to the mechanism that would be required to set up the working group nor were the costs associated with it identified. It added that this was a matter of concern. It suggested that these issues be further discussed.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** expressed hope that greater efforts could be implemented to bring the World Heritage and Sustainable Development strategy to fruition in the future. It added that culture and cultural heritage are essential components of the diversity of people, and a major concern these days for international cooperation, as they were important to help put an end to poverty and war, and to introduce peace and justice in the world. It continued saying that it was the responsibility of member states to support programmes to enforce this strategy. It noted that they had hosted a workshop on integrity, which had dealt with current concerns over this issue and hoped to run similar initiatives in the future. It concluded by thanking the government of Qatar for having funded the interpretation into Arabic at the Committee meeting.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** stated that it fully supported the messages of the meetings in Paraty and Ouro Preto. It further stated that sustainable development policies cannot ignore conservation, adding that this point should further be integrated in the policy guidelines document. The Delegation assured the continued support of the State Party of Brazil in this process and informed the Committee that a brochure with the key messages of the Ouro Preto meeting would be distributed to all participants.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** underlined the importance to discuss the key theme of sustainable development for the future of the *World Heritage Convention* and the Sustainable Development Goals which will be defined following the Rio+20 Conference. The Observer Delegation suggested that thought should be given to the concept of sustainable conservation and how to make it operational in the Convention. The Delegation strongly welcomed the establishment of a working group on this subject.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the Draft Decision and noted the amendment to paragraph 5 from the Delegation of **Germany** to add the term "a proposal for a policy".

The Draft Decision **36 COM 5C** was adopted as amended.

5D. REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE THEMATIC PROGRAMMES

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/5D

Decision: **36 COM 5D**

The Secretariat presented document 5D and recalled that the document on the thematic programmes reports on the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme, concluding its first regional phase focusing on Africa and the Arab States and reaching out to other regions in the world; the World Heritage Cities Programme with the highlight of the adoption on 10 November 2011 UNESCO's General Conference of the new Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape emerging from World Heritage Committee discussions; the World Heritage Forests Programme, among the highlights the 2011 International Year of Forests; the Small Island Developing States Programme, with a focus on capacity building including through a

project “Capacity Building to Support the Conservation of World Heritage Sites and Enhance Sustainable Development of Local Communities in Small Island Developing States (SIDS)”); the World Heritage Marine Programme with various activities in line with the 5 Cs and also supported by the Government of Flanders; World Heritage Thematic Programme Human Evolution: Adaptations, Dispersals and Social Developments (HEADS), with a great variety of different activities involving the scientific community globally and several publications and, the initiative Astronomy and World Heritage, adopted in 2005 with a side event at the Pulkovo observatory in the evening of 28 June at this session. The Secretariat highlighted that these programmes were quite successful in their implementation and produced a number of results including the most recent publications of the World Heritage paper series numbers 28 to 30.

The Chairperson asked if there were comments or questions from the Committee Members on the thematic programmes.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the World Heritage Centre on the training workshop in Vizcaino and the Gulf of California in 2011 as part of the marine programme. It noted that the training had had as an objective to lay the foundations for a system to improve the management and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of these properties. It called on the Secretariat to report on the contents of the thematic programmes it ran.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** reminded the Committee about the side event at the Observatory later in the week, and informed the participants that the presentation would focus on the achievement of the World Heritage astronomy programme initiatives. It explained that many countries had indicated an interest in the event.

The Delegation of **India** commended the Advisory Body IUCN on their work on a wide range of themes including the marine programme and recalled the successful collaboration with the State Party of Germany and IUCN during over the past year.

The Delegation of **Germany** highlighted the importance of the World Heritage Marine Programme in view of the fact that 80% of the States Parties are coastal states and in particular referring to the SIDS countries. The Delegation described the collaboration of the World Heritage Marine Programme with the German Academy for Nature Conservation from the island of Vilm and explained how representatives from ten marine World Heritage sites had participated in a workshop there in May 2012.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted with appreciation the support of international donors in the thematic programmes and welcomed the involvement of the local communities in particular in the Marine World Heritage and Earthen Architecture. The Delegation called for more focus on sustainable development to ensure the wise use of resources.

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

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** conveyed its amendment expressing its wishes to change the title of the thematic initiative, as “Astronomy, Space Technology and World Heritage Thematic Programme” and asked for support from the members of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Mali** explique que l’important c’était le contenu du programme.

The Delegations of **Switzerland** and **Colombia** endorsed the Delegation of Mali's comments.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained that including the words "space technology" represented only a minor change in the title of the programme, and incurred no financial costs but would help highlight the measures taken by other countries in taking forward space heritage as important part of the *Convention's* work.

ICOMOS clarified that the thematic studies undertaken by ICOMOS touches upon a wide range of topics including space technology and therefore the additional specification may not be necessary.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** invited all participants at the World Heritage Committee meeting to the astronomy side event at the Pulkovo Observatory so that they could have a better understanding of the point they were trying to make.

Chairperson noted that there seems to be no support to the amendment the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 5D** was adopted.

5E. WORLD HERITAGE TOURISM PROGRAMME

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/5E

Decision: **36 COM 5E**

The Secretariat reported on the work undertaken to develop the World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme in response to the Decision 34 COM 5F.2 of the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session in Brasilia in 2010. The Steering Group comprised of States Parties representatives from the six UNESCO Electoral Groups (Germany (I), Slovenia (II), Argentina (III), China (IV), Tanzania (Va), and Lebanon (Vb)), the Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies (IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM), the United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) and the Swiss Government as the donor agency. The programme development process was enriched by an outreach to representatives from the main stakeholder groups including the tourism sector, national and local governments, property managers/coordinators and local communities. The programme was further developed at an Expert Meeting in Sils/Engadine, Switzerland October 2011. The Secretariat took this opportunity to thank the members of the Steering Group and particularly the Government of Switzerland for their support to this important process and underlined that the Programme will also demonstrate that the implementation of *World Heritage Convention* can be an accelerator for sustainable development at the local and national levels for the simple reason that World Heritage Sites create jobs, highlighting that in this context UNESCO's work can be considered as not only cultural, but also economic. The Secretariat outlined the key features which have emerged from an extensive consultative process including a focus on early intervention, strengthening the enabling environment, co-operation and partnership with the tourism sector, taking a destination approach to tourism management, promoting capacity development for site management and local communities. The Secretariat also highlighted the need to further refine the actions and set priorities and during this process the guidance of the States Parties and other stakeholders will be sought.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Body ICOMOS to give a joint statement on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies.

On behalf of the three Advisory Bodies, **ICOMOS** explained how they had actively participated on the definition and subsequent development of policy orientations for the World Heritage Tourism Programme. They stressed that adequate planning for and implementing sustainable tourism practices played a critical role in sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. ICOMOS added that aligning strategies and processes was essential so as to ensure their conservation while effectively harnessing opportunities to contribute to development goals and benefit communities. It further noted that the continuation of this programme will further advance the development of a strategic framework for conservation and tourism which in turn would serve to inform decision-making and formulation of policies at national and local levels. ICOMOS indicated that the Advisory Bodies looked forward to continuing their involvement and support in this thematic programme. Finally, ICOMOS noted that its International Committee on Cultural Tourism had incorporated a destination approach as the over-arching theme for its triennial research programme 2011-2014.

The Chairperson invited the participants to consider the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its appreciation for the sustainable tourism programme and particularly commended the inclusion of sustainable tourism indicators into the Periodic Reporting questionnaire. The Delegation highlighted that this programme would support the integration of planning and management for responsible tourism in World Heritage properties, to move it away from an ad hoc issue as it has often been in the past.

The Delegation of **Germany** informed the Committee that Germany has been part of the Steering Group which accompanied the process of development of the programme and expressed appreciation of the way it had been developed, the consultative and participatory process involving States Parties, experts and the tourism industry as a main stakeholder to achieve implementation of sustainable tourism properties worldwide. The Delegation recalled the joint efforts in the context of the Wadden Sea World Heritage property (Germany/the Netherlands) which had shown that attracting additional funding for this important issue is possible. The Delegation also announced that the German Commission for UNESCO had reaffirmed in a Declaration on the occasion of the 40th anniversary (Stralsund, June 2012) the need to sustainably develop tourism in World Heritage sites in order to ensure their long-term protection.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated its appreciation of the tourism programme and endorsed its action plan. It assured the Committee that the programme expanded knowledge and would welcome the launch of the programme at the 40th anniversary celebrations in Kyoto in November.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** expressed appreciation for the preparation of the programme and highlighted that it comes at a timely moment to establish further partnerships to fill the gaps between heritage and tourism. The Delegation further explained that many States Parties seemed to suffer from perceived strict conservation policies and thus considered this programme a turning point to assist these States Parties.

The Delegation of **India** endorsed the view of the Delegations of **Estonia** and the

United Arab Emirates that the present report is one of the most excellent ones. The Delegation highlighted this revolutionary decision which opens the way for an alliance of conservation, protection and the promotion of tourism and noted that there is a need to integrate tourism programmes in development policies. The representative emphasized the multi-stakeholder approach which includes communities and commended the work on the draft action plan.

The Delegation of **Mexico** noted that a report delivered on 9 February 2012 by the World Heritage Centre indicated that the Centre had been in touch with the Mexican Tourism promoter in New York to explore future opportunities for cooperation. In the meeting, a number of issues were discussed, specifically the “Protecting Places” initiative, aimed at the private sector, providing them with guidelines on the preservation of World Heritage sites. UNESCO had expressed its wish that the Mexican centre for promotion of tourism be part of the campaign started this year. In light of this, and in the context of the 40th anniversary celebration, the Delegation indicated that it was organizing an important event in Queretaro dealing with World Heritage, culture and development which would include the participation of stakeholders throughout the Latin American and Caribbean region.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** explique que le travail en ce qui concerne le tourisme et le patrimoine mondial est à son début – et que dans ce cadre, le délégué lance un appel à la participation de tous les membres intéressés de participer dans le programme, plus spécifiquement au niveau de participation financière.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stated that the World Heritage and Tourism Programme was an essential project, and indicated its support for it. It further agreed with the Delegation of Switzerland that this was only the beginning of a larger effort.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** expressed appreciation for the report which moves into the right direction. The Delegation also highlighted the convergence of this programme with the sustainable development initiative and expressed full support to the programme.

The representative of an NGO for indigenous peoples in the Russian Federation informed that they share the concerns of the Committee. The representative stated that memory and consciousness it reflected in the sacred lands, however a proper regulatory framework for the management of sacred land does currently not exist and encouraged the Committee participants to adopt it in their agenda.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 5E** was adopted.

ITEM 6 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE RELATED CATEGORY 2 CENTRES

Document: *WHC-12/36.COM/6*

Decision: **36 COM 6**

The Secretariat presented document 6 and further reported that the process of integration of all Category 2 Centres is proceeding well, with a lot of interaction and synergies, especially among Centres with a regional focus and those that work on specific themes. The improvement of the reporting and communication system of the Category 2 Centre is being undertaken and the webpage created by the World Heritage Centre will serve as a cooperation platform among the various Centres. An

information brochure was prepared by the African World Heritage Foundation, supported by the Nordic World Heritage Fund, was also distributed to the members of the Committee.

The Secretariat stated that with time, the Category 2 Centres will be able to develop all their potential to contribute to the implementation of the Convention in all regions of the world. In particular, they will be able to play a major role in the context of the Periodic Exercises and of the implementation of the Strategy for Capacity Building, adopted last year by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Bodies ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN for comments on this item.

ICCROM welcomed the report on the UNESCO Category 2 Centres related to World Heritage and recalled its fruitful cooperation with these institutions, which includes carrying out joint training courses, providing strategic advice, and participating in the meetings of their advisory boards. ICCROM particularly noted the biennial courses that are carried out in partnership with the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and Pacific Region in China, and courses that have taken place at the Zacatecas Centre in Mexico, and in Bahrain, as well as participation in initiatives of the Africa World Heritage Fund.

ICCROM looked forward to continuing its work with these important institutions, and in particular to working with them to improve institutional, professional, and community capacity for the better safeguarding of World Heritage properties, through the development of courses and resource materials, in line with World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy.

ICOMOS stated that Category 2 Centres represent a unique opportunity to directly collaborate and coordinate activities at the regional and national levels to strengthen the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and its statutory processes. ICOMOS reported that it had been actively involved with the work of Category 2 Centres, particularly those in Latin America. ICOMOS looked forward to continue to lend support, through its Scientific and National Committees and their broad network of professionals, to specific activities to be implemented, including capacity building, training workshops and research, among others.

IUCN welcomed the progress made in establishing Category 2 centres, and indicated that it had established useful reference libraries all over the world that could provide additional support to these institutions. It further noted that IUCN had identified contact points in each region so that cooperation with these centres can be re-enforced. IUCN envisaged strengthening the capacity of Category 2 Centres and particularly to assist them in developing action plans and projects.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted progress of Category II Centres. The State Party noted these centres can contribute to the global strategy implementation and assist States Parties with new nominations. South Africa strongly suggested that other States Parties continue to support these Category II Centres. One of these centres is located in South Africa and sees first hand the benefit of them.

The Delegation of **Mexico** welcomed efforts of the International Centre for Economics of Culture Category 2 Centre. The Delegation welcomed work undertaken by ICCROM and initiatives on the integration of risk strategy. The Delegation thanked

the Secretariat for its invaluable support on Periodic Reporting that was conducted with the help of the Category 2 Centre.

La Délégation du **Mali** remercie le Secrétariat pour la qualité du rapport et demande pourquoi CHDA (Center For Heritage Development in Africa) et l'Ecole du patrimoine africain (EPA) ne sont pas reconnus comme centres de catégorie 2 alors qu'ils jouent le même rôle que le centre établi en Italie, i.e. former les cadres, etc....

The Secretariat points out that Category 2 Centres are institutions owned and managed by States Parties. States Parties need to propose them as Category 2 Centre and to put forward requests for feasibility studies to UNESCO. No comprehensive proposal has been received in this regard.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, tout en souhaitant que l'on fasse état d'actions pertinentes pour les apprécier par rapport aux objectifs et à la mission du patrimoine mondial, soutient le rapport dans sa globalité.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que les activités de ces huit Centres ne sont pas toutes reflétées dans le document, mais que ce dernier fournit le lien du site web pour pouvoir les consulter.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** thanks the Russian Federation for the warm welcome. The State Party appreciates the Category 2 Centre and welcomes the support of the Nordic World Heritage Fund and the African World Heritage Fund and the Advisory Bodies. The State Party understands that Africa has more Category 2 Centres than those presented by the Secretariat. It is important to make it clear to States Parties what needs to be done to ensure the Category 2 Centres. Does the whole continent apply or only specific States Parties? The delegation further notes that for the African continent, there should be avoidance of overdependence on external capacity. There is a need to work more with African institutions in the implementation of Category 2 Centres and notes it is important that the Committee recognizes a good balance and ensures that the regional capacity is integrated in the Category II Centre. There is a need to carefully understand the needs of each of the regions. Africa continent should strengthen its Category 2 Centres, particularly with regional expertise.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) remercie le Secrétariat pour le rapport et le projet de décision, en notant que le paragraphe 5 du projet de décision reprend l'intégralité d'une recommandation faite lors de l'atelier à Bahreïn en 2010. La Délégation souligne que d'autres points/recommandations pourraient être repris, ainsi que l'utilité d'avoir un format standard lors de l'établissement des rapports.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 6** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 6 of the Agenda.

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

7C REFLECTION ON THE TRENDS OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/7C

Decision: **36 COM 7C**

The **Secretariat** provided an overview of the document WHC-12/36.COM/7C with PowerPoint slide presentation. It presented progress achieved with regards to Decisions **35 COM 7C** and **35 COM 12E**, especially on the expert meeting on the global state of conservation of World Heritage (Dakar, Senegal, April 2011). It highlighted some statistics about the main factors negatively impacting on World Heritage properties and on a number of recurrent conservation issues. The Secretariat also informed the Committee members about the significant financial assistance received from the Flemish Government for the establishment of a comprehensive online Information System on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and that the first data would be available by November 2012. Finally, the Secretariat presented specific issues on the state of conservation of some properties, which were received and analyzed after the deadline.

IUCN indicated that oil and gas exploration is a growing conservation issue, among others. IUCN is preparing advice notes for an oil and gas exploration policy note to the World Heritage Committee as requested at the 34th and 35th sessions of the Committee as information is lacking for a great number of sites. Information system is needed to mobilize support. IUCN also refers to the NGO Forum, which took place on 22-23 June 2012 in St Petersburg.

ICOMOS indicated that States Parties have many conservation challenges. Disastrous events, earthquakes, lack of adequate management, and other problems are increasing and long term sustainable solutions are crucial. Conflict is also a key challenge to conservation and custom solutions are required. World Heritage is a source of national pride, the recovery of places in conflict required attention. In infrastructure development, including those such as wind farms, the Advisory Body notes that these issues can have a detrimental effect on the World Heritage property, despite the contribution to their green economy. The attributes of the OUV need to be clearly set out for each property and the finalization of the SOUV will be an important assistance to site managers for the conservation of their site. The need for long-term strengthening of capacity among site managers and communities is essential. The Advisory Body ICOMOS is ready to provide support in tackling these challenges and notes that some of the challenges come suddenly and without warning.

The **Rapporteur** noted one amendment from South Africa that concerns the current conservation issues.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'UNESCO pour son travail et souligne que ces questions sont importantes du fait que 40% des sites en péril proviennent des Etats africains. La Délégation, indiquant que le continent africain est sous-aménagé, préconise une attitude préventive et pose la question de l'impact sur la VUE de chaque site.

The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the document presented and indicates the importance of the document for the future national policies in the field of conservation. The Delegation asks for a clarification on point 12, particularly why the Secretariat included the information in this point.

The **Secretariat** indicated that a section is included in this report that reflects on conservation challenges for specific sites that were not subject to a State of Conservation reporting in document 7B.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** expressed its concern over the categories used in the report for which it is not clear how they impact on the OUV. For buildings and development for example, it is not clear what the impacts on the OUV of the property are. It asked the Secretariat to improve the categories used in the report and be more detailed on how these categories affect the OUV. The State Party further indicates that the Draft Decision makes reference to the report without it being available.

The **Secretariat** clarified that it used the same categories as the Periodic Reporting. The **Chairperson** invites IUCN for further clarification.

IUCN indicated that the report was an independent work and suggests rephrasing the Draft Decision to the preparatory phase for the report which might be more appropriate.

The Delegation of **Serbia** requested clarification about the need to increase dialogue since there is already a quite a lot of discussion ongoing.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the World Heritage Committee decided to increase dialogue and notes it receives information from the States Parties often very late and would like to improve the situation to ensure more transparency. The Secretariat wanted to improve dialogue with the States Parties to improve the transparency on this item. It further noted that the document is only a brief overview, and a snapshot of the many letters the Secretariats receives on a wide variety of issues (Reference made to paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande s'il ne faudrait pas approfondir la notion d'extension des zones-tampon et considère qu'il est nécessaire de l'étudier dans le cadre de la revue des *Orientations*, en réfléchissant à une notion plus vaste.

The **Secretariat** indicated the importance of buffer zones and notes that not everywhere buffer zones are needed in the same way. Reference is made to the Buffer Zone expert meeting held in Davos in 2008. The report was presented to the World Heritage Committee which decided to have more reflection on the recommendations made at the time. It is indicated that the World Heritage Committee can reflect on this issue in the *Operational Guidelines* working group and make proposals for modifications.

The Delegation of **India** noted the information received from third parties was shared at the same time with others, including the Advisory Bodies and asked whether it would not be a better idea to carry out a credibility check before the information is shared.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie la remarque pertinente de la Délégation de l'Inde.

IUCN indicated that it does undertake a credibility check on the issues being raised. The Secretariat and IUCN did a first check to see whether the information was worth to pursue. This process was what the IUCN tries to improve and become more part of.

The Delegation of **India** noted that in times of financial distress, it would be easier if the Secretariat just simply wrote to the State Party.

The **Secretariat** indicated that this procedure was being followed. According to paragraphs 174 and 175 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Secretariat waits for the reply of the State Party before sending it to the Advisory Bodies.

The Observer Delegation of **Yemen** thanks the Russian Federation and Qatar for the Arabic translation. The Delegation endorses the proposal of India.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** supported comments for the need of greater clarification of conservation issues as categorized in the report, especially on notes such as « social/cultural uses of heritage is related to tourism, etc ». It is essential to be very clear what the categories refer to (like tourism, wind farms) and what the linkages are between the Sustainable Development Goals that emerge from Rio+20 and the need for World Heritage to be consistent with those and its mission. There needs to be an obvious link between sustainable development and OUV and the threat categories indicated.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** supported the proposal made by India: the credibility check can ensure the historical background is added.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that tourism is a multi-disciplinary activity and thus multi-level type of threat and can have many impacts arising from a variety of aspects related to tourism, and thus cannot be isolated as such.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** recognized the fantastic work of the report. It notes that 40% of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger in Africa are unacceptable. There is something wrong surely considering that much work is being done in the continent. Africa faces some real challenges and there is really need to tackle them while recognizing the partners that assist and help the African countries. Traditionally management systems should be recognized more fully. There is a need to work better with partners in the context of conflict and to take a more positive attitude to dialogue. There is also a danger that the States Parties to the Convention would become divided along the North/South lines.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie les Etats Parties qui ont contribué, comme l'Afrique du Sud, ainsi que le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain et UICN. La Délégation souligne la nécessité de revoir les Orientations, ainsi que la possibilité de travailler également avec d'autres institutions telles que le Bouclier Bleu et ICOM. La Délégation rappelle l'autorité des Etats Parties signataires de la Convention à décider et que le dialogue prévaut sur le jugement. La question du développement doit être abordée au cas par cas pour ne pas diviser le nord et le sud.

The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** wanted to support what Kenya said. It noted that decisions often require a report the following year while often the information is not yet available or the research has not been completed on the issue. The time schedule needs to be revised so that the reporting can be done with longer time frames, like for example 2, 3 years to allow the information to be assembled.

The Observer of **Greenpeace** noted that there are problems within NGO's. The problem is information access. Monitoring mission reports, for example, are not provided in time. There is a need for more public participation. The Secretariat does often not have sufficient information but this can be compensated significantly by NGO's. Issues such as World Heritage in areas beyond national jurisdiction, for example, should be considered by the Secretariat. Greenpeace, by citing the example of the Baikal Lake, is surprised that many other conservation issues are not

included in the Draft Decision and hopes that the Convention can take more into account the knowledge available at NGOs. Greenpeace is ready to provide this level of support.

The **Rapporteur** noted that two amendment proposals were received that refer to recurring conservation issues.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** explique que l'on ne peut « accueillir avec satisfaction » un rapport que l'on n'a pas encore vu.

The Delegation of **South Africa** clarified its amendment and indicated that the report should be distributed to all stakeholders for input so that all of them can be held accountable for the challenges faced in the future.

The Delegation of **India** recognized the point and noted that the Secretariat should just put the document on their website.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** demande de trouver un moyen pour diffuser.

The Delegation of **Serbia** asked for clarification on the note on independent study indicating there is already a lot of independent dialogue ongoing.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est d'accord avec l'Inde et demande que le texte original de l'amendement, soumis en français, soit la base pour les changements en cours. La Délégation différencie « faire connaître » de « distribuer ».

The Delegation of **South Africa** agreed with the suggestion made by Switzerland.

La Délégation du Mali préconise de simplifier la proposition de la Suisse en s'arrêtant (dans le texte) à « procéder à leur diffusion ».

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7C** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 7 pm.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 26 June 2012

THIRD MEETING

10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

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

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/7A
WHC-12/36.COM/7A.Add
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.7A

Decisions: **36 COM 7A.1 to 7A.36**

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 7A of the Agenda indicating that according to Paragraph 190 of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Committee “*shall review annually the state of conservation of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.*”

She recalled that, at its 35th session, the Committee adopted Decision **35 COM 12B**, by which, as stated in its paragraph 10 decided to default to a minimum two-year cycle for the discussion of the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, except for cases of utmost urgency.

The Chairperson indicated that, in response to Document WHC-12/36.COM/INF.7, some Committee members requested to discuss a number of state of conservation reports which were initially submitted for adoption without discussion. She underlined that, for the first time, the Committee will not discuss all the reports on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Furthermore, she asked the Committee members who have requested some state of conservation reports to be opened for discussion to take the floor and explain the reason why they felt it important to discuss the report.

Finally, the Chairperson informed the Committee that this year it has been decided to start the presentation and discussion of items 7A and 7B with **cultural properties** in the following order of regions:

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

After the examination of **cultural** properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee shall proceed with the examination of **mixed and natural properties**, in the **same** presentation order of regions that it was outlined for the cultural properties.

The **Chairperson** proceeded by remarking that 66% of the state of conservation reports had been received after the deadline of 1 February, while some had not been in one of the two working languages of the World Heritage Convention (English or French), which complicated matters considerably for the Secretariat and she requested the States Parties to comply with the rules and regulations in this regard, rules 22.5, 22.6 and 22.7.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)

The **Chairperson** informed the Members of the World Heritage Committee that the Delegation of Georgia had just arrived and that the suggestion was put forward to postpone the discussion of this property to the end of session 7A to allow for consultation with the Committee. This proposal was approved.

Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis)

The **Chairperson** requested the Secretariat to present the state of conservation report of this property.

The **Secretariat** informed the World Heritage Committee that no new information had been received after the state of conservation report had been made available on 1 June 2012.

The **Chairperson** informed that an amendment had been received from the Delegation of India to adjourn the discussion of this item of the Agenda and requested the Delegation to explain its request.

The Delegation of **India** explained that since the World Heritage Committee meeting in Quebec (2008) the World Heritage Committee had found it preferable to adjourn the discussion on the proposed Draft Decision, since it touches upon issues, which are, in a certain manner, outside of the core remit of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** enquired whether the Draft Decision should be read out or put on the screen, after which the Delegation of **Germany** requested the Rapporteur to read out the Draft Decision while mentioning that it seconded India's request to adjourn the debate.

The **Rapporteur** read out the Draft Decision: "the World Heritage Committee decides to adjourn the debate on this Agenda item to its next ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee".

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.32** was adopted as amended.

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C708)

The **Chairperson** requested the Members of the World Heritage Committee to take note of the state of conservation report for this property and to adopt the Draft Decision without any further discussion.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.31** was adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

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

Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178) - 36 COM 7A.33
Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366) -36 COM 7A.34
Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (C 658) -36 COM 7A.35

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

AFRICA

Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'état de conservation de ce bien, inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril depuis 2010. Il informe des progrès dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives identifiées par le Comité suite à l'incendie qui a ravagé, en mars 2010, le bâtiment Muzibu-Azaala-Mpanga, abritant les tombes de quatre rois du Buganda. Un projet de recherche sur les pratiques traditionnelles de construction des tombes royales a été lancé par l'Etat partie pour permettre de documenter l'ensemble des pratiques de construction et les liens étroits qu'elles ont avec les aspects immatériels. La préparation du chantier de reconstruction est également bien avancée. En outre, les travaux de reconstruction ont été lancés sur les tombes plus anciennes de Wamala. Cette démarche est aussi entreprise dans le cadre du projet d'appui à la reconstruction soutenu par le gouvernement du Japon, qui s'assurera de la mise en place d'une stratégie durable de gestion des risques, et de la réalisation, avec l'appui des experts japonais, d'un programme de recherche sur les

toitures végétales des tombes royales du Buganda. Le Secrétariat informe le Comité qu'un accord officiel sur le financement de la reconstruction a été signé le 16 juin dernier entre le gouvernement et les autorités traditionnelles du Buganda, prévoyant la mise à disposition d'un montant de près de 1 million de dollars EU en faveur de la reconstruction.

ICOMOS commended the State Party on the reconstruction strategy and the support it had received from the Local Government as well as from the Government of Japan in the rebuilding efforts. It continued by outlining the remaining challenges, such as achieving a proper balance between the tangible and intangible components of the property, the definition of a capacity-building strategy, the integration of revised tools for landscape management and a strategy for disaster risk preparedness, among others. However, the progress made thus far illustrated the effectiveness of the tool of Danger Listing. ICOMOS remained committed to supporting the State Party in its efforts.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne l'attachement de la France à ce bien auquel elle a apporté de l'expertise après l'incident. Elle reconnaît que de progrès importants ont déjà été faits. Maintenir le bien sur la Liste en péril semble nécessaire tant que le plan de réhabilitation du site n'a pas été complètement mis en œuvre.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party, the local communities and the Government of Japan for their combined efforts, as acknowledged by ICOMOS, including the raising of funds and the establishment of a training programme, and it stated that the progress made so far would merit removing the property from the Danger List.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime que les progrès faits démontrent l'utilité et efficacité de la Liste en péril ; elle remercie l'Etat partie pour les efforts entrepris, ainsi que les autres Etats parties d'avoir apporté de l'aide et de l'expertise au site. Le retrait de ce site de la Liste en péril deviendra possible quand toutes les autres conditions seront réunies. Elle appuie le projet de Décision tel que proposé.

The Delegation of **Germany** referred to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010) where the State Party informed of the disaster that had happened at the site, and that it was moved now to see all the joint efforts undertaken and the progress made, including the special training programme. However, the Delegation also stated that the work was not finished yet and therefore the property should remain on Danger List to sustain all the efforts.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie tous ceux qui ont aidé l'Ouganda à faire face à la restauration de ce site. Elle suggère au Centre et à ICOMOS de considérer ce malheureux événement en tant qu'exemple et de mettre en place des systèmes efficaces de prévention des risques. Nombre de paysages culturels africains peuvent rencontrer ce problème, d'où l'intérêt de développer une stratégie de prévention de tels risques.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the combined efforts for reconstruction and seconded the previous remarks made by the Committee Members, as well as the efficiency of the tool of Danger Listing, and it agreed maintaining the property on the Danger List until the rebuilding had been completed.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.18** was adopted.

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

Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 144) - 36 COM 7A.19

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

ARAB STATES

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)

The **Chairperson** informed that the examination of the state of conservation of this property was being postponed while consultations are going on.

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)

Le **Secrétariat** présente le rapport sur l'état de conservation de ce bien et rappelle les 2 missions de suivi réactif de 2005 et 2009 après son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en 2001. Depuis deux ans, l'Etat partie n'a pas transmis le rapport sur l'état de conservation demandé par le Comité, ce qui rend impossible d'évaluer l'avancement des mesures prises. Il présente au Comité de nouvelles informations alarmantes parvenues très récemment au Centre du patrimoine mondial, comportant des photos témoignant des travaux de reconstruction contraires aux principes internationaux de la restauration qui semblent avoir été entrepris. Il informe le Comité avoir immédiatement contacté les autorités égyptiennes au début de juin dernier, en demandant des détails sur ces travaux, mais qu'aucune réponse n'était encore parvenue.

ICOMOS expressed its concerns with regard to the state of conservation of the property and the apparent extensive interventions and reconstruction of this property and that no precise evaluation was possible as there had been no information, but it seemed apparent that the works were threatening the Outstanding Universal Value of this property. It concluded that updated information was needed to properly assess the impacts and that ICOMOS stood ready to assist in this regard.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its concern about the situation at the site. It recalled that the property was one of the great monuments of the Mediterranean Region and that further damage would be a great loss.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s'inquiète de ces nouvelles en proposant que l'Etat partie invite une mission de suivi réactif sur le site, afin que le Comité puisse en délibérer à sa prochaine session en 2013.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the Delegation of Switzerland and stated that further information was needed, while work on the property's management plan was continuing.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the recommendation made by ICOMOS, Switzerland and Germany, recalled the difficult situation in the country but that concrete results were needed to make an informed decision on this property.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la proposition suisse.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported Switzerland in calling for a reactive monitoring mission to the site.

The Delegation of **India** seconded the request for a reactive monitoring mission to the site as soon as possible.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** rappelle la notoriété de ce bien et estime qu'une explication de la part de l'Etat partie sur les travaux menés est nécessaire. Elle exprime son soutien à l'Egypte pour la restauration de ce site emblématique et demande des clarifications à l'Etat partie.

The Observer Delegation of **Egypt** explained that its Government was mindful of the issue and that experts had been selected to participate in this World Heritage Committee session, but had been delayed due to the internal situation in Egypt. The authorities have undertaken the lowering of the water table at the site and a wall is being constructed around the property. It concluded by stating that it would revert back to the World Heritage Committee and its Secretariat about the situation in order to ensure the proper conservation of the site and expressed the wish that cooperation be continued to protect the OUV of the property.

The **Chairperson** informed the Members of the World Heritage Committee that an amendment had been received calling for a reactive monitoring mission to the site and she asked the Rapporteur to read out the amendment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise avoir proposé un amendement dans lequel il est demandé à l'Etat partie d'inviter une mission conjointe de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS pour évaluer l'état de conservation du bien avant la 37ème session du Comité en 2013.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.20** was adopted as amended.

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

Ashur (Qal'at Shergat) (Iraq) (C 1130) - 36 COM 7A.21
Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 227 rev) - 36 COM 7A.22
Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611) - 36 COM 7A.24

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

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171)

The **Secretariat** recalled that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981 and on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2000, while in 2007 the World Heritage Committee adopted guidelines for the desired state of conservation for the

removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger by its **Decision 31 COM7A.24** adopted at Christchurch, New Zealand.

The Secretariat further informed that current report of the State Party was received on 30 April 2012 in conjunction with a reactive monitoring mission, which visited the property from 27 April to 1 May 2012, and that no additional information or new elements had been received after the preparation of the working document. It explained that during the reactive monitoring mission the following four main issues were discussed with the State Party:

- Corrective measures implemented in response to the decisions made by the World Heritage Committee in previous years;
- Current state of conservation of the property;
- Future actions necessary to guarantee the sustainable conservation and management of the property and its buffer zone in the long-term;
- Possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Based on the findings of the mission, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies considered that significant progress had been achieved by the State Party in the implementation of the corrective measures and therefore recommended the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Secretariat, however, together with ICOMOS and ICCROM, urged the State Party to formally submit to the World Heritage Centre a new proposal for the establishment of a buffer zone, for the approval by the World Heritage Committee.

ICOMOS commended the State Party for implementing the corrective measures as suggested by the World Heritage Committee. A mission to the site had ascertained the results. ICOMOS therefore approved the Draft Decision proposed.

La Délégation de la **France** se réjouit de voir un bien retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et félicite l'Etat partie pour ses efforts.

The Delegation of **Germany** commended the Government of Pakistan on the progress achieved, and that although capacity building was still needed it would support the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its appreciation for the removal of the property from the Danger List and stated that although there was still work to be done it would endorse the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** commended the State Party for all its efforts and supported removing the property from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **India** complimented and congratulated the Government of Pakistan on its achievements and stated its understanding of the challenges of working in historic cities.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se joint aux félicitations à l'Etat partie pour les efforts entrepris permettant le retrait du bien de la Liste en péril. Ceci représente encore un heureux exemple de l'utilité de cet instrument. Elle incite les membres du Comité de se rappeler de ce bon exemple lors de futures discussions.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** félicite l'Etat partie pour ses efforts et se joint aux autres membres du Comité pour appuyer le retrait de ce site de la Liste en péril.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated the Pakistani authorities for their longstanding work on the site.

The Delegation of **Mexico** endorsed the previous comments made by the Members of the World Heritage Committee, stating that it had to be considered as 'best practice' as it constituted a correct application of the World Heritage Convention. It also commended the work of the Advisory Bodies.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se réjouit de l'issue pour ce site et remercie l'Etat partie de ses efforts, tout en félicitant l'ICOMOS pour son rapport excellent.

The Delegation of **Thailand** congratulated the State Party for its efforts and ICOMOS for its state of conservation report.

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the Government of Pakistan as it had set an example for others to follow, after which it commended ICOMOS for the work done.

The Delegation of **Iraq** joined the other World Heritage Committee Members in their congratulations to the State Party, in its knowledge of the difficulties of working in sites inscribed on the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party for its efforts and expressed its satisfaction with the withdrawal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Serbie**, se réjouissant de cette situation, rappelle que ce sont des exemples à suivre dont tous les Etats parties doivent se féliciter. Elle félicite également l'ICOMOS pour son travail.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** expressed its great satisfaction with the progress made, as well as with the work done by ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'Etat partie pour ses efforts et l'ICOMOS pour son rapport très clair. Il s'agit d'un exemple de bonne pratique pour inspiration pour d'autres Etats qui ont des sites sur la Liste en péril.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its happiness for Pakistan.

The **Chairperson** joined the Members of the World Heritage Committee in congratulating the State Party of Pakistan with the removal of the property from the Danger List, and she thanked the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and the international community for their sustained efforts.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.28** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party of Pakistan to take the floor, however the Observer Delegation was not present in the room.

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C 722)

The **Secretariat** recalled that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1995 as a living Cultural Landscape and on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2001, while the corrective measures for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger were identified by the World Heritage Committee in July 2006, and further revised in 2010.

The Secretariat indicated that a report on the state of conservation of the property had been received from the State Party on 31 January 2012, providing detailed information on the significant progress that had been made towards achieving the desired state of conservation and the implementation of the corrective measures, including the recommendations of the March 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission. The Secretariat emphasized the need to develop an integrated tourism strategy and to address the control of tourism-related infrastructure development. It concluded that in view of this, the Draft Decision proposed that the World Heritage Committee remove this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS commended the State Party for its sustained efforts and welcomed the grass roots approach to the implementation of the corrective measures, and stated that it supported the proposal to remove the property from the Danger List. However, it continued by stating that, notwithstanding this success, the property remained vulnerable and that therefore considerable efforts and sustained resources remained needed. Several measures that need to be implemented in the short term are included in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS for their efforts, recalling that 28% of the property had been damaged previously and it stated in particular the work undertaken with local support groups.

The Delegation of **Estonia** welcomed a removal from the Danger List, but it stated its hope that the State Party would proceed with the establishment of a tourism development plan for the site.

The Delegation of **Mexico** expressed its satisfaction with the current situation of the property, praising in particular the element of sustainability by involving the local community which could be considered a case of 'best practice'.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** recalled the challenging situation on site in regard of its climate, with typhoons occurring, and it thanked the State Party and the Advisory Bodies for their sustained efforts over 10 years.

The Delegation of **Thailand** congratulated the State Party and considered this a case of 'best practice'

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime sa satisfaction quant au retrait de deux biens de la Liste en péril. Tout en remerciant l'Etat partie, elle l'invite à poursuivre les efforts nécessaires pour que ce succès soit durable.

La Délégation de l'**Allemagne**, s'exprimant également au nom de la Délégation de la **France**, souligne le rôle et l'importance des communautés locales dans ce site. Elle rappelle également que le tourisme est une ressource bien plus durable que les extractions minières.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite le pays et l'ICOMOS. Les actions de l'Etat partie sont d'autant plus méritoires que la position naturelle de ce site est particulièrement difficile. Elle incite l'Etat partie à impliquer les communautés locales dans la préservation du site.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated the State Party for its efforts and ICOMOS for its report, referring to the element of sustainability, and requested to keep up the efforts.

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated the difficult job that had been undertaken; it congratulated the State Party and recalled the assistance provided by the neighbouring countries.

The Delegation of **Iraq** called this case a special achievement and congratulated all who had contributed to its success.

La Délégation du **Mali** se joint aux autres Délégations pour remercier les Philippines pour le travail accompli, et félicite également l'ICOMOS et les communautés locales. Elle remarque que l'inscription sur la Liste en péril ne doit pas être comprise de façon négative, mais en tant qu'un repli pour mieux réagir ; néanmoins, elle souligne qu'un sentiment de joie est présent à chaque fois qu'un site sort de cette Liste.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** endorsed the comments made by previous speakers, thanked the Advisory Body and called for an on-going collaboration on the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the State Party and thanked the Advisory Bodies for their assistance, mentioning the difficulty of protecting natural sites when disasters happen.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remarque que c'est le deuxième site de la région Asie-Pacifique à être retiré de la Liste en péril et se félicite du succès de l'Etat partie. Elle encourage par ailleurs l'adoption d'une législation pour une meilleure prise en charge de la protection du site.

The **Chairperson** concluded by stating that there was a unanimous decision to remove the property from the Danger List.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.29** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party of the Philippines.

The Observer Delegation of **the Philippines** thanked the World Heritage Committee for its recognition of the strong commitments of the State Party. It recalled the harmonious relationship between the local communities and the natural environment that started 2000 years ago by the Ifugao people and the work that was undertaken in a spirit of collaboration. It expressed its appreciation to the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their assistance. This site, it continued, was a prime example of an evolving living landscape and the

2001 inscription on the Danger List awakened efforts by the national, international and local communities to implement the corrective measures through an extensive mobilisation of resources. It concluded by stating that the State Party realized that some of the challenges remained for which continued efforts would be needed and it extended a wish for continued support in this regard.

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

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev) - 36 COM 7A.25

Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev) - 36 COM 7A.26

Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1208 bis) - 36 COM 7A.27

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76) – 36 COM 7A.14

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

Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764)

The **Secretariat** recalled that the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger primarily due to the ongoing destruction of these ecologically important islands by tourism related resort development. In 2010, the World Heritage Committee learned of oil exploration concessions having been granted in many parts of the property. Though the State Party indicated in its 2012 report that it had temporarily suspended issuing of any new oil exploration licenses, existing licenses remain active. Under these circumstances, the Secretariat and IUCN consider that the property's integrity remains threatened and recommend that the property be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN supported the points raised by the Secretariat, and recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite a mission to the property, undertaken by IUCN, to assess the State of Conservation of the property as a whole, update the corrective measures and establish a timeframe for their implementation, and assist the State Party in developing the Desired State of Conservation for Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie les recommandations du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN invitant l'Etat Partie à recevoir une mission conjointe de suivi réactif.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.15** was adopted.

Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711)

The **Secretariat** and IUCN noted some progress on several issues raised at the time of inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The only infrastructure project that the State Party is likely to proceed is for an electrical utilities corridor which is projected to pass close to the property boundary, for which an assessment of its potential impacts on the property is recommended. Security has improved considerably, and the State Party reported that it can now function normally in the area. On the basis of this, the Secretariat and IUCN considered that the property remains under threat and that it should be maintained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN noted that the 2011 joint reactive monitoring mission, together with the State Party, updated the corrective measures and developed a Desired State of Conservation for Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN noted that the recent indigenous *Wounaan* settlement within the property is compatible with Colombian legislation and protected area policies and can also be justified according to the *Operational Guidelines*, provided that conservation objectives are not compromised. Clear negotiated natural resource use agreements are needed, and until these have been finalized and implemented, there is on-going concern over how this newly established community may affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value over time.

La Délégation de la **France** se réjouit des progrès faits et invite à poursuivre les efforts.

The Delegation of **India** was very encouraged by the progress made for the conservation of this property and commended Colombia for the work accomplished.

The Delegation of **Mexico** also congratulated the State Party for its commitment.

The **Chairperson** announced she would give the floor to Colombia and asked whether the Committee was ready to adopt the Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said that following the property's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the process was positive and fruitful and, to this extent, it wished to thank the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.16** was adopted.

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

The **Secretariat** and IUCN considered that the State Party had taken important steps in drawing the necessary political attention to dealing with the issues raised by the Committee and had successfully removed 73 illegal settlers in a peaceful manner along with 600 head of cattle. Land tenure regularization continued and a clear legal

process was identified through which indigenous lands were expected to be titled in the coming years. Though the State Party should be commended for its efforts and dealing with the issues raised by the Committee, the Secretariat and IUCN considered that significant progress remained to be made before the property's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN noted that the State Party provided a copy only in Spanish of the environmental impact assessment report of the Patuca III hydroelectric dam. IUCN noted that the information submitted was insufficient to draw a definite conclusion regarding the potential impacts from the dam on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and considers that the State Party should provide, in one of the two working languages of the Convention, information regarding the direct, indirect and long-term impacts of the dam on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. IUCN recommended that the Committee urge the State Party to pursue its efforts at redrawing the property's boundaries to reflect the increased size of the protected area, the new zonation, and the existing land uses, taking into account potential impacts from the Patuca III hydroelectric dam on areas that are considered for inclusion in the property.

The Delegation of **India** reminded that this was one of the first properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. It also said that the State Party did an extremely commendable work and noted that the World Heritage Centre affirmed that the dam would not cause harm to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The Delegation said that the Committee should be objective and change the proposed Draft Decision and, to this extent, it announced the proposal of amendments. It finished its intervention by saying that Spanish is an elegant language and that it could have been possible to accept and read without problem the information concerning the environmental impact assessment report.

The **Chairperson** reminded that, even though Spanish is an elegant language, the official languages of the *Convention* were English and French.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Observer Delegation of Honduras for the work achieved in implementing past decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the previous interventions made by the Delegation of India and Mexico and expressed the wish that the Draft Decision could have been amended to fully reflect the actual situation as presented.

The **Rapporteur** introduced the amendments submitted by the Delegation of India to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by **Estonia**, disagreed with the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the Secretariat to hear its opinion.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déclare de ne pas pouvoir accepter l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'**Inde** et invite à plus de souplesse.

The Delegation of **India** asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the Secretariat to further clarify and reminded that the Committee should be encouraging the State Party.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rejoint les positions de la Délégation de l'Inde et de la Délégation de Colombie.

The **Secretariat** explained that the project for the dam is 77 km away from the boundary of the property and that the Patuca river watershed did not overlap with the property.

IUCN declared that it was not in the position to firmly assess the impacts of the projected dam on the Outstanding Universal Value and that was the reason why the wording of the Draft Decision was left open. IUCN added that without a proper Environmental Assessment Impact it would be difficult to reach definitive conclusions.

The **Chairperson** noted that this explanation did not help the conclusion of the debate.

The Delegation of **India** asked for evidences and said that until such evidences were presented it would have been improper to do any kind of affirmation.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegation of India.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** note qu'il s'agit d'une question sémantique et propose un amendement pour refléter de façon plus claire la situation actuelle et prendre en compte les hésitations pour le futur exprimées par l'IUCN.

The Delegation of **Mexico** agreed with the Delegation of Switzerland affirming that there was a semantic issue and that it would be difficult to be fortune tellers. It therefore suggested to use the wording proposed by the Secretariat and IUCN in the original Draft Decision or to accept the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie la Délégation de la Suisse en déclarant qu'il est essentiel de faire une différence entre une analyse fondée sur un protocole scientifique et une simple observation.

The Delegation of **Germany** affirmed that it wouldn't be worrying if in the amended Draft Decision would appear the word "currently".

The Delegation of **Colombia** suggested the same wording proposed by the Delegation of Mexico which was in the same spirit of the one used by the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that the Environmental Assessment Impact was not assessed yet and therefore disagreed with the wording "will not" in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** observe qu'il faut garder simplement le présent de l'indicatif.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat whether the dam existed or not.

The **Secretariat** said that the dam did not exist yet.

The Delegation of **Mexico** explained that was the reason it would have preferred to keep the sentence "does not currently".

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed to use the wording of the Secretariat and of IUCN.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose de supprimer le paragraphe 4 étant donné que le barrage n'a pas encore vu le jour.

The **Chairperson** asked the Secretariat whether it received all the documentation.

The **Secretariat** answered that the Environmental Assessment Impact was submitted in December 2011 only in Spanish.

The Delegation of **Colombia** proposed to use the wording "does not pose a threat" in the text of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** supported the wording proposed by the Delegation of Colombia.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee what it wished to do considering that the dam did not exist yet.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose de garder le libellé initial du Secrétariat.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed to delete the word "affect".

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the version suggested by the Chairperson.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** affirme qu'il est prématuré de parler d'impacts concernant un barrage qui n'existe pas encore.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** soutient le Sénégal en proposant d'ajouter « projet » de barrage au texte de Décision pour résoudre la question.

The Delegation of **India** reminded the Committee members that they were broadcasted and it said that, in this case, there was a State Party that had done a lot of efforts. The Delegation hoped that the debate could be simplified, it proposed to use the wording "does not affect" and asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Honduras** said that, as noted by the Secretariat, this was a project and it affirmed that it provided the necessary documentation trying to meet all potential concerns. It ended its intervention by saying that no speculations should have been made and that the Committee should have been realistic and not pessimistic.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegations of India, Switzerland and Colombia to meet and propose a compromise for the text of the Draft Decision. Then she proposed to move on to the following property on the agenda.

AFRICA

Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475)

The **Secretariat** and IUCN noted that the State Party emphasized its commitment for the restoration of the site but noted the challenges in implementing the corrective measures due to the insecurity related to the presence of rebels of the Uganda Lord Resistance army and collateral effects of the Darfur conflict in Sudan. The Secretariat and IUCN reiterated the urgency to take decisive actions for the restoration of the site. They recalled that almost all flagship species and large mammals had disappeared from the property due to poaching. They considered that there still remained a very fragile potential for the regeneration of the Outstanding Universal Value based on the relict pockets of biodiversity and exchanges with neighboring zones. They considered that if the trends in the loss of wildlife in northern Central African Republic were not reversed quickly, the World Heritage Committee had to consider in the near future the removal of the property from the World Heritage List.

The Secretariat and IUCN considered the site should be maintained on the List of World Heritage List in Danger and that should be subject to Reinforced Monitoring.

IUCN considère que l'atelier proposé par la République centrafricaine dans sa demande d'assistance devrait être organisé afin d'élaborer un plan d'urgence à court terme pour restaurer les valeurs du bien au niveau des poches rélictuelles de biodiversité. La recherche de financement pour la mise en œuvre de ce plan d'urgence est un impératif car le bien est sur le point de perdre sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. L'IUCN est disposé à accompagner l'élaboration et la mise en œuvre de ce plan de réhabilitation du bien.

The Delegation of **India** said that it had no concerns over the analysis presented and the proposed Draft Decision. It explained that its concern was linked to the role of the Advisory Bodies noting that, when talking about rebels and civil unrests IUCN was going beyond its mandate.

La Délégation du **Mali** remarque qu'il est connu que les rebelles de la l'Armée de résistance du seigneur (LRA) sont bien de nationalité ougandaise.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked IUCN for the comprehensive report presented and, as mentioned by the Delegation of Mali, the Committee should support the proposed Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** said that the situation about the different threats to the Outstanding Universal Value was alarming. It hoped that the proposed workshop to deal with the protection of the property would take place soon.

La Délégation de la **France** s'inquiète de l'atteinte à la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien et salue le courage des experts de l'IUCN et donne plein appui à la recommandation.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la Délégation de la France.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that it proposed an amendment, using the standard text for similar cases.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to adopt the Draft Decision with the proposed amendment and asked the Rapporteur to read the paragraph amended.

The **Rapporteur** read the amended paragraph.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.1** was adopted.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63)

The **Secretariat** and IUCN noted that since the last session, the Democratic Republic of the Congo Government authorized the British based oil company SOCO to start an airborne magnetic and gravimetric survey as part of its oil exploration activities in block V and inside the property. The Director-General of UNESCO in a letter dated 17 April 2012 addressed to the President of Democratic Republic of the Congo, expressed her deepest concern about these decrees, which seem to be contrary to the Government's decision of March 2011 to suspend petroleum exploration pending completion of the strategic environmental assessment. In a letter dated 19 April, the Minister clarified that the survey will be carried out without physical incursion into the Park and that a decision on petroleum exploration will be taken based on the results of the strategic environmental assessment. The Secretariat and IUCN were also informed since the last session of the Committee that the French company TOTAL, in partnership with the South African company SacOil, acquired the exploration rights on block III, which also straddled the Park. The Secretariat and IUCN also wanted to point out that since the preparation of the working document violence had flared up again in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo between a group of recidivist rebels and the national army. The Secretariat and IUCN recommended retaining Virunga National Park on the List of World Heritage in Danger and maintaining the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism for this property.

IUCN noted that it was gravely concerned by the further degradation in Virunga National Park's conservation status, not only with respect to the security situation but also regarding active oil exploration within its boundaries. IUCN said that it recently received information that SOCO was authorized to establish a camp in the park, to operate boats on Lake Edward inside the park and to upgrade roads and airstrips in the park and even to take geological samples inside the park. IUCN indicated had written to both SOCO and Total to advise them that oil exploration and exploitation in Virunga seriously threatened the property's Outstanding Universal Value, and to also recommend that both companies do not undertake oil and gas developments within World Heritage properties, in line with the 'no-go' commitments of extractive industry leads such as Shell. IUCN noted that there were Non-Governmental Organizations observers present at the Committee meeting who managed conservation projects in Virunga, and that the Committee may wish to hear from them before taking a decision on this property.

The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the proposed Draft Decision and asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the Observer Delegation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo appealing it to stop the oil exploration activities reported by IUCN and the Secretariat.

Les Délégations du **Mali**, du **Sénégal**, de la **Colombie** et de la **Suisse** demandent de donner la parole à l'Etat partie en s'alarmant de la dégradation dangereuse de la situation.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** (Observateur) remercie la communauté internationale qui s'est mobilisée pour présenter ses inquiétudes et déclare qu'elle est très préoccupée de la dégradation de la situation due à la présence de bandits et rebelles et que ce problème est plus important que celui de l'exploration pétrolière. Elle informe qu'il s'agit de structures organisées militairement qui portent atteinte aux communautés riveraines et congolaises.

The Delegation of **Serbia** stressed that oil exploration was a big threat for the future of the site and therefore supported what IUCN and the Delegation of Germany have proposed and it asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the Non-Governmental Organizations who were working on the issues that are threatening the property.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie le texte proposé.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that the oil exploration or exploitation is not compatible with World Heritage status.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne qu'il s'agit de deux problèmes. Le premier est celui des exploitations pétrolières pour lesquelles les autres Etats parties ont aussi des responsabilités comme les compagnies pétrolières sont établies sur leur territoire. Le deuxième est celui des combats en cours et elle rappelle que dix gardes d'un autre site du patrimoine mondial, la réserve de faune à okapis, viennent d'être tués et propose une minute de silence en leur hommage.

Following the minute of silence, the **Chairperson** announced that there were 2 proposed amendments and gave the floor to the Non Governmental Organization World Wildlife Foundation.

The **Non Governmental Organization World Wildlife Foundation** (WWF) thanked the Chairperson for allowing it the opportunity to make a statement on behalf of all the organisations that wish to express great concern for Virunga National Park. These organisations are Wildlife Conservation Society, Fauna & Flora International, Greenpeace, Frankfurt Zoological Society and the Lukuru Foundation, organisations that work on the ground in the Virunga and have done so for many years. Virunga Park, the oldest National Park in Africa was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 and it suffered over 20 years of violent conflict. The NGO went on saying that the Congolese government, together with the international donor community, combined forces and had shown an enormous financial and human commitment to safeguard this unique global property. The NGO explained that all these efforts and commitment were now at risk, as oil companies had been granted concessions which overlap more than 80% of the Virunga National Park. So far, none of the companies had stated in an official public statement that they will respect the protected status of the Park and declare Virunga a no-go zone. The people of Congo have the right to profit from their natural resources. The people of Congo also have the right to profit from their natural resources today and in the future years to come. WWF said that if oil drilling was to go ahead in the Park area and in Lake Edward, the people of Congo would risk losing access to fresh water, access to sustainable livelihood opportunities, including fishing and agriculture, and it would also lose the economic opportunity to profit from Virunga as a unique tourism destination. Moreover, WWF stated that if the international community opened the door to oil companies and

allowed them to enter the places we had agreed to protect, Virunga will not be the last World Heritage property to be potentially lost for ever. WWF therefore urged the Committee to adopt the Draft Decision as presented. It also urged those State Parties where the oil companies are headquartered to use their political power to ensure their companies do not enter the Park, and to declare Virunga Park a no-go zone. If both the Committee as committed signatories to the World Heritage Convention and the conservation organisations could not save Virunga and maintain its protected status by stopping oil development in the Park, WWF wondered what would be the role of these bodies. WWF concluded by saying that Virunga is a symbol of the importance of the World Heritage Convention that is designed for a global good, and to maintain properties of Outstanding Universal Value for present and future generations.

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposal of the Delegation of Algeria on paragraph 6 and the proposal of the Delegation of France on paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **South-Africa** asked for a clarification about the deletion of the name of the company « Total » from the text of paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision to see whether “SOCO” should had been deleted as well.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the members of the Committee discussed the proposed amendments among themselves during lunchtime.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 26 June 2012

FOURTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES (*continuation*)

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710) (*Continuation*)

The **Chairperson** reopened this item, announcing that an amendment had been received.

The **Rapporteur** informed that they received a proposal from the Delegation of Germany to adjourn the debate on this agenda item until the 37th session of the Committee in 2013.

The **Chairperson** asked Germany to explain the reasons for its proposal.

The Delegation of **Germany** commended ICOMOS on its excellent work and shared the analysis of the seriousness of the issue. It stated, however, that any decision at this moment might have effects going beyond World Heritage issues. It also stated that it proposed this adjournment in the understanding that the Government of Georgia would be fully committed to work with ICOMOS. It emphasised that this proposal was exceptional and should not serve as reference for other cases.

This proposal was endorsed by the Delegations of **India, Colombia, Japan, Cambodia, Algeria** and **Switzerland**. Cette dernière ajoute que ce report ne changera pas l'état du bien, dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle semble déjà perdue.

The **Chairperson** noted that there seemed to be a consensus among the Members of the Committee. She hoped that the State Party would do its best to safeguard the site with support from ICOMOS.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.30** was adopted as amended.

NATURAL PROPERTIES *(Continuation)*

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) *(Continuation)*

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Chairperson for having given them time to discuss the amendment proposed by the Delegation of France and stated it had no objection to it.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked whether the fact that the TOTAL Company had changed the plan and would not operate in the area had been factually confirmed.

The **Secretariat** explained that TOTAL had been granted permission for exploration in the block III which included a part of the property but it had declared it was not going to explore for oil in the World Heritage property for the moment. The Secretariat also noted that paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision was a general paragraph calling on the companies to sign up to the commitment already made by Shell and ICMM not to undertake petroleum exploration or exploitation within World Heritage properties.

La Délégation de la **France** déclare se rallier à la proposition de l'appel général aux compagnies SOCO et TOTAL au paragraphe 7, du moment qu'au paragraphe suivant on différencie la nature du travail des deux compagnies en ce qui concerne l'exploration et l'exploitation.

The Delegation of **India** asked why the decision of the Committee should deal with individual companies. It should be limited to the subject of exploring resources.

The Delegation of **Germany** commented that if there were concrete companies involved the Committee should appeal to them in its Decision.

After the Delegations of **Germany**, **Switzerland** and **France** had clarified that paragraph 7 could be adopted without amendment and that the new paragraph 8, proposed by the Delegation of France, was to be kept, these two paragraphs were adopted.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** rappelle qu'elle a proposé un amendement sur le paragraphe 6, qui n'a pas encore été discuté.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande si des permis ont déjà été accordés, car si tel était le cas, le texte original est juste et le texte amendé entérine les permis déjà accordés.

The **Secretariat** clarified that for the moment permission had already been granted alongside the general exploration license for an aeromagnetic and aerogravimetric survey.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** considère que la manière dont le paragraphe est rédigé en fait une injonction à un Etat souverain et que le Comité n'a pas de prérogative pour intervenir dans le domaine de souveraineté d'un Etat. Toute intervention sur un site protégé est soumise à un régime d'autorisation ou d'avis préalable.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que le terme « ne plus autoriser » est correct, puisque les permis accordés sont des permis d'exploration et non d'exploitation. Elle ajoute que soit la formulation est revue, soit elle est acceptée telle quelle.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que la crédibilité du Comité est en jeu. Pour elle, il ne s'agit pas d'une ingérence dans les affaires intérieures d'un Etat. Autoriser l'exploitation minière ou pétrolière dans un site du patrimoine mondial n'est pas acceptable, et fermer les yeux sur les permis déjà accordés est encore plus dommageable. Elle se déclare donc en faveur de la formulation initiale du paragraphe.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** précise que son amendement dit « ne pas autoriser » et non « ne plus autoriser ». Elle suppose que de nombreux pays ont une réglementation précise soumettant tout demandeur à un régime d'autorisation préalable. Les contrats signés ou les permis accordés relevant de la souveraineté de l'Etat, celui-ci doit être libre de décider de la forme que devra prendre leur interdiction ou de leur annulation.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that it preferred the initial text.

The **Chairperson** stated that requesting cancellation of the permission that had been already granted was imposing as the Delegation of Algeria pointed out. She however recalled that the wording was the terminology which the Committee had used all the time. She invited the Advisory Bodies to reconsider which terminology should be used in the future.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** déclare qu'elle est prête à revoir le texte dans le cadre d'un groupe de travail auquel la Délégation de la **Suisse** pourrait être associée.

The **Chairperson** reminded about a small working group to be set up after this Committee session which would deal with the wording alongside other issues.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Algeria.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the wording used in the initial paragraph 6 was the same as usual, but she supported the establishment of a small working group.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** estime qu'il ne s'agit pas ici d'une question de forme, mais de fonds, car on emploie dans le langage des décisions une terminologie de guerre.

The Delegation of **Germany** said it understood the proposal from the Delegation of Algeria. The Committee was not in a position to make a decision on what the State Party was going to do but it could request something from the State Party. It therefore proposed the word 'revise' instead of 'cancel'.

The Delegation of **Colombia** said it understood the positions of both the Delegations of Algeria and Switzerland. The decision had to be taken by the State Party but the Committee was there to support it in the protection of the sites. It suggested the wording 'Recommends' or 'Reiterates its recommendation', in order not to have an injunction.

Cette formulation est soutenue par les Délégations du **Sénégal** et de l'**Algérie**.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande à ce que les permis accordés soient revus selon les procédures internes au pays et que de nouveaux permis ne soient pas accordés.

The Delegations of **Colombia** and **Estonia** supported this proposal.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Delegations of **Germany**, **Algeria**, **Colombia**, **India** and **Switzerland** gathered to agree on a proposed text.

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

The **Secretariat** recalled that the Headquarters of the Reserve had been attacked by Simba rebels on Sunday 24 June, and that preliminary reports indicated that several rangers had been killed and other staff had sought refuge in the forest. It also informed that the rebels were reported to have killed 14 okapis in the breeding station and to have looted the infrastructure of the reserve. It also noted the lack of progress in respect to the cancellation of the rights granted by the Mining cadastre. It recommended that the Okapi Wildlife Reserve be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that a reactive monitoring mission be undertaken.

L'**UICN** se déclare vivement préoccupée par les menaces pesant sur l'intégrité du bien. Elle estime qu'une mission de suivi réactif doit être réalisée de toute urgence sur le site pour prendre les mesures idoines afin de protéger sa Valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle exprime également sa compassion suite à l'attaque de la Réserve par des bandits armés, qui a causé la mort de plusieurs gardes.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande si la Déclaration de Kinshasa faisait état de tous les éléments mentionnés au paragraphe 6 du projet de Décision, à savoir le dialogue/coopération au niveau politique avec les services de l'état, la prise de mesures immédiates pour arrêter l'implication des militaires FARDC dans le braconnage, la reprise du contrôle des zones envahies par les rebelles Simba et l'annulation immédiate des titres miniers chevauchant le bien.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that in the Kinshasa Declaration the Government included a commitment to respect the different laws in relation to conservation. Specifically, the Declaration mentions the provisions of the mining law that there can be no mining concession in the protected areas.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN pour les missions conjointes réalisées par le passé dans des régions difficiles et soutient la proposition de mission de suivi réactif.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the statement made by the Delegation of France.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee would work on the wording of future decisions in consultation with the Advisory Bodies. She then asked if the Committee could agree to add a paragraph which expressed deepest concordance to the families of the people killed in the attack. There was no objection to it.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.8** was adopted as amended.

World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC)

The **Secretariat** presented the Kinshasa declaration in which the Congolese Government committed to implement all the corrective measures and to create the necessary conditions for the rehabilitation of the 5 DRC World Heritage properties currently inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It highlighted that so far, the signature of the Kinshasa Declaration unfortunately had not yet resulted in a concerted action between the different Ministries, the army and different technical agencies, which was necessary to resolve some urgent conservation issues in the sites and create the conditions for their rehabilitation. It recommended that the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to fulfill the commitments taken on in the Kinshasa Declaration and to ensure the implementation of the Strategic Action Plan to create the conditions for the rehabilitation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the different properties.

L'**UICN** note que plusieurs exemples mentionnés dans les rapports d'état de conservation montraient le manque de mise en œuvre de la Déclaration de Kinshasa. L'**ICCN** manque toujours de l'équipement nécessaire à l'application de la loi, en particulier en termes d'armements et de munitions, ce qui met sérieusement en danger la vie des gardes qui font face à des groupes bien armés, comme cela a encore été démontré par les événements tragiques qui se déroulent actuellement dans la Réserve de faune à okapis.

La Délégation du **Mali** fait remarquer que tous ces sites maintenus sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril sont situés dans un pays où sévissent des bandits armés. Ces sites du patrimoine mondial sont sous occupation et on ne prête pas suffisamment d'attention dans les projets de décisions à ce qu'il faut faire en cas de conflit armé sur un site.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Mali for raising an important and difficult problem and stated there might be a solution for the question in the future.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.36** was adopted.

Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

The **Secretariat** recalled that this site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger following illegal logging of rosewood and ebony resulting in deforestation which had seriously affected the overall integrity of 2 components of the serial property. It noted that to address the issue of illegal logging in a sustainable way, it was important to tackle the governance of the forest sector and in particular eliminate all existing rosewood and ebony stocks, as foreseen in the urgent corrective measures. It recommended that the World Heritage Committee urged the State Party to continue its efforts to implement the corrective measures and that the property be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN reiterated the conclusion of the 2011 mission that all existing rosewood stocks originate from illegal logging and therefore should be considered illegal. It took note of the strategy for a sale of these stocks, which had been proposed by the State Party, and welcomed that it was based on a "zero stock, zero logging and zero transporting" approach for rosewood and ebony. However it stressed the need to confiscate illegal timber, including illegal timber stocks retained by timber traders. It also considered that the involvement of an independent observer was crucial for the

credibility of the process. **IUCN** also underlined the successful inscription of rosewood and under appendix 3 of the CITES convention and encouraged the State Party to get these species listed under appendix II at the next COP in March 2013. It also highlighted the importance of State Parties to the *Convention* taking concrete measures to ensure that illegal timber from Madagascar is forbidden from entering their domestic markets.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the complex and illustrative report and commended the efforts made by the State Party. It also noted that this case was a very good example showing how two big conventions in the context of biodiversity (*World Heritage Convention* and CITES Convention) worked together and brought excellent results.

La Délégation de la **France** encourage l'Etat partie à poursuivre ses efforts. Elle rappelle également qu'il appartient à tous les Etats parties à la *Convention* de refuser la commercialisation de bois illégalement coupé et qui se retrouve maintenant sur le marché.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient l'idée d'un embargo sur l'exportation de bois précieux et souhaite entendre l'Etat partie à ce sujet.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) indique que, malgré la situation de crise, le gouvernement malgache en concertation avec Madagascar National Park et la Fondation des Aires Protégées et de la Biodiversité de Madagascar s'efforce de continuer à résoudre le problème de l'exploitation de bois précieux et l'exploitation minière au sein du site de l'Atsinanana. Il adhère pleinement au projet de décision et se prononce en faveur d'une éventuelle extension du bien pour inclure les aires protégées et les corridors forestiers adjacents, dès que ces dernières rempliront les conditions d'intégrité. Il remercie également la Norvège et la Bulgarie pour leurs contributions aux activités relatives à la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives et souligne sa volonté de mettre en œuvre le plan d'action qu'il a préparé, mais pour cela un délai de deux ans est nécessaire. Il réitère enfin sa demande d'assistance internationale afin de restaurer la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle et l'intégrité du bien, ce qui permettra de le retirer de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite avoir des précisions sur ce qui a déjà été fait pour l'extension du bien et la mise en place du plan d'action.

En ce qui concerne le plan d'action, la Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) explique que les opérations de contrôle de l'exploitation illégale de bois de rose se poursuivent dans les sites concernés. En revanche, il n'est pas encore en mesure d'apporter des éléments relatifs à une éventuelle extension du bien.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.10** was adopted.

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

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227) – 36 COM 7A.2

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155 bis) – 36 COM 7A.3

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137) – 36 COM 7A.5

Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136) – 36 COM 7A.6

Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280) – 36 COM 7A.7

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9) – 36 COM 7A.9

Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573) – 36 COM 7A.11

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153) – 36 COM 7A.12

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

ASIA-PACIFIC

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN had received a progress report from the State Party, but many of the principal issues affecting the property remained of high concern. The State Party is in the process of identifying donors for funding an Environmental Impact Assessment to look at the cumulative impacts of road construction. The State Party also undertook several anti-encroachment operations but poor boundary demarcation has resulted in further encroachments in other areas. The nature of this serial property and the types of issues it faced with a call for a coordinated approach in implementing a response. In this regard, the reactivation of the inter-ministerial World Heritage working group would be a welcomed development. The Secretariat therefore recommended that the property be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN noted that although the State Party had confirmed that there was no active mining in the property, it had not provided information regarding concerns about illegal prospecting taking place within the property. It considered that the International Assistance Request submitted by the State Party to hold a workshop for the further development and socialization of the Emergency Action Plan, which was recommended for approval, could provide an opportunity to develop corrective measures and a proposal for the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment on paragraph 9 proposed by the Delegation of **Thailand**. This amendment was supported by the Delegations of **India, Cambodia, Malaysia, Senegal** and **Algeria**.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** fait remarquer que le paragraphe 8 reprend la même formulation que celle qui va être revue par le groupe de travail.

The **Chairperson** indicated that there were also other decisions with the same wording which had been adopted by the Committee and that they would not look back to all those decisions.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.13** was adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN *(Continuation)*

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196) *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** proposed to return to this item which was still pending and invited the **Rapporteur** to take the floor.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment on paragraph 4 proposed by the informal working group who worked on the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the adoption of the Draft Decision, after having given time to all Committee members to read it first on the screen upon request from the Delegation of **Mexico**.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.17** was adopted as amended.

AFRICA *(Continuation)*

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Germany to read out the amendment written by the informal working group established previously.

The Delegation of **Germany** explained their guiding stars for formulating the proposal. It then read out the amendment both in English and in French. There was no objection raised.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7A.4** was adopted as amended.

Regarding the state of conservation of the **Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)**, the Chairperson indicated that the Bureau, at its first meeting, recommended to the Committee that the decision 7A.23 concerning this property would be presented in two separate parts:

7A.23.A: The Old City itself

7A.23.B: The Mughrabi ascent

The Chairperson indicated that this recommendation met the unanimous approval of the members of the Bureau, she therefore suggested that it be endorsed by the Committee in order to allow consultations on the drafting of this decision to take place on this basis.

The proposal was endorsed.

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

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/7B
WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add
Decisions: **35 COM 7B1 to 7B 107**

The **Chairperson** introduced item 7B, explaining that the order of decisions would start with cultural properties to be followed by natural and mixed properties. The regions would be discussed in the following order: Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, Arab States and Asia and the Pacific. The Secretariat would introduce each item followed by comments from the Advisory Bodies.

Furthermore, she asked the Committee members who have requested some state of conservation reports to be opened for discussion to take the floor and explain the reason why they felt it important to discuss the report.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat for the adoption of conservation reports not open for discussion.

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Europe and North America Region.

Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160bis) – 36 COM 7B.70
Walled City of Baku (Azerbaijan) (C 958) – 36 COM 7B.71
Historic Centre of Brugge (Belgium) (C 996) – 36 COM 7B.72
Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616) – 36 COM 7B.73
Provins, Town of Medieval Fairs (France) (C 873 rev) – 36 COM 7B.75
Villa Adriana (Tivoli) (Italy) (C 907) – 36 COM 7B.76
Portovenere, Cinque Terre and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto) (Italy) (C 826) – 36 COM 7B.77
Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994) – 36 COM 7B.78
Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland) (C 1165) – 36 COM 7B.80
Historic Centre of Sighișoara (Romania) (C 902) – 36 COM 7B.82
Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544) – 36 COM 7B.83
Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170) – 36 COM 7B.84

Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540) – 36 COM 7B.85
Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632) – 36 COM 7B.86
Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev) – 36 COM 7B.87
Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) – 36 COM 7B.89
Tower of London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island) (C 488) – 36 COM 7B91
Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island) (C 426bis) – 36 COM 7B.92
Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island) (C 1215) – 36 COM 7B.94

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

Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80 bis)

La Délégation du **Sénégal** déclare avoir examiné ce dossier attentivement, surtout quant au plan visuel, avoir superposé les points de vue en direction du Mont et examiné le sort réservé aux différents projets d'éoliennes. Tous les projets prévus dans la zone tampon ont été retirés, et le seul projet autorisé a été suspendu ; donc tous les points soulevés lors de la mission ont été résolus. Elle demande seulement à l'Etat partie sur quelle base les deux derniers pôles d'éoliennes hors de la zone tampon ont été maintenus et quelles actions ont été engagées suite au suivi réactif.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor first to the Secretariat and to ICOMOS.

The **Secretariat** informed that the item was opened for discussion by the Delegation of Senegal on 1 June, the reason being that the State Party had some new elements concerning measures to preserve this site. The Secretariat also received new information concerning the approval of three new zones of wind farms earlier in the day. The State Party could provide clarification on this as the Secretariat had not been able to verify the information.

ICOMOS recalled that the mission recommended that an area for wind farms should be defined through computer-based cartography in order to minimize subjectivity and to ensure consistency, and to map all areas from where turbines over a certain height might be visible from the mount. It stated that until such an area had been defined and integrated into the planning system, no new proposals for turbines should be approved.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que le Mont-Saint Michel a été inscrit en 1979 sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial au titre de trois critères qui fondent sa Valeur universelle exceptionnelle : échange d'influences, portée universelle et chef d'œuvre du génie créateur. Seul ce dernier critère pourrait être concerné par un impact négatif des éoliennes. Depuis la mission, l'Etat partie a défini une zone d'exclusion de 40 km de long sur 20 km de large, à l'intérieur de laquelle aucun permis de construction éolienne n'est possible. Le seul permis accordé a été retiré suite à une visite du Délégué permanent sur le site pour sensibiliser les autorités locales au problème. Les trois permis accordés sont hors de la zone d'exclusion et le seul qui ait été demandé depuis à l'intérieur de cette zone a été refusé.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked how this exclusion zone had been defined.

La Délégation de la **France** explique qu'elle a été basée sur l'aire d'influence paysagère définie grâce à des croisements d'études bibliographiques et de modèles numériques réalisés sur le terrain. Cela permet d'avoir accès non seulement aux caractéristiques topographiques, mais aussi aux sensibilités sociales liées au symbolique et à l'affectif. Cette aire d'influence paysagère considère le paysage vu de l'extérieur vers le Mont et prend notamment en compte la ceinture des « Monts joie », qui étaient les premiers points de vue que les pèlerins avaient sur le Mont à leur arrivée.

The Delegation of **Russia** warmly thanked the State Party for the clear picture presented. It created a new zone which broadened the visual purity of this wonderful site. The care of this analysis taken has produced positive results, so that most of this turbine projects were blocked or cancelled. Therefore it congratulated the State Party for having successfully resolved the matter.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite également l'Etat partie pour le travail colossal effectué et qui a permis de respecter les recommandations de l'ICOMOS, qui est également félicitée. En référence au paragraphe 8 du projet de Décision, elle demande quel serait l'impact d'une passerelle d'une hauteur supérieure à 6,80 m.

La Délégation de la **France** explique qu'elle essaie de rétablir le caractère maritime du Mont. Une hauteur de 6,80 m pour le pont-passerelle ne garantit pas aux personnes habitant ou travaillant sur le Mont une sécurité absolue, qui de toute façon n'existe pas. La hauteur retenue de 7,30 m résulte donc d'un arbitrage entre des considérations de sécurité et des considérations esthétiques.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the Committee needed to consider in the years to come how it was going to deal with visual integrity, since the issue of technologies which did not exist in the late 70s needed more and more to be addressed.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son rapport et l'Etat partie pour avoir accueilli la mission en novembre 2011. Elle estime que la zone d'exclusion définie depuis lors préserve la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite à son tour l'Etat partie d'avoir mis en place des régulations pour l'implantation d'éoliennes. Elle souligne que, de plus en plus, l'exploitation des ressources d'énergies renouvelables pose problème aux sites iconiques. Il existe suffisamment de zones ayant un potentiel d'exploitation de l'énergie du vent à l'écart de monuments importants pour pouvoir être exploitées en premier. Renoncer à toute installation dans le champ visuel tout entier depuis le Mont et vers le Mont sera donc un standard et un signal clair et important. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS si elle estime que la zone d'exclusion est suffisamment grande. Elle note également que les secours peuvent atteindre le Mont par d'autres moyens et se prononce en faveur d'un maintien de la passerelle au niveau le plus bas possible afin d'augmenter les moments d'authenticité maritime du Mont.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the visual integrity of a property cannot be treated in an arbitrary manner and needs to be better defined.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** noted the positive actions undertaken by the State Party with regard to the exclusion zone for the wind turbines.

ICOMOS provided more information on the exclusion zones and the unique and aesthetic sense of place.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** supported the position of the Delegation of **France**.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked the Delegation of **France** for the report and emphasized the spiritual attributes of the site and questioned to what degree modern developments impact these values.

La Délégation de la **France** confirme que le Mont Saint Michel est un mélange de culture, de nature et de spiritualité. Un pont entre le ciel et la terre, un point fixe dans un paysage maritime changeant. Elle rappelle que sur le Mont Saint Michel, vit et travaille en paix, une communauté de moines.

La Délégation du **Qatar** souligne que la France a fait de gros efforts pour répondre aux exigences du Comité et qu'au-delà de 40 kilomètres, il n'y a plus de risque d'impact visuel. Enfin, elle souligne que le Mont est plus visité que la Tour Eiffel.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique que l'ICOMOS nous rappelle à nos responsabilités mais qu'en la matière, la vision paysagère ne souffrira pas des éoliennes.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the position of Mali to keep the word "adversely" in paragraph 3.

The **Rapporteur** moved to the amendment to paragraph 4 which proposed to replace the word "mission" with "decision".

The Delegation of **Estonia** supports the Delegation of **Switzerland's** recommendation to retain the word mission.

A lot of Delegations support the Delegation of **Switzerland's** recommendation.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.74** was adopted as amended.

Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Serbia to explain the rationale for opening this particular report.

The Delegation of **Serbia** suggested an amendment to the wording of the paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision and urged the State Party to reconsider the bridge proposal and explore other means including improved ferry services, by-pass route in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and develop a spatial development plan and transport strategy.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that a letter from the State Party had been received requesting that these issues be addressed in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

ICOMOS provided an overview of the state of conservation stressing the need for an integrated transport strategy and the irreversible negative impacts a bridge would have on the OUV of the property.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out the assumptions surrounding the visual impacts and that no agreed objective way to conduct an assessment exists and requested the World Heritage Centre to define something objective. It further pointed out that the Advisory Bodies need to perform an assistance role and share information in advance.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed their concern over the opposition to the proposed amendment and reinforced the need for cooperation between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que l'amendement proposé par la Serbie est tout à fait dans l'esprit de la Convention.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS for clarification.

ICOMOS emphasized that it was an issue of impact and the need for a methodological approach to look at the impact of the proposal on the values of the landscape.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that ICOMOS is not a standard-setting organization and that visual impact was key in this regard. They emphasized the need to devote time and effort to better understanding the visual impact.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out that method established by ICOMOS provided for assessing visual impact and that this is done on a case by case basis. The **Secretariat** supported further consultation to address the issue more strongly.

The **Chairperson** suggested that this can be taken up by a working group.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the decision paragraphs by paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed the need for a structured view on visual impact and asked for clarification from the Delegation of **Montenegro**.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the amendment, as well as consultations to address the visual impact.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed their uncertainty of the assessment.

The Delegation of **Montenegro** confirmed their agreement of the amendment as written and discussed on consultations with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to leave space to seek alternatives.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souhaite avoir des précisions sur le projet de rocade dans la mesure où le pont semble avoir été abandonné mais celui de la rocade

envisagé à nouveau, alors qu'il semblait avoir un impact négatif sur le bien. Elle aimerait savoir comment joindre les deux thématiques, pont et rocade.

The **Chairperson** requested the view from **ICOMOS**.

ICOMOS discussed the various options and confirmed that a road outside the property might be a better solution. **ICOMOS** expressed their support for the State Party for finding solutions for a regional transportation strategy.

The Delegation of **Germany** recommended not excluding any alternatives and any possible by-pass routes.

The Delegation of **Serbia** pointed out that paragraph 8 takes into account the Delegation of **Germany's** concern and the Delegation of **Germany** expressed their support.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.79** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** announced that both the Observers Delegation of **Portugal** and **Spain** requested postponement of the discussion of 36COM 7B.81 and 36COM 7B.88 respectively.

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island) (C 1150)

The **Secretariat** indicated that new information had been received from the State Party stating that there was an error in the state of conservation report which the Secretariat has taken into account. In the letter to the World Heritage Centre the State Party indicated that the redevelopment proposal had not yet been sent to national authorities for approval.

ICOMOS expressed its concern over the proposed development and indicated that English Heritage also had concerns over the proposal. Therefore, inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger was proposed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que les autorités nationales ont pris en compte les recommandations du Comité quant à l'impact négatif que le projet de développement pourrait avoir sur le bien. Elle note également qu'il y a divergence d'opinions entre les autorités nationales et locales. Les Délégations de la **Suisse** et de l'**Allemagne** soutiennent le texte du projet de décision proposant l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.93** was adopted.

Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis)

The **Secretariat** indicated that no new information had been received since the State of Conservation report was published.

ICOMOS provided information on their assessment of the state of conservation and their concerns regarding the construction projects. They proposed a joint reactive monitoring mission to further assess the situation.

The **Chairperson** indicated that a letter had been received from the State Party with an explanation on the pending legislation and other measures in progress.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** pointed out that the proposed construction project was outside the buffer zone, that the matter was now before the court and that dialogue and transparency are going forward. They indicated their support for a mission in order to make an assessment.

The Delegation of **India** also supported a mission before considering putting the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed their desire to keep the possibility of Danger listing to send a strong message.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed their support to the position of the Delegations of **Germany**

Plusieurs Délégations (Allemagne, Suisse, Estonie et Serbie) soutiennent le point de vue selon lequel il faut envoyer un message fort aux autorités nationales mais qu'il ne faut cependant pas menacer l'Etat partie d'une inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril cette année.

The State Party of the **Ukraine** indicated that the Draft Decision did not reflect the progress made and was not based on a monitoring mission. A court case was also pending with regard to one of the development projects.

The Delegation of **Mexico** agreed that a mission was needed to obtain all of the information to make a decision.

The Delegation of the **UAE** indicated their support and encouraged the Advisory Bodies to conduct a mission and share this information with the Committee.

The Delegation of **Colombia** endorsed the position of the Delegation of **Mexico** that more time was needed.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that the Draft Decision is not to put the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger but to send a strong message to remind the State Party that this is possible if corrective measures are not taken. They agreed with the Delegation of **Mexico** that more time is needed and that a mission is required to further assess the situation.

La plupart des Délégations considèrent que l'Etat partie, d'une part, a déjà fourni des efforts et que, d'autre part, il est important de connaître les résultats de la mission de l'ICOMOS, qui n'a pas encore eu lieu. Il faut donc attendre 2013 pour envisager l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the majority do not support the proposed language concerning danger listing.

The Delegation of **Thailand** and **Ethiopia** expressed their support for the position of UAE and Mali.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Delegation of **Germany** that a strong statement needs to be sent to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Estonia** reminded the Committee of similar decisions in the past.

The Delegation of **Germany** suggested a drafting group to find wording that satisfies all parties.

The **Chairperson** moved to approve those paragraphs with no amendments. Paragraphs 1-10 were adopted. She asked the Secretariat for further clarifications.

The **Secretariat** explained the State of Conservation findings and that all issues were reflected in the report.

The Delegations of the **Russian Federation** and **Colombia** reiterated their desire to remove the wording on endangered listing based on the progress made and pending mission and court case.

The Delegation of **India** withdrew its proposal to keep the danger listing language.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested the State Party to confirm that construction on the buildings has been stopped.

The State Party of the **Ukraine** confirmed that construction has stopped due to the pending court decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.90** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 7 pm

THIRD DAY – Wednesday, 27 June 2012

FIFTH MEETING

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA (continuation)

The Delegation of **India** on behalf of the Committee Members conveyed the deepest appreciation for the reception organized by the host country and the local authorities yesterday.

Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) (C 1046)

The **Chairperson** explained that the state of conservation report on the World Heritage property Alto Douro Wine Region (Portugal) was opened for discussion as per the request of the Delegation of France.

The **Secretariat** reported on the last correspondence with the State Party after the publication of the state of conservation report and the meeting held with the Portuguese authorities to discuss the options for the dam project at the World Heritage property. The Secretariat also reported on the discussions concerning the dates of the proposed Reactive Monitoring mission. In addition, the Secretariat reported that the dam project has been widely covered by the press and the attention from NGO's to the issue.

ICOMOS expressed its concerns about the potential visual and ecological impact of the dam project on the property and its buffer zone, clearly demonstrated by the visual simulation provided. ICOMOS reminded that information on this project was provided to the World Heritage Centre only in 2010 when most of the approvals were already in place and that the construction works started in April 2011 and are continuing. ICOMOS stated that State Party is ready to revise the plans and that a joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre reactive monitoring mission will be undertaken hopefully in the next two months to urgently discuss with the State Party all possible modifications to the project.

La Délégation de la **France** constate que la discussion s'insère dans la continuité des réflexions de la veille au sujet d'un équilibre entre exigences de conservations et développement des énergies durables. Elle rappelle qu'une mission ICOMOS a eu

lieu en avril 2011 en fournissant des éléments que le projet ne prend pas en compte et elle souhaite ouvrir un débat sur 1) quel critère peut être affecté par l'existence du barrage 2) quelles sont les révisions au projet 3) en quoi le barrage contribue au développement durable du territoire et aux communautés locales.

The Delegation of **Mexico**, supported by the Delegations of **Japan** and **Colombia**, shared a general observation on the balance between development and conservation and recalled that in 2001 the Committee (Helsinki) inscribed the site on an emergency manner as a fragile cultural landscape. It asked the State Party to clarify what is being implemented in order to preserve the OUV of the property.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of Portugal to reply to the questions raised from the Committee members.

The Observer Delegation of **Portugal** recalled that the World Heritage property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2001 with three dams within the property and which did not seem to be considered a problem at the time of inscription. It further explained that the valley in which the current dam is planned displays a different type of landscape without vineyards, which is one of the reasons why this had not been inscribed on the World Heritage List in its totality. The Observer Delegation continued to report that in an explanatory letter of April 2011 to the World Heritage Centre the State Party of Portugal had reiterated its readiness for dialogue and that a mission is currently planned for the end of July 2012. It's readiness to reduce the pace of construction was highlighted; however there could be no question of halting the overall construction.

The Delegation of **India** invited the Committee to consider the World Heritage property as a man-made landscape and asked where the line for human intervention should be drawn. The Delegation mentioned that if the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS had existed at the time of the construction, the pyramids in Egypt would never have been built. The Delegation further requested that the local population should also be taken into account and questioned if the Committee is going to stop development at each World Heritage property. The Delegation also questioned if this information had been shared at the time of inscription and why ICOMOS had not drawn its attention to this then.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle l'importance de ce débat sur le développement et la conservation et constate qu'il est trop tard pour discuter des travaux déjà en cours qui peuvent difficilement être modifiés. Elle demande de dépêcher au plus vite une mission de suivi réactif.

La Délégation du **Mali**, soutenue par la Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis**, note que l'Etat partie a fait des efforts considérables pour définir une zone tampon et a fourni des informations supplémentaires dont il faut en tenir compte.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the principles laid out in the *World Heritage Convention* should not be forgotten and therefore it might be a good idea that the *World Heritage Convention* be read out before each session and the Committee members commit to abide to its principles. The Delegation pointed out that in the present case it is unclear if the dam project represents a real case for sustainable development as pointed out by some Committee members. The Delegation mentioned further that the impact on the landscape judging by the pictures presented by the Secretariat seem to be rather significant and called for the State Party of Portugal to confirm its readiness to look for a solution together with the Advisory

Body ICOMOS, and as a result of a Reactive Monitoring Mission.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** supported the request of further information from the State Party.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** rappelle que le formulaire d'inscription devrait contenir les informations sur le développement de ce genre de projets et déclare qu'il s'agit aussi d'une négligence de la part de l'ICOMOS. Elle demande à l'Etat partie de fournir des informations supplémentaires sur le plan de gestion.

The Observer Delegation of **Portugal** stressed once again that the dam project is to be located within the buffer zone and quotes the April 2011 mission report which stated the "surprisingly there would be no severe visual impact". The Observer Delegation informed that the architect had changed after the mission and that the project would have a beneficial impact on the population and the climate by providing strategic water reserves and enhancing tourism facilities. According to the representative of the Observer Delegation, the dam project contributes to sustainable development and the creation of jobs for young people. It further regretted that the State Party of Portugal had not informed the World Heritage Centre in advance about this project but stated that they are now fully committed to work in a spirit of transparency and cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, including during the proposed mission. The Observer Delegation also committed itself not to undertake any work that might affect the landscape of the property until the presentation of the outcomes of the mission.

The **Chairperson** reminded about the rules of procedures that the representatives of the concerned World Heritage property may only provide clarifications to questions from the Committee members, but may not advocate for their case.

The Advisory Body **ICOMOS** welcomed the position of the State Party to improve the project and reminded the Committee that the discussions on the project highlighted the urgent need for a robust management plan in the whole property which addresses not only how to sustain traditional practices but also explores new forms of development to support the Outstanding Universal Value and the rural life. ICOMOS announced that the mission will look at the visual impact but also the impact on the micro-climate for the vine yards. ICOMOS agreed with the Committee that the discussion on the compatibility of renewable energies and the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties is an important and rather urgent one. ICOMOS also highlighted the decision by the World Heritage Committee at its last session which requests the States Parties to be as transparent as possible and inform about large-scale projects already during the nomination process.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the role of the World Heritage Centre was not to halt all development projects at World Heritage properties. Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines requested that the State Parties to bring to the attention of the World Heritage Committee all projects which may have a potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage properties. In addition to that, certain guidelines have been developed over time and these should be taken into account in the decision making process such as on buffer zones, heritage impact assessment and others.

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

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to paragraphs 5, 7 and 8 proposed by the Delegation of **France** and supported by the Delegations of **South Africa and Colombia** which also replaced the words “halting” to “reducing the pace” of the construction.

The Delegation of **Estonia** addressed on the economic viability of “significantly” reducing the pace of the construction as proposed by the Delegation of Germany.

The Delegation of **Colombia** also reminded the Committee member that the criteria for which the World Heritage property was inscribed for the visual perception from the river and that the present construction project will not have a visual impact on the property and enquired if a date for publication of the reactive monitoring mission report could be set for the State Party of Portugal not to lose too much time.

The Committee agreed that drawing on the experience from last year’s decision 35 COM 7B.52, the paragraph “decides to request the Director-General to approve the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission report” should be added in the Draft Decision, in view of the urgency for the State Party to receive a clear answer if the dam project had an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **India** agreed to the formulation of paragraph 8, but highlighted that the same applied to the Advisory Body of ICOMOS, as part of an open process.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to take note of this.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.81** was adopted as amended.

Cathedral, Alcazar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that after the dispatch of the state of conservation report no new information had been received and that in the months of May and June meetings had taken place with national and local authorities. The media had given extensive coverage on the issue.

ICOMOS recalled that since the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee, in Seville, Spain (2009) concerns had been expressed with requests to modify the project, as the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, which resides in the monumental complex with the Cathedral as a vertical landmark, was being threatened by the new tower of twice the height and thereby altering the relationship in the urban landscape. It further informed that construction work was continuing, despite an agreement of the authorities to look for solutions. It concluded by stating that the development on the ground was not problematic, that the height of the tower was negatively impacting on the property and that it regretted there had been no dialogue with the State Party.

The **Chairperson** invited the Members of the Committee to comment.

La Délégation du **Mali** se réfère à la présentation faite par le Secrétariat, notamment la mention que des rencontres ont eu lieu entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l’Etat partie, et des solutions possibles ont été envisagées. Elle souhaite savoir quelles sont les solutions évoquées. Elle souhaite inviter l’Etat partie à expliquer les mesures prises en matière de réduction de l’impact visuel.

The Delegation of **Colombia** requested an explanation of the State Party on possible proposals to mitigate the visual impact of the project.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle les cas de Cologne et de Dresde. Concernant Cologne : le bien avait été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, puis l'Etat partie a modifié le projet et diminué les hauteurs, et ensuite le bien a été retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Concernant Dresde : le projet n'avait pas été modifié et le bien a été retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle exprime le souhait que le cas de Séville suive l'exemple de Cologne et non pas de Dresde. Elle invite l'Etat partie à expliquer l'état d'avancement exact du projet. Elle en appelle au promoteur pour la sauvegarde du bien exceptionnel situé dans son pays. Elle soutient l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rappelle que la tour est située à 1600m des monuments inscrits, et que la perspective visuelle se trouve en dehors de la zone tampon. Elle invite l'Etat partie à expliquer les limites du bien et de la zone tampon. Elle indique qu'il n'est pas nécessaire d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, si l'Etat partie peut accéder à certaines recommandations de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated that this was a complicated subject that required proper analysis, such as on the early time of inscription in 1987, when no guidelines were available and in fact the World Heritage Centre did not exist yet, the huge size of the property, the tower's location outside of the buffer zone, with some visual impacts, but that the question had to be raised how far the World Heritage Committee's powers extended in this regard. It further reminded the Delegation of Switzerland that there was no link with the case in Dresden (*sic*), which was a Cultural Landscape and thus a totally different case.

The Delegation of **Germany** recalled that the new tower was higher than the tower in Cologne; that not the whole city of Seville was inscribed on the World Heritage List; that in Seville the Decision on Dresden was taken; as well as the State Party's obligation to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It reminded the Members of the Committee that the proposed tall buildings in both St. Petersburg and Cologne were also located outside the buffer zones of those properties, and that both were now glad that they hadn't allowed their construction to continue.

It further recalled the duty of the World Heritage Committee to help the Mayors of World Heritage cities to resist to pure and non-sustainable developments, that if it did not include this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger the credibility of the World Heritage Committee would be jeopardized, and urged therefore the Members of the World Heritage Committee to take another thorough look at the photo of the project as presented on the screens.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported Germany and further stated that the debate on potential impacts of the new tower had started already before its construction began, that the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies have been completely ignored, and that no fruitful debate on cooperation had taken place. It thus supported the Draft Decision to put the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Iraq** stated that any construction near historic sites requires cooperation with the authorities. How could the constructions permits have been given? Had the experts been consulted?

La Délégation du **Cambodge** constate qu'il s'agit encore une fois d'un cas d'impact visuel. Elle attend des explications de l'Etat partie. Elle suggère que dans le futur, il faudrait faire des simulations des différentes vues. Elle rappelle qu'il s'agit d'un paysage urbain, et non pas seulement d'un point de construction.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** clarified that the inscribed property comprised 3 monuments and that the new tower was at a distance of 1600m from these inscribed properties and 800m from the buffer zone, but that it was not located in any vista of these inscribed sites. It continued by stating that the new tower was located in a modern part of town, that the state of conservation of the inscribed property was exceptional, while acknowledging that the project had been controversial with different opinions from different experts.

It concluded by remarking that in the near future it would put forward a request to UNESCO to expand the boundaries of the inscribed property and for now it proposed to study alternative solutions and to organise an expert meeting on this so that the results could be applied in Seville as well as in other places in the world.

The floor was given to **ICOMOS**, who welcomed the State Party's suggestion to extend the protected area of the World Heritage city of Seville, but reiterated its regrets that no dialogue had been possible in an earlier stage of the project and that currently the tower was going up with unfortunate consequences as it was setting a precedent for other urban sites.

The Delegation of **Serbia** stated the importance of the timing of listing, as well as the 'methods of seeing' as it explained that the photo of the project, as shown on screen, was taken with a tele-lens which distorted spatial relationships and, instead of the stated height of the building of 178m being twice the height of the cathedral in Cologne, the actual height was equal to the inscribed Cathedral of Seville.

The **Chairperson** informed the Members of the World Heritage Committee that she would proceed with discussing the Draft Decision for which several amendments had been put forward.

The **Rapporteur** informed that amendments had been brought forward for paragraphs 3 to 12, and further requested that any amendments be submitted directly to the Secretariat so that they could be integrated into the texts.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Germany** intervened by requesting the insertion of the previous World Heritage Committee decisions on St. Petersburg and Cologne, which dealt with similar issues.

In the ensuing discussion the Delegations of **Estonia, Mali, Switzerland, Senegal, Algeria, Germany, Switzerland, Iraq, Estonia, and Algeria** took the floor, after which the Chairperson decided to put paragraph 4 to a vote, by which 12 Members of the World Heritage Committee voted in favour of keeping the paragraph as was originally proposed, with 5 Members against and 4 abstentions, thus the paragraph was kept in its original wording.

In the continuing discussion the Delegations of **Colombia, Germany, Iraq, and Algeria** took the floor, requesting once more a clarification from the State Party on any mitigations of the negative visual impact.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** explained that the visual impact was negative, but that it was limited only to a few places, while the photo of the project on screen was taken from the air and that the project site was located 800m away from the buffer zone.

The **Chairperson** interrupted by stating that these answers were not a reply to the question asked, which concerned whether or not the authorities were prepared to stop the project.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** explained that the legislation in Andalucía allowed the construction to go ahead, but that the project could not be stopped due to the compensation to the project developer that would be involved, while further stating that the State Party was ready to meet with ICOMOS to discuss how the visual impact could be reduced.

The **Chairperson** proposed to break for lunch so that a compromise could be sought during the break.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

THIRD DAY – Wednesday, 27 June 2012

SIXTH MEETING

3 p.m. –7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA (continuation)

Cathedral, Alcazar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev)
(continuation)

The **Chairperson** reopened the discussion on the question to put the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se déclare pour l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril car les menaces sont confirmées. Elle rappelle également les décisions antérieures du Comité soulignant l'impact négatif. Le projet s'étant poursuivi, il en va maintenant de la crédibilité du Comité. L'an prochain, on pourrait tirer des conclusions allant au-delà de ce pas.

The Delegations of **Estonia and Germany** supported the original wording of the decision to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation of **Germany** also considered that on the basis of the existing information the Committee could have delisted the property.

La Délégation de la **France** se déclare tout à fait opposée à l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle estime en effet que d'ici cent ans, on pourrait vouloir inscrire sur la Liste cette tour construite par un architecte de renommée internationale. Elle souligne la relativité des jugements : des problèmes sérieux sont posés par les exploitations minières un peu partout dans le monde, mais en même temps la France va proposer cette année l'inscription d'un bassin minier. En ce qui concerne la qualification d'impact visuel, la tour n'est visible que depuis le clocher de la Giralda, situé au-delà du fleuve. Cette perspective n'est pas une perspective historique de la ville. En outre, il n'existerait qu'un seul point d'où la tour et la Giralda seraient visibles ensembles, et ce point est situé bien au-delà de la zone tampon. Le projet de la tour comporte d'autres aspects, tels que la requalification de la valeur urbaine de la ville, le développement des services sociaux, le développement économique et l'aménagement urbain. Tous ces volets pourraient être intégrés dans une approche rénovée du bien incluant, le cas échéant, un projet d'extension.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the point of view expressed by the Delegation of France, adding that it considered Seville as one of the impeccable examples of protection of integrity and authenticity. The tower built outside the buffer zone had indeed a visual impact; therefore the Delegation wanted to know from the new local authorities of Seville what would happen with the development plan to avoid that other towers be constructed in the future.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported the statements made by the Delegations of France and Colombia.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la déclaration de la France. Cette tour ne sera pas démolie, c'est un fait accompli. Elle suggère que le Comité demande à nouveau à l'Etat partie de suspendre les travaux pendant une durée minimale, étant donné les incidences économiques, afin d'étudier les moyens de limiter l'impact visuel.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle que ce projet de tour avait déjà été discuté au Comité de Séville en 2009. Cette tour existe maintenant, mais en-dehors de la zone tampon. L'impact visuel est très négatif. Une solution alternative serait un gel, accompagné d'un suivi renforcé et de solutions correctives. La Délégation estime que le patrimoine n'est pas seulement ce que nous avons reçu en héritage, car les communautés apportent toujours quelque chose à ce dont elles ont hérité. Il est important de réfléchir à la manière dont les patrimoines peuvent évoluer tout en conservant leur Valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose d'appliquer le mécanisme de suivi renforcé au lieu d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Des actions étant en cours, elle estime qu'il faut laisser à l'Etat partie le temps de les mener à terme.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** opposed an inscription on the Danger List since uncontrollable events had occurred. The government did not put a stop in time but the Committee should give Spain and the city's authorities further opportunity to react.

The Delegation of **Mexico** recalled that the property was not inscribed as a cultural landscape but as a group of monuments. Therefore it should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** concurred. It stressed that the State Party had committed to make efforts and should be given a further opportunity. The Delegation would also like to know what would be the other repercussions, outside the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **India** pointed to the difficult history. This city should be considered an iconic city for its architecture and its way of life. Monuments were inscribed and it was not an urban landscape. The State Party would take steps that would enable an objective process of assessment. India opposed the inscription on the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** considered that mitigations measures were possible.

ICOMOS explained that in the State Party's report from the last year, the relationship of the site with the city had been emphasized. The city was described as an indispensable support to the World Heritage site and that there was the need for the study to foster reaction both in and outside the buffer zone. The site inscribed could only be understood within the wider context of the urban landscape.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the majority of the Committee was against the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** said it could accept a one-year delay provided the language used was firmer.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported this idea, although it considered that the State Party had not done its duty. It recalled that the city of Tallinn had stopped its programme of high rise buildings further to the recommendations made by the Committee.

La Délégation du **Mali** rappelle sa proposition d'appliquer le mécanisme de suivi renforcé.

The **Chairperson** replied that this mechanism could apply only to a site inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Spain.

The **State Party represented by the Representative of the City of Seville** reiterated its commitment to the *Convention* and highlighted that Seville should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The project was legally approved and was part of the modern part of the city. The municipal authorities were currently adopting a plan that would prevent any project having an impact on the historical urban landscape to be approved in the future in parts which are World Heritage. But the value as World Heritage comes currently from the three monuments and not from the landscape as a whole. The municipal authorities also still intend to extend the current property. The tower, which is partially built, would have significant social and economic impacts and would meet the highest standards of environmental efficiency. It would help to decongest the centre and to develop the city. The State Party also recalled the proposal of her city of Seville to host an expert meeting to discuss the historical urban landscape approach and develop standards so that everybody had the same views and knew what they were dealing with. Finally, he stressed that it had never been made clear to the municipal authorities how to eliminate the visual impact. It considered that it would be necessary to make a lot of progress with regard to the instructions given under the *World Heritage Convention*.

The **Chairperson** suggested a working group to draft a text and invited the Delegations of **Switzerland, Colombia** and **France** to participate.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** décline cette proposition, estimant qu'elle ne pourra pas être très utile.

The **Chairperson** suggested then that the Delegation of Mexico be part of the drafting group, which was accepted.

The Delegations of **Colombia** and **Mexico** insisted that it was not possible to ask for an interruption of the works.

The **Chairperson** resumed the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph recalling that paragraphs 1 to 4 had already been adopted.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** considered that ICOMOS would be willing to cooperate with the State Party and could therefore be mandated to carry out further studies and seek ways and means of avoiding this kind of experience in the future. The Delegation insisted again that the Committee be patient further and gave another chance to the State Party.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** propose la formulation suivante : « prie instamment l'Etat partie de geler les travaux et d'entreprendre, en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS, des études en vue de mettre au point des mesures correctives pour atténuer l'impact visuel de la tour ».

The Delegation of **Colombia** insisted that since the city authorities would change the urban plan for the city, this would be a key factor in preventing this happening again.

La Délégation de la **France** estime que la majorité des membres du Comité ne veut pas faire sortir Séville de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et que puisque la tour existe, il faut en profiter pour mener une approche rénovée du bien.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed to strike out the part of the decision where a suspension or end of the work of the tower was asked for. The Committee should ask the State Party to continue its dialogue with ICOMOS and study possible corrective measures that could be implemented.

The **Chairperson** remarked that the tower could not be modified.

The Delegation of **Mexico** agreed, but it wanted to keep a part of paragraph 5, considering that it was important that the Committee requested that the State Party commit to make efforts, such as corrective measures.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** est d'accord, car elle estime que le Comité ne peut pas baisser les bras et démissionner. Il faut prendre acte du fait, mais de manière active. Il ne faut pas donner un chèque en blanc à l'entrepreneur dont le seul but est de faire des bénéfices. Elle maintient donc sa formulation. L'Etat partie doit faire un effort, car le Comité de son côté en a fait beaucoup. Sans cela, des cas similaires se produiront à l'avenir.

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered that the only solution left was to work with ICOMOS to avoid that such a situation occurred again in the future. The tower has been built and the Committee had been talking about it for four years now.

The Delegation of **India** concurred.

The Delegation of **Germany** spoke against an invitation to the State Party to enlarge the site.

The **Rapporteur** explained the amendments by Algeria, France and Senegal and the following paragraphs which were adopted.

The Delegation of **Germany** would prefer to completely delete paragraph 7. Les Délégations de la **France** et de la **Suisse** sont d'accord, cette dernière trouvant curieux de se féliciter de l'extension.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.88** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **India** stated that this discussion turned around the issue of a monument that converted into an urban landscape. When monuments were inscribed, they should be treated as monuments and not be converted into an urban landscape. It requested the World Heritage Centre to give it some thoughts and come back to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that the Committee was torn between its own rules and principles and its members' wishes. Principles were to lose ground and principles were slipping. When the Committee discussed the day before a dam, it decided it was too early to take a decision and now it considered it too late. This would not be the right message to send out. It brought a matter to mind where several chances had been brought forward to a State Party to find a better solution but this had not been the case. The Committee needed to be consistent in its decisions or the *Convention* is jeopardized.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déclare qu'en adoptant cette décision, le Comité a honoré ceux qui agissent contre l'esprit de la *Convention* alors qu'il n'est pas là pour cela.

The Delegation of **Serbia** remembered the large list of great cities in Europe that showed the opposite case of what had been debated. Discussion should be held and could be useful to draw out conclusion with value for the future.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBEAN

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison (Barbados) (C 1376) – 36 COM 7B.95
City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420) – 36 COM 7B.96
Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia) (C 285) – 36 COM 7B.98
Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129) – 36 COM 7B.100
Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414) – 36 COM 7B.101
Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) – 36 COM 7B.104
Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay) (C 747) – 36 COM 7B.105

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

Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445)

The **Chairperson** explained that the state of conservation report on the World Heritage property Brasilia (Brazil) was opened for discussion as per the request of the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **India** explained its request to open the report for discussion and its amendments proposed by pointing to an unusual recommendation as to hold the ongoing consultation process and to establish an intersectoral official working group. The consultation process was the wish of the Committee and had already been undertaken by the Brazilian government. The Delegation emphasized the conflict between what the *Convention* could do and the sovereign rights of the State Party.

The **Secretariat** introduced the item by reporting on the reactive monitoring mission that took place the year before. The Secretariat also mentioned the local, federal and national regulations of the urban plans of Brasilia. Since the date of inscription of the site in 1987, the regulations of the Plan Piloto should be taken into account when preparing the conservation plan and the management plan for the city. Today it exist a conservation plan for the urban context, a land management master plan, a land use plan of occupation of the metropolis as well as a plan directorate on the territorial planning of the federal district. It could be important for the State Party to take all the necessary measures to coordinate and better articulate all the regulations in different kind of frameworks that were important but caused some fragmentation of the decision-making process.

ICOMOS noted the limited progress in implementing the recommendations of the last reactive monitoring mission and the recommendations of the Committee. Therefore strong measures were imperative. The attributes that convey the Outstanding Universal Value are based on the safeguarding of the vision. ICOMOS recognized the dynamic nature of the city but considered that change needed to be within the parameters of protection of Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS offered assistance in reviewing the existing planning tool and projects to ensure adequate solutions could be identified prior to implementation.

The Delegations of **Germany, South Africa, Serbia, Cambodia** and **Colombia** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Estonia** pointed to the fact that Brasilia was a very fast developing city that had grown out of the Lucio Costa plan limits. The pressure from developers was very serious and building matters were not too well regulated. Therefore the Delegation of Estonia supported the strong tone of the original draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** felt that the State Party of Brazil should be given the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for the joint reactive monitoring mission which took place in March 2012 and for the extensive report which provided relevant guidance for the conservation of the property. The State Party concurred that the preservation plan currently under consultation needed to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. The local government informed that this was the largest consultation process with the largest democratic participation in the history of Brazil. These consultations were a legitimate component of the democratic elaboration of an urban plan and could not be halted at this stage. Besides the local legislation, the federal legislation protected the property and in case of differences between these two legislations, the more restrictive legislation would prevail. The attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value were not threatened.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.97** was adopted as amended.

National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180)

The **Secretariat** reported on the preliminary report on the results obtained from the survey carried out from 6 to 22 March 2012 on the vulnerable state of conservation of the fortified structures and on the interest of the World Bank in financing the identified emergency interventions. A monitoring system to record microclimatic changes inside the Batterie Coidavid and to record movements was put in place after the 2010's devastating earthquake. A second technical report with updated monitoring indicators showed that every part of the Citadel complex was in movement. Particular attention was focused on the Batterie Coidavid due to the evidence of structural damage. There were two movements at the same time: the collapse of the spur that compressed the inner part of the building and the rotation of the spur to the rest of the building. Both movements were continuous, inelastic and very dangerous and put on risk the safety of the monument with evident peril to the visitors. Therefore all visits should be halted without delay until the emergency measures can be put in place. According to the information of the State Party, the construction of a road inside the property was not considered.

ICOMOS noted the consequences of the severe earthquake in January 2010 and commended the State Party for establishing a monitoring system and providing the technical reports on the condition of the property. The structural issue posed a serious danger to elements of the property and to visitors. ICOMOS pointed at the economic difficulties of the State Party and the desire to enhance tourism opportunities, but stressed that tourism should not be prioritized over conservation. ICOMOS offered assistance to the State Party to ensure short, medium and long-term actions for recovery, identification and protection of its heritage. Due to the urgency and serious needs, the State Party might consider inscribing the property in the list of World Heritage in Danger in order to enhance the possibilities of cooperation and the fund-raising.

The Delegation of **Colombia** offered its technical assistance to the State Party of Haiti.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que la situation reste très difficile. Elle estime qu'il n'est pas vraiment réaliste de demander que les mesures soient prises entre août et novembre et souhaiterait un délai un peu plus long, si cela était possible.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the Secretariat and ICOMOS submitted an amendment, which consisted of the addition of two paragraphs.

The **Chairperson** read out the two new paragraphs, which raised no objections.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.99** was adopted as amended.

Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

The **Secretariat** informed about new information submitted by the State Party that was not included in the national report of the state of conservation. The reports contained proposals for intervention on the most affected parts of the fortified structures and the terms of reference of the structural evaluation for cases in severe deterioration. Due to the very poor state of conservation and degradation the proposed interventions include systems to prop up the walls and to reinforce the platform of the batteries with materials like reinforced concrete. The study proposed

interventions without data from archaeological surveys. The repair work dealt with the consequences of degradation but not the causes. In June 2012, the State Party proposed interventions without data from archaeological surveys or without having analyzed the original mortars.

ICOMOS mentioned that serious concern about the State of this property had been expressed for years and criticized the low progress in addressing the considerable decay. Management arrangements and measures to control urban expansion, encroachment and the state of conservation were not adequate to deal with the existing conditions which impact the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS recalled the adoption of measures by the Committee at its 35th session that should have been implemented before March 2012. Many measures included an emergency plan had remained at a planning stage and no timeframe had been provided for implementation. The rate and extent of the deterioration required sustained action. The property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger to ensure that the threats were comprehensively and sustainably addressed and receive the necessary international support.

The Delegation of **Serbia** asked whether it would be possible to give the floor to the State Party of Panama.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** agreed to put the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Government had made an effort to preserve the property and to create a management plan but had in 2011 major rains and major natural hazards that caused the loss of lives and damages to the fortress of Porto Bello and some to San Lorenzo.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.102** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Colombia** reminded the historic links between Panama and Colombia, where the site of Cartagena also illustrated the Caribbean fortifications. The Government of Colombia therefore proposed its technical assistance to the State Party of Panama.

Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá) (C 790bis)

The **Secretariat** reported on the historic district where the State Party proposed the construction of a viaduct as the only proposal to be evaluated by the Committee. The World Heritage Centre had received new information on the submission of the buffer zone of the historic district. The information did not follow the official standards required in terms of cartography and format for minor boundary modifications. An alternative that included platforms and maritime viaduct was submitted. The third option included a reduction in the size of the island in front of the Presidential Palace, a car park in the immediate proximity to the government Palace as well as structures for institutional purposes and a large distance between the viaduct and the peninsula in part of its trajectory.

ICOMOS recalled that the state of conservation of this property had been examined by the Committee for the last four sessions and noted limited progress in addressing the threats. Effective management arrangements, enforcement of regulations, the decay of the historic district and speculation remained unsolved. The viaduct project had been analysed; it would encircle the edge line of the historic district and would compromise the conditions of integrity and authenticity. The historic relationship of

the centre with the sea would be lost and there would be radical transformations of the natural seascape. The Outstanding Universal Value of the property with the historic district component emphasized its setting in the peninsula. It was a testimony of an early settlement and an urban settlement that had remained until today. An appropriate maritime buffer zone should protect the values of the property. ICOMOS recommended the inscription in the List in Danger as an urgent call for action.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that there seemed to be problems with the state of conservation of the property, and wished to hear the views of the State Party as there seemed to be a lack of understanding between ICOMOS and the State Party regarding the analysis of the Advisory Bodies and the conclusions about the property. Panama needs to bear in mind the conclusions of the Committee before launching any work. The last reactive monitoring mission was in October 2010 and all the documents could be received from the Panamanian Diplomatic Mission. It wished to also draw the attention of the Committee to the arguments put forward by the Panamanian Government, and suggested that a new wording of the Draft Decision should be prepared which does not inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger or withdraw it from the List.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked a question on procedure as the reactive monitoring mission in 2010 rejected the plan to build a tunnel underground. The State Party prepared an alternative plan to build a long viaduct outside of the buffer zone; however the Draft Decision is suggesting a tunnel once more as an alternative option. It requested clarification from ICOMOS and the State Party on the inconsistency of the Draft Decision in that it requested an alternative plan for the Tunnel Project despite the fact that the State Party had already prepared it, and this inconsistency can cause frustration and waste of time and money.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated that it had closely studied the case, as it was curious about some inconsistencies between what is stated in the report, what is in the Draft Decision and what is said by the State Party. The Draft Decision refers to a construction project which the State Party has said has not yet begun. The Draft Decision as currently drafted was hastily done as it does not correspond with the information provided by the State Party or the information the Committee has. Before continuing with the debate, it requested clarification from the State Party whether the construction work had already begun and what impact the construction work could have if it went ahead.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Delegations of Japan and Mexico in that there are inconsistencies in the file and listening to the explanations and presentations by the Secretariat and ICOMOS. It stated that it would like to hear from the State Party in order to clarify the issues. What is the process regarding the projects presented? There have been four or five projects presented but rejected for different reasons. The report also says construction has begun, yet the Committee is hearing that this is not the case. Panama needs to resolve its traffic problem. It should be seriously considered when a State Party is making efforts, spending money and submitting projects and the Committee says it's not acceptable without giving them alternatives or options. Would like to hear from the State Party and ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite connaître s'il y a un impact positif de ces travaux sur le site.

La Délégation du **Mali** demande à l'Etat partie si un plan de gestion existe et le cas échéant, l'état de sa mise en œuvre.

The Delegation of **Germany** wished to know how the alternatives to the tunnel project had been elaborated.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** s'associe aux Délégations précédentes pour poser ces mêmes questions.

The Delegation of **South Africa** also requested a clarification from the State Party on the points already raised. It is of the understanding that construction has not yet started and the State Party considered other alternatives, also the coastline was not considered as a feature when the site was being inscribed.

The Delegation of **Serbia** requested clarification from the State Party on the situation of the buffer zone of the property and also asked if it was possible to have another visual approach to the property's setting regarding the viaduct.

The Delegation of **India** also supported the requests for clarification from the State Party.

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

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** replied to the questions made by the Committee members and stated that the state of preservation of the buildings of the Historic District is the main concern of Bill 64/11 which provides financial incentives to restore the buildings of the Historic District of Panama. Regarding the tunnel project, in 2010 there was a monitoring mission who studied two alternatives – surface and tunnel, both were however rejected and it was felt that the tunnel option would do irreversible damage to the area. The State Party started to work on a third option – option C, which was submitted to UNESCO and ICOMOS in January 2012. In June it came back with answers to something that had been decided not to be done two years before. It stated that it had a problem with the inconsistency of the evaluations being done.

In terms of the Master Plan, there is one in place that is a decade old. The Management Plan is concise and is being used for the development of Casco Viejo. The buffer zone was put in place in 2004 by Panamanian law, which has already been communicated to the Centre; UNESCO advised of some changes, but these have yet to be done. The report said there is no buffer zone in place, when this is not the case. It would have been better for the Committee to know that Panama has a buffer zone created by decree and law and respected, and it has tried to register it but this has not been done so as yet.

In terms of consistency between the Draft Decision and the mission report why the tunnel was not built, nothing corresponds to the 2010 mission report presented by ICOMOS of the impact studies for that option – for example of the risk on the heritage in the old city, dangers to public safety, danger of flooding, limited road capacity, pressure on the entry points and impact on the centre, the need for ventilation and evacuation along the tunnel route, and the high maintenance cost of infrastructure; these were the technical and physical aspects most relevant in the decision to agree with the 2010 report. Some of those things have already been mentioned in the various comments. To answer the question regarding the benefits that the project could bring to the historical centre, the Centre is suffocating and

congested. The project is innovative and will renew the old centre while respecting its integrity and authenticity. It will convert the Centre into a pedestrian zone and eliminate pollution and congestion that the city has been suffering from, as well as enhancing sustainable tourism by setting up parking lots and other facilities. It will favour social inclusion and prevent damage to the old city, which has its back turned to the modern city.

The Delegation of **India** stated that from the explanations provided by the State Party, the Secretariat and ICOMOS, and pointing to a heritage site with people living within in and around it, and entitled to benefiting from development of access. It had not seen any justification to inscribe the property on the Danger List. There is a lack of communication between the mission or the perceptions of the mission and the Government which could have been reconciled before with dialogue. Being dogged by the issue of visual integrity, he questioned how far visual integrity was defined. The fort faces out to the ocean. How far do you define the visual integrity of the site? Only arbitrary answers at this time as well developed guidelines are not available. The debate is on how these challenges will be confronted as well as there are far too many issues. Many of these issues could have been addressed over time in a consultative manner. It requested further clarification.

ICOMOS clarified that the 2010 mission had not rejected the tunnel option but had expressed their willingness to evaluate the entire project noting the impacts the project could have on the property in the future if measures were not implemented to mitigate against it. It also noted that they had expressed their interest in assessing all options available, in consultation with the construction company, the Ministry of Public Works, and Panamanian authorities. It stated that an interest and willingness to help the State Party to assess all available options was indicated. Technical assistance and Advisory Missions had been foreseen in 2011, which were cancelled by the State Party. It stated that impacts are at the core of the discussion, and several impacts were ascertained not only from this development but impacts raised and highlighted by previous Committee sessions. It recalled there were several impacts on the condition of authenticity pertaining to the urban layout and form which would be impacted by this proposed project. In terms of integrity, there is also an erosion of the limits which exist today between the built heritage and the small peninsula, an intrinsic part of the selection of this area. It further underlined that it was not only the proposed construction of the viaduct that was of concern and expressed, but also a question of the state of conservation of the built fabric. The 2009 and 2010 missions reiterated and ascertained the conditions that were pointed out to the Committee in past sessions, which constitute an ascertained danger to the property.

The Delegation of **Mexico** repeated the same question and asked for clarification from the State Party if the work had started, and if yes, how far has it advanced? Much of the Draft Decision depends on this and no answer had been received on this.

La Délégation du **Mali** réitère ses questions, s'adressant cette fois à ICOMOS et au Centre.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** also requested clarification on the points the Delegation of **Mexico** raised and to understand from what perspective this document was prepared.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** replied that the construction work had not begun for connecting up the ends of the project in accordance to the meeting of 2008. There are two sites in Panama quite far from public spaces and the historic centre and are entitled to do construction there. Panama has fully respected the *World Heritage Convention* and is making huge efforts to protect its heritage sites. The Old City of Panama includes different historic areas. In this context, the project would not have any particular impact on the visual integrity of the property. Almost a stretch 300m of the project is below the sight line of an observer of the Historic Centre. There is a great range of views of the Old City. The coastal route does not have a negative impact but instead is a positive dialogue between these highly contrasting areas of the city.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** repose sa question sur l'impact visuel : y a-t-il la possibilité de scruter la vieille ville à partir du viaduc qui n'aurait pas été possible sans ce dernier? Si oui, ceci pourrait être considéré comme un impact positif.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** highlighted that we are talking about two different sites; the Archaeological site of Panama Viejo is an archaeological park exclusively. The Historic District is a living site, requires sustainable tourism and has an active economy. It underscored this issue should not have been discussed in the context of an urban landscape as it was not related to the criteria under which the property was inscribed, nor is it fair or appropriate, and would be grateful if that could be taken into account. It then responded that the construction work of this viaduct would not only enhance the historic centre but also give a new way of looking at the old city, not only from cars but pedestrians as well. It also presents a new value to the old city.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that the State Party had already spoken several times in the middle of the debate which was contrary to the Rules of Procedures. The State Party should only speak once at the end. It requested clarification from ICOMOS on the visual and acoustic impacts. It highlighted the project would certainly have impacts on the historic centre and this issue should be carefully reviewed. In this 40th Anniversary of the *Convention* we should think how we deal with our heritage and how we hand it over to the future generation. It cannot imagine that this project has no impact on the property, and why there is enough money for this project but no money to enhance the historic fabric or the ecological sites of Panama. Committee members should use the instrument of the List of World Heritage in Danger to get one more year to figure out what is going on with the site, and should also consider the impacts for the future generations as well.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** estime que le cas est très intéressant car il nous permet de voir la question sous un angle positif – celui d'une éventuelle conciliation entre les impératifs de la préservation et les nouvelles exigences du développement. Elle propose d'inviter l'Etat partie et l'ICOMOS à entreprendre un dialogue en vue d'intégrer la dimension « valorisation » comme l'un des indicateurs d'évaluation en matière d'impact visuel. Il faut accorder à Panama un délai raisonnable pour proposer à ICOMOS, ou en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS, un projet revisité qui aurait pour effet d'être un élément de valorisation structurant au profit du site archéologique de Casco Viejo et du district historique du Panama. Ceci serait un défi à relever pour l'Etat partie et les organisations consultatives.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime son étonnement par le fait que le Comité ne suit pas la même logique qu'il a appliquée pendant la discussion sur le cas de Séville le matin même, selon laquelle il ne pouvait pas arrêter une construction déjà faite. Or,

dans le cas de Panama les travaux ne sont qu'à leur début. Il est tout à fait à l'honneur du Panama de ne pas avoir entrepris les travaux en attendant la décision du Comité, comme la Délégation du Panama l'a confirmé. Dans ce cas le Comité n'est pas mis devant un fait accompli, et le Panama honore ainsi ses obligations envers la Convention. Ayant entendu toutes les explications des membres du Comité, de l'ICOMOS et de l'Etat partie, la Suisse propose de garder la décision soumise. En effet, si le Comité refuse l'inscription de Séville sur la Liste en péril, sous prétexte que la tour a été construite mais aussi celle de Casco Viejo, car ceci ne se justifie pas à ce stade, la Délégation se demande quel type d'impact négatif doit il y avoir pour inscrire un site sur la Liste en péril ? Cette fois, la réflexion ne peut pas être considérée comme précipitée car on peut encore influencer sur l'impact. La crédibilité du Comité est de nouveau en jeu.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** informed that there were amendments to the Draft Decision, but that there were no proposed amendments for paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision.

Paragraph 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** informed that the proposed amendment by the Russian Federation to paragraph 3 included the deletion of the last sentence 'and the impacts related to the Cinta Costera project'.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déclare qu'elle ne peut pas accepter l'amendement. Il y a sans doute un impact visuel, donc la phrase doit rester telle que proposée.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal of Switzerland that the proposed deletion should remain as in the original paragraph.

La Délégation de la **France** se déclare gênée par les mots « processus d'embourgeoisement » estimant que ce terme ne rentre pas dans le domaine de la Convention et qu'il n'appartient pas au Comité de juger ce phénomène sociologique.

ICOMOS explained "gentrification" was the scientific word commonly used, and in the context of the Draft Decision it means substitution of the local communities by speculation processes and the changing of the nature of the historic centre itself, and it's a term commonly used to note issues pertaining to changes in the spirit of historic centres.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the amendment proposed by the Russian Federation as the Cinta Costera project has not yet begun so it seems strange to prejudge potential impacts of the construction work that had not yet begun according to the State Party. It also supported France's proposal, to remove term 'gentrification processes' and find a better way of explaining this.

The Delegation of **India** also supported along with Mexico the proposal of the Russian Federation. It expressed its concern about using the word "gentrification" which was not fully understood by other people.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient les propos de la France : en français le terme « embourgeoisement » est fortement connoté. Par respect pour l'Etat partie il faut trouver un autre terme.

The Delegation of **Colombia** pointed out that for the term “gentrification” that the translation may not be right in the French text and proposed an alternative, ‘notable substitution of the local population by incoming population with higher income’.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal from the Delegation of **France** and the Russian Federation and the removal of the impacts of the project considering that the project has not begun, and also the removal of the term gentrification process

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of **France** if it wanted to give a French translation of gentrification.

La Délégation de la **France** réitère que les transformations sociologiques d'un site ne relèvent pas de la Convention. La population des villes est toujours changeante et le Comité ne doit pas se préoccuper de ce problème.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that the Committee is discussing integrity aspects and if this is a valuable aspect for ICOMOS and ICCROM that they draw attention to, it should not be interpreted as a reference to a « horrible » situation. It agrees with Mexico regarding “potential” impacts related to the Cinta Costera project but would like to suggest as a compromise. ‘the Historic Centre and the potential impacts related to the Cinta Costera project’

La Délégation du **Mali** propose de parler de remplacement des bâtiments historiques par de nouveaux bâtiments, au lieu de parler des populations.

The Delegation of **Mexico** suggested doing away with ‘and the impacts of the Cinta Costera project’ as the State Party stated that the work has not yet begun, and requested the suspension of the Draft Decision for the moment so that the Committee could check if the amended paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision was in line with the remaining paragraphs.

La Délégation de la **France** demande le retrait de la partie de la phrase qui concerne les populations locales.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la proposition de la France.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported the comments made by Algeria and France.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended text of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision and informed that there was no consensus on the term “potential impacts related to the Cinta Costera project”.

The Delegation of **Mexico** requested leaving this paragraph pending until the Committee goes along to the rest of the decision. The **Rapporteur** asked the Secretariat to clean the text following what was read.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections

Paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision was adopted.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the text adopted was that which was offered by the Delegation of Mexico on 'the potential impacts' and amazed at Mexico's reaction. The text on the screen had already been adopted.

The Delegation of **Mexico** underlined it had not said "potential impacts" but that the project doesn't exist so it couldn't be assessed. It clarified its stance saying that it had initially supported the proposal of the Russian Federation, which was deletion of paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, but now it agreed with leaving the paragraph in brackets to see how the other following paragraphs appear.

The Delegation of **Germany** also requested leaving the proposals of Switzerland and Germany in brackets.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the Mexico's proposal; the phrase should be put in brackets to come back to later.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the decision leaving paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision in brackets.

Paragraphs 4 to 5d were adopted.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the amendment of the Russian Federation of paragraph 6, regarding the previous paragraph, once paragraph 5 is approved with the amendments as suggested, the Delegation of Mexico would like to stress that the final phrase of paragraph 3 should be deleted, as the State Party will review its legislation and provide more information to the Committee. The Committee cannot assess the impacts of this project at this stage. Paragraph 3 should not end with 'the impacts that the project may have'.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la proposition du Mexique.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime sa vive préoccupation concernant l'impact, pour le moins potentiel, de ce projet, en insistant de garder le paragraphe 3 du projet de décision.

La Délégation de **France** rappelle que, selon la doctrine du Comité de patrimoine mondial, une étude d'impact patrimonial doit avoir été faite, et s'enquiert si celle-ci existe. La Délégation demande plus de précision sur les impacts, notamment quelles valeurs seront affectées, et souhaite obtenir une description précise des changements qui vont se faire sur la VUE. Elle précise qu'il faut quantifier les changements ; de même elle souhaite savoir en quoi la situation va changer de façon négative avec le viaduc. Le Comité doit savoir cela avant de prendre une décision.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party if the heritage impact assessment had been done.

The **State Party** replied that the heritage impact assessment had been completed and submitted to the World Heritage Centre as well as to ICOMOS in 2012.

ICOMOS confirmed that it had received the heritage impact assessment and noted that the evaluation of the assessment was in the state of conservation report.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its agreement on the amendment made by the Russian Federation, Mexico and Algeria on paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision. What did the heritage impact assessment say? It pointed out that the term “reverse” in paragraph 7 was not appropriate as it was impossible to reverse the project that had not yet begun.

The Delegation of **Germany** recalled the decision of the 35th Committee session which had requested the State Party to discontinue the construction of the Cinta Costera project Phase III. It stated that crossing out the sentence in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision made the Committee decision irrelevant to last year’s decision, which must not happen. The Committee could not proceed like this. It asked the Delegations of the Russian Federation, Mexico and Algeria to reconsider.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated although last year’s Committee had made a decision on this issue, it should be taken into consideration that the State Party had clarified the project had not begun. The project can’t be discontinued if it hasn’t begun. The Committee can make a factual reference to all decisions taken but should also make reference to explanations just heard. As the paragraph stands, it is not appropriate and would need to be amended and references made to the decision taken last year and then take on board the new information.

La Délégation de l’**Algérie** demande s’il y a une information vérifiée sur l’état de construction et d’avancement du projet.

ICOMOS gave the floor to the **Secretariat** who underlined the platform had already begun as shown in the photos in the presentation - part of the project Cinta Costera II and Cinta Costera III, as well as the itinerary of the viaduct that encircles the peninsula. This information was received from local and national associations.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated although there had been a Committee decision, it should be reviewed appropriately when new information was provided.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, suite aux clarifications du Secrétariat, propose au Comité de saluer, dans la Décision concernant ce site, le fait que les travaux n’ont pas encore commencé, mais d’exprimer son regret que les travaux d’aménagement des plateformes aient débute, contrairement aux demandes du Comité.

The Delegation of **India** asked for clarification from the State Party on the work, is it exploratory or planning work, or is this beginning of the project. The paragraph was not central to the theme as it is developing.

The **State Party** explained there were two parks being developed which were outside of the property and had no link to the project the Committee was discussing. It repeated again that the State Party had not begun any project, not one pillar. Panama has respected the comments, observations and decisions of the Committee at the 35th session and carried out massive studies to get the best options. It wasn’t just one project but a series of detailed studies with all the repercussions and how the heritage could be protected. This is a project that is a long way from the area and is a viaduct that would fit in with its environment. The peninsula will remain a peninsula. The attributes for which the property was inscribed are intrinsically there. The State Party reiterated that it had not begun any work on the Cinta Costera project.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked if the State Party would say what the Secretariat had explained on the commencement of the building process, not on the viaduct itself is untrue and a lie.

The **State Party** reiterated that the viaduct has not begun. Any other project or platform built in the country has absolutely no relevance simply because it is in proximity to the area being talked about. Reiterated that they had not started.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, suite aux clarifications apportées par l'Etat partie, propose un nouvel amendement, par lequel le Comité salue le fait que les travaux du viaduc n'ont pas encore commencé, en conformité avec la demande du Comité. Elle est appuyée par la Délégation du **Sénégal**.

The Delegation of **India** considered the paragraph factually correct and a good idea. It underscored that a credibility check must be done on the information provided by third parties to the Secretariat, and a balance must be maintained. The Committee is an intergovernmental body, and the Committee should not deal with a Government of a country like that.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the amendment to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision made by the Delegation of **Switzerland**.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne la remarque pertinente de la Délégation de l'Inde, en précisant que souvent les informations sont envoyées au Centre du patrimoine mondial par des groupes de pression qui ont d'autres buts que la préservation du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the Committee stop discussion on paragraph 6 and asked if there was any objection to the amendment made by the Delegation of **Switzerland**, of which there was none.

Paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** moved to the next paragraph and invited the Delegation of **the Russian Federation** to give its rationale for the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained that since the State Party informed the Committee that the construction work had not yet begun, the Draft Decision should be in line with the statement.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie la proposition de la Délégation de la Russie d'abolir le paragraphe 6.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee agreed with abolishing paragraph 7 of the resolution.

The Delegation of **India** supported the **Russian Federation** and recalled what the Delegation of **France** had stated regarding the Outstanding Universal Value adopted at the time of inscription of the property. We cannot continue to play by changing the rules of the game successively.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie la proposition de la Délégation de **l'Inde**.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remarque que ces amendements sont maintenant contradictoires en ce qui concerne l'impact visuel sur la VUE.

The Delegation of **India** asked if there is any impact on the Outstanding Universal Value as originally inscribed.

ICOMOS explained that at the time of inscription no formal Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (SOUV) had been adopted. The retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value (RSOUV) was submitted in 2011, revised by ICOMOS, and has been sent back to the State Party for consideration and final review. The brief synthesis indicates this relationship between the Historic Centre and the seascape, and also the notion of location and setting. The criteria mentioned by the State Party were included in the Statement of OUV as was adopted - criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of **India** further asked if the State Party had accepted the RSOUV.

The **State Party** confirmed that it had received the RSOUV revised by either ICOMOS or the Centre in which it had been reiterated that the criteria under which the property was inscribed were (ii), (iv) and (vi), and none of the criteria was related to the sea. This designation is made up of two different properties – Panama Viejo and the Historic District. Panama Viejo has other criteria, none of the criteria being discussed here has to do with the sea.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked if at the time of inscription if it had been mentioned that it was a historic village at the seaside used by people travelling by a boat or something like that. Reminded the Committee that the resolution is for the Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and the Historic District of Panama.

The **State Party** replied that criterion (ii) was for the existing buildings then, the link between the Historic Centre and the sea was never defined in terms of access and there was never any direct access to the sea for this peninsula. The only thing taken into consideration at the time of inscription was route construction and the first European settlement on the Pacific coast but there had been no question about accessibility from the sea that had been taken into account. The Delegate of **Germany** noted it had the reference as it had been mentioned that this fortification was towards the sea. It supported the proposal of the Delegation of **Switzerland**.

The **Chairperson** proposed a modification to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision to make it a necessity to do an assessment 'Cinta Costera III Maritime Viaduct project has to be studied for its impact on the OUV of the Historic Centre of Panama'

The Delegation of **India** stated it was easy to propose an assessment but it would need time as well as money. Delays to the project result in costs. There is a sustainable livelihood dimension to this project without compromising the inherent OUV of the property. The world is moving on and these are not easy times.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la proposition de faire une étude d'impact du projet sur la VUE.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the Delegations of **the Russian Federation, India and Switzerland** sit together and formulate a new proposal for the paragraph. Meanwhile, she moved to the next paragraph.

The **Chairperson** asked for paragraph 8 regarding the updated version of the management plan and the comprehensive urban transportation strategy. She asked if there were any objections to this paragraph

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to add “including alternative options”.

The **Chairperson** noted that this does not concern the viaduct but transportation within the Historic Centre, and requested the Russian Federation to make the clarification.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted the proposal referred to the comprehensive strategy of all transportation and such strategy should offer options.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated that the amendment made by the Delegation of **the Russian Federation** was quite correct and necessary as many of the details of the project needed to be provided by the State Party so that the Committee could have all the necessary information.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande d'ajouter une mention sur les alternatives possibles au projet Costa Cintera 3.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the paragraph as amended by Germany and Switzerland.

Paragraph 8 was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** moved to paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision and proposed deleting it as it was decided not to put the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision was related to paragraph 6 which had been suspended, therefore the Committee could not adopt paragraph 9 until paragraph 6 was adopted.

The **Chairperson** proposed examining some items not requiring discussion by the Committee, and proceeded with the next item.

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Africa region.

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis) – 36 COM 7B.40
Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15) – 36 COM 7B.41
Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18) – 36 COM 7B.42
Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev) – 36 COM 7B.44
Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227) – 36 COM 7B.45
Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599) – 36 COM 7B.46
Saloum Delta (Senegal) (C 1359) – 36 COM 7B.47
Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev) – 36 COM 7B.49

Au sujet de la Ville de pierre de Zanzibar, le **Secrétariat** porte à l'attention du Comité qu'au moment de la présentation du rapport, l'Etat partie a soumis son étude d'impact environnemental, ce qui pourrait être reflété dans la Décision.

The **Chairperson** authorized the Rapporteur to do it without discussion.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise qu'elle avait soumis un projet d'amendement concernant Djenné, Mali.

The Delegation of **Germany** wished to examine the State of conservation report of the **Old Towns of Djenné (Mali)**.

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted, except **36 COM 7B.44**.

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

Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87) – 36 COM 7B.50

Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89) – 36 COM 7B.51

Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299) – 36 COM 7B.52

Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850) – 36 COM 7B.53

Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190) – 36 COM 7B.54

Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287) – 36 COM 7B.55

Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750) – 36 COM 7B.56

Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433) – 36 COM 7B.57

Ancient Villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1348) – 36 COM 7B.58

Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37) – 36 COM 7B.59

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) – 36 COM 7B.60

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

The meeting rose at 7pm.

FOURTH DAY – Thursday, 28 June 2012

SEVENTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

The **Chairperson** opened the session recalling the provisions of paragraph 190 of the Operational Guidelines, concerning the procedures for the opening of state of conservation of reports for debate by the Committee. She then resumed the discussion of item 7B.103, concerning the Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and Historic District of Panama.

Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and the Historic District of Panama (Panamá) (C 790bis) *(continuation)*

La Délégation de la **Suisse** lit l'amendement proposé au paragraphe 6 et précise que l'étude demandée doit se faire sur la base des critères actuellement inscrits. Elle remercie ses deux collègues pour l'avoir aidée dans la rédaction de cet amendement.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its support to the spirit of the amended paragraph and noted that more time should have been given to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Mexico** wondered why the revised paragraph alluded to the non-compliance, by the State Party, of some of the requests by the Committee. It further stated that before asking the State Party to undertake a full Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), it was important to understand the status of the project for the Cinta Costera. In this regard, the Delegation asked whether the State Party should be given the floor to clarify the matter.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique que la situation est bien connue et que chaque mot a été pesé. Elle précise que c'est dans cet esprit que l'adverbe « pas entièrement » a été introduit et propose de ne pas donner la parole au Panama.

The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee if there was any objection to the wording of paragraph 6 as amended by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that the State Party had fully complied with the requests by the Committee and, in agreement with the Delegation of Mexico, asked that the word “not” be removed from the paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** est d'accord avec ce paragraphe 6 amendé.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its full support to the original Swiss amendment.

The Delegation of **India**, which had contributed to the drafting of the amendment before the Committee, stated that the real question was to ensure that ICOMOS would consider the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project with « fresh eyes », and as soon as possible, so as not to delay the progress of an important project for the local development. The World Heritage Centre should guide this process so that it can be brought to a close, and would like to be reassured that this assessment would be carried out as soon as possible.

La Délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** rappelle que l'Inde ne figure pas parmi les auteurs de l'amendement, et prie le Comité d'adopter le paragraphe amendé.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** est d'accord avec la proposition suisse, russe et indienne et rappelle que l'Etat partie s'est prononcé hier et a répondu à nos questions. Elle souligne que cette étude d'impact est importante.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the amendments to paragraph 6 by the Delegations of Switzerland, Russian Federation and India.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** est d'accord sur l'amendement du groupe de travail et se réjouit de voir un compromis.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient également la Suisse en indiquant que cet amendement ouvre la porte à une étude et laisse le temps à l'Etat partie de faire ce qui est nécessaire.

The Delegation of **South Africa** concurred with previous speakers on the need to adopt this paragraph and move forward.

The **Chairperson** declared paragraph 6 adopted, as amended by the Delegations of Switzerland, the Russian Federation and India. She then proceeded to the examination of other paragraphs of the Draft Decision, notably 7, which was adopted, 9 and 10, which were deleted since they referred to the initial proposal for danger listing, and finally ex paragraph 11, now paragraph 8, which was also adopted. The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.103** was adopted as amended.

AFRICA (*continuation*)

Vieille ville de Lamu (Kenya) (C 1055)

Le **Secrétariat** indique que depuis la préparation de ce rapport, le Centre du patrimoine mondial n'a pas reçu de nouvelles informations. Néanmoins, il est important de rappeler la principale préoccupation concernant les projets d'aménagement du corridor Lamu-Sud Soudan-Ethiopie et du Port de Lamu, sans que les nécessaires études d'impact environnementales et d'impact sur le patrimoine n'aient été fournies au Centre du patrimoine mondial, ni la documentation technique demandée par le Comité dans ses précédentes décisions.

ICOMOS expressed its concern about the state of conservation of this property, noting that the recommendations of the mission carried out in 2009 had had limited implementation. It also stressed the lack of detailed information on a development project that could potentially have a significant impact on the old city of Lamu, and recommended the halting of the works until a heritage impact assessment would be carried out.

The **Chairperson**, noting that there were no amendments proposed to the Draft Decision, asked whether there were any comments by the Members of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite que le Comité donne à l'Etat Partie la possibilité de s'exprimer.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Committee for its support to the conservation of the Old City of Lamu. It noted that the proposed development was 20 kms away from the listed property and well outside its buffer zone. An Environmental Impact Assessment was planned while the organization in charge of heritage protection had been asked to conduct a mapping exercise of all significant sites. The Observer Delegation stated that all the information concerning this process and its initial results would be provided to the Committee at its next reporting cycle.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee members if there were any proposed amendments to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** considère que l'Etat Partie a pris toutes les mesures annoncées et si le projet est situé à 20 km de la zone tampon, il est inutile de garder la fin du paragraphe 10.

The Delegations of **South Africa** and **Colombia** agreed with the previous speaker, noting that more time was needed for the State Party.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that the question posed to the State Party had not been specific, which had given the latter an opportunity to advocate for a favorable decision.

La Délégation du **Mali** considère, à la suite à l'exposé du Secrétariat, que le Kenya est de bonne volonté. Le projet n'ayant pas encore démarré et étant situé à 20km du site, elle est d'accord avec la Délégation du Sénégal.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** expressed its support to the statements of the delegations of Senegal and Mali.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the proposal, considering that it is a straightforward issue. It recalls that the project is still at an early stage, that there is cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and this is a positive sign.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** soutient les précédentes interventions.

The **Chairperson** read out paragraph 10 as amended by the Delegation of Senegal and, noting that there were no objections, declared it adopted. She then declared adopted the entire Decision **36 COM 7B.43**.

Biens du patrimoine mondial au Mali (Mali)

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que le 1er avril 2012, la région nord du Mali a été occupée par des mouvements rebelles et groupes armés. Cette région abrite deux des quatre biens du patrimoine mondial, Tombouctou et le Tombeau des Askia. Face à cette situation, et suite à un appel lancé à l'UNESCO par le Gouvernement du Mali, la Directrice générale, Madame Irina Bokova, a dépêché une mission de haut niveau au Mali du 18 au 20 mai.

En ce qui concerne le bien Tombouctou, le Secrétariat indique que le 4 mai 2012, le mausolée Sidi Mahmoud, l'un des 16 mausolées qui composent le bien, a été endommagé et profané par l'un des groupes islamiste Ansar Dine. Un autre mausolée situé lui dans le camp militaire occupé par le groupe armé Ansa Dine, prêt de la mosquée de Djingareyber. Le nouveau Centre Ahmed Baba, construit avec le soutien de l'Afrique du Sud, censé abriter plus de 30,000 manuscrits, est occupé par le groupe islamiste et situé à proximité de la Mosquée de Sankore.

Pour ce qui est du Tombeau des Askia, la ville de Gao est entièrement sous contrôle des groupes islamistes et aucune gestion n'est possible.

Le Secrétariat annonce que, suite à la mission de l'UNESCO de mai 2012, le Mali envisage d'adhérer au 2ème protocole de 1999 de la Convention de 1954 et a soumis une requête d'assistance internationale afin de mettre en œuvre les actions urgentes de formation au suivi de l'état de conservation des ONGs humanitaires qui interviennent dans le cadre du corridor humanitaire, à l'armée malienne, et de sensibilisation de la société civile à l'importance de ne pas détruire ce patrimoine mondial.

Le 20 mai 2012, l'Etat partie a adressé une lettre à la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO lui demandant de transmettre au Comité son souhait que les biens de Tombouctou et du Tombeau des Askia, soient inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Enfin, le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** et l'**ICOMOS** sont d'avis qu'en raison de la situation de conflit armé qui prévaut dans cette région, les conditions optimales de leur protection ne sont plus réunies et ceux-ci sont menacés par un danger prouvé, précis et imminent.

L'**ICOMOS** est favorable à la demande de l'Etat partie d'inscrire ces biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et soutient la requête d'assistance internationale soumise. L'**ICOMOS** est prêt à apporter son aide pour la mise en œuvre du plan d'action.

The Delegation of **South Africa** shared the deep concern for the properties of Mali, which were threatened by the on-going armed conflict. It mentioned in particular the importance of the ancient manuscripts conserved within those sites, and a recent project for the construction of the Ahmed Baba research centre dedicated to the study and the conservation of these precious testimonies of African history, which was carried out with support from South Africa.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** adhère totalement à ce projet de décision, mais veut apporter deux précisions : elle souhaite que dans la phrase citant les pays frontaliers, le Sénégal soit rajouté, et que soit demandé à ces pays frontaliers de se réunir avec

les collègues maliens pour faire le point à travers un atelier sous-régional concernant le trafic des biens culturels. La Délégation du Sénégal souligne que les biens de Tombouctou sont liés à l'histoire générale de l'Afrique, c'est l'histoire écrite de l'Afrique.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que Tombouctou est un des cœurs spirituels de l'Afrique et que l'Etat partie a lancé un appel au secours au Comité. Elle soutient le projet de décision.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient ce projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Germany** concurred with the views expressed by previous speakers and appealed to all parties to protect the World Heritage properties of Mali, which were jewels of mankind.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the proposed Draft Decision and noted that international assistance was required to support the conservation of these properties, including through the Emergency Fund of UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** supported the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie bien entendu le projet. Elle condamne fortement la destruction de ces biens et déplore la violence et les pertes en vie humaines. Elle félicite l'Etat partie du Mali de demander l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** indicated that it would like to support the request put by Mali and agreed with Colombia that there is a need to increase international cooperation.

La Délégation du **Mali** remercie le Comité et exprime l'émotion qui l'étreint devant cette décision qui l'engage face à ses responsabilités. Reconnaisant la portée de la décision, elle veut sincèrement remercier le Comité et tous ceux qui ont contribué à la rédaction de cette décision, ainsi que tous ceux qui de près ou de loin sont prêts à l'aider à sortir de ce péril.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to take the Committee through the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** reads paragraph 9 with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Senegal.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite ajouter un segment dans le paragraphe 10 demandant aux Etats frontaliers de tenir un atelier.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** note que cela relève de la responsabilité de ces pays et que ce n'est pas au Comité de leur demander de tenir un atelier sous-régional.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** agreed with Switzerland noting that the Committee must avoid imposing anything on governments. However an appeal to neighbouring countries could be launched asking to fight against illicit traffic of cultural property.

With reference to paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Colombia** suggested adding the words « in particular » before the words “those linked to its properties”.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique son adhésion à cette idée de lancer un appel aux Etats frontaliers en soulignant qu'une coopération dans le domaine du patrimoine et de la lutte contre le trafic illicite à toujours existé. En outre, la Délégation propose de biffer « à la région nord ».

The **Chairperson** clarified that the decision being considered by the Committee regarded precisely the World Heritage properties located in the northern region of Mali.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** insiste pour supprimer cette portion de phrase.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande son opinion à la Délégation du Mali.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stated that it understood the difficulties in Northern Mali but noted that illicit traffic could take place anywhere.

La Délégation du **Mali** confirme que tout le monde sait qu'il s'agit du Nord du pays, tout en soulignant que le centre n'est pas épargné, et donne son accord pour laisser simplement Mali.

The **Chairperson** read out the paragraph as amended following the suggestion by the Delegations of Colombia and Algeria and, noting no objections, declared it adopted.

The Draft Decision **36COM 7B.106** was adopted as amended.

L'**ICCROM** indique qu'il est en train d'organiser un cours destiné à la formation d'experts dans le cadre de la lutte contre le trafic et de la protection du patrimoine en cas de conflit armé qui se tiendra en octobre 2012 à Rome.

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)

Le **Secrétariat** présente le rapport d'état de conservation et rappelle qu'à la demande du Comité, une mission du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS a visité le bien en janvier 2012 pour étudier l'évaluation d'impact sur le patrimoine (EIP) préparé par l'Etat partie, ainsi que l'impact potentiel du projet d'extraction houillère de grande envergure à l'est du bien. La mission devait également examiner les progrès accomplis vis-à-vis de la délimitation d'une zone tampon à l'est du bien comme identifiée au moment de l'inscription, et l'état de conservation général du bien. La mission devait également étudier d'éventuelles mesures d'atténuation si elle concluait que le projet minier ne menaçait pas de façon irréversible la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle (VUE) du bien.

Le Secrétariat souligne que cette mission avait été initialement prévue à la fin de novembre 2011, sur invitation de l'Etat partie. Elle a été différée au mois de janvier 2012 à la demande de l'ICOMOS qui souhaitait avoir plus de temps pour étudier l'EIP avant la mission.

La mission a découvert que l'usine de traitement de la houille était à 95% achevée et que les activités d'extraction avait repris au sein de la première parcelle d'extraction à ciel ouvert de 50 ha. La mission a noté que l'impact visuel de cette extraction, même limitée, de la carrière à ciel ouvert que Coal of Africa envisage pour l'ensemble de ses activités d'exploitation dans la zone sud-est était déjà considérable. Du point de vue de la mission, la logique défendue par la société Coal of Africa, d'opter pour une mine à ciel ouvert dans la zone sud-est et souterraine dans la zone nord-ouest, alors que la veine de charbon se trouve plus ou moins à la même profondeur dans les deux secteurs, ne se justifiait pas. La mission ayant conclu que la principale menace pour l'environnement du bien était le procédé d'extraction à ciel ouvert car son impact sur le paysage mettrait en danger le continuum culturel entre le paysage du bien et celui de son environnement, a considéré qu'aucune mesure d'atténuation n'était possible pour réduire l'impact sur la VUE d'une exploitation à ciel ouvert. Par conséquent, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS recommandent que les opérations minières à ciel ouvert soient stoppées à l'actuelle surface et que toute exploitation future au sein de cette zone, qui aurait dû faire partie de la zone tampon lors de l'inscription du site en 2003, soit réalisée en souterrain.

ICOMOS explained that at the time of the inscription of the property, no buffer zone was proposed by the State Party. The understanding, at the time, was that a buffer zone of an adequate size, representing the TFCA boundaries, would be established as per the 2003 agreed discussions, however this had not happened. ICOMOS stated that the mission had considered the impact on the property of the mining operations, which had already begun, and that there were no mitigation measures to the open-cast mining. In this respect, ICOMOS considered that underground mining would be the preferable alternative. It recalled why the area affected by the mining was significant in relation to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as it provides its setting and might contain important archaeological testimonies.

La Délégation du **Mali** note qu'ayant écouté les interventions et considéré les informations de l'Etat partie, il semble y avoir une incompréhension entre l'Etat partie et l'organisation consultative. Il apparaît que la carte utilisée par la mission n'est pas la carte réelle et l'Etat partie indique que l'extraction se situe loin du site, et n'a donc pas d'impact négatif sur le bien. L'organisation consultative dit qu'il n'y a pas de délimitation précise mais l'Etat partie dit que oui.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to take the Committee through the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed by the Delegation of India to paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Draft decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique son désaccord sur l'absence d'impact et demande à la Délégation de l'Inde la logique de cet amendement en soulignant qu'il y a une claire alternative qui est l'exploitation souterraine. Elle considère que le choix se trouve entre la conservation du bien et les intérêts d'une compagnie privée de maximiser l'exploitation.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the statement made by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the question of which technology was best suited to conduct the mining was not the point. The real issue here seemed to be that the

operations appeared to be well outside the buffer zone, and requested the Chairperson to allow the State Party to clarify this matter.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique être entièrement d'accord avec la Suisse, la priorité doit aller à la conservation. Mais elle note une incompréhension entre l'Etat partie et l'organisation consultative sur les cartes utilisées, la mission ayant utilisé des cartes dépassées. La Délégation pense qu'il n'y a pas d'impact, considérant la distance par rapport au bien.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its deep concern about the ongoing mining operations. It appealed to the State Party to go for the underground option, and supported the position expressed by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of the **Federation of Russia** underlined that, as in many cases, the key is that the Committee members have different points of view, plus the issue of maps as explained by Mali and India. It indicated that it wanted to support the amendment made by India.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** pose une question sur la clarification des limites, demandant où se trouvait cette exploitation.

Le **Secrétariat** précise que le Centre du patrimoine mondial n'a jamais reçu de carte officielle et que le site a été inscrit en 2003 sans zone tampon. Il note toutefois qu'à l'époque, des précisions avaient été données par l'Etat partie sur cette zone tampon prévue.

ICOMOS recalled that, at the time of inscription, its recommendation to the Committee had been to defer the nomination, precisely because of the lack of a buffer zone. The Committee, however, decided to inscribe the property regardless. No buffer zone had been officially proposed by the State Party by the time of inscription. The map which the mission used reflected clearly what had been agreed at the time of inscription. ICOMOS noted as well that the mission included a mining expert who discussed the various options with the company in charge of the mining operations. From this consultation, ICOMOS understood that underground mining is indeed being done in a certain area of the concession, to protect citrus plantations, and that it would be possible to apply the same technique for the entire area concerned by the mining.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** considère qu'il semble y avoir en effet un malentendu concernant la zone tampon de ce bien. Elle estime que ce problème doit être résolu par un meilleur dialogue entre l'organisation consultative et l'Etat partie, qui puisse aboutir à un accord.

La Délégation du **Mali** note que le projet d'extraction houillère semble concerner une zone qui se trouve en dehors des limites de la zone tampon, et soutient la proposition de la Délégation de l'Inde.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** appuie la Suisse.

La Délégation de **Serbie** souscrit à ce qu'a dit le Sénégal. Elle note que, dans le cas précédent concernant les biens du Mali, l'étude était très bien menée tandis que dans le cas actuel, la présentation n'est pas bonne avec des cartes dont on n'est pas sûr. Elle soutient l'Inde et considère qu'il est possible de travailler afin de trouver un compromis.

The Delegation of **India** noted that, as matter of fact, there was no agreed buffer zone for this property. In this context, what mattered was the area inscribed on the World Heritage List, from which the ongoing mining seemed to be far away. In this context, rather than starting to “creep” into the areas surrounding the property, what was needed was a clarification on the boundaries, so as to avoid wasting the time of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Qatar** est d'accord sur la nécessité de clarifier.

The Delegation of **Estonia** agreed that a clarification on the limits of the buffer zone was indeed necessary. Precisely for this reason, it considered that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India, which acknowledged that the ongoing mining operations had no impact of the property, was too radical at the other extreme of the original text, and not justifiable. The Delegation proposed to take out this paragraph entirely, as there was no consensus.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la proposition de l'Estonie de biffer tout le paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal by the Delegations of Estonia and Switzerland.

La Délégation du **Mali** demande à entendre l'Afrique du Sud.

The Delegation of **South Africa** affirmed its deep respect for the Committee and its concern that the ongoing debate seemed to waste its precious time. It noted that the report presented by ICOMOS referred to an “envisaged” buffer zone. In this regard, the Delegation wished to state that the mining operations were taking place in an area which was outside of the buffer zone, as delineated in various maps submitted by the State Party, including at the time of inscription. The Delegation clarified as well that a number of studies had been conducted before undertaking the project, including heritage and social impact assessments. It further stated that the Government of South Africa based its decisions on scientific evidence, especially after having invested so many resources for the above-mentioned studies.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'elle vient de soumettre un amendement sur le paragraphe 4 demandant de clarifier les limites du bien.

The Delegation of **South Africa** continued to explain that heritage impact assessment take at least six months and that they have undertaken several studies and that they will duly respect the recommendation of the experts.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to return to the consideration of paragraph 4.

The Rapporteur read out the proposed amendment by the Delegation of **Switzerland** which requests the State Party to submit a boundary clarification of the World Heritage property.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** reminded the Committee Members that the State Party of South Africa clearly stated that mining takes place outside the World Heritage property and therefore supported the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** also supported the amendment by the Delegation of India, but also stated that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland is acceptable if the formulation is slightly improved.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** considère que l'amendement de la Suisse rend compte des débats du Comité et qu'il apporte des éléments matériels pour les discussions futures.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland is a consensual proposal which could be accepted, but it could not replace the paragraph 4 supported by the Delegations of India, Russia and Malaysia.

The Delegation of **Estonia** specified that the information provided by the State Party was not sufficient and proposed to postpone the decision until the maps are provided to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Serbia** demanded that the proposed Swiss amendment should be in a separate paragraph.

La Délégation du **Mali** approuve la proposition de la Suisse.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** considère qu'il faut donner la parole à l'Etat partie car si l'ICOMOS avait en sa possession les bonnes cartes, il ne s'en est pas servi. Le Comité a besoin d'avoir des informations correctes.

The Delegation of **Serbia** requested to see the maps that have been provided to the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **South Africa** confirmed that the maps are available but that in the interest of time they could be consulted on the World Heritage Centre webpage, which shows the maps that were submitted in 2003.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to clarify the issue.

ICOMOS explained that the maps on the screen showed that property but not its buffer zone which had been requested at the time of inscription in 2003. ICOMOS highlighted that they had recommended the property for deferral to allow the State Party more time to strengthen the protection of the property. ICOMOS was not aware of any other maps that have been submitted.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the amendment by the Delegation of Switzerland and agreed with the representative of Serbia, that it should be included in a separate paragraph. The Delegation of Mexico further proposed that the Committee should note the conclusions of the Heritage Impact Assessment which indicated that the mining activity will have a minor impact on the property.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son doute sur la situation qui empêche, à son avis, que le Comité prenne une décision forte et définitive.

The **Chairperson** expressed concern that the Draft Decision as it stands is rather illogical and invited the Committee members to come up with coherent proposals.

The Delegation of **Mexico** reiterated its wish to the amendment proposed by Switzerland in a separate and amend the paragraph 4.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souhaite arriver à un consensus au sein du Comité mais il lui faut des clarifications quant aux limites du bien, sans quoi le Comité ne pourra pas parvenir à une conclusion. Il faut apporter des modifications au projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** read out the amendment proposed by Switzerland and highlighted that it was a rather consensual paragraph.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its concern about the discussion and specified that the maps provide inadequate information without clarity for the Committee to take an informed decision, which would not be fair vis-à-vis the concerned State Party.

In the light of this, the **Chairperson** proposed to delete the part of the phrase that referred to the mining activities. The Delegation of Estonia highlighted the need to keep the reference to the mining activities. The Chairperson insisted on the proposal to delete the reference and adopted paragraph 4 as amended.

The **Chairperson** continued to read out the amendment to paragraph 5 proposed by the Delegation of India who explained that the amendment replaced a statement of judgment by a statement of fact.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of India if the proposed amendment is crucial although there does not seem to be a problem about deleting it.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime ses difficultés à comprendre la situation relative à la zone tampon et aux limites du bien et considère qu'il est crucial de laisser la première partie du paragraphe 6 car il relate des éléments factuels.

The Delegation of **India** expressed doubts about the recommendations of the experts and the mission members and indicated that the Committee cannot take a technical decision based on the inadequate information provided in the mission report.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** summarized the discussion by indicating that the information provided to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies was not very clear and that the distance between the mines and the buffer zone has not been confirmed. That is why the Delegation wished not to take a decision now, but in one year, when the Committee will be provided with updated maps and information.

The **Chairperson** questioned if the World Heritage Committee is in a position to take a stance on a technical issue and if it had the mandate to advise State Parties or private companies in these matters. The Chairperson highlighted that the Committee is only in a position to express concern.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to request the State Party to explore alternative ways to the current mining activities.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se dit de plus en plus dubitative quant à la décision à prendre. Elle propose qu'un petit groupe de rédaction travaille sur le sujet.

La Délégation du **Mali** adhère à la proposition de la Suisse et réitère son souhait d'attendre d'avoir les cartes avant de prendre toute décision.

This was supported by the Delegation of **Colombia** who also supported the amendment to paragraph 4 proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of **Estonia** proposed to request the State Party to ensure that mining activities do not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property.

The Delegation of **Japan** also supported the opinion that in view of the lack of information the Committee cannot take a decision.

The **Chairperson** proposed to establish a working group composed of the Delegations of Colombia, India, Germany and Senegal to come up with a proposal for a Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite se joindre au groupe qui va travailler sur l'amendement au projet de décision.

Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173 rev)

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to consider the Draft Decision of those items that need to be updated but not discussed.

The **Secretariat** explained that the update of the Draft Decision was proposed by the Secretariat because the Heritage Impact Assessment requested was received by the World Heritage Centre. The Rapporteur read out the relevant amendment.

The Draft decision **36 COM 7B.49** was adopted as amended.

Villes anciennes de Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)

The **Chairperson** explained that the Delegation of Senegal wished to open the discussion on this item, but that the World Heritage Centre had received the request after the set deadline.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** accepte cette décision puisque c'est le règlement.

The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the Draft Decision on Djenné and asked the Delegation of Senegal whether there were any objections.

The Delegation of **Senegal** stated that there were no objections.

The **Chairperson** said that it was up to the Committee members to open the debate and that it was impossible to the Delegation of Mali to request this, as it is the concerned State Party.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated the need to comply with the Rules and wondered if there was an urgent matter for Djenné.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** provided details relating to the procedure concerning the discussion on the state of conservation reports. He concluded by saying that the Delegation of Senegal could request the Chairperson to open this item.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, compte tenu de la situation actuelle du Mali, considère que l'on peut s'arrêter au paragraphe 9 et que la dernière phrase doit être supprimée.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that it did not understand the rationale for opening this item for discussion and the Secretariat made the proposal that following the earlier discussions on the World Heritage properties in Mali and the Committee could keep the original paragraph.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.44** was adopted.

ASIA PACIFIC

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Asia-Pacific region.

Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C1056 rev) - 36 COM 7B.61
Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115) - 36 COM 7B.62
Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 479rev) - 36 COM 7B.63
Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481) - 36 COM 7B.64
Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666 rev) - 36 COM 7B.65
Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121) - 36 COM 7B.66
Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451) - 36 COM 7B.68
Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 rev) - 36 COM 7B.69

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

Monuments historiques de Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

The **Secretariat** presented the document and reported on new information received since the last Reactive Monitoring mission including on the measures taken to address the issues of building stabilization and the development of a comprehensive master plan which is expected to be finalized by July 2012. Work on the development of the buffer zone had also been commissioned. Notwithstanding, the danger to the property as laid out in the mission report is still considered to be confirmed and it is therefore proposed to consider in one year if the property should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger in view of the positive progress made by the State Party.

ICOMOS commented that limited progress seemed to have been made in the implementation of the previous Committee decision and that the exposure of built constructions to the open air deteriorates the state of conservation of the property. ICOMOS reiterated the need to put in place revised management structures and remained committed to identify appropriate measures for the property.

AFRICA (continuation)

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099) (continuation)

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to resume the consideration of previous Draft Decision 36 COM 7B.48 and invited the Delegation of Switzerland to read out the proposed paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** informe le Comité de l'amendement proposé par le groupe de rédaction, qui consiste à garder le paragraphe 5 étoffé de l'amendement estonien et d'enlever totalement le paragraphe 6 initial, le reste demeurant inchangé.

The Rapporteur reads out the proposed amended paragraphs and the Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.48** was adopted as amended.

After the adoption of the decision, the Delegation of **Germany** took the floor to draw the attention of the Committee to the importance of a clear delineation of the World Heritage properties which should be kept in mind especially in the upcoming discussions on the nominations.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to resume the consideration of Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.67**.

The Delegation of **India** noted the new developments and requested to give the State Party a chance and delete the reference to danger listing from paragraph 11 of the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.67** was adopted as amended.

MIXED PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Europe and North America region.

Pyénées – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis) – 36 COM 7B.37
Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454) - 36 COM 7B.38

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

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

The **Secretariat** presented the new information, i.e that according to Decision 35 COM 38, the Committee and the State Party invited a technical mission to set up an international panel to support national authorities in the implementation of an Emergency Action Plan, as adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2009. A preliminary report has been sent to the State Party with the main recommendations of the mission. The Secretariat indicated that the experts showed concern on the uncontrolled development of Aguas Calientes and they highly recommended finalizing and approving the regulations of the new management unit as soon as possible. The decision making process needs to be clarified and agreed on with no delay between members in order to update the master plan and to allow the emergency measures to be developed.

ICOMOS expressed its strong concern concerning the state of conservation of the property and reiterated the recommendations of the mission report. The proposed Draft Decision could be a strong sign for the State Party to adopt measures to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. ICOMOS also highlighted the importance of setting up the International Committee to implement the emergency plan.

The Delegation of **India** highlighted the significant steps undertaken by the State Party and would like the representative of the Delegation was also delighted to hear that there are plans to include the trail leading up to the Machu Picchu should be included within the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** also informed the Committee that the Observer Delegation agreed with the Draft Decision as it stands.

The **Rapporteur** read out the Draft Decision including the proposed amendment by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies in paragraph 6 a) and f) and the Chairperson asked if the Committee had any comments.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the recommendations of the May 2012 mission have been discussed and agreed by the concerned State Party.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.39** was adopted, as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the mixed World Heritage properties of Africa

AFRICA

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Africa region.

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (C/N 39) - 36 COM 7B.35

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

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Asia-Pacific region.

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 ter) - 36 COM 7B.36

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Chairperson: (South Africa)

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)

The **Secretariat** presented the document and reported that there seemed to be evidence of mining activities and that the State Party removed legal protection from certain parts within the World Heritage property.

IUCN stated that there had been earlier proposals to the World Heritage Committee to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in danger listing which is being reinforced by the clear evidence of mining activity. It was further reiterated that the removal of the legal protection is in contravention of paragraph **15** of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **India** referred to the previous decision in which the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session requested the State Party to submit a significant boundary modification by 1 February 2013. The Delegation therefore expressed its confusion why these issues are proposed for discussion at this year's Committee session in 2012. The Delegation of India also would like to know from the State Party more details about the Federal Law Nr 365 mentioned in the state of conservation report and in what way it weakens the protection of the property.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the property was proposed for inscription on the danger list because of the clear evidence of mining within the property today and that

concerning the future 2013 request for boundary modification it would be too early to pre-empt the Committee decision on this question.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that it is of great concern that changes in the legislation for the protection of the property are undertaken first and then the World Heritage Committee is notified. The Delegation also informed that Germany had contributed 3 million USD dollars through the UN agency UNDP in order to prepare the property for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation further highlighted the importance of this property in relation to climate change and therefore supported the Draft Decision without amendments.

A point of order was raised by the Delegation of **India** that the question addressed to the Secretariat concerning the weakened legislation had not been replied to.

The **Secretariat** clarified that legislation in the Russian Federation foresaw a very strict nature protection regime for strictly protected areas; however, with the new federal law, certain infrastructure projects are allowed within the strictly protected areas.

The **Chairperson** proposed to resume the discussion of this item in the afternoon session.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

FOURTH DAY – Thursday, 28 June 2012

EIGHTH MEETING

3 pm – 7 pm

Chairperson: (South Africa)

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

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) *(continuation)*

La Délégation de **Serbie** note que l'Etat partie a jusqu'au 1er février 2013 pour soumettre différents éléments demandés dans la Décision **35 COM 7B.25**. Elle ne comprend donc pas pourquoi on demande l'inscription sur la Liste en péril dès maintenant. Elle demande également si l'Etat partie pourrait expliquer ce qu'est la loi 365.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite savoir quel serait l'impact d'une modification des limites sur le bien.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that in order to have consistency with the decision made by the Committee at its 35th session, the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It emphasised that being on the Danger List was not a punishment but a positive tool to support the property.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est d'accord avec les Délégations de l'Allemagne et de l'Estonie. La modification du statut juridique et le péril prouvé existent. Comme il s'agit, comme son nom l'indique, d'une forêt « vierge » où les activités humaines doivent être limitées ou inexistantes, la justification pour l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril est claire.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained that the boundaries of the property had not changed since its inscription. A clarification of the boundary was done in 2010 and was presented at the 35th session of the Committee. The State Party was preparing a boundary modification which extended the area by 200,000 ha in accordance with the Committee's decision in 2011, and would be submitted next year. There was no mining operation on-going within the area, which was only 2,000 ha out of the 3,000,000 ha of the property, only preparatory activities to establish the mine. All gold mining operations in the past were outside of the boundary and there had been no mining operation since the establishment of the National Park.

Therefore none of the criteria under which the property had been inscribed were affected.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite que l’IUCN confirme ou infirme ce qui vient d’être dit.

IUCN explained that the recommendation was based on the situation where IUCN identified the threats to the area. It also stated that since there was a clear and long established policy for mining within the boundary, it was necessary to keep consistency to the policy. As for impacts by extension, IUCN could not answer at this stage as no proposal had been put forward.

The **Secretariat** added that the mining area that had been included in the World Heritage property since its inscription was no longer under legal protection as the State Party had taken it out of the National Park.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 3 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 4 as amended by the Delegation of India and mentioned the subsequent deletion of paragraphs 5, 6 and 7.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par les Délégations de l’**Estonie** et de l’**Allemagne**, remarque que la seconde partie du paragraphe 4 justifie l’inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Cette formulation avait en outre été utilisée l’an dernier ; il n’y a donc aucune raison de l’enlever.

The Delegation of **India** insisted that the information had to be submitted in 2013.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** fait remarquer qu’on ne parle pas des mêmes limites. Il est donc indispensable de conserver la seconde partie du paragraphe 4.

The Delegation of **Estonia** pointed out that the State Party had made decision on the boundary modification within the States but not informed the Secretariat. Hence no boundary modification proposal had been presented to the Committee. It stated it could not accept the amendment at this stage as it was not clear what kind of boundary modification would be coming up next year.

The Delegations of **Colombia**, **South Africa**, **Serbia**, the **United Arab Emirates**, **Cambodia**, **Algeria** and **Mali** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India.

La Délégation de la **France** exprime sa perplexité. Elle aimerait avoir des informations sur la seconde modification des limites qui doit être soumise en 2013, car elle a besoin d’une image globale qui fait pour l’instant défaut.

IUCN recalled last year’s decision (**35 COM 7B.25**) which requested the State Party to take immediate action as well as to submit a significant boundary modification.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime qu’il y a un moyen de sortir du dilemme. Selon elle, le texte que la Délégation de l’Inde a proposé de biffer n’est en effet pas très bien exprimé. Il ne s’agit pas d’une modification de limites telle qu’expliquée par la Délégation de la Fédération de Russie, mais c’est le parc national qui constitue la protection juridique du site aux termes de l’article 180 b i) des *Orientations*. La

Délégation de la **Suisse** propose donc l'amendement suivant : « et que les modifications du statut juridique protégeant le bien, à savoir le parc national de Yugyd Va, n'ait pas été annulées ». En effet, il ne s'agit pas d'un problème de modification des limites mais de protection juridique. La Délégation de la **Suisse** espère que cette proposition de compromis pourra être acceptée.

The Delegation of **India** considered there had been no modifications of the juridical status.

The Delegations of **Colombia** and **Germany** stated they were lost. The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** called for further explanations from IUCN first, then from the State Party.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the law 365-FZ concerned only the southern component of the property and had therefore nothing to do with the issue currently under discussion. It explained that the State Party modified the boundary of the national park of the World Heritage property, which was the northern component of the property, without changing the boundaries. There was no longer legal protection for the area since it was taken out from the National Park in the nomination and there was a mining operation foreseen in the area. It added it was clear the area was still included in the property as there was no hole in the map submitted.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** repeated there had been no change to the boundary for past 20 years. It added although it had been decided what was the National Park and what was not in 2004, the boundary for the property had not changed and the forest remained untouched. It noted a new boundary proposal for the World Heritage site would be submitted in 2013 with an extended buffer zone.

La Délégation de la **France** demande que soient clairement définies les limites des quatre zones, à savoir celles du parc, de la réserve, du bien lui-même et de la zone tampon.

The Delegation of **Colombia** saw no point of asking for these clarifications since nothing had changed and asked what "clarification of the boundary" meant.

The **Chairperson** called for the constitution of a working group composed of the Delegations of **Colombia**, **Algeria**, **Germany** and **Estonia** for the writing of a revised paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **India** stated that it was not possible to go ahead with the examination of this Draft Decision without having clear ideas on paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked if the area taken away from the National Park was still a part of the World Heritage property.

IUCN confirmed that the area still had the World Heritage status but without legal protection under national law.

Both the Delegation of **Germany** and **IUCN** stressed that there were no difference between what the State Party and what the Secretariat had said.

The **Chairperson** decided to suspend this item pending the conclusion of the work of the drafting group.

The Delegation of **South Africa** pointed out that paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision was related to the following paragraphs. It then proposed to move on to the next item.

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Europe and North America Region.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225) – 36 COM 7B.18
Gulf of Porto: Calanche of Piana, Gulf of Girolata, Scandola Reserve (France) (N 258) - 36 COM 7B.19
Natural System of "Wrangel Island" Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023) – 36 COM 7B.20
Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis) – 36 COM 7B.21
Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) – 36 COM 7B.22
Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900) – 36 COM 7B.23
Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev) – 36 COM 7B.25
Henderson Island (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 487) – 36 COM 7B.26
Yellowstone National Park (United States of America) (N 28) – 36 COM 7B.27

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

Chairperson: H.E. Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161)

The **Secretariat** informed the State Party had approved five developed applications within the property in the past years. It also informed that the State Party had noted that it was considering which option might be available in dealing with this situation and a meeting with IUCN to discuss development issues had to be organized.

IUCN emphasised that further development within the property needed to be strictly prohibited or completely halted as they would be a critical threat to the OUV of the property as already pointed out by the 2010 monitoring mission.

The Delegations of **Colombia, Mexico, Senegal** and **France** asked that the State Party of Saint Lucia provide information about where it stood in its collaboration with IUCN.

The Observer Delegation of **Saint Lucia** explained that it was preparing to conduct a study on this issue with IUCN and that the funds for the study had already been allocated. It also informed the Committee that the administrative structure had been changed in order to provide proper management to the property and that no new developments had been authorized in the Pitons Management Area. It concluded by emphasising the commitment of the State Party towards the protection of the property.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with examination of the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that there was no amendment proposal for paragraphs 1 to 4 but that the paragraphs that followed had been amended by the Delegation of Colombia.

Paragraphs 1 to 4 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its doubt about the amendment and asked for clarification on the wording of the original text

IUCN noted that the wording was based on the assessment made by the monitoring mission.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that the Committee could not make decision until the results of the study stated in a previous paragraph are available.

The Decision **36 COM 7B.34** was adopted as amended.

Chairperson: (South Africa)

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** reopened this item and gave the floor to the Delegation of **Colombia** so that it could read out the text elaborated by the working group.

Upon this reading, the Delegation of **India** stated that in its view, there had been no modification of the juridical status.

The Delegation of **Colombia** explained that the sentence meant to say the legal status had not been cancelled.

The **Chairperson** proposed “change” instead of “cancel”.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, supported by the Delegation of **France**, proposed “has not been modified”.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par la Délégation d'**Estonie**, estime qu'on a repris sa proposition à l'envers et n'accepte donc pas la modification proposée.

IUCN pointed out the amended text was contrary to last year's State of Conservation report and was therefore factually incorrect.

The Delegation of **Colombia** clarified that it had misread the text and gave the correct version of what had been drafted by the working group.

The Delegation of **India** questioned whether the Committee 'took note' of a fact or of a perception. It did not know to which fact the new drafting was referring to.

IUCN explained that as a result of an exercise on the boundaries, there were “holes” in the property where there was no protection. That was the reason why there was mining in these areas.

The **Secretariat** clarified that under the Russian legislation you cannot have mining activities, not even preparatory ones, in a National Park. Therefore to be able to undertake preparatory mining activities, the State Party had to change the juridical status of these areas. They were part of the National Park; now they were no longer part of it.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** asked whether the law had been changed to be able to carry out mining extraction in those areas, and wanted to know whether the boundaries went against the legislation as it stood.

The Delegation of **India** asked for a strong clarification from the State Party.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose de réutiliser la formulation de la Décision **35 COM 7B.25** : « réitère sa plus vive préoccupation quant aux modifications des limites de la composante nord du bien, le Parc national de Yugyd Va, qui ont ainsi retiré leur statut de protection à ces zones, et à l'approbation de l'exploitation d'une mine d'or sur le territoire du bien à Chudnoe ». Plus loin, on pourra prendre note du fait qu'il y aura une modification de frontière, prévue pour le 1^{er} janvier 2013.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** explained that the change in national legislation does not affect the property. The boundaries of the park were not specified in 2008. The cadastre sets out the boundaries of the National Park. The State Party indicates that the boundary of the natural reserve and the park have not changed over the past 20 years. The boundaries are now clearly established and have not changed the protection regime for these areas. The protection of these areas is under the jurisdiction of the Russian ministry of Environment. The State Party further states that so far, no mining is taking place, only preparatory activities.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime sa confiance dans les affirmations de l'Etat partie déclarants qu'il n'y a pas d'exploitations en cours mais seulement une préparation des explorations.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** stated that the drafting of the decision can be strengthened and has been done by asking the State Party to provide information and proof that no modification of boundaries has been undertaken for the property.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** avance une proposition de consensus en encourageant l'Etat partie à poursuivre les efforts pour la protection du bien tel quel délimité initialement.

The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that the points they wished to make have been addressed.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether the proposal replaced the proposal of Switzerland and supports it if it does.

The Delegation of **Colombia** and of **United Arab Emirates** supported the proposal of Algeria and India.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie l'amendement de la Délégation d'Algérie mais insiste pour garder l'amendement suisse qui souligne que le statut de protection de ces zones a disparu.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** note qu'il y a eu un malentendu de la part de la Délégation de la Suisse parce qu'il ne s'agit pas d'un problème linguistique mais de fond et que l'Etat partie a fourni les explications nécessaires. Il y a eu pour ce bien des problèmes techniques de cadastre qui peuvent être réglés.

The Delegation of **Germany** rephrased the paragraph on the demarcation exercise as agreed by the World Heritage Committee during its 35th session.

La Délégation de la **France**, soutenue par la Délégation de l'Inde, regrette le manque de consensus sur la proposition algérienne qui contient aussi les positions de la Suisse et de l'Allemagne.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the draft amendments now split the text over three paragraphs and asks the **Rapporteur** to read paragraph 4, 5 and 6.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether paragraph 5 reiterated what was said in previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Rapporteur** read out the relevant decision taken at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee.

IUCN clarified that the current proposal is entirely consistent with the decision taken for the property at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee. He further indicated the difference between national agreed boundaries under national legislation and the boundaries of the World Heritage property agreed at the time of inscription.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande à l'Etat partie de clarifier ce dernier point.

The Delegation of **Russia** clarified that the information boundaries of the property have not changed and that by 1 February 2013 all information will be submitted to clarify the boundary aspects to ensure all is clear and no confusion exists.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that the Draft Decision should refer to the "boundaries at times of inscription" instead of "initial boundaries" in draft paragraph 6. The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the German proposal.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that also the actions to be taken could be reiterated and would shorten the discussion on this issue.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** indicated that time has been taken to ask IUCN and that it supported the proposal of Algeria. It was agreed to give the State Party more time to respond with additional information and reiterates that the former paragraph suggests an issue that will be discussed in 2013 only. The Delegation indicated that, when not adopted as it stands, the previous paragraph does not make sense.

Le Délégation du **Sénégal** observe un problème de contradiction entre les déclarations de de l'Etat partie et celles de l'IUCN et soutient la proposition faite par la Délégation de l'Algérie.

The Delegation of **India** proposed to delete paragraph 7 entirely.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, soutenue par les Délégations de l'**Allemagne**, de la **Suisse** et de la **France et de l'Inde** propose de changer l'ordre des paragraphes pour plus de clarté.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that the part of the retrospective sOUV should be kept in the Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the sOUV needs to be made in any case in the context of the Periodic Reporting.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par la Délégation de l'**Allemagne**, propose d'ajouter une déclaration de reconnaissance des efforts faits par l'Etat partie.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the language should stick to the standard of the Operational Guidelines which is agreed upon.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.24** was adopted as amended.

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

The Delegation of **Germany** asked to open the discussion on Lake Baikal and asked the Delegation of the Russian Federation to clarify the information.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** indicated that the BPBM would be closed. It still has not been closed for two reasons. One is related to the environment and its protection. Measures to clean up the land on which the plant is build are not taken yet, and can pose a serious threat when closing the plant. Second issue is a social issue. The inhabitants of the region work in the plant. The Russian parliament organized auditions of governments, NGO's, parliamentarians on the future of the BPBM. The conclusions are established in a letter to the president and requested the closing of the plant and not the switching of the plant to the closed cycle. The minister responsible for this issue will organize a major event to look at the financial aspect and other issues related to the plant. The issue cannot be solved in 1 year after the plant has been going on for 40 year, including the pollution of the land. The State Party indicated it is acting along the lines of the World Heritage Committee's requests.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.22** was adopted.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

The **Secretariat** indicated the reactive monitoring mission to the Great Barrier Reef in Australia and lists the threats to the property. **IUCN** noted that the Great Barrier Reef is among the largest properties on the World Heritage List and has tackled a range of issues over the years. However, the property is at crossroads and decisions

that will be taken over the next years will be decisive. The overall management of the property should result in a net-benefit for the property and the current progress on water quality should be maintained. It suggests that a new outlook report will be presented to the World Heritage Committee and the Strategic Assessment should be developed and presented for consultation to the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session. The presentation of the Strategic Assessment should include the long-term plan for the sustainable development of the reef.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne la complexité du site et les efforts fait par l'Australie tout en rappelant son extrême vulnérabilité liée à la nature du bien.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that this is a major property that stretches the entire coast of Queensland and asked the State Party to indicate the measures they have taken.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that the State Party has managed the property well as the largest coral reef system in the world. An abundant precautionary approach will need to be adopted so that the issues can be resolved as soon as possible.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.8** was adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)

The **Secretariat** summarized the status of the property and the collaboration between Argentina and Brazil..

IUCN indicated the importance of the property and the deforestation of the area that has gone on over the years. The threats of exotic species affect both areas in Argentina and Brazil.

La Délégation de la **France** invite les Etats parties de l'Argentine et du Brésil à coopérer pour préserver ce site exceptionnel.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.28** was adopted.

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

The **Secretariat** summarized the status of the property and reminded the Committee that roads crossing the property should be avoided as much as possible.

IUCN indicated its concerns about the environmental impact assessment that indicates that there are serious environmental threats.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked the State Party what the current status is of the hydroelectric project developments.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** thanked Argentina for the close cooperation and indicated that this will continue. It stated that all measures will be undertaken to continue conservation of the OUV of the property. A bill has been proposed at Parliament. The government is against the re-opening of the road. The road remains

closed and the environment remains protected. The Observer Delegation indicated its commitment to the conservation and integrity of the property and stated that the hydroelectric project developments do not have an impact on the OUV of the property.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.29** was adopted.

Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032)

The **Secretariat** summarized the status of the Cerrado protected area.

IUCN indicated that a reactive monitoring mission was needed to the property.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.30** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** made a statement and indicated the measures the government had already taken to conserve the property. It indicated that the government of Brazil is committed to the conservation of the OUV of the property.

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of state of conservation reports to be adopted without discussion for the Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis) - 36 COM 7B.31
Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1bis) - 36 COM 7B.32
Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev) - 36 COM 7B.33

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

AFRICA

Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

The **Secretariat** summarized the status of the property indicating that a recent IUCN/WHC joint mission found that since the previous mission, several important new threats have surfaced including the construction of a new dam which will flood part of the property; a license for iron ore exploitation given within the property as well as several other exploration licenses in its immediate vicinity, as well as a rubber plantation being established in the immediate vicinity of the site without any measures to mitigate its impacts.

The Secretariat indicated that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN conclude that, in view of the accumulation threats, the property meets the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and that consultations will be engaged with the State Party so that these new identified threats be dealt urgently.

The Secretariat indicated that a letter from the Minister for Forests and Wildlife has just been received in which it is stated that several actions have already been undertaken since the monitoring mission to implement its recommendations, notably the development of an emergency action plan to secure the site. The letter also noted that discussions are underway to revise the mining licenses which overlap with the Reserve.

L’UICN note que les missions de suivi réactif de 2009 et 2012 ont montrées des menaces liées à l’activité minière et des dangers précis et imminents et recommande l’inscription sur la liste en péril.

La Délégation du **Mali** considère qu’il est prématuré de proposer l’inscription dans la liste en péril. Elle rappelle que le Ministre des forêts et de la faune de l’Etat partie a exprimé une volonté politique d’améliorer la gestion et la préservation du site en augmentant de 50 à 115 le personnel employé sur place avec un investissement de 62 millions de francs.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal of Mali and indicated that the State Party needed more time to maintain its current positive trends.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the Centre and IUCN for its comprehensive report and restated the decision taken at last years’ World Heritage Committee session and quoted the relevant parts of the decision. It indicated that it wanted to see progress.

The Delegation of **Estonia** underlined the need for consistency among the Committee decisions regarding mining issues and other issues and that no further delay was advisable.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** reconnaît les efforts de l’Etat partie et souhaite lui donner une année de plus pour la mise en place des mesures nécessaires.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** indicated that the reports stated clear progress and that an additional year could be given to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by the Delegation of **Serbia**, clarified that one more year would be given to the State Party in light of the positive last minute changes.

La Délégation de la **France** reconnaît les efforts de l’Etat partie et invite à continuer dans cette direction.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the amendments received by South Africa.

Several delegations requesting to see all the amendments in writing, the Chairperson suspended the examination of the item.

Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)

The **Chairperson** started the discussion on Lake Turkana National Park in Kenya while the amendments to Draft Decision 36 COM 7B.1 were being printed and distributed to the Committee Members.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the monitoring mission undertaken recently to the site concluded that the potential and ascertained cumulative impacts of the GIBE III dam and related developments were highly likely to impact the OUV of the property and therefore recommended that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in accordance with paragraph 180 (b) of the *Operational Guidelines*.

IUCN expressed its concerns over the conservation of Lake Tükana and the dam developments are threatening the OUV as well as the livelihoods of the local communities. It reiterated that this matter needed to be considered jointly with the State Party of Ethiopia with special attention to the cumulative impacts. Developments should be halted until the environmental impact assessment is completed and if developments go forward, a potential loss of the OUV of the property is possible and could be followed by a suggestion for deletion of the property from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted the importance of dialogue between the two countries involved and that this should be supported. It further noted that a new mission should be undertaken and more time should be given to the State Parties to avoid conflict in the African region.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Delegation of South Africa and suggested a mission to the other country where the development is taking place.

The Delegation of **Mali** indicated that a mission to Ethiopia is necessary to see what is going on in the property.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that this dam is already half way developed and that there are concerns about threats to the OUV in two countries. It noted that solutions should be sought on a bilateral basis between the two countries concerned.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that the lake is central to the livelihood of the local community. The water is essential for the survival of the people in the region and asks the Ethiopian State Party if it is willing to work together.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** confirmed its readiness to work together very closely with the World Heritage Centre and the neighbouring countries.

La D el gation du **S n gal** souhaite attendre la mission future avant de prendre une d cision.

La D el gation de l'**Alg rie** appuie la proposition de l'Afrique du Sud d'envoyer une mission dans les deux pays.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the idea for another mission to the region.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the two countries for their willingness to cooperate but questioned the adequacy of the expert information provided to the World Heritage Committee for this property.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that sufficient knowledge is available and that the expertise should not be doubted since the information and conclusions are quite evident.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** observe qu'il faut tenir compte de la discontinuité politique qu'a eu lieu dans le pays et souhaite que toutes les possibilités soient explorées dans le cadre de cette collaboration entre les deux pays.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the World Heritage Committee for recognizing the problems in the property and indicated the close relationships with Ethiopia. The concern expressed by the WHC-IUCN mission team was well received by the highest levels of the government in Kenya but the State Party considers should visit Ethiopia before any decision on danger listing is taken.

The Delegation of **Senegal** asked for the position of Ethiopia.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** indicated that the environmental assessment had been undertaken according to the highest international standards. Development interventions, including water supplies, have been undertaken. The developments will not pose a threat to the OUV of the Lake but ameliorate its health. The indigenous people have the right to ensure their children can go to school and have a good life. The State Party stated that it is committed to the World Heritage Convention and the protection of the property.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that 3 amendments were received from Senegal.

The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that the Draft Decision as a whole poses a problem because of the lack of a mission to the other country where the developments are taking place. It indicated the countries need more time and should agree on the modalities for the environmental assessment so it can be done jointly.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient l'intervention de l'Afrique du Sud et rappelle que l'inscription sur la liste en péril sert à inciter l'Etat partie à prendre des mesures correctives d'urgence et que les communautés locales ont besoin d'une action immédiate.

The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that there is more time needed and negotiations are crucial for solving the problem.

The **Chairperson** closed the discussion for the day and suggested taking some time for negotiations before resuming the session.

The meeting rose at 7 pm.

FIFTH DAY – Friday, 29 June 2012

NINTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

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

NATURAL HERITAGE

AFRICA

Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407) *(continuation)*

The **Chairperson** resumed examination of amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** stated that no amendments were proposed for paragraphs 1 to 6 and introduced amendments proposed to paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed the wish to keep the language of paragraph 7.

The **Chairperson** indicated the common spirit in the room yesterday that was in favour of giving the State Party another year to discuss the property and its state of conservation.

La Délégation du **Mali** confirme qu'une majorité était favorable au fait de sursoir à ce paragraphe et de donner une chance à l'Etat partie de prendre les mesures nécessaires.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que la proposition de l'Allemagne est juste et que le Comité doit revenir au paragraphe 7. Elle indique ne pas avoir compris qu'il avait été décidé de le supprimer.

The **Chairperson** asked for clarification on what had been discussed.

The Delegation of **Germany** clarified that it supported the idea to give the State Party another year as proposed by South Africa.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique son intention de soutenir le pays pour une autre année afin de mettre en œuvre les mesures et maintient son souhait de supprimer le paragraphe.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la proposition allemande.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed to give the State Party another year but wished to keep paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **South Africa** clarified its view and indicated that the State Party should be supported and be given more time. It noted that the language of paragraph 7 was a threat and that it should not be included now in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note un recul et indique sa conviction que l'Afrique du Sud a raison. Elle note qu'ayant été informée des mesures correctives qui sont en cours, elle considère comme raisonnable de laisser du temps à l'Etat partie et d'attendre l'année prochaine.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose, comme compromis, d'écrire « inscription possible » au bout d'une année, afin de laisser du temps à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that in the spirit of cooperation the rephrased paragraph 7 proposed by Mali was acceptable.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique son accord avec les modifications apportées au paragraphe 7 et propose d'ajouter au point a) le fragment « et de s'assurer que cela n'a pas d'impact sur la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle ».

Paragraph 7 was adopted.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the proposed new deadline date in paragraph 8 is not consistent with the standard practice as set out in the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that a report was needed by February 2013 to enable discussion at the 37th session, considering that no discussion was possible without a report.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime son accord, notant qu'il est logique de garder la date butoir du 1^{er} février et l'examen du bien à la 37^e session du Comité.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated that the State Party might not be ready by February 2013 and asked whether the State Party concerned could make a statement on its progress.

The **Chairperson** suggested a compromise and to ask the State Party for a progress report.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient l'Afrique du Sud en considérant que le délai de 2013 est trop court.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** approuve la proposition de la Présidente en ce qui concerne la nécessité d'avoir un rapport pour l'année prochaine et le fait qu'un rapport d'avancement serait une solution de compromis.

La Délégation de la **France** indique son accord pour la demande d'un rapport d'étape.

The Delegation of **Germany** declared that it agrees with a progress report to be submitted by February 2013.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.1** was adopted as amended.

Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis) *(continuation)*

The **Chairperson** announced the discussion of amendments in paragraph 12 of the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, en ce qui concerne le paragraphe 12, déclare avoir compris les préoccupations des Organisations consultatives, mais considère qu'il ne s'agit pas là d'une question technique seulement, mais aussi d'une question politique, humaine, gouvernementale, et qu'elle ressort de la bilatéralité. Elle souligne que le Comité doit faire attention à ne pas mettre d'huile sur le feu mais au contraire donner aux deux Etats parties la possibilité de se concerter, de discuter, de trouver des solutions politiques à une situation qui peut devenir grave. La Délégation rappelle que les populations qui vivent autour du lac vont ressentir des contraintes et indique ne pas souhaiter que le bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en raison de la charge négative qui y est associée.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'elle partage le point de vue du Sénégal, et qu'il faut laisser du temps à l'Etat partie. En revanche, la proposition de l'Afrique du Sud de reporter la discussion du point à 2014 ne convient pas, il est nécessaire de maintenir 2013.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the position of Switzerland to keep the date of 2013 and proposed that a compromise be made again here for a progress report similar to the previous property.

The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that this case was different from the previous one. They cautioned the Committee members to not rush the respective States Parties to a solution and provide them with more time for negotiation, especially since two State Parties are involved.

The Delegation of **India** supported the position of South Africa. They indicated that actions were taken on the basis of hypothesis rather than actual information and noted that the other dams were only at a planning stage.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** partage cette opinion, soulignant que dans le cas du Dja, il s'agissait d'un seul pays, alors que deux sont concernés ici.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the proposal of Senegal and agreed to give the State Party more time. But it also indicated that it was not possible to postpone for too long. The Delegation wondered how long the Committee would continue postponing and stated that the report should be presented in 2013.

La Délégation du **Mali** soutient la proposition de l'Afrique du Sud, considérant qu'il faut au moins 2 ans, sinon ce n'est pas réaliste. Les experts des deux pays doivent se rencontrer.

La Délégation de **l'Allemagne** exprime son accord avec l'Afrique du Sud sur l'importance d'intensifier le dialogue et sa satisfaction d'entendre que les pays concernés sont prêts à négocier. Elle souligne néanmoins que la population locale a besoin de cette eau. Elle considère qu'il est nécessaire de pouvoir évaluer les progrès, le Comité a besoin d'avoir des informations, tout en laissant du temps à l'Etat partie.

The **Chairperson** suggested providing a progress report by 2013.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that this issue was far more complex than the previous case and underlined that the delay that is being asked for is only 7 months. There might be no progress because it is a complex issue. The State Party asked the Committee to consider a progress report for 2014 and indicated that this would save the valuable time of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** stressed that 7 months is a very short time to produce anything valuable to present for discussion to the World Heritage Committee and asked for more time.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** voudrait se joindre aux voix demandant un intermédiaire jusqu'en 2014 pour laisser le temps aux deux Etats parties de négocier.

La Délégation de la **France**, appuyée par la Suisse, accepte l'idée d'un compromis comme suggéré par la Présidente.

The **Chairperson** suggested asking for information about the negotiations and the progress made instead of a real progress report.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that there might be political issues involved in the issues related to this property. It is a complex issue, it is about water, livelihoods, communities, which require political negotiations that will take more time beyond 2013 and which should not be subject for discussion at the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** suggested adding "review of the issue at the World Heritage Committee's next session".

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la proposition du Sénégal en ce qu'elle reflète un accord qui a sa place ici.

La Délégation du **Mali** est d'accord avec le Sénégal pour maintenir ce paragraphe, considérant que la question de la mission est très importante.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.3** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** wished to make a statement. It recalled that it had proved commitment to the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value to the World Heritage Committee and indicated its close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the Category 2 Centre. The Delegation indicated that it had taken all actions for conservation consistent with the national legislation. It

further stated that the responsibility is a shared one with Kenya and demanded reconsideration of paragraph 7.

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

Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195) - 36 COM 7B.2

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684) - 36 COM 7B.4

Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156) - 36 COM 7B.6

Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe) (N 509) - 36 COM 7B.7

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

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Shiretoko (Japan) (N1193)

The **Secretariat** and **IUCN** indicated that the State Party of Malaysia requested that this state of conservation report be opened for discussion and asks whether the State Party can state its position.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** expressed its concern over the Draft Decision regarding 'removal of river construction'. The Committee had asked for the complete removal of dams, allowing the free movement of salmon and to give priority to the monitoring of the construction projects. It quoted the State Party which indicated however that the environmental assessment for the river construction modifications had showed increased bats.

The Delegation of **India** stressed that the river construction and mitigation of the effects derived from it were done. The statement was that construction projects have negative impacts on biodiversity and fish migration and that the river health had shown a positive trend. The Delegation further indicated that it is appropriate to monitor more closely the impacts for at least 2 more years before a new decision on the river construction is taken.

The Delegation of **Colombia** declared that it understood Japans' situation and the impact from river dam construction projects. It further understood the actions undertaken in terms of mitigating effects from the river construction and asked the State Party for clarification of the actions taken.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** souscrit à la déclaration de la Colombie et tient à entendre l'Etat partie. Elle félicite l'Etat partie des efforts déployés pour la protection de ce bien.

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that Shiretoko was a high risk area for sediment disaster from heavy rain fall that causes serious damage to livelihoods and the fishing industry providing an important source of income for the local community. To mitigate the sediment disaster, the river construction is indispensable and concerns small dams that are essential. The removal of these dams is impossible because people live there. The Delegation further noted that about 100 of these dams existed at the time of inscription in 2005. To improve the situation the State Party conducted

an environmental assessment study that included review of the salmon movement and the disaster prevention function of the developments. After these study and consultation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, the State Party started in 2006 modification of the small dams to allow salmon to go upstream for spawning. The Delegation stressed that the solution was mutually agreed with IUCN-WHC and, as a result of the effort, science monitoring data showed the status has improved. The Delegation assured that it undertook efforts to improve the situation and to increase monitoring of the effects and asked for understanding regarding the fact that removal of the dams was not acceptable because of the local people who would be very much affected.

La Délégation de la **France** indique qu'elle a écouté avec intérêt et qu'elle souhaite féliciter l'Etat partie et l'encourager à poursuivre sa coopération avec l'IUCN.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendments were received from Malaysia on paragraphs 5 and 6.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the amendment proposed by Malaysia.

The Delegation of **Mexico** also supported the amendment of Malaysia and felt that this wording reflected their concerns.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the amendment and the 2015 deadline.

The Delegation of **India** supported the amendment.

The Advisory Body **IUCN** noted that it had spoken to the State Party directly. The salmon issue was noted at the time of inscription. It further stated that the points raised by the World Heritage Committee were reflecting the viewpoints of the Advisory Body concerning this property.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** appuie cette décision et considère qu'elle est dans la logique des paragraphes 5 et 6. Elle approuve également que la date du prochain rapport soit 2015.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.12** was adopted as amended.

East Rennell (Solomon Island) (N 854)

The **Secretariat** summarized the conservation issues and indicated that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received reports of logging operations near the boundaries of the property. They learned that a hearing to consider an application for logging concessions within the property itself had been scheduled for April 2012. The World Heritage Centre sent a letter to the State Party requesting clarification of this issue. A response has not yet been received. The World Heritage Centre understands that the hearing has been postponed.

IUCN recalled that at the time of inscription no invasive species such as rats and land snails were present on the island and considered that logging would have a more severe impact on the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value, particularly considering the small size of the property. IUCN also recalled that at the time of inscription questions arose about confining the property to only a portion of the island, where the extent of forest is insufficient to ensure the long-term survival of the endemic bird population. IUCN considers that the scale of commercial resource

extraction on Rennell Island, particularly in the context of a small island ecosystem, is likely not sustainable and may have significant negative impacts on the OUV of the property. IUCN considers that if the logging continues there is clearly a possible elevated threat and if this would be confirmed, there is a clear case for considering the property to be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** annonce qu'au vu de la présentation faite par l'UICN elle approuve la proposition de rajouter la phrase habituelle sur l'inscription possible sur la liste en péril dans le dernier paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked to the State Party when the requested reactive monitoring mission would take place.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the State Party was not present.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the position of Switzerland.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.15** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that the NGOs wished to make a statement at the end of agenda item 7B.

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

Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083 bis)- 36 COM 7B.9

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338) - 36 COM 7B.10

Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340) - 36 COM 7B.11

Phoenix Islands Protected Area (Kiribati) (N 1325) - 36 COM 7B.13

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120) - 36 COM 7B.14

Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203) - 36 COM 7B.16

Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590) - 36 COM 7B.17

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

The observer representative of a conservation **NGO** stated that the World Heritage Convention could be a very powerful tool for the conservation of the most exceptional places on the planet. Key words for the Convention and this Committee are "credibility, transparency, integrity". They urged the Committee not to limit the discussion to the issues in our lifetimes. They further stated that 90% of the planet was available to humans for development with only 10% of the planet having a real protection status. They indicated that the NGO community was committed to contribute to the three key words of the World Heritage Convention but stressed that they could not fulfill this task if the World Heritage Committee weakens the conservation of its properties, especially with regard to oil exploration. The NGO urged the World Heritage Committee to take a firm position on these issues for these irreplaceable properties.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8A. TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF 15 APRIL 2012, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/8A

Decision: **36 COM 8A**

The **Secretariat** introduced briefly the document WHC-12/36.COM/8A which presents the Tentative Lists of all States Parties submitted in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* as of 15 April 2012.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated that it did a very rigorous work on the Tentative List and that it had submitted a revised version but that it does not appear on this document presented by the Secretariat. The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that the information provided by the World Heritage Centre was not up to date.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the list was received in Spanish only which is not an official language of the Convention, and that this is why it is not integrated in the document.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated that the list was sent in English and had been resubmitted about a month ago and required a discussion with the Secretariat.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the English version was submitted too late to be integrated into the document.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked what the Secretariat meant by the wording “regional harmonization”.

The **Secretariat** explained that “harmonization” is indicated in the *Operational Guidelines* but that its implementation is a question of organization and funding of the meetings required to undertake the work. It further stated that the regional harmonization would enhance the discussion about upstream processes.

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that it understood the matter and its connection with the upstream processes.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8A** was adopted.

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/8B
WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.8B1
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.8B1.Add
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.8B1.Add.2
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.8B2
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.8B3

The **Chairperson** briefly introduced the relevant working documents concerning item 8B. She informed the Committee that she received a letter dated 22 May 2012 from 70 indigenous people's organizations and NGOs from around the world on the "lack of implementation of the UN Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples in the context of the World Heritage Convention". They delivered a statement at the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues on 15 May 2012 and referred to the inadequacy of the World Heritage Committees procedures, to the lack of transparency in nomination processes and specifically mentioned the inscription of Lake Bogoria National Reserves in 2011, and the nominations of Western Ghats and Trinational de la Sangha.

She further indicated that she replied to the Executive Director of the International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) on 25 May 2012 to acknowledge the submission and to advise her that she shall inform the Committee. Furthermore, she pointed out that IWGIA has been admitted as an observer to this session under Rule 8 of the Rules of Procedures and that UNESCO has a longstanding cooperation with the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues and is closely following this matter. She informed that the World Heritage Centre has made a special issue of the World Heritage Review on the topic of indigenous peoples (Number 62, 2012) which provides with more information on this important matter.

CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The Secretariat presented the 4 changes of name of the following properties:

Argentina – Los Glaciares National Park
Ireland – Skellig Michael
United States of America – Taos Pueblo
Uzbekistan – Samarkand: Crossroads of Cultures

The Draft Decisions **36 COM 8B.1, 36 COM 8B.2, 36 COM 8B.3 and 36 COM 8B.4** were adopted.

NOMINATIONS WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE STATE PARTY

The **Secretariat** stated that a total of **6 nominations** were withdrawn before the commencement of the session.

Withdrawn nominations at the request of the State Party (BEFORE publication of the working document):

United Republic of Tanzania – Eastern Arc Mountains Forests

Withdrawn nominations at the request of the State Party (AFTER publication of the working document):

France - The Chauvet - Pont d'Arc decorated cave
Mexico – Banco Chichorro Biosphere Reserve
Spain – Plasencia-Monfrague-Trujillo: Mediterranean Landscape
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia – Archaeo-astronomical Site - Kokino

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland – Twin Monastery of Wearmouth Jarrow.

Withdrawn Minor Boundary Modifications at the request of the State Party

The Secretariat indicated that India withdrew **7 out of 8** Minor Boundary Modifications submitted. These are:

Group of Monuments at Mahabalipuram
Khajuraho Group of Monuments
Sun Temple, Konârak
Agra Fort
Fatehpur Sikri
Buddhist Monuments at Sanchi
Chhatrapati Shivaji Terminus (formerly Victoria Terminus)

Regarding Manas Wildlife Sanctuary, the Secretariat informed the Committee that the minor boundary modification of “Manas Wildlife Reserve” was included by mistake under the sub-item 8B.Add “Minor Boundary Modifications”. The Secretariat informed that, in fact, this proposal is under the process of obtaining administrative approval of the Government, after which it would be submitted by the State Party.

Therefore, the Secretariat informed the Committee that it withdraws this part as well as its related Draft Decision and that it apologized for this situation.

The Delegation of **India** wanted to comment on the subject. It indicated that India had 7 Minor Boundary Modifications withdrawn and it found, to its surprise, that it was listed as a boundary modification for Manas, which was taken off the List of Danger last year.

The Delegation of India indicated that its concern was not with the fact that there was consideration of such a boundary modification. Its concern was that the Secretariat, the IUCN, the World Heritage Centre, all went through the document. All went through everything and thought the State Party had proposed the nomination of the Minor Boundary Modifications which the State Party had not. And it is now in this unfortunate position of having used up a lot of paper, a lot of time, a lot of energy.

The Delegation noted the apology offered by the Secretariat, but it explained that it think it was incumbent on the Committee to maintain the highest standards. The Committee - on the basis of recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and the inputs of the World Heritage Centre - is telling State Parties, putting their Lists on Danger, putting their sites on danger, taking decisions. The Delegation expressed the hope, and the trust, that is done with the highest standards of professionalism. However, it noted that obviously this has not been done. The Delegation underlined that it emphasized this only to say that even these are fallible. It underlined the need to go into the whole issue of the functioning of the Bodies and their interrelationships and the rule. It noted that the Chairperson had been kind enough to speak and talk of a working group. The Delegation finally indicated that it would expect the highest professional standards.

The **Chairperson** mentioned that she understood the Director of the World Heritage Centre would like to make some comments on this matter.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that the Secretariat noted the observation of the distinguished Delegate of India and that it would like to assure the Committee that the Centre functions to the highest standards of professional integrity and professionalism. The Director of the Centre underlined that the Secretariat wanted to provide the Committee with the best information in order for it to base its judgments on. He indicated that finally the Secretariat was also human and fallible, and made mistakes. In this particular case, he indicated that the State Party had submitted a draft proposal which it is still working on - together with the map and that the Secretariat sort of mistook it as a proposal and it was evaluated. The Director of the Center indicated that the Secretariat accepted that mistake and had withdrawn it. He indicated that he hoped in the future these things will not happen.

The Delegation of **India** took the floor indicating that it was hoping that it would not have to say this. It clarified that India did not submit a draft proposal, but that this information was contained in a State of Conservation Report and that it was only information. So, the Delegation insisted on corrections the impression that India submitted a proposal draft or other ways. It mentioned that it cannot be extrapolated from information that was provided. The Delegation underlined that it just wanted to correct the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** took note of this correction.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took the floor and expressed the wish to provide the correct information again. He indicated that he understood this was not a draft proposal, however he underlined that all State Parties usually provide in the State of Conservation Report, as a follow-up to the decisions of the Committee, proposals for boundaries changes. In this case also, he indicated that there was a draft which was annexed to the State of Conservation Report. This was how it was submitted by the State Party, and this was mistaken as the final report.

FACTUAL ERROR LETTERS

The Secretariat noted that a number of letters were received, however only some of them or part of them were considered as containing factual errors. The factual error letters were translated and distributed. These letters concerned the following nominations:

Brazil – Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea

Canada – Grand-Pré

Chad – Lakes of Ounianga

Côte d’Ivoire – Historic Town of Grand-Bassam

Croatia – Sacral Complex on the remains of the Roman Forum in Zadar

Germany – Schwetzingen: a Prince Elector’s Summer Residence

India – Hill Forts of Rajasthan

India – Western Ghats

Indonesia – Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the *Tri Hita Karana* Philosophy

Malaysia – Archaeological Heritage of the Lenggong Valley

Portugal – Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications

Qatar – Al Zubarah Archaeological Site

Russian Federation – Lena Pillars Nature Park
Russian Federation – Russian Kremlins
Sweden – Decorated Farmhouses of Hälsingland
United Republic of Tanzania – Selous Game Reserve

The Secretariat indicated that the Advisory Bodies were going to comment on the identified errors during their presentations on the related nominations.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out an issue that was discussed during the Operational Guidelines Working Group for the need of more transparency on the process of assessing factual errors.

The **Secretariat** explained the current process of assessing the factual error letters as indicated in paragraph 150 of the *Operational Guidelines* and welcomed revising the Operational Guidelines to make the process more transparent and timely.

ICOMOS further explained their evaluation process.

The Delegation of **India** thanked ICOMOS and expressed the desire to have received the presentation before. The State Party expressed concerns over the evaluation process and the lack of dialogue between States Parties and Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies. By using the inverted pyramid analogy the State Party questioned whether the Operational Guidelines precluded this dialogue. The Delegation of India noted the problems experienced in the process.

The Delegation of **Mexico** also voiced concern of the process of evaluation and dialogue with the State Party. The State Party called for more transparency in the process and better dialogue. They questioned who for instance was on the panel of evaluations.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Delegation of Mexico's position and called for a Working Group under 5B.

The Delegation of **Qatar** endorsed the Delegation of India, Mexico and Colombia's call for greater and better engagement of State Parties in the process.

The Delegation of **Germany** again referenced the factual error corrections beforehand. The Delegation stressed the need for a rule to ensure that this does not happen.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** underscored the importance of the discussion to make the consultative process open and transparent and include a timely dialogue.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the view of the Delegations of Mexico, India, United Arab Emirates, Germany and Colombia.

La Délégation de la **France** note les mots utilisés par le Comité : « transparence » et « dialogue ». Elle pense qu'un accent plus grand doit être mis sur « dialogue », mais elle souligne qu'il s'agit surtout de « méthode ». Elle exprime son respect pour le travail des organisations consultatives, mais à fin de permettre le dialogue, il faut résoudre la question importante du calendrier. Si le calendrier était aménagé autrement il y aurait moins de crispation à la fin du processus.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted the importance of dialogue both on evaluations and upstream issues and emphasized the need to define how to conduct this dialogue.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** rappelle qu'elle est un nouveau membre du Comité, mais qu'elle a une longue histoire d'implication avec la Convention. Elle exprime son accord avec les Délégations précédentes : elle respecte les organisations consultatives avec lesquelles la Serbie a une longue et bonne collaboration. Elle souligne, comme d'autres avant elle, le besoin de transparence et de dialogue et d'une coopération très proche avec les Etats parties.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle le fructueux dialogue avec les organisations consultatives lors de la discussion du point de l'ordre du jour 5B. En se joignant aux interventions précédentes elle rappelle l'importance de la consultation en amont. Elle appuie la Délégation de la France concernant son souci de méthode et de calendrier, mais elle souligne le manque de temps entre l'évaluation et le moment quand l'Etat partie se saisit des problèmes. Elle est d'avis qu'une année pourrait être ajoutée au processus d'inscription ; mais, encore plus important est l'impact financier dont personne ne parle. Elle estime que la charge de travail du Secrétariat et des organisations consultatives pour arriver à une évaluation correcte peut être décrit comme « avoir de l'eau jusqu'au menton ». Le Comité ne peut pas exiger beaucoup plus. Les Etats parties doivent assumer leur responsabilités et réfléchir comment répondre aux exigences dans la situation actuelle du budget. Elle conclue qu'il faut chercher une méthode d'étaler les propositions d'inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son accord avec la Suisse, en soulignant avoir une perception très positive du travail des organisations consultatives et de l'aide qu'elles accordent aux pays pendant le processus. Selon elle, parler de « transparence » est trop fort, et ce qui est plus important est la question de la « programmation ». Les pays ne sont pas laissés le choix pour programmer les missions d'évaluation, ce qui des fois peut avoir une influence sur la possibilité de faire une évaluation bien documentée. Elle évoque l'exemple d'une visite d'évaluation d'un parc ornithologique qui se passe quand ceux-ci sont partis. En effet, il faut de l'argent et du temps. Les groupes de travail que le Comité a créés doivent l'aider à mettre la méthode et le processus dans une meilleure forme.

The Delegation of **Estonia** emphasized the need to provide the necessary resources and thanked and congratulated the Advisory Bodies for their work.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** pointed out that the Committee members have not adequately expressed their thanks and appreciation to the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre and welcomed improved and enhanced working methods between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** reiterated the point concerning factual errors and requested that the document becomes a formal part of the completed dossier and should appear on the website.

The Observer Delegation of **Yemen** noted their lack of experts to create nominations and lack financial resources and requested a mission to assist in the nomination process.

IUCN welcomed the reflection and clarified a point with the exclusion of a nominating State Party in evaluating a dossier. They welcomed the discussion regarding sharing

information and decisions with the State Party before the Committee. They emphasized that they are working under a very strict calendar and budget and welcomed the opportunities for dialogue where appropriate.

ICOMOS welcomed the discussion to address the challenges before the Committee and the need to define to what extent possible for dialogue with States Parties given strict calendar and resources. They emphasized that the dialogue needs to begin at a very early stage and before nominations are submitted. They welcomed the idea of a Working Group to address these issues.

The **Chairperson** recalled the essential procedures of nominations in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*. She recalled the Rules of Procedure, specifically the paragraphs on advocacy, and underlined that clarifications could only be provided on specific points.

Giving the floor to IUCN and ICOMOS for the general introduction, she requested them to be brief in their presentations.

ICOMOS and IUCN presented their evaluation process.

A. NOMINATIONS TO BE PROCESSED ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS

Property	Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem
Id. N°	1433
State Party	Palestine
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS presented the details of the proposed nomination of ***Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem, Palestine***.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the emergency procedures, criteria and threats. ICOMOS indicated that it does not consider that the conditions required by paragraph 161 of the Operational Guidelines are fully met, concerning damage or serious and specific dangers to the Church of the Nativity that make its condition an emergency that needs to be addressed by the World Heritage Committee with immediate action necessary for the survival of the property. ICOMOS recommended that the nomination should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List on an emergency basis. ICOMOS encouraged the State Party to resubmit the nomination in accordance with normal procedures for nomination.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle les constatations de l'ICOMOS sur l'état de conservation du site et ne comprend pas qu'il soit possible de ne pas considérer l'urgence pour ce dossier. Elle aboutit à une conclusion opposée à celle de l'ICOMOS : l'inscription d'urgence est justifiée. Elle mentionne un épais rapport technique sur l'évaluation de l'église de la Nativité, indiquant la gravité de la situation.

The Delegation of **Estonia** recalled to the Committee the previous debate of the role of Advisory Bodies. Based on their own assessment, it indicated that the **ICOMOS** assessment is accurate. It pointed out that they did not see potential for criteria iv and thus criterion vi is more substantial in this regard.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** s'adresse à l'Estonie car elle ne comprend pas que quelqu'un puisse douter du caractère universel exceptionnel de ce lieu. Aussi, des voix s'élèvent pour rejeter l'inscription d'urgence, alors que la Délégation estime qu'il reviendrait plutôt à ICOMOS elle-même de décréter le caractère d'urgence.

The Delegation of **South Africa** acknowledged the agreement on the importance of the property and pointed out that the assessment indicated that the situation is grave and that the site is outstanding. It requested **ICCROM** for its view as well.

The Delegation of **India** referred to the report mentioned by the Delegation of Senegal and asked whether ICOMOS was aware of this report.

ICOMOS confirmed that the report had been consulted and assured the Committee that there was no disagreement and emphasized that the question before the Committee was whether this is an emergency situation or not.

ICCROM explique avoir été sollicité en novembre 2010 par les autorités palestiniennes en vue d'analyser onze dossiers qui ont été présentés sur la base d'un appel d'offres international des autorités palestiniennes en vue de la restauration de l'église de la Nativité. ICCROM a constitué un comité composé de spécialistes au sein de l'organisation. Les 11 dossiers présentés ont été analysés par des universités, des experts comprenant des ingénieurs, architectes, archéologues et spécialistes de restauration de fresques et des mosaïques. Un rapport a été soumis aux autorités palestiniennes choisissant les 3 firmes ou groupements d'experts qui présentaient les qualités et l'expérience pour la restauration de ce monument. Dans tous ces dossiers il était indiqué la nécessité d'intervenir rapidement, notamment sur la toiture, car l'infiltration de l'eau affecte notamment les pavements en mosaïques. Nous avons considéré que les travaux devaient alors être entrepris rapidement et avons conseillé les autorités à leur mise en œuvre, compte tenu de l'importance de ce monument insigne du patrimoine de l'humanité.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

FIFTH DAY – Friday, 29 June 2012

TENTH MEETING

3 pm – 7 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continued*)

A. NOMINATIONS TO BE PROCESSED ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS (*continuation*)

Property	Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem
Id. N°	1433
State Party	Palestine
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iv)(vi)

The **Chairperson** resumed examination of this item.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested that should the Committee proceed directly to voting, then it would like to connect their remarks with the voting procedure.

The **Chairperson** recalled that there was no consensus as yet on how to proceed.

ICOMOS acknowledged the information submitted by the Delegation of **Palestine** and ICCROM's comments concerning repairs to the roof of the church, and said that the State Party is dealing with this project. It confirmed that a study has been done on the roof of the church and those works will be undertaken shortly. It emphasized that as this work is not considered as an emergency, it should therefore be undertaken with great care.

The **Chairperson** stated that the debate was over and invited the Committee to look at the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** referred to the text submitted by the Delegation of **Algeria**, and that all Committee members have the proposed text in English and French.

The Delegation of **Germany** recalled the recommendation of **ICOMOS** to address this nomination through the regular process. It expressed that it supported a sustainable solution and requested a vote on the overall decision by secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported proceeding with a secret ballot.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie la proposition du Japon et de l'Allemagne en soulignant la nécessité de voter pour l'intégralité de la décision.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie le commentaire de l'Algérie et exprime son soutien à cette proposition. La Délégation de la France souligne son soutien est en ligne avec le sens de vote de la France pour l'adhésion de la Palestine à l'UNESCO qu'a eu lieu le 31 octobre 2011. Elle précise que la France participe déjà à la conservation du site et contribue à la préparation de son plan de gestion. Elle déclare que le lieu et la région sont exceptionnels, et que la décision est inspirée par un souci de la réconciliation.

The Delegation of **Germany** raised a point of order underlining that as Palestine has become a full Member State of UNESCO already, it should currently be considered as such. It highlighted the irrelevancy of referring to the Decision of the 2011 UNESCO General Conference.

The **Chairperson** appealed for consensus. She referred to paragraph 3 which calls for inscription under the criteria (iv) and (vi) and stated that the main question is to inscribe the property or not. She said that after this point, the other paragraphs will be automatically accepted.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** proposed to obtain agreement on the proposal for inscription and to revise the paragraph since the site is not in danger.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s'interroge pour savoir si le paragraphe 161 des Directives Opérationnelles est entièrement rempli. Donc, il propose de voter sur la question de l'inscription en urgence.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested that this question be addressed to the Legal Advisor, and underlined the need to clarify whether the urgent procedure was applicable this time.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that the proposal is the amendment submitted by Algeria, and that the Chairperson proposed to vote for the Decision in its entirety. She clarified that if the Committee wished to go ahead with voting on the text in its entirety, then this is one way to proceed. She added that if a Committee Member wanted to vote on the question of whether it is a case of emergency, then the vote could be addressed in parts. She concluded that it was the Committee that would ultimately decide upon how to proceed.

The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed to a secret ballot vote on the inscription of the site, and reiterated that it would require a two-thirds majority.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the comments of the Chairperson.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique son accord pour la proposition présentée par la Présidente.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise que cette proposition est très cohérente.

The Delegation of **Germany** questioned the legitimacy of the legal advice offered and underlined a difference between the urgency and the inscription. It requested the clarification by the Legal Advisor on the future ramifications of combining both elements in one voting process.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that if a Committee member wishes to vote on paragraph 1 and the issue of whether it is an emergency, then Rule 24 of the Rules of Procedure is applicable and allowed.

La Délégation de la **France** précise que c'est une question de procédure.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie la proposition de la Présidente de passer au vote sur l'ensemble

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that if the vote was directly referring to inscription then it would call for a debate on the criteria proposed.

The **Chairperson** stated that there has already been a debate.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the Chairperson's proposal.

The **Chairperson** asked Legal Advisor to clarify the process of voting on the entire text.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that proceeding to a vote for the Draft Decision text proposed by Algeria in its entirety would require a two-thirds majority. She further clarified that the Delegation of Germany had proposed to firstly vote to endorse the remarks by ICOMOS that this is not a case of an emergency as per paragraph 2. She reiterated that Rule 24 is applicable if the Delegation of Germany requested to proceed this way, and that the Committee could proceed to a secret ballot with a simple majority.

The Delegation of **Germany** said that it had requested a secret ballot for the issue of emergency by secret ballot, and questioned the accuracy of the information given by the Legal Advisor.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that it was possible to proceed first to a secret vote on whether it was an emergency, and subsequently the entire text could be sent for vote.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle le Règlement Intérieur concernant la procédure du vote, article 25.1.

The **Chairperson** announced that an inscription would also entail that it is inscribed on an emergency basis. She requested the Legal Advisor to provide advice on voting by secret ballot.

The **Legal Advisor** outlined that Rule 41 states the rules for secret ballot, and Rule 42 is the rule of conduct. She advised the appointment of two tellers from the members of the Committee, after which the Chairperson could proceed with the vote.

The Delegation of **Colombia** questioned the specifics of the vote and whether the Committee would be voting on the new proposal or the amendment put forward by Algeria.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the vote would concern the amendment proposed by Algeria, and underlined that the proposal of Algeria was to inscribe the property on an emergency basis. She proposed the delegations of Colombia and Ethiopia to act as tellers for the secret ballot voting process.

The representatives from **Colombia and Ethiopia** were appointed as tellers.

The **Legal Advisor** clarified that the Committee would be voting on the text proposed by Algeria, to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** announced that there would be a break of 10 minutes to allow the Secretariat to prepare for the voting process.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that all World Heritage Committee members had received their voting papers.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested clarification on how to define abstention as per rule 39 of the Rules of Procedure.

The Delegation of **South Africa** requested as well clarification on abstention.

The **Legal Advisor** explained that the abstentions were not taken into account in defining the number of votes. She stated that negative and affirmative votes are counted as the total number.

The **Chairperson** explained to members of the Committee that they should use the green paper, and requested the Legal Advisor to clarify how the votes will be counted.

The **Legal Advisor** read Article 39 of the Rules of Procedure.

The **Committee** proceeded with the vote.

The **Chairperson** announced the Results of the vote: 21 States Parties voted; 19 valid votes,. Majority required: 13. No invalid votes; 13 were affirmative; 2 abstentions; 6 votes were negative.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.5** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Palestine** and gave it the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Palestine** thanked the Committee for the inscription of the site, and was pleased that it happened in the museum city of Saint Petersburg. The Delegation pronounced a Statement on behalf of Mr Mahmoud Abbas, President of the Palestinian National Authority. It underlined that these sites are threatened by destruction through Israeli occupation, the building of the separation

wall and the measures taken to stifle Palestinian identity. The Delegation reiterated its commitment to promote the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* so that together the heritage of humanity can be protected. It said that Palestine was a cradle of human civilization and called on everyone to help to protect this land. Palestine is rich in World Heritage and would be making further proposals for nominations. Consideration should also be given to the village in south Jerusalem threatened by the wall being built. The Delegation reiterated that the Palestinian State intends to comply with all articles of the *World Heritage Convention* as well as the 2010 *Kiev Statement on the Protection of Religious Properties within the Framework of the World Heritage Convention*, adopted during the International Seminar on the Role of religious communities in the management of World Heritage properties. The inscription of the Church of the Nativity is a qualitative leap for the Committee and is a testimony that the world is bent on protecting Palestinian heritage.

The **Chairperson** expressed congratulations once more and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Israel**.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** stated that there is no doubt that the site has Outstanding Universal Value; but that, however, the decision on inscription is political and does great damage to the *Convention* and its image. The trust and prestige of the *Convention* derives from its professionalism and the work of the Advisory Bodies. It considered it was unadvisable for the Committee to do this as the ICOMOS recommendation was clear in this case. It stated that the Committee's decision had no foundation and it was irresponsible to breach the Status Quo that had led the management of the Church of the Nativity for 500 years. It noted that the Palestinian Authority was not prevented from fixing the church in the last 2 years since ICCROM's recommendation. The Delegation stated that the Palestinian Authority was not prevented from intervening in the church. The Committee has made its decision and has sowed potential seeds for a severe conflict between the Palestinian Authority and the churches managing the site which have objected to the inscription and added that, moreover the State Party that asked for the inscription did not yet exist. The Delegation considered that UNESCO had opted to live in an 'Alice in Wonderland reality' but that reality still prevails. He declared that the decision today risks the credibility and usefulness of the *Convention* in the real world.

C. MIXED PROPERTIES

C.2 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Sites of Human Evolution at Mount Carmel: The Nahal Me'arot / Wadi el-Mughara Caves
Id. N°	1393
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(viii)

ICOMOS asked for clarification of the order of presentations, the rationale of which was explained by the Chairperson.

ICOMOS and IUCN presented the details of the proposed nomination.

ICOMOS recommended its inscription under cultural criteria (iii) and (v) and noted the recommendations that were made in the evaluation.

IUCN considered that the property does not meet natural criterion (viii)

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that it was a valuable site and proposed an amendment as criterion (viii) was not accepted; one sentence in criterion viii would fit into criterion iii, asked for sentence to be added there.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.13** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Israel.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** thanked the Committee and the Advisory Bodies on behalf of the Israel World Heritage Committee, the regional council and the local communities, for the inscription of the property, and stated that they were custodians of the valley and would provide continuity to sustain the values of the site and was privileged for this trust. All local stakeholders, with the University of Haifa, the Nature and Park Authority and the Government of the State of Israel participated in the nomination process, sharing ideas, problems and expectations with professionals from all over the world; and will continue to support joint activities in dialogue with the HEADS programme. The inclusion of this site will lead to a more balanced List, strengthening the sites of human evolution which provide a record of life on earth. The Observer Delegation of **Israel** extended an invitation to celebrate the site's inscription at a workshop in the coming year within the framework of the HEADS programme.

C.1 ASIA / PACIFIC

C.1.1 New Nominations

Property	Rock Islands Southern Lagoon
Id. N°	1386
State Party	Palau
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vii)(ix)(x)

ICOMOS and IUCN presented the details of the proposed nomination.

ICOMOS recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party in order to address the raised points – better protection, developing a database and improving management. The State Party was also asked to consider changing the name of the property to reflect the cultural values of the property.

IUCN recommended its inscription on the selected natural criteria.

The Delegation of **Japan** pointed out there was an existing management plan which was being revised currently and that the site should be inscribed as a cultural property as well. It recalled that this site would be the first site of Palau in the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Estonia** encouraged the State Party to continue its efforts with regard to the cultural elements.

The Delegation of **Colombia** took the floor to support inscription under cultural criteria. It also asked the State Party to provide details concerning the Management plan, currently under revision.

In its reply, the Observer Delegation of **Palau** addressed the inclusion of cultural elements in the national registry and provided details concerning the Management Plan, namely that the Management Plan has been operational for the last 5 years and pointed out that it is planned that the revision of the Management plan is to be finalized by July 2012.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party for the nomination and asked whether the revised Management Plan will be finalized by end of July 2012.

The **Chairperson** then passed the floor to **ICOMOS** which expressed concern about some of the villages included in the nomination and highlighted the need to protect these properties. The issue needed to be addressed and a tourism management plans needed to be put in place. It also highlighted that the existing framework was not robust enough to face the existing challenges. It welcomed the revision of the management plan and highlighted the need to address also other urgent issues and challenges.

The Delegations of **Cambodia** and **India** congratulated the State Party for the nomination file and supported Japan in its proposal for consideration of the cultural criteria.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Rapporteur** who explained the revised Draft Decision presented by **Japan**.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the amendment concerned paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision, which proposed to include also criteria (iii) and (v).

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.12** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated **Palau** on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Palau** conveyed the appreciation for the Chairperson's exceptional leadership of the session. It highlighted that the decision concludes a long and difficult journey started 6 years ago, which has confirmed that the heritage of Palau is equally important to the world as it is to its own people. It thanked all its partners and supporters that have accompanied them during this journey. It further went on to explain what the Rock Islands Southern Lagoon meant to the people of Palau. It highlighted the key role it has long played for the sustainable livelihood of the Palau people and that it has often been referred to as the food storage house for the people of Palau. The sacred character of the Rock Islands was also highlighted as was the biodiversity in the islands which is unequalled in other concentrated small island groups.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande que la déclaration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle soit adaptée à la décision d'inscription, notamment en son paragraphe 8. Elle suggère que l'intitulé de ce paragraphe qui commence par « renvoi » soit remplacé par « demande » en gardant le même libellé de la phrase pour les points non réalisés.

The **Chairperson** passed the floor to the Rapporteur who explained that the amendments in the revised Draft Decision concerned paragraphs 3 and 5 and that paragraph 8 was deleted.

The **Rapporteur** clarified that the concern of the Delegation of Switzerland was addressed in the revised text, as long as the paragraph concerning the Management Plan had not been deleted.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that she has taken this into consideration.

D. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

D.3 ASIA / PACIFIC

D.3.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy
Id. N°	1194 Rev
State Party	Indonesia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(v)(vi)

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that there was a request by Indonesia to discuss Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy at this stage due to question of schedule of the representatives of their Government, which was agreed by the Committee members.

ICOMOS presented the nomination and provided a brief overview of its recommendation to inscribe the site on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi).

The Delegations of **Malaysia, Mexico**, and the **United Arab Emirates** welcomed the nomination of the Cultural Landscape of Bali Province and supported its inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation of Mexico informed the Committee that a Mexican well known artist has been leaving and working on this territory and that such inscription will definitely reinforce cooperation between Mexico and Indonesia. The Delegation of the United Arab Emirates reminded the Committee that it was in Bali where the last Committee on intangible cultural heritage took place.

They were joined by the Delegations of **India, Germany, Japan, Colombia, Algeria** and **Cambodia** who congratulated the State Party of Indonesia and expressed their support. The Delegation of Japan mentioned that this inscription was the second of an agricultural landscape in the Asia and Pacific region. The Delegation of Colombia explained that such an inscription was portraying the success of the World Heritage Convention and was demonstrating the exemplarity of the relation between conservation and sustainable development.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite l'Etat partie pour avoir soumis une proposition d'inscription aussi fascinante. Elle le remercie d'avoir également entrepris de réaliser toutes les recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS après la dernière décision de différer l'examen du site, et considère que cette proposition d'inscription est un bon exemple qui a permis de garantir la préservation durable du site.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.26** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** pointed out that this was a historical moment for the people of Indonesia, and particularly the Balinese people, for which they have

waited for 12 years. They are happy and proud that their ancient cultural heritage has been acknowledged as part of the culture of the world. The Subak system has become an important element of the common landscape and also of religious life, institutionalized in the temple culture of Bali Province since the 11th Century. The Delegation expressed its appreciation to the “friends of Subak” and all friends of Bali from all over the world for their constant support to this nomination. Finally, it underlined that the inscription on the List is not an end in itself and that the preservation of the Subak Cultural Landscape for the benefit and prosperity of the next generation is of paramount importance.

D.2 ARAB STATES

D.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Rabat, modern capital and historic city: a shared heritage
Id. N°	1401
State Party	Morocco
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(v)

The **Chairperson** requested the Committee to consider next the nomination of Rabat, modern capital and historic city: a shared heritage further to the request of the Delegation of **Morocco**, to which no Committee Member objected.

ICOMOS présente la proposition d’inscription et sa recommandation d’inscrire le site sur la base des critères (ii) et (iv).

La Délégation de la **France** félicite l’Etat partie pour ce dossier qu’elle considère comme exemplaire, ambitieux, et qui donne l’occasion de faire vivre un patrimoine qu’elle considère « doublement partagé ».

La Délégation de l’**Algérie** soutient également l’inscription du site, tout en félicitant le Maroc pour l’excellent travail réalisé, et l’ICOMOS pour avoir su mettre en relief la relation très étroite entre le patrimoine moderne et le patrimoine traditionnel.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** considère que la proposition soumise par le Maroc est un « dossier béton » et souligne que si l’ICOMOS l’a appelé « ville Almohade », cela démontre que sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle attribuée est indiscutable.

The inscription of the site on the World Heritage List was supported by the Delegations of **Mexico, Qatar, Russian Federation, Estonia, Colombia, the United Arab Emirates, Cambodia** and **Iraq**. Support was also expressed by **Serbia, Malaysia, South Africa, Germany** and **Thailand**.

Les Délégations du **Mali** et de la **Suisse** appuient elles aussi l’inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.18** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Morocco on behalf of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Maroc** félicite la Fédération de Russie pour l'excellente organisation du Comité, et notamment la Présidente pour la sagesse avec laquelle elle conduit les débats. Elle félicite également le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS. Elle informe les membres du Comité de son engagement à assurer, plus que jamais, la conservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Elle explique que l'ajout de l'expression « partagé » est l'illustration de la tolérance qui habite le peuple marocain.

D.3 ASIA / PACIFIC

D.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Site of Xanadu
Id. N°	1389
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee about the request of the Observer Delegation of China to consider next the nomination of the Site of Xanadu, which was agreed by the Committee.

ICOMOS presented the nomination and its recommendation to inscribe the site under criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The Delegations of **Japan, India, Colombia, Serbia, Mali, Cambodia, the United Arab Emirates and Algeria** expressed their support for the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List and commended the State Party for its efforts in preparing the nomination.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.21** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **China** thanked the Committee for the inscription and made an intervention highlighting their commitment to preserve and protect the newly inscribed World Heritage site.

D.1 AFRICA

D.1.1 New Nominations

Property	Bassari Country: Bassari, Fula and Bedik Cultural Landscapes
Id. N°	1407
State Party	Senegal
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi)

L'ICOMOS présente son examen de la proposition d'inscription et recommande de renvoyer l'examen du dossier pour permettre à l'Etat partie de promulguer et mettre en œuvre le plan de gestion, et confirmer les mesures de protection pour empêcher l'exploitation minière.

After the presentation of ICOMOS, the **Chairperson** established a list of speakers.

The Delegation of **Japan** pointed out that, after a careful examination it considers that the conditions of integrity and authenticity as well as criteria were justified and that the protection is adequate, but the Management plan should be reinforced. It requested the State Party to address those aspects and expressed its support for the inscription of the site.

La Délégation de la **France** est convaincue par la richesse et la variété de ce paysage culturel. Elle est donc favorable à son inscription par le Comité et fait confiance à l'Etat partie pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations formulées par l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Mali** constate que l'on est en face d'un site vivant et d'une catégorie de biens pas encore assez représentée sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Comme la France, elle se dit favorable à l'inscription tout en faisant confiance à l'Etat partie pour la mise en œuvre des recommandations formulées par l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **India** endorsed the comments of Japan and expressed its support for the inscription. It also stated that with cultural landscape, one should admit that documentation can never be complete to the satisfaction as this category of sites is very complex.

The Delegation of **Colombia** informed the Chairperson that there is a typo mistake on paragraph 2 of the amended Draft Decision which says the site is inscribed under criterion (iv) while it should be criterion (v).

The Delegation of **Mexico** noted that there was also a mistake on paragraph 3 the way it was redrafted.

The **Chairperson** asked whether all other speakers wanted to express their support and suggested to move directly to discussing the amended Draft Decision presented by Mali as the session had to be closed shortly but one more nomination had to be discussed before that.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the amendment of paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision concerned a typo error. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had already been integrated.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraphs.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.16** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie la Fédération de Russie et la Présidente du Comité pour l'excellente organisation logistique, mais aussi des travaux du Comité. Elle accueille cette nouvelle inscription d'un site sénégalais non comme une gloire, mais comme un nouveau défi dans sa politique de protection de son patrimoine. Elle remercie enfin le Royaume d'Espagne pour son appui financier dans le cadre du programme MDG-UNESCO.

D.1.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Historic Town of Grand-Bassam
Id. N°	1322 Rev
State Party	Côte d'Ivoire
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

L'ICOMOS présente son examen de la proposition d'inscription et recommande que la proposition d'inscription soit renvoyée afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de régler toutes les questions liées aux limites de la zone tampon, au classement des bâtiment d'intérêt patrimonial dans la Liste du patrimoine national, et clarifier les questions de titre foncier.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted the recommendation of the Advisory Body and added that a few issues could be raised. First of all, Grand-Bassam is a living city with a normal way of life. There are issues that are practically impossible to be addressed by the national and local authorities, such as the precise number of population. The Delegation suggested that the Committee should consider inscription and proposed that the floor be given to the State Party to provide clarifications and a reply.

The Delegation of **Colombia** addressed the issue of restoration of buildings in the property and asked whether the State Party had the financial means to preserve the property.

La Délégation du **Mali** note que dans l'analyse faite par l'ICOMOS, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est démontrée. Elle constate aussi avec satisfaction que le site fait actuellement l'objet d'une mobilisation de plusieurs corps étatiques en faveur de sa protection. Par conséquent, elle recommande l'inscription du site par le Comité.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat partie pour avoir réussi à préparer cette proposition d'inscription et pour avoir pris des mesures en matière règlementaires et

d'attribution des permis de construire. Elle rappelle que la Côte d'Ivoire a un régime de propriété particulier et qu'il n'est pas évident de mettre en œuvre certaines des recommandations de l'ICOMOS de manière aussi évidente.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that it is getting late and the interpreters should leave soon, therefore she invited the Committee Members whether they had any question they wanted to ask to the State Party of Cote d'Ivoire.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande à l'Etat partie de répondre sur les dix points évoqués dans l'analyse de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **France** exprime son soutien en faveur de l'inscription du site car elle considère que les structures essentielles sont mises en place pour assurer sa protection et sa gestion. Elle demande néanmoins à l'Etat partie de préciser quelles structures de gouvernance ont été mises en place.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande à l'Etat partie d'expliquer pourquoi les zones tampons ont été modifiées par rapport à la proposition d'inscription de 2008.

La Délégation de la **Cote d'Ivoire** (Observateur) informe le Comité qu'elle a une politique globale de protection depuis 1977. Elle rajoute que la politique de restauration des bâtiments classés est en cours et que le système de gestion du site a été renforcé avec de récents décrets qui viennent d'être pris. Sur la question de la zone tampon, elle informe le Comité que celle-ci fait cinq fois le bien, et qu'un travail est déjà en cours pour revoir ses limites. La nouvelle carte qu'elle tient à disposition sera soumise au Comité l'année prochaine pour approbation. Enfin, elle précise que la Commission des permis de construire n'est absolument pas consultative, mais son avis technique est définitif.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the Draft Decision and pointed out that only a French language version of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value existed, for the time being.

The **Rapporteur** presented the modified Draft Decision presented by Mali, Ethiopia, France and Colombia. At this stage it was proposed that the Committee adopts the Statement of the Outstanding Universal Value provisionally. The rapporteur made some further remarks concerning the proposed amendments.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose de rajouter un paragraphe supplémentaire qui demande à l'Etat partie de soumettre un rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien pour 2013, afin de permettre au Comité d'examiner les progrès accomplis dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations qui seront adoptées.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.17** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) remercie les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour cet immense honneur fait à la Côte d'Ivoire en inscrivant ce site très important pour son pays. Il explique la symbolique qu'est l'inscription de Grand-Bassam précisément à Saint-Pétersbourg la ville de Pierre Le Grand. Elle s'engage à mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations du Comité.

The meeting rose at 7 pm

SIXTH DAY – Saturday, 30 June 2012

ELEVENTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

D. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

D.2. ARAB STATES

D.2.1. New Nominations

Property	Al Zubarah Archaeological Site
Id. N°	1402
State Party	Qatar
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)

ICOMOS presented the item and its recommendation for a deferral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Mexico**, supported by the Delegations of **Colombia**, **Malaysia**, the **Russian Federation**, **France** and the **United Arab Emirates**, would like to hear from the State Party which measures had been taken to protect the integrity of the site. The Delegation of **Mexico** also wondered, as did the Delegation of **Colombia**, why questions were being posed concerning the integrity of such a large site.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** souligne trois caractéristiques importantes du site contribuant à sa Valeur universelle exceptionnelle, à savoir sa position unique dans la région du Golfe, sa muraille de 2,5 km de long et son plan en damier qui ne sont pas courants et enfin le rapport entre le désert et la mer avec une implantation humaine vieille de trois siècles reflétant des relations commerciales intenses entre le Golfe, l'Asie et l'Europe.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaiterait entendre l'Etat partie à propos des recherches faites après le passage de la mission de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime que des questions restent ouvertes par rapport au statut de patrimoine mondial. Le grand projet de recherches archéologiques en cours ne sera terminé que dans quelques années, et il n'est pas encore certain que des liens avec l'industrie perlière distinguent cette ville des autres dans le Golfe. Le

dossier est prématuré car la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle n'est pas encore établie. Différer l'examen est donc justifié afin de mettre ce dossier sur la bonne voie.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que le site est intact et exceptionnel et souligne qu'il est un des rares sites du Golfe à ne pas avoir été touché par l'industrie. En ce qui concerne la zone tampon, des documents officiels ont été approuvés et sont en cours de mise en œuvre par le Ministère des Municipalités et du Plan. L'ICOMOS a également indiqué qu'une étude d'impact environnementale était également en cours de préparation par une équipe interdisciplinaire.

The Delegation of **India** considered that the site was of great importance and deserved inscription, noting also its state of conservation in a very fragile and hostile environment. It acknowledged that some issues would have to be addressed, but requested the State Party to elaborate on the state of the research at the site.

The Delegation of **Germany** concurred with previous speakers on the great significance of the proposed site. It had consulted with the State Party and considered that it would be able to provide all the clarifications required within a relatively short time. The Delegation recommended, therefore, that the nomination be referred back to the State Party, rather than deferred.

La Délégation de la **France** fait remarquer que l'industrie perlière n'est pas de nature à provoquer l'établissement de grosses infrastructures et laisse peu de traces.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that the State Party had included a twentieth century military fort, a real curiosity considering its time of construction, within the scope of the nominated area. In this regard, it suggested that this building be retained within the concept of the revised nomination to be resubmitted by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Serbia** had a positive impression from the nomination, which it considered extremely promising in terms of future possible archaeological discoveries. It had no doubt about its great importance, and stated that the site should have been inscribed immediately, since the results of archaeological excavations could not be predicted.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stressed it had very good relationships with ICOMOS. Knowing that other questions would be asked, it had prepared a work programme which was three times bigger than usual due to the participation of archaeologists, scientists, specialists in heritage management. They prepared a full dossier (700 pages) in order to be in a position to reply to as many questions as possible, whether they relate to the historical value, the management or the conservation of the site, in order to avoid the deferral. The site was an exceptional example of a crossing point between maritime (fishing and pearling) and land resources. The archeological remains as well as the written records confirmed the pearling trade. The current excavations would give even more information in the future. Finally, an interdisciplinary team was in place for all the aspect of the management of the site.

ICOMOS agreed that the site was unique in the Gulf region. The question was to be able to clarify what exactly made it special. ICOMOS had not stated that the site was not authentic or that it did not have integrity, but only that it could not assess these conditions on the basis of an unclear statement of Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS further noted the huge work carried out by the State Party in terms of research and was confident that this would deliver its results in due time. As regards

the possibility of a closer dialogue with the State Party, ICOMOS noted the constraints of the current system, particularly with regard to the tight timeframe in which nominations were to be evaluated. ICOMOS added that in its view, a referral would not allow an assessment of a revised proposal, as there would be no mission to the site. A deferral, on the other hand, would enable precisely the dialogue which was called for by the members of the Committee, and would do justice to the great amount of research that the State Party has been able to carry out.

The Delegations of the **United Arab Emirates**, **Germany** and **Algeria** stressed that this nomination file was the first prepared by Qatar. The State Party lacked experience but it had made great efforts. It should have been given the benefit of the doubt. Le Comité doit lui exprimer sa confiance.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** also stated it was deeply aware of the unique characteristics of the site. It regretted there had not been more exchanges with the Advisory Bodies during the two-year process.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that it was no-one's fault if the information regarding the results of the latest archaeological research had not reached ICOMOS on time. However, this seemed to be ready now and this was why the Delegation considered that a referral would be the best solution.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat partie pour les efforts déployés afin d'établir un dossier complet et bien documenté. Le rapport de l'ICOMOS est globalement positif, mais la Délégation estime que l'approche adoptée ne tient pas suffisamment compte du fait qu'il s'agit d'un site archéologique et non d'un paysage. Les hésitations à propos de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle semblent liées au lien avec l'industrie perlière ; or celui-ci a bien été démontré par l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported this statement. It also thanked the State Party for having chosen this site, which was greatly symbolic in the collective memory and history of the region. It considered that the authenticity and integrity were present and that all the vestiges reflected of the importance of the site.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to take the Committee through the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that there was an amendment submitted by the Delegation of **India**, suggesting a referral, and that the related hard copy had been distributed in the room.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.19** was adopted.

Chairperson: South Africa

D.2.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Pearling, testimony of an island economy
Id. N°	1364 Rev
State Party	Bahrain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to present the next item, which concerned a nomination that had been referred back to the State party by a previous session of the Committee.

ICOMOS presented the item and its recommendation, which was to inscribe the nominated property.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** expressed its satisfaction at the present proposal for inscription. The features and variety of the site in terms of archaeology and human activities were exceptional. Therefore inscription was fully justified. The State Party of Bahrain was an example of commitment to abide by the recommendations of the Committee and to work for the heritage preservation. It hosts the Category 2 centre whose role is important and valuable. It offered a symbol for its respect of the recommendations made by the Committee and it was serious and patient enough to meet all of them. The Delegation of the United Arab Emirates congratulated wholeheartedly the State Party of Bahrain.

The Delegations of **Germany, Colombia, Mali, Estonia, Cambodia, Algeria, Serbia, Qatar**, the **Russian Federation** and **Senegal** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the State Party for the respect it had demonstrated for the recommendations of ICOMOS and the Committee, which had clearly been put to good use. This showed how a recommendation for referral could deliver positive results.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stressed the importance of a good conceptualization for a nomination, where tangible and intangible attributes that together demonstrated a human activity were selected. This was not common and the State Party should be thanked for its effort.

Les Délégations du **Mali** et du **Sénégal** rappellent l'attitude de l'Etat partie l'année précédente, lorsqu'il a demandé le maintien du renvoi et refusé l'inscription immédiate du site. Elles soulignent qu'il s'agit là d'un cas exceptionnel et exemplaire.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.20** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Bahrain** praised the Committee for its tremendous efforts in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* and the protection of World Heritage, especially in the Arab region. The State Party had been expecting this inscription for a long time. It recalled that it had withdrawn the nomination last year whereas the site could have been inscribed, in order to respect all the conditions set by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. This day is a memorable one for Bahrain, with a second site inscribed on the World Heritage List. This will be a catalyst to protect this site even more than it is now. All the juridical and management instruments are in place and the beneficiaries of the protection will be the local community itself. It thanked the Committee and the Advisory Bodies for all their efforts and cooperation which led to the inscription of this site.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

D.3 ASIA / PACIFIC

D.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Hill Forts of Rajasthan
Id. N°	247
State Party	India
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS presented the item and its recommendation for the serial nomination, which was not to inscribe the proposed site.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments by the members of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that there seemed to be some factual errors in the evaluation conducted by ICOMOS and asked ICOMOS to react to this. The issues concerned the location of the Forts, which contrary to what ICOMOS stated, were not all situated in a mountain environment, and the actual historic interpretation of these Forts, which had major implications for the criteria used by the State Party to select the sites under consideration among all existing fortresses in the region.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** considered that the value of the site required no additional comment, as the pictures proposed were very impressive. A lot had been done to protect this site and given its state this protection needed to be ensured quite quickly. For the South-East part of Rajasthan, the nomination could be accepted as it stood. The Delegation would like to have further explanations on the basis for the disagreement.

The Delegations of **Ethiopia** and **Senegal** asked that the State Party be given the floor to clarify these questions.

The Delegation of **Thailand** noted that the selection of five fortresses out of the over 30 that existed in the region, which was questioned by ICOMOS, had to do also with questions of ownership. The State Party had obviously chosen those sites on which it

had direct control and of which it could ensure the protection and management. It also noted some mistakes made by ICOMOS in its understanding of the typologies of the fortresses, and asked that the State Party be allowed to clarify these particular points. Considering therefore that the selection of sites put forward by the State Party seemed to be appropriate, the Delegation recommended that a referral be agreed for this nomination and asked for a mission to be conducted to assist the State Party, in the framework of the upstream process.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remarque que la question qui se pose ici est la même qu'à la réunion d'Ittingen, à savoir la sélection des composantes des biens en série grâce à une analyse comparative interne. D'autres biens auraient dû être pris en compte mais ne l'ont pas été pour des raisons internes. Le renvoi ne serait pas suffisant car il ne permettrait pas de modifier la série. Mieux vaut donc différer afin de mener une revue d'ensemble. Cela fait certes perdre un an, mais c'est peu au regard de la longue histoire de ces forts.

The Delegations of **Qatar, Serbia, United Arab Emirates** and **South Africa** supported a referral. This would give the State Party the opportunity to provide further information and to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** seconded the proposal by Colombia and asked for further information on the factual errors that had been submitted by the State Party of India.

With regard to the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the Delegation of **Germany** asked ICOMOS if for all components of the site the criteria were in doubt.

ICOMOS informed that the factual errors had been communicated in writing. As regards the various typologies, ICOMOS acknowledged that Gagron Fort could also be considered a water fort and that Ranthambore a forest fort but that the justification of the State Party focused on the category of hill forts and the comparative study was conducted for hill forts. ICOMOS furthermore acknowledged that significant examples of hill forts may be under private ownership but a number of World Heritage was under private ownership and this should not judge the justification of Outstanding Universal Value in the world. Finally ICOMOS clarified that not all the five forts were proposed under all the criteria suggested. That was a conceptual problem. In the current serial, the criteria had not been justified under the theme presented.

The State Party of **India** informed about the selection of the most outstanding and representative forts for this nomination. An exhaustive and methodical selection of the five forts was based on the physiographic terrain and the cultural subzones within Rajasthan. In a first step, the State Party made a listing of the existing Rajput forts. The initial selection resulted in more than five hill forts that were further evaluated selecting a wide variation on the hilly terrain as well as major phases of Rajput defence architecture. Authenticity and integrity, management, protection and ownership were further selection factors. Western Rajasthan had two to three representative forts with OUV which were not taken as part of the serial property because they did not share the landscape linkage, they were undergoing conservation measures or privately owned and hence unprotected. Each component of the nomination contributed to the integrity and completeness of the serial property with an effective protection and an agreed management framework. These five forts were the most outstanding and the most extend Rajput forts in Rajasthan taking into consideration issues of authenticity, integrity and management. An extension of the

series could be considered in a few years with at least one representative fort from the desert region of Western Rajasthan.

La Délégation de la **France** est en désaccord avec l'ICOMOS, qui considère que les critères choisis par l'Etat partie ne se retrouvent pas tous dans chacun des forts rajputs proposés. Elle rappelle que lors d'une inscription de sites sérielle, c'est l'ensemble de la série qui doit contenir tous les éléments. Il s'agit du sens-même des sites en série.

La Délégation des **Emirats arabes unis**, après avoir écouté les explications de la Délégation de l'Inde, ne souhaite plus prendre la parole.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie l'Etat partie pour ses explications très utiles et, à la lumière de celles-ci, souhaite lui demander de différer la soumission du dossier d'inscription, ce qui permettrait d'adapter la composition de la série. Elle précise qu'au contraire, si le dossier est « renvoyé », l'Etat partie n'aura pas le temps de préparer un nouveau dossier en série de qualité.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS if they could support the State Party in a short time.

ICOMOS underlined the issue of selection of the five components and that a referral was not the format to submit a new selection of a serial nomination. New components would need to be visited by a full evaluation expert mission which would not be possible in the timescale after new material would be received by first of February. The timeframe of a referral would not allow the State Party to make significant revisions of the selection currently presented.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that the State Party did not intend to provide significant and substantial additional information. The mission should focus on the factual errors acknowledged by ICOMOS. If the mission presented its report by August or September, the State Party would be able to comply with the requirements.

La Délégation du **Mali** est en faveur du renvoi au vu des efforts fournis par l'Etat partie et de sa volonté manifeste de faire le maximum pour améliorer le dossier.

The **Chairperson** went to the Draft Decision and asked the Rapporteur to introduce the amendments of Ethiopia to refer the nomination.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie le rapporteur pour son travail exceptionnel mais mentionne qu'elle a trouvé cinq ou six erreurs dans les Décisions, aussi bien dans l'anglais que dans le français. Enfin, elle indique que quelque chose ne va pas dans l'amendement de l'Ethiopie.

The Delegation of **Estonia** underlined that at the moment, the nomination needed more time and work and that a referral limited the options of the State Party to redefine its nomination. Furthermore it would rule out the possibility of an expert mission to this site. Therefore the nomination should be deferred.

The **Chairperson** explained that the majority of the State Party spoke for a referral.

The State Party of **Colombia** recommended that the State Party should request an advisory mission.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère qu'il faut supprimer « pour l'ICOMOS » dans le paragraphe amendé afin d'encourager le processus en tant que tel qui est essentiel pour cette proposition d'inscription.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.22** was adopted as amended.

Property	Masjed-e Jasmé of Isfahan
Id. N°	1397
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination recommending the deferral underlining that an impact assessment should be conducted for any revised design. ICOMOS offered an advisory mission for the revision.

The Delegation of **India** stated that Masjed-e Jāme' was an outstanding example of architecture, the oldest mosque and that an exhaustive comparison had been provided. The State Party had nominated under several criteria and ICOMOS had recognized criteria (ii) to be valid. Therefore essential requirements to move ahead were met and the other seemed to be met also. The Delegation of India was in favour of an inscription.

The Delegation of **Estonia** recognized the Outstanding Universal Value of the mosque but noted the development pressures Meydan-e Atiq project as a threat. Measures should be taken to protect the integrity and authenticity of the property before inscription.

The Delegation of **Mexico** recognized the undeniable value of the impressive monument as one of the oldest mosques that represented a melting pot of 2000 years of history. The delegation asked the State Party for more information on measures taken in the buffer and core zone.

The Delegations of **Qatar, South Africa, Germany and Colombia** requested the State Party to provide more information on the measures that were taken to address ICOMOS' concerns about the developments in the surroundings of the mosque and on the Meydan-e Atiq project.

La Délégation de l'**Irak** déclare que ce site est un chef d'œuvre de l'architecture islamique et souhaite poser une question à l'Etat partie sur la zone tampon du bien.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** partage les avis exprimés précédemment par les autres Délégations mais aimerait poser une question sur le grand projet d'aménagement, qui doit absolument être clarifié avant l'inscription. Il faut être sûr que ce projet ne risque pas de porter atteinte au site.

La Délégation de la **France** partage les critiques exprimées par l'Etat partie sur le rapport de l'ICOMOS et se dit d'accord avec les préoccupations soulevées par la Délégation de la Suisse.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie l'ICOMOS et se dit a priori favorable à l'inscription mais souhaite obtenir des informations de l'Etat partie sur le projet de développement.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** exprime son étonnement quant au fait que l'un de plus grands monuments de l'architecture mondiale ne soit pas déjà inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle appuie donc l'inscription de la grande mosquée d'Ispahan car elle le mérite.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** déclare que ce bien est un chef d'œuvre de l'architecture islamique mais qu'elle voudrait cependant avoir des informations supplémentaires de l'Etat partie. Elle ajoute également qu'elle soutient la Délégation de la Serbie, en faveur de l'inscription de ce site, dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est indiscutable.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee Members to limit their interventions.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** supported an inscription insofar that the Outstanding Universal Value was confirmed and that the concerns of ICOMOS could be addressed by the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** explained that a revision of the revitalisation plan concerning the Northern part of the square and a decision had been adopted by the responsible local and national officials to limit the activities on the northern part of the square only to restoration and maintenance operations. The revitalisation plan had been elaborated by the Iranian Cultural Heritage Organisation. The authorities were present at the session to show their commitment to this decision and their efforts to limit the revitalisation plan to the southern part.

ICOMOS appreciated that the revitalisation project would be limited to the southern part of the mosque but asked for further detail on the effect on the northern part of the mosque in terms of visitors flows given that a large amount of people would gather in the square. How these visitors flows could be directed that they would not influence the historic mosque.

The **Rapporteur** informed that no amendments to the Draft Decision had been received.

The Delegations of **Colombia, India, Iraq, Algeria, France, Qatar, Malaysia and South Africa** supported an amendment to inscribe the site in the List of World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the original wording to defer the nomination.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that no confirmed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value existed so far. In case of inscription, the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be accepted on a provisional basis. ICOMOS had recognized only one criterion and it should be decided under what criteria the site should be inscribed.

The **Rapporteur** informed that ICOMOS had prepared a proposal for a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criterion (ii).

ICOMOS clarified that they had acknowledged Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of authenticity and integrity under criterion (ii) and would be able to provide a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value on this.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** explained that they had prepared an outline on the values of the mosque.

The **Chair** invited the Observer Delegation of **Iran** to join the working group in order to work on a Statement on the further basis of criterion (i) and (iv).

La Délégation de l'**Estonie** soutient le projet de décision initiale sur la base de l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient la Délégation de la Colombie.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient l'inscription sur la base des critères (i) (ii) et (iv).

La Délégation de la **Suisse** trouve étonnant que l'Etat partie puisse participer au travail de rédaction de la déclaration de valeur et s'y oppose formellement.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** considère que si le site peut être inscrit au titre du critère (ii), il n'est pas nécessaire d'attendre. Elle estime par contre que, si d'autres critères sont ajoutés, il faut travailler à nouveau sur le dossier et remettre à plus tard l'inscription. Enfin, la Délégation de la Serbie souhaite que l'Etat partie donne son avis.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.23** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** expressed its gratitude for the inscription of the property and its commitment and efforts to safeguard this heritage for the future. The delegation expressed its respect for two internationally known scholars that worked and researched on Masjed-e Jāme' of Isfahan.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

SIXTH DAY – Saturday, 30 June 2012

TWELFTH MEETING

3 pm – 7 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

D. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

D.3 ASIA / PACIFIC

D.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Gonbad-e Qabus
Id. N°	1398
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of **India** who proposed that for nominations for inscription the Committee move to the Decision unless there is an objection and asked Committee members to refrain from congratulations.

ICOMOS provided an overview of the nomination and the recommended inscription according to criteria (i), (ii), (iii), (iv).

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections and moves to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.24** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** provided a statement in response to the inscription.

After this inscription, the **Chairperson** expressed sadness and concern over the recent damage inflicted to the World Heritage property of Timbuktu.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the Director-General of UNESCO will make a statement in regard to the damage to Timbuktu.

Property	Archaeological Heritage of the Lenggong Valley
Id. N°	1396
State Party	Malaysia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS provided an overview of the nomination. ICOMOS recommended the nomination for deferral.

The Delegation of **India** sought clarification from ICOMOS as the statement of OUV should warrant referral.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that all criteria for OUV had been satisfied and questioned the deferral status and asked State Party of Malaysia and ICOMOS for clarifications. Japan supported that the property be inscribed, provided that a management plan is developed by 2014.

ICOMOS indicated that they wrote to State Party of Malaysia to address the outstanding issues. A response was received and incorporated. The rationale for deferral was addressed and reiterated that protection and management is included in a property's statement of OUV. ICOMOS emphasized that they felt these were not adequate and a mission is needed for further assessment and acknowledged that it will take time to put into place.

The State Party of **Malaysia** responded by thanking ICOMOS and Secretariat and responded to the questions from the Delegations of Japan and India. The State Party of Malaysia confirmed that a draft management plan was completed and that protection measures had been put in place. It indicated that ICOMOS did not have the most recent information since the assessment including a tourism management plan and boundary clarifications had been made since the ICOMOS mission.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** commended the efforts of the State Party and the assessment work provided by ICOMOS. They noted the lack of a management plan but given the State Party response supported inscription.

La Délégation **d'Algérie** félicite et remercie l'ICOMOS. Elle appuie les commentaires d'ICOMOS, mais y note un malentendu, ou un décalage entre ce que l'ICOMOS recommande et ce que l'État partie a en effet accompli. L'État partie paraît avoir répondu à toutes les inquiétudes soulevées par l'ICOMOS depuis que l'ICOMOS les avait exprimés en 2011. Pour cette raison, la Délégation recommande l'inscription du bien.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remarque que selon le rapport de l'ICOMOS il y avait des problèmes, des lacunes dans la nomination du bien, mais elle note que le représentant de la Délégation de la Malaisie avait répondu à ces inquiétudes et appuie la recommandation de la Délégation de l'Algérie.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the proposals made by the Delegations of India, Japan, Algeria and Cambodia.

The Delegation of **Thailand** noted that the site had satisfied all of the criteria for OUV and noted that Operational Guidelines state that the State Party could submit a management plan after inscription. The Delegation of **Thailand** supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee who opposes the nomination.

The State Party of **Malaysia** confirmed that the legal protections have been in place for many years and that the draft management plan is being implemented.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique que le rapport de l'ICOMOS indiquait certaines lacunes – mais que depuis, l'État Parti avait fourni des informations importantes supplémentaires sur ces points. Elle indique que toutefois, il n'était pas possible d'évaluer ces nouvelles informations sans effectuer une visite du terrain qui normalement accompagne une nomination différée.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated that ICOMOS was implying that to have OUV, a management plan was required. It expressed disagreement, saying that a management plan can be done after inscription. The Delegation expressed surprise that the nomination had been recommended for deferral based on the absence of a management plan.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that a discussion is needed as the issues concerning the Malaysian nomination are difficult. Found that the deferral too harsh and asked ICOMOS that given the response from the State Party could they work with them to develop a management plan.

ICOMOS responded about the criteria for OUV and that management and protection is included. They noted that protection has to be in place for it to be sustained. They noted that they have not been able to review the late information but confirmed that an advisory mission could take place.

The State Party of **Malaysia** responded that the property is a protected area so the protection exists.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** exprime un souci en ce qui concerne la mise en œuvre d'un plan de gestion pour un site qui n'est pas encore inscrit.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Delegation of Germany and noted that the pressures experienced by the site are linked to sustainable development (farming, tourism). The Delegation of South Africa supported inscription with clear mitigation measures.

The **Chairperson** questioned if the Delegation of Switzerland based on the information received would reconsider their position.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'elle se sent obligée de respecter la grande majorité des Délégations.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

On paragraph 3, the Delegation of **Ethiopia** pointed out a language discrepancy.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** exprime un problème avec le petit B du paragraphe 4 de la décision. Elle se demande comment le Comité puisse demander à l'État partie que le bien soit protégé sous une loi qui doit être passée en décembre 2012 – c'est-à-dire une loi qui n'est pas encore passée en Malaisie.

The Delegation of **India** asked the State Party for clarification.

The State Party of **Malaysia** provided clarification on the amendment.

The **Rapporteur** asked the Delegation of India for clarification.

The Delegation of **India** provided clarification and pointed out that national regional legislation is complicated.

The State Party of **Malaysia** further clarified the amendment.

The Delegation of **Mexico** suggested further clarification to the amendment.

The **Rapporteur** provided alternative language to the amendment.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.25** was adopted as amended.

The State Party of **Malaysia** thanked the Committee in response to the inscription.

D.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

D.4.1 New Nominations

Property	Landscape of Grand-Pré
Id. N°	1404
State Party	Canada
Criteria proposed by State Party	(v)(vi)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination recommending the inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked if there are any objections and finding none moved to the Draft Decision.

In the absence of comments, the Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.27** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** provided a statement in response to the inscription underlying the work with communities at the site.

The **Chairperson** suggested a change to the order of discussion to accommodate those States Parties who needed to leave.

Property	Heritage of Mercury. Almadén and Idrija
Id. N°	1313 Rev
State Party	Slovenia / Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(v)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination recommending the inscription.

The **Delegation of Mexico** expressed its gratitude and thanked the States Parties for this type of cooperation.

The **Chairperson** noting no objection moved to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.39** was adopted.

The States Parties of **Slovenia and Spain** made a joint statement to thank the Committee in response to the inscription.

Property	Margravia Opera House Bayreuth
Id. N°	1379
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination recommending the inscription on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv).

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to move to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.30** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Germany** and the Mayor of Bayreuth thanked the Committee in response to the inscription and invited the Committee to see the Opera House.

Property	Garrison Border Town of Elvas and its Fortifications
Id. N°	1367
State Party	Portugal
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination recommending that it should be deferred.

The **Rapporteur** informed that no written amendments had been presented to the Draft Decision.

The **Delegation of Mexico** noted that Elvas was well preserved and requested the State Party to clarify which measures had been taken to guarantee the future management of structures inside the fortifications.

The Observer Delegation of **Portugal** answered it had new elements to give on all 3 recommendations of ICOMOS. It noted that all fortresses are national monuments and that the intra-muros classification was underway. It stressed that the requested changes in the buffer zone to protect the view lines was also being done and that a revised map would be submitted. It finally noted that the Office had been established at the end of May and concluded all recommendations had been Implemented.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** suggère de donner la parole à l'Etat partie afin que celui-ci explique quelles sont les mesures prises dans la zone intra muros.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the clarification of the State Party was very convincing and proposed that the site should be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked the question when the classification and new buffer zone would be ready.

The Observer Delegation of **Portugal** noted that the intra-muros parts are already de facto protected as the classification process freezes any development. It further clarified that all World Heritage Sites in Portugal are automatically protected under Portuguese law. Everything would be finalized by the end of the year.

The **Chairperson** noted that to inscribe the site, a Statement of OUV was necessary.

Les Délégations du **Qatar** et de la **France** se prononcent en faveur de l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** observed that there was a lot of support for immediate inscription.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that ICOMOS had accepted the site responded to criterion iv and the Statement of OUV could be prepared on that basis.

The **Chairperson** asked if there was anybody against adopting the decision as amended.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to include reference to the national legislation on World Heritage sites.

The **Chairperson** considered it would be difficult to include this as the details were not available.

The Draft Decision **36COM 8B.34** was adopted as amended by the Committee concerning the inscription of the property under criterion (iv).

The Observer Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Committee upon this inscription.

Property	Sacral Complex on the remains of the Roman Forum in Zadar
Id. N°	1395
State Party	Croatia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination recommending a deferral.

The Delegation of **Serbia** did not share the view of ICOMOS. It noted that the proposed site was a complex of major significance for the entire region and a meeting place of cultures covering 2 millennia from Roman times till today. It considered that the reconstruction was a testimony to its turbulent history. It agreed that the city was severely bombed in 1943 leading to the destruction of many important buildings but these were carefully reconstructed and resulted in significant archaeological discoveries including the Roman Forum. It proposed inscription.

The Delegation of **Estonia** agreed Zadar was a wonderful place but also supported the recommendation of deferral by ICOMOS, as there were complex issues to address.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que les problèmes d'intégrité existent. Certaines parties sont décrites mais ne sont pas dans le périmètre du bien; d'autres parties ne sont pas décrites tandis qu'elles sont dans le périmètre. Elle suggère que le dossier doit être retravaillé, afin de démontrer en quoi exactement ce site est exceptionnel. Constatant que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle n'est pas établie, elle suggère de différer l'examen de ce dossier.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** suggested to give the floor to the State Party so that to receive clarifications concerning the authenticity and the integrity of the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** requested the State Party to clarify the factual errors which were identified.

ICOMOS noted that in terms of authenticity several components of the site had been reconstructed. In terms of integrity it was difficult to see how the the proposed area could be considered complete.

The Observer Delegation of **Croatia** noted the considerable factual errors in the ICOMOS report which might have influenced the judgment of the OUV. It agreed that

some buildings were recomposed based on the original materials and based on very clear documentation. In the case of the church, only the roof had been reconstructed. It noted that the complexity is part of the value of Zadar. It clarified that in terms of authenticity the city has retained its city plan from Roman times and that the grid plan was interpreted in following eras.

La Délégation du **Mali** se prononce en faveur de l'inscription du bien.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne qu'il s'agit d'une ville mille-feuille d'histoire, symbole de métamorphose européenne. Elle exprime sa volonté de travailler avec l'Etat partie pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Elle se prononce pour le renvoi du dossier à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **India** supported by the **Delegation of Ethiopia** noted that this was one of the most interesting nominations. It had a problem with the typology of ICOMOS and considered the site deserved inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, compte tenu de la réponse au relevé d'erreurs factuelles, se prononce en faveur de l'inscription.

The Delegations of **Iraq, United Arab Emirates, Serbia, Algeria, Malaysia** and **Qatar** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted guidance was needed on which basis this could be decided.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was an amendment with a proposal for Statement of OUV.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted it considered that it is not possible to inscribe this site at this point in time.

The **Chair** proposed to move to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Serbia** noted that point 4-d should be deleted.

The **Chair** proposed to first decide on the inscription, deferral or referral.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** relève que la majorité se prononce pour l'inscription, et que ce faisant, on détourne les recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS. Elle souligne que si la demande du plan de gestion est remise à plus tard, cela empêche le Comité de prendre la décision sur une base réelle. Elle se prononce pour différer l'examen de la proposition d'inscription, afin de laisser le temps à l'Etat partie de répondre à la demande de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la proposition faite par la Délégation de la Suisse.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** souligne le nombre de lettres d'erreurs factuelles, et regrette que ces erreurs se soit produites, dont certaines ont été acceptées par l'ICOMOS, d'autres pas.

The **Chairperson** proposed to decide on referral.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne que le renvoi n'a pas été proposé.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** suggère de fixer un délai dans lequel l'Etat partie devra répondre aux recommandations, et l'assortir d'une mission de suivi.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its concern about the factual errors and considered ICOMOS should provide some explanations on this.

ICOMOS explained the different errors it had recognized.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que la proposition faite par l'Algérie correspond à l'option de l'examen différé.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted it had received a copy of the factual error letter and considered that most of the information in the letter was not factual.

La Délégation de la **France** regrette les erreurs factuelles, qui brouillent un peu le débat, et s'interroge si une inscription conditionnelle, proposée par l'Algérie, serait possible.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that as a result of the factual errors this can no longer be considered as a case of deferral.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the conditional inscription.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor of the Legal Advisor.

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that conditional inscription is not foreseen in the Operational Guidelines.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stated that it is in favor of inscription, with recommendations. It suggested that the floor should be given to the State Party.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** clarifie qu'elle n'a pas proposé d'inscription conditionnelle. Elle suggère qu'un débat plus général devrait avoir lieu dans le cadre de la révision des *Orientations*, afin de trouver des solutions intermédiaires. Elle souligne qu'il n'y a pas de mauvaise volonté ni de mauvaise foi de la part de l'Etat partie.

ICOMOS clarified that it has not identified the OUV in the current nominated property.

The **Chairperson** requested the Legal Advisor to clarify what an intermediate decision could be.

The **Legal Advisor** noted that the procedures available are deferral and referral.

The Delegation of **Colombia**, with support from the **Delegation of India**, proposed referral as a compromise.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que les missions d'évaluation ont lieu seulement dans le cadre d'examen différé. En cas de renvoi, il s'agit d'une mission consultative.

The Delegations of the **Russian Federation, France, Germany and United Arab Emirates** all supported the proposal.

The Delegation of **Serbia** proposed to request if the State Party is in agreement.

The **Chairperson** clarified that this is not in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines* and proposed to move to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision with amendments.

The **Delegation of India** proposed to set a timeframe.

ICOMOS noted that it would need more information from the State Party on what is the perceived OUV of the Property.

The Draft Decision **36COM 8B.28** was adopted as amended.

Property	Nord-Pas de Calais Mining Basin
Id. N°	1360
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination recommending the inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked if there are any objections to move to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36COM 8B.29** was adopted.

The Delegation of **France** thanked the Committee upon this inscription.

The meeting rose at 7 pm

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday, 1 July 2012

THIRTEENTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

D. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

D.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

D.4.1 New Nominations

Property	Schwetzingen: a Prince Elector's Summer Residence
Id. N°	1281
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS presented the details of the proposed nomination and recommended non-inscription.

The **Chairperson** invited the floor to make comments.

The Delegation of **Colombia** invited the Delegation of Germany to respond to the ICOMOS evaluation.

La Délégation de la **France** pose la question à l'ICOMOS concernant le critère (iv) tout en précisant que les trois premiers critères sont des critères d'exceptionnalité et les trois derniers sont des critères de représentativité.

L'**ICOMOS** précise qu'il n'y a pas de différence dans la présentation. Le site doit être exceptionnel. Dans ce cas précis, l'inscription n'est pas justifiée.

The Delegation of **Germany** responded, indicating that it had compared its site with approximately 30 other sites. It added that there had been a comparison between outstanding buildings and layouts in the gardens with other European residences.

One element included the mosque. The Delegation explained that this was the only existing mosque in Western Europe of the 18th century – and it represented the openness to other culture and religions. It also noted that the theatre was special in that it was a Gallery Theatre, with everyone sitting on the same level listening to the music. This concept also enabled new music forms of greater popularity.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie les précisions données par l'ICOMOS en soulignant que le débat est au cœur de la Convention. Il souligne que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle et les critères ne sont pas justifiés.

The Delegation of **India** asked ICOMOS if the mosque had been considered as part of the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Qatar** indicated that beyond the fact that the site had exceptional cultural value, it noted that the co-habitation of several religions served as an important mechanism for the improvement of dialogue between civilizations and supported the inclusion.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que l'exemple présenté n'est pas représentatif et que la VUE ne peut pas être réduite aux éléments séparés. Tous les éléments sont exposés par l'ICOMOS et qui justifient la non-inscription.

L'**ICOMOS** précise que la Mosquée a été prise en compte en tant que monument. Cependant, ce monument ne représente pas de valeur justifiant un tel débat. Ce type d'expression de multiculturalisme était très présent à l'époque et que d'autres exemples d'une valeur largement supérieure ont été déjà reconnus. La question d'équilibre de la Liste et de sa crédibilité se pose.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie l'avis technique de l'ICOMOS. Cependant, elle précise que la mosquée en tant que l'un des signes de l'orientalisme est d'une nature largement exceptionnelle. Ce site a contribué à la naissance de l'orientalisme en Europe. La Délégation de l'Algérie appuie la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** noted its appreciation of the efforts made by the State Party and ICOMOS, but warned that before moving to the decision, the nominating State Party should be given the chance to respond to the questions presented, particularly in regard to the number of elements which formed the whole.

The Delegation of **Qatar** expressed its support for the proposal of the Delegation of the United Arab Emirates and of Algeria, and indicated that the mosque was a good example of how to use the past to serve the present, promoting tolerance and co-existence, and expressed its support for inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note que l'idée de développer des liens avec l'orientalisme peut être intéressante. Cependant, il faut que cette proposition s'appuie sur les critères très précis. De là, il faut prouver que l'ICOMOS a tort. Il appelle le Comité à commencer de raisonner dans les termes de la Convention.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne que le problème de cette mosquée décorative ne doit pas éclipser l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie les présentations du Sénégal et de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Switzerland, France and Senegal.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** expressed hope that there was no misunderstanding – that they were not focusing on one factor on the basis of ideological beliefs – and explained that this is not what they had said. It asked the Delegation of Germany to comment on the ICOMOS conclusions.

The Delegation of **Mexico** endorsed the Delegation of Senegal as regards the actual essence of what was being discussed here, also supported the presentation of the Switzerland and Colombia.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** indicated that there were many unique features of the nomination, and wanted to know from the State Party if the mosque was the only one preserved from the Baroque era.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that this mosque had been the only one built in stone at that period. It explained that the mosque had broken with the tradition of the decorative mosque in Europe, and that it was the only one that remains from this era. In the 1900's, the mosque was the only one existing in the western world and the only one that was not only painted inside, but with wisdoms from the philosophy of the orient. The Delegation expressed regret that this fact had not been mentioned in the ICOMOS report. The mayor continued, indicated that the mosque had influenced very much the people living in the region – and that it has been a sign of tolerance until today.

The **Chairperson** interrupted on point of order.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** pose une question à l'ICOMOS pour avoir les clarifications si c'est la seule mosquée de cette époque qui existe dans le monde occidental.

The Delegation of **Germany** continues with information on the theatre – indicating that it was the first of the new philosophy, where the emperor put people and himself on the same floor, indicating a new way to relate to the people.

L'**ICOMOS** précise que la proposition d'inscription concerne la résidence d'été avec son palais construit dans un style baroque et avec son jardin.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne également que la proposition d'inscription ne concerne pas la mosquée mais bien le palais.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande un avis du conseiller juridique pour savoir si le Comité peut inscrire un seul élément ayant la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **India** observed that the evaluation process involved a set of facts provided by the nominating State Party, taken up by ICOMOS, distilled and then transmitted by them. The Delegation noted that there could be a selective distillation which at times State Party may feel is not comprehensive enough. Not inscribing does not give the State Party the chance to rework it, and suggested a referral or a deferral might be a better way to proceed.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son désaccord pour cet «acharnement thérapeutique » et appelle le Comité à rester cohérent et de ne pas prendre en

considération des éléments subjectifs. Il précise que si le Comité accepte cette inscription incohérente la Convention sera endommagée.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que le rôle du Comité est de ne pas découper le site. Cependant, si l'Etat Partie le souhaite, il peut soumettre une proposition d'inscription pour cette mosquée. Il faut donc présenter un nouveau dossier. La proposition actuelle ne doit pas être retenue.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that the ICOMOS report had been well presented and expressed concern that bad precedents could not be made. It recommended deferral of the nomination.

La Délégation de la **France** précise que c'est une mosquée sans fidèles, sans croyants. Il y a beaucoup de mosquées de cette époque en Europe. Il exprime son accord avec les avis exprimés par la Suisse et le Sénégal.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the proposal for deferral.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the position of the Delegations of Switzerland and Senegal.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the Delegations of Switzerland, Colombia and Senegal, but added that it was important to keep in mind the fundamental principles of representativity and balance, noting that palaces in Europe were already well represented on the list, and that the mosque was not the heart of the matter in this nomination.

La Délégation de **Mali** exprime son soutien pour inscrire ce site.

The **Legal Advisor** answered the question of Algeria, noting that it believed that a nomination could not be split during the Committee deliberations for consideration by the Committee.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise que ce n'est pas une mosquée représentative et ne constitue qu'un élément décoratif.

The **Chairperson** recognized the difficulty with regard to this situation, with a three way split in the Committee, and suggested that perhaps a deferral would be an acceptable option.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la proposition de la Présidente pour différer l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to present the amended text.

The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that for a deferral, the Advisory Body usually provide a recommendation on what needed to be addressed to improve the dossier, and went on to suggest a text to address this requirement.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se demande comment l'ICOMOS pourrait changer son avis seulement en deux jours. Le site proposé ne doit pas être inscrit mais l'Etat Partie peut revenir avec un nouveau dossier de proposition d'inscription de cette mosquée.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that a nominating Committee member attending the Committee meeting carried a risk of not being able to participate in these discussions – that was a fact it had to accept. It added that while the ICOMOS evaluation did not find OUV this had been clearly contested by some members of the Committee. It explained that the deferral option gave the nominating State Party the chance to review the proposal – and suggested a way to deal with this particular file, concluding that a deferral was the best option at this time.

L'**ICOMOS** précise que ce site n'a pas été proposé pour l'inscription. La VUE n'a pas été démontrée. Le débat se fixe sur une seule composante qui n'est qu'un élément décoratif de l'ensemble.

The **Chairperson** asked the Legal Advisor to quote a rule of procedure pertinent in this case.

The **Legal Advisor** explained the relevant paragraph of the Operational Guidelines, notably paragraph 158, to the Committee members.

The **Chairperson** suggested that a deferral might be recommended and asked the Delegation of India to participate in proposing recommendations for the improvement of the nomination under the deferral option.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** souligne l'importance de cette discussion. Il propose de reporter cette proposition afin de permettre à l'Etat Partie de refaire le dossier sur la base de ce nouvel élément.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** referred to paragraph 160 of the Operational Guidelines, concerning deferral and suggested a text in that regard.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que c'est une question de principe. L'Etat Partie pourrait soumettre une nouvelle proposition d'inscription. Cependant la proposition de différer cette inscription n'est pas acceptable. Il propose un vote.

The State Party of **Colombia** reiterated its support for the ICOMOS recommendation.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appelle à la non-inscription.

The **Legal Advisor** explained the rules for votes on inscription matters, and clarified that the request from Switzerland was for a vote on non-inscription recommended by ICOMOS.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** précise que l'Etat Partie a une marge de manœuvre pour présenter un nouveau dossier. Il se pose la question de savoir si l'Etat Partie est convaincu qu'il n'y a pas de VUE.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** accepte les explications du Conseiller juridique.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the proposal of United Arab Emirates and underlined that the State Party should explain its position regarding a new nomination.

The Delegation of **Germany** explained that it had heard the Committee, and that they would accept a deferral for a part of the nomination, and that this outcome would be more acceptable, given the administrative structure in Germany. It corrected an earlier statement by another Delegation, and indicated that Muslim rituals had indeed been practiced in the mosque in question.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que si les Membres ne s'accordent pas sur la proposition de différer, le vote pourra être proposé. Il n'est pas contre de différer cette inscription. Il demande si l'Etat Partie est d'accord. Cependant, si la Suisse maintient sa position et pour ne pas perdre le temps le vote doit être lancé.

The **Chairperson** asked that the Committee proceed to the vote.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** s'interroge sur le sujet proposé pour vote.

The **Legal Advisor** indicated it would be by show of hands, explaining that the vote was to agree not to inscribe this site, and reminded the Committee that a two thirds majority was required.

The Delegation of **Japan** made a point of order, quoting rule 25 on votes for amendments – and indicated that since amendments had been made, that these first had to be voted on.

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that the Rapporteur had not received an official amendment, and under these circumstances, the vote on the original Draft Decision could proceed. The vote took place, and the proposal was rejected.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the vote now must be made for inscription or not.

La Délégation du **Mexique** précise que la réaction des Membres du Comité est proportionnelle à l'importance de cette question. Il demande de se prononcer sur la proposition de différer l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** agreed that a deferral could be discussed.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** explained that it wanted to discuss the deferral option.

The **Chairperson** invited Algeria, Qatar and Mali to withdraw their proposal to inscribe the property.

La Délégation de **Qatar** accepte et retire sa proposition.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** exprime son regret et maintient sa position pour que cette inscription soit différée.

La Délégation du **Mali** exprime également son accord pour le différer.

The Delegation of **South Africa** raised a point of order, and expressed some confusion on the issue. It indicated that Senegal's issue had not been addressed, and that the voting process had been interrupted and sought guidance.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the voting had been completed and clarified the Delegation of South Africa misunderstandings.

The **Legal Advisor** announced that the 2/3 majority was not reached for “not to inscribe Schwetzingen: a Prince Elector’s Summer Residence on the World Heritage List”.

The Delegation of **Mexico** was against the extreme proposal of inscription.

The Delegations of **Qatar, Algeria and Mali** withdrew their proposal for inscription and went along with deferral proposal.

The Delegation of **South Africa** sought further clarification.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the Committee was only discussing the proposal for deferral.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.31** was adopted as amended.

CULTURAL HERITAGE PROPERTIES IN MALI

The **Chairperson** introduced the Minister of Culture and Tourism of Mali to the Committee.

Le Ministre de la Culture et du Tourisme du Mali, Mme Diallo Fadima Touré, remercie la Russie pour l'excellent accueil et organisation dans cette capitale culturelle mondiale de Saint-Pétersbourg. Elle remercie également la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO, Mme Irina Bokova, pour avoir été à côté des maliens depuis le début des événements qui affectent le pays, ainsi que l'ICCROM, l'ICOMOS, l'UICN, les ONG, la presse et tout le personnel de soutien à ce travail du Comité. Elle remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour avoir accepté le 28 juin dernier la demande du Mali d'inscrire les biens culturels de Tombouctou et le tombeau des Askia sur la liste en péril. Elle constate comme le monde entier a appris avec indignation la démolition des lieux de culte et de mémoire à Tombouctou dont plusieurs mausolées. Elle demande à l'assemblée jusqu'à quand elle voudra rester à contempler ce spectacle qui demain pourrait se répéter dans un autre pays. Elle rappelle comme il n'y a pas de pays au monde qui n'ont pas bâti leur grandeur sur des valeurs culturelles. Elle adresse un cri de cœur pour que aucun pays puisse apporter un aide à des groupes qui détruisent le patrimoine universels car ces crimes n'ont rien à avoir avec l'Islam, dont ces groupes se réclament proches, qui est une religion de paix. Elle lance un appel à l'ONU à prendre des actions exemplaires. Elle rappelle que le Mali a déjà commencé le processus de saisine à la Cours pénale internationale.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** s'adresse à l'assemblée suite aux actes inqualifiables de profanation des tombeaux et de destruction du patrimoine de l'humanité perpétrés par des hordes sauvages à Tombouctou. Elle déclare que toute la communauté islamique condamne ces actions qui sont aux antipodes de l'Islam, religion de paix. Elle demande que l'UNESCO prenne toutes les mesures nécessaires dans le cadre de ses compétences.

The **Chairperson** expressed the Committee's condolences on the event happened in Timbuktu (Mali) and proceeded to a minute of silence.

Property	Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato
Id. N°	1390
State Party	Italy
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(v)

L'ICOMOS présente le rapport d'évaluation du bien et recommande de différer l'inscription.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was proposed to the Draft Decision.

The **Delegation of Japan** asked clarification on the selection criteria of the nominated sites from the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** responded by providing the justifications for the selection of the nominated sites in relation to vineyard cultivation of the living cultural landscape, with particular attention been paid to the integrity of the property. It further confirmed that the State Party is ready to follow the recommendations made by ICOMOS.

ICOMOS constate deux difficultés sur ce dossier: la première est celle de revoir les délimitations individuelles pas seulement des terrains mais aussi les châteaux qui actuellement sont à l'extérieur du bien; la deuxième est dans la sélection de la série qui doit être plus rigoureuse.

The Delegation of **Germany** sought clarification on the follow-up to ICOMOS recommendations.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** confirmed that some of recommendations have already been put into place, and that it will follow them fully.

The Delegation of **Germany** then proposed a referral.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** observe que cette candidature a besoin d'une révision des limites et de la composition du bien sériel qui ne peut pas être faite avec un renvoi et il faut que la candidature soit différée.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.32** was adopted.

Chairperson: (SouthAfrica)

D.4.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Major Mining Sites of Wallonia
Id. N°	1344 Rev
State Party	Belgium
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

L'ICOMOS présente le rapport d'évaluation du bien dont la candidature avait été différé lors de la 34^{ème} session du Comité.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.38** was adopted.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** (Observateur) remercie pour la reconnaissance attribuée par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à ce long processus qui a amené à l'inscription du bien. Elle rappelle que la décision de différer l'inscription il y a deux ans a donné l'opportunité d'approfondir le plan de protection du bien. Elle remercie les experts et s'engage à mettre en œuvre les recommandations reçues. Elle explique comme le charbon a profondément marqué l'histoire de la Wallonie et elle veut partager cette inscription avec les pays dont les habitants sont venus travailler en Belgique et ont contribué à sa richesse et son multiculturalisme.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

Property	Decorated Farmhouses of Hälsingland
Id. N°	1282 Rev
State Party	Sweden
Criteria proposed by State Party	(v)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the deferred nomination. It recommended the property for referral back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that the conditions for inscription were met and it is in favour of inscription. It asked the State Party of Sweden for clarification on the follow-up of ICOMOS' recommendations in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked the State Party to provide information on the current status of dealing with issues raised in Draft Decision. In view of confirmation by the State Party, it will propose the property for inscription.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Colombia and further suggested that the State Party of Sweden to provide a report on the progress made to follow-up on the substantial issues to the Committee at its next session.

The State Party of **Sweden** noted ICOMOS's viewpoint and informed the Committee that a Site Management Committee was set up in 28 May 2012 and the Committee adopted the Management Plan for property. Also, protection plans for all 7 component sites were approved. Furthermore, buffer zones for 6 sites were established and only one is in the consultation process. Other measures are taken to ensure that the property is under the highest level of protection.

ICOMOS noted the State Party of Sweden's follow-up action. However, details on buffer zone demarcation need to be provided and confirmation of the management system and approach is also needed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient l'inscription de ce bien et reconnaît les efforts de la Suède qui a accepté le différer il y a deux ans ce dossier. Elle note également que ceci démontre encore une fois l'intérêt de cet instrument pour travailler sérieusement sur un dossier d'inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient le projet d'inscription.

The Draft Decision **30 COM 8B.40** was adopted as amended.

The **State Party of Sweden** provided a statement in response to the inscription and welcomed the commitment of the private owners.

The **Chairperson** requested from the Committee the authorization to examine a property from Latin America and the Caribbean region, the Brazilian Minister of Culture being in the Room. No objection was put forward before the Committee.

D.5 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

D.5.1 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea
Id. N°	1100 Rev
State Party	Brazil
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(vi)

ICOMOS provided its assessment on this deferred nomination of 2003 and suggested that the nomination be referred back to the State Party with recommendations in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that the Outstanding Universal Value was identified and justified and therefore suggested the property for inscription. It further asked the State Party of Brazil to provide clarification on how the entire property is protected and what is the appropriate management system.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted enormous efforts made by the State Party of Brazil and supported the proposal for inscription.

The Delegation of **Mexico** recognized the nomination demonstrates the Carioca identity and it further asks the State Party of Brazil to clarify on measures taken to guarantee the long-term protection of the property and what indicators will be developed for monitoring the change of the city.

La Déléation du **Sénégal** est favorable à l'inscription d'un bien qui allie paysage culturel et naturel et demande des éclaircissements à l'Etat partie sur le plan global de gestion, sur les mesures contre la pollution marine ainsi que sur la zone tampon.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday, 1 July 2012

FOURTEENTH MEETING

3 pm – 8 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

D. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

D.5 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

D.5.1 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea
Id. N°	1100 Rev
State Party	Brazil
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(vi)

(Continuation)

The Delegation of **India** supported the inscription. It stated that there is a conceptual confusion in the urban landscape notion that needed to be discussed by the Committee at some point.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son rapport qui confirme que les conditions sont remplies et félicite l'Etat partie pour cette nomination d'un bien si extraordinaire.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** félicite l'ICOMOS et l'Etat partie, soutient l'amendement de la Colombie et attends les précisions de la part de l'Etat partie concernant notamment la délimitation de la zone tampon.

The Delegation of **Brazil** addressed the questions put forth by other delegations concerning the buffer zone, pollution and monitoring of the proposed World Heritage property.

The **Chairperson** moved to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that amendments were received and that a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value was inserted into the Draft Decision. Paragraphs one is adopted. Paragraphs 2 and 3 are adopted as amended. Both paragraphs 4 and 5 were adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Colombia** raised some problems of typos and substance to address at a later stage.

ICOMOS suggested discussing the statement of Outstanding Universal Value and offered assistance to finalize it so that it could be adopted.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.42** was adopted as amended.

The **Minister of Culture of Brazil** provided a statement in response to the inscription. While thanking the Committee Members for the decision, she stated that the inscription of Rio de Janeiro represents a landmark to the World Heritage List, since it refers to the first urban area in a metropolis inscribed as cultural landscape. The Minister underlined the importance of the protection of cultural landscapes, as heritage policies need to address the relation of human beings with their environment in the context of sustainable development.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Brazil** and suggested to develop studies to analyze and move forward the agenda of urban cultural landscapes.

The Delegation of **India** endorsed the Delegation of **Colombia's** proposal and requested the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture to provide guidance on the issue.

Chairperson: (SouthAfrica)

D.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

D.4.1 New Nominations *(continuation)*

Property	Russian Kremlins
Id. N°	1378
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination. Inscription was not recommended.

The Delegation of **India** recognized the importance of the nomination and underscored the lack of information available on serial nominations and the limitations on scope and potential series extensions. They questioned the balance on

when information is asked by **ICOMOS** from the State Party and based on assessment why additional information was not requested.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked **ICOMOS** for its assessment. It supported the Delegation of **India's** statement and asked the State Party of the **Russian Federation** to respond.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** constate qu'il y a eu un malentendu dans ce dossier d'inscription. Elle suggère d'appliquer une analyse comparative à l'intérieur de la série dans laquelle chaque élément doit contribuer en manière unique à la VUE. Elle rappelle qu'il y a déjà 4 kremlins inscrits dans la Liste et que dans cette candidature présentée il n'y a pas d'analyse comparative. Elle soutient une inscription des kremlins russes qui doit absolument contenir les 4 kremlins déjà inscrits et peut-être être complétée avec un autre encore. Elle est donc contraire à l'inscription de la série tel quelle présentée.

The Delegation of **Estonia** appreciated the Kremlin nomination but was confused on why they were put forward as a serial nomination as they felt the four Kremlins were not directly linked giving the example of cathedrals in France. They noted that an adequate comparative analysis was needed and supported a reassessment of the nomination.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que les inscriptions des cathédrales françaises sont anciennes et qu'elle pourrait envisager dans le futur une inscription en série. Elle déclare que la série des kremlins semble se justifier même si le principe doit être bâti de façon plus forte. Elle demande à l'Etat partie d'expliquer si les kremlins faisaient partie d'une structure étatique ou avaient chacun une fonction spécifique.

The Delegation of **Mexico** noted that a debate was necessary to clarify criteria for a serial nomination. They further noted that the assessment by **ICOMOS** on authenticity had to link to the significance of the properties to the communities and requested a response from the State Party.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande à l'Etat partie de fournir plus d'éléments sur l'impact des kremlins sur le paysage moderne et l'environnement [sic].

La Délégation du **Cambodge** souhaite avoir des précisions sur les restaurations apportées à ces monuments.

La Délégation du **Mali** demande à l'ICOMOS plus de clarification sur la définition de « kremlin ».

The Delegation of **South Africa** agreed that the issue is confusing and requested a response from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Germany** acknowledged the significance of the Kremlins and the need to protect for future generations. They suggested a referral back to the State Party to clarify the outstanding issues.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** addressed the questions put forth by other delegations on timing of information requested and received by ICOMOS, an explanation of the serial nomination and how they are linked including the history and integrity of the properties and their authenticity.

ICOMOS explained the process of their assessment noting when information was sent and received to and from the State Party, noting they did not receive a response from their original letter so no further letters were sent. They also noted that the response to a factual error could not be accepted beyond the cut-off date.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Delegation of Germany for their referral intervention and stressed the scale of the series of Kremlins. They commented on the significance and authenticity of the Kremlins and the importance of serial nominations and the importance of upstream support from **ICOMOS**.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle l'immensité et la beauté du territoire de la Fédération de Russie et constate que ce dossier prend en compte une petite constellation de kremlins qui peut s'ajouter aux inscriptions des 4 principaux dans la Liste.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que l'approche du bien sériel peut être poursuivie et constitue une forme moderne de penser le patrimoine mondial qui toutefois nécessite d'une analyse comparative qui dans ce cas n'est pas présente. Elle ajoute que les précisions apportées par l'Etat partie ne parlent pas des autres 10 kremlins qui n'ont pas été pris en considération dans ce dossier et réitère par conséquent son refus d'accepter la série telle quelle est maintenant.

ICOMOS clarified that they viewed these properties beyond being military garrisons and acknowledge their use for community integration.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that serial nominations are fairly new "instruments" and asked the Legal Advisor whether it was possible to inscribe properties within a series and expand it at a later date.

The Delegation of **Serbia** added that serial nominations pose special difficulties in terms of expectations to compile vast amounts of information.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted the need to inscribe as soon as possible and again reiterated their support for a referral.

ICOMOS further clarified that with regard to the French and Mexican examples the information came through a comparative analysis.

The **Legal Advisor** noted that the rules governing serial nominations could be found in the Operational Guidelines rule 139 and further noted that properties can be submitted in several cycles.

The **Rapporteur** moved to the Draft Decision and noted that an amendment was received from the Delegation of India requesting a referral.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est favorable à examiner l'idée de différer l'inscription mais elle ne peut pas accepter de la renvoyer compte tenu de l'énorme travail de révision à faire sur cette nomination. Elle considère toutefois que la non inscription donnerait à l'Etat partie la possibilité de bâtir un dossier plus solide.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the Delegation of Switzerland's request for a deferral.

The Delegation of **Estonia** endorsed the proposals of Switzerland and Colombia for

a deferral.

The Delegation of **India** noted the issue of distance between the properties and further noted the perceived errors in their analysis. They questioned whether the World Heritage Centre could call on additional assistance from other bodies to make assessments.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** supporte pleinement la proposition de l'Inde.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la proposition indienne du renvoi de l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported the proposals from France and India.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** supported a referral noting that time is needed to make a complete assessment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que la proposition de l'Inde ne peut pas se faire sous l'empire du renvoi mais uniquement sous celui d'un différemment compte tenu des nombreux éléments à apporter au dossier.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie la solution du renvoi mais demande à l'Etat partie si est dans la position pour relever ce défi.

The Delegations of **Mexico, Iraq, Germany, South Africa, Malaysia and Senegal** supported India.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported Switzerland.

The **Secretariat** responded to the question from the Delegation of India regarding other advisory assistance noting that 8.3 of the *World Heritage Convention* provides for "representatives of other intergovernmental or non-governmental organizations, with similar objectives, may attend the meetings of the Committee in an advisory capacity."

The Delegation of **India** requested a consultative mission be scheduled to provide advice and assistance to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that Article 16 of the Operational Guidelines defined a deferral with a mission and a referral without a mission.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** noted that the previous Committee decision set a precedent for a referral with a mission.

The Delegation of **Colombia** reiterated their support for a deferral.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that in terms of advisory capacity Paragraph 38 provides for assisting in programmes and projects and that it was up to the Committee to interpret.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** reiterated their support for a referral.

The Delegation of **India** suggested using the language previously approved in terms of requesting a mission.

La Délégation de la **France** soulève le même point que celui de l'Inde.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.35** was adopted as amended.

Chairperson: H.E. Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

Property	Neolithic Site of Çatalhöyük
Id. N°	1405
State Party	Turkey
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS provided its assessment of the nomination with the recommendation of referring it back to the State Party to allow it to complete the Management Plan of the property and to identify funding for conservation and maintenance.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated this property should be inscribed on the World Heritage list as criterion (iii) and (iv) were demonstrated and asked for clarification from the State Party about the management of the property.

The Delegation of **India** stated this site had to be inscribed on the World Heritage List considering the value that the site was an example of the first settlements of mankind.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat Partie pour avoir présenté un site préhistorique exceptionnel située dans un endroit très spécifique et appuie la proposition de l'Inde d'inscrire ce site.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Turkey to answer the question raised.

The Observer Delegation of **Turkey** recalled that all aspects except management plan had been justified for inscription and emphasized its commitment to preserve the property under the newly established management plan.

ICOMOS explained the management plan itself was not a real issue as it had been developed and there was no doubt about the State Party's commitment. It however underlined that ICOMOS was concerned about the implementation of the management plan.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with examination of the Draft Decision and gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** informed that amendments had been submitted by the Delegation of Algeria, United Arab Emirates, Qatar and Ethiopia on paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision and a new paragraph 3 had been added.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** also supported the inscription of the property.

The **Chairperson** moved on to the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision was adopted.

La Délégation de la **France** s'interroge sur l'utilisation du critère (iv) car il considère que le critère (v) est plus adapté pour justifier l'inscription.

ICOMOS replied criteria (iv) had been proposed by the State Party.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** précise qu'il s'agit d'une structure d'habitat physique et donc le critère (iv) s'applique pleinement.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stated the nominated property was the testimony of the first human city and the criteria (iv) was applicable.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** intervient sur le paragraphe 6 et souligne qu'il est nécessaire de respecter l'égalité dans le traitement des dossiers. Le plan de gestion n'est pas adopté. Cette proposition doit être renvoyée.

The **Chairperson** moved on to the examination of paragraph 2 and gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment.

Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Draft Decision were adopted as amended.

Paragraph 4 and 5 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that it was not necessary to refer to the effort made by the State Party in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision as it was already taken note of in another paragraph.

The **Chairperson** expressed agreement with India's proposal.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.36** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Russian Government for its hospitality and expressed its gratitude to the Committee. It reiterated the Turkish government's commitment to the protection of property.

D.4.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Kyiv: Saint-Sophia Cathedral with Related Monastic Buildings, St. Cyril's and St. Andrew's Churches, Kyiv-Pechersk Lavra (extension)
Id. N°	527 Ter
State Party	Ukraine
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS made a presentation of the nomination and recommended deferral.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** requested referral for the property.

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

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the original text.

The Delegation of **Estonia** congratulated the State Party on the nomination. It however noted that the development pressures occurring around the property needed to be addressed before its inscription. It supported deferral.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the original text to give the State Party time to solve the issues raised.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie les interventions de l'Allemagne, de l'Estonie et de la Colombie.

The Delegation of **Serbia** requested a clarification from the State Party on the points in discussion.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Ukraine.

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** explained the management plan would be approved and implemented by the end of 2012.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** informed there had been no formal amendment but it seemed that a referral had been proposed by the Delegation of Russian Federation supported by the Delegation of **Serbia**, which in case of being adopted, would require adjustment of the text of Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** noted it seemed the majority supported deferral. She then proceeded with the adoption of the original Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.41** was adopted.

B. NATURAL PROPERTIES

B.1 AFRICA

B.1.1 New Nominations

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to IUCN who explained the evaluation process.

After this explanation, the Chairperson gave the floor to an NGO.

An **Observer** from an NGO working on indigenous issues stressed the importance of indigenous people's participation in nomination process as well as in preservation and conservation of World Heritage properties. It noted the example of the Rift Valley Lakes in Kenya which was inscribed in 2011 although the local indigenous people had urged the Committee to defer the nomination as they had not been consulted. It requested that all documents related World Heritage Properties such as monitoring mission reports or committee documents should be available as soon as possible. It recommended that the nomination for Sangha Trinational and Western Ghats be deferred to ensure the participation of indigenous people and informed consent of the indigenous people on these nominations.

Property	Lakes of Ounianga
Id. N°	1400
State Party	Chad
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)

IUCN made a presentation of the nomination and proposed the inscription under criterion (vii). IUCN considered that criterion (viii) was not justified.

The Delegation of **Mexico** asked if the Chairperson was proposing a debate on this issue.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that it was extremely important to take note of the ban on mining activities as they were often a threat to properties. It emphasised that the Committee needs to be watchful regarding the consequence for the environment.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party for the successful nomination that deserved the inscription under criterion (vii).

The **Rapporteur** informed there was no amendment proposed therefore the Committee could adopt the decision as a whole.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.7** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Chad** thanked all people concerned and the Committee. It stated conservation of the property was extremely important for people living around the lake and promised the government's commitment to the management and conservation of the property for all humanity.

B.1.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Sangha Trinational
Id. N°	1380 Rev
State Party	Cameroon, Central African Republic and Congo
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ix)(x)

IUCN made a presentation of the nomination recommending the inscription of Sangha Trination under criteria (ix) and (x).

The **Chairperson** proposed to go directly to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that there was no amendment proposed; therefore the Committee could adopt the decision as a whole.

The Draft decision **36COM 8B.8** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Cameroon** thanked the Russian government and the volunteers for its hospitality. It also thanked all people who contributed to inscription of the property.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Kenya** which wished to respond to the statement made by the representative of the indigenous group.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** stated the information provided by an Observer from an Indigenous group was not correct. It emphasised that local people were very much involved at every stage of the nomination process.

B.2 ASIA / PACIFIC

B.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Chengjiang Fossil Site
Id. N°	1388
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(viii)

IUCN made a presentation of the nomination recommending the inscription under criteria (viii).

The **Rapporteur** informed there was no amendment proposed; therefore the Committee could adapt the decision as a whole.

The Draft decision **36COM 8B.9** was adopted.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its gratitude for all people concerned and renewed its commitment to implementation of the Convention as well as to preservation of the property.

B.2.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Western Ghats
Id. N°	1342 Rev
State Party	India
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(ix)(x)

IUCN made a presentation of the nomination and proposed to defer its examination, noting the potential for a revised nomination in the region to meet criteria (ix) and (x).

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** stated the nominated property was one of the most important mountainous sites which had rich diversity. It also noted the State Party had shown its capability to protect the unique biodiversity. It therefore proposed inscription.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the original decision while it understood the great value of the property. It noted there were too many issues which have to be addressed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que cette région recèle la biodiversité exceptionnelle et félicite l'Etat Partie pour avoir choisi cette région. Cependant, il précise que les conditions pour l'inscription de ce site ne sont pas réunies. Il s'interroge sur la méthode utilisée pour choisir des composantes et pourquoi la série est la même que celle présentée l'année dernier.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported IUCN's evaluation and enquired what kind of management mechanisms has been put in place to protect the site and if these measures are based on an ecological study.

The Delegation of **Germany** took note the importance of the property as it filled a gap in the World Heritage list. It however noted that it was surprised that although the nomination had referred back with specific recommendation at the last session, the State Party came back with a little change on the nomination but rather included additional criteria (criteria ix).

The Delegation of **Japan** asked for clarification from the State Party on the way the State Party selected the serial sites as it seemed the main problem of this nomination between the State Party and IUCN.

La Délégation de la **France** précise que la Valeur universel exceptionnelle est indéniable et qu'aucun débat sur ce sujet n'est nécessaire. Cependant, il souligne qu'il y a une confusion sur les questions liées à l'écologie. Il demande l'Etat Partie de donner des précisions sur ce point.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** congratulated the State Party on the efforts made in preparing the nomination documents on the basis of IUCN's evaluation report. It endorsed the inscription.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated the important thing was how each site is managed individually and comprehensively and requested IUCN to elaborate on the complexity of the nomination.

The Delegation of **India** explained the property was almost the size of Greece and as such each component had its own management plan which had been approved by the federal and local governments. It highlighted that each management system was efficient and there would not be mining or any other threats within the property.

IUCN explained that in fact in 2011 IUCN had proposed deferral but the Committee's decision was for referral. For IUCN this decision was against the State Party to address all the work that needs to be done. Concerning criteria (ix), for IUCN there is potential for this criteria to be met but that in the present configuration of the nomination, and based on the comparative analysis, there is not enough argument to justify this criteria. .

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande de nouveau l'Etat Partie pourquoi le périmètre n'a pas été modifié.

The Delegation of **India** replied that since the boundary had been defined by national legislations, any modification on the boundary must go through the parliament. The second argument not to change the boundaries was of the interest to keep the largest area under conservation.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that there was an amendment on paragraph 2 to inscribe the site which was proposed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation and a new paragraph 3 was proposed as draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee member to quickly express its opinion.

The Delegations of **Serbia, Malaysia, South Africa, Ethiopia, Iraq, Mali, Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Cambodia, Thailand, Algeria and Senegal** supported the proposal from the Russian Federation and endorsed the proposal for inscription.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated it supported the original text as deferral was justified by IUCN.

The **Chairperson** noted the majority supported inscription.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision which had been amended.

Paragraph 2 was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 3 and 4 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 5 which had been amended by the Delegation of Russian Federation.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s'interroge sur la nature des études scientifiques effectuées et sur les résultats obtenus. Il propose un amendement au paragraphe.

The **Russian Federation** agreed with the amendment made by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The **Chairperson** was not sure if the amendment made sense and asked the Rapporteur for formulation.

The **Rapporteur** noted the study the paragraph was referring to should be Western Ghats Expert Panel.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party on this point.

The Delegation of **India** replied at least 7 different levels of academia as well as numbers of universities and scientific bodies would get involved.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to include Western Ghats Expert Panel in the context. It pointed out the beginning of the paragraph was confusing.

The **Chairperson** noted the second part of paragraph 5 was clear enough but the first part might be unclear. She proposed removal of the first part.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** endorsed the proposal.

The Delegation of **Germany** opposed to proposal for removal as it did not make sense without the first part. It proposed an alternative.

The **Chairperson** presumed there was an institution which worked on the property.

The **Rapporteur** informed she was just finishing up the drafting.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted it accepted these amendments.

IUCN clarified the context corresponded to the evaluation. It also raised the possibility that the property could be extended to all the area according to the Western Ghats Expert Panel.

The Delegation of **India** stated it is reasonable to limit the number of institutions involved in the property as there are too many opinions generated by the huge population.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to keep the beginning of the paragraph as there seemed to be possibility to extend the property's boundary.

The **Chairperson** put full stop after the word "recommendation". Paragraph 5a was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Germany** opposed to the decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 5b.

Paragraph 5b was adopted as amended.

IUCN proposed to use specific wording so as to give clear recommendation to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported what the Delegation of Switzerland had proposed.

The Delegation of **Russian Federation** disagreed with the proposal as it did not seem that everything was taken into consideration.

The **Rapporteur** proposed to add paragraph 5d so the inconsistency to be addressed.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with adaption of paragraph 5c. Paragraph 5c was adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 5d.

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

The Delegation of **India** stated that the formulation of the second half of paragraph 5d was too specific to be adopted by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** deleted the second half of paragraph 5d.

Paragraph 5d was adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **36COM 8B.10** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to an Observer.

The **NGO** from an institution which works for the property emphasised the need to protect the property from the severe impact of the climate change. He noted the community involvement and engagement were extremely high level along the reiterated the institution's commitment to the conservation of the property. He concluded by thanking the Committee for its decision of inscription.

The Delegation of **India** thanked IUCN and all people concerned for their support. It noted its recognition to the responsibility in preservation and conservation of the property. It further noted that it would work together with institutions concerned and possibly with individual NGOs in order to maintain the OUV of the property.

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

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

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)

The **Chairperson** explained the original Draft Decision had been separated into 2 parts; 7A.23.I concerning the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls itself and 7B.23.II concerning The Mughrabi Ascent. She mentioned that, regarding the Draft Decision on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, the parties have agreed to a text which is being distributed in this room. She indicated that the text was the result of intense negotiations and that it was proposed to adopt it without debate.

The **Chairperson** mentioned also that she would like to put on record that one Observer Delegation concerned, Israel, disagreed with this text and that some State Parties disassociate themselves with it.

The Draft Decision **7B.23.I** was adopted.

Concerning the Draft Decision on the Mughrabi Ascent, 7B.23.II, the **Chairperson** indicated that the parties concerned had reached an agreement on the Draft Decision which was distributed in the room and that therefore she proposed to adopt it without debate.

The Draft Decision **7B.23.II** was adopted.

INFORMATION ON DESTRUCTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN MALI

The **Chairperson** informed that 3 more mausoleums in Timbuktu had been destroyed and noted the Committee might need to discuss what UNESCO should do in such a case. She also informed a draft resolution for this event was being prepared.

La Délégation de **Mali** informe le Comité que les 16 monuments d'une grande importance sont menacés de destruction. Elle demande à la communauté internationale de créer un fond d'urgence. Elle précise que les extrémistes veulent poursuivre leurs actes barbares car ils savent que cette question est actuellement discutée ici. Elle souligne qu'il est nécessaire de maintenant rassembler les documents d'archives. La situation dépasse le Mali. Elle précise qu'ils ne savent plus quoi faire face à cette menace et exprime un souhait qu'une action concrète soit prise par les membres du Comité.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie cette demande et souligne que l'UNESCO doit conduire une action afin de préserver ce patrimoine du vandalisme. Il précise que le Comité prendra une décision qui mentionnera la création d'un fonds d'urgence.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** exprime la préoccupation du Comité vis-à-vis de cette situation. Il apporte tout son soutien au peuple malien. Il informe que l'Algérie a reçu une lettre de la part de Madame la Ministre de la Culture du Mali. Il souligne que

l'Algérie soutiendra le gouvernement malien. Au sein de l'UNESCO, l'Algérie apportera son soutien pour trouver la solution la plus adaptée à cette situation d'une extrême gravité.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** noted it shared all the sadness expressed by member states.

The Delegation of **South Africa** showed its concern about the situation and proposed to adapt a resolution on this issue.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported to adapt a resolution and suggested to create immediately the Funds.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne que nous sommes face à la situation gravissime et que Tombouctou a été le dernier sanctuaire à violer en Afrique, tout en soulignant que la communauté internationale a sa part de responsabilité. Il paraît que cette situation est la suite donnée par des extrémistes après l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Il propose de lancer un appel à toutes les nations sur ce qui est en train de se passer.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'il se fait l'écho des interventions précédentes et note que c'est le Comite qui a également été attaqué par ces actes barbares. Il soutient entièrement la proposition de la France, ainsi que la création d'un Fonds d'urgence tel que propose par Mali. Il faut sauver le maximum de choses. Il précise que les pays voisins, et notamment l'Algérie doit apporter rapidement tout leur soutien au Mali. Il souligne qu'il est nécessaire de rendre attentive la Directrice Générale à cette question et sur l'ensemble des propositions avancées sur ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Qatar** highlighted that Islam should not be associated with such acts of vandalism. It also stated it would not remain without action but support the government of Mali in any way to preserve the property.

The Delegation of **Mexico** noted this event concerned not only a state but all States Parties. La Délégation du **Mexique** adresse ses condoléances au peuple malien. Il note l'Article 6 de la Convention et souligne que répondre à l'appel lancé par la France est une obligation pour chaque état. Il précise que la Déclaration s'appuyant sur le texte de la Convention doit faire appel à la communauté internationale. Il faut également définir le caractère du fond d'urgence.

The Delegation of **Colombia** endorsed to adopt a resolution.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its condolence.

The **Chairperson** noted the possibility to take some action with press being here. She also noted the Committee could prepare a good statement.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture of UNESCO** explained the difficult situation where the area the property is located was hard to access as even the government of Mali had no real access. He informed that the Director-General of UNESCO was very active and was mobilizing a mission to the area. He concluded by emphasizing UNESCO's commitment to the State Party

Le **Directeur général adjoint pour la Culture** rappelle que la situation est similaire à celle de Bamyân en Afghanistan. Il note que M. Bouchenaki a suivi à l'époque

cette question. Il précise que malheureusement la folie des hommes ne connaît pas de limites et qu'il est impossible de la maîtriser. La ville est tombée entre les mains de deux groupes qui ne reconnaissent pas la valeur de ce patrimoine. Les outils pacifiques nécessaires vont être mis en œuvre, et notamment au titre de la Convention 1970 en coopération avec l'INTERPOL. Malheureusement, le Gouvernement ne maîtrise plus la situation. Il informe qu'une mission s'est rendue sur place pour définir la portée des dégâts et définir les actions à entreprendre. Il précise qu'un appel seul et isolé ne pourra pas résoudre la situation. Il informe que la mission a essayé de sensibiliser les autorités religieuses pour lancer des négociations localement. Il faut également prévoir des mesures de reconstruction et pour cela le fonds doit être établi rapidement. Il a souligné que l'UNESCO a une grande expérience et restera mobiliser pour préserver au mieux ce patrimoine.

La Délégation de la **France** précise que le Comité n'a pas de casques bleus, mais le minimum c'est de lancer un appel solennel au monde entier qui aura la force certaine. L'Hermitage – ce site magnifique – pourrait être le lieu pour une telle action.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la proposition de la France et précise qu'il faut utiliser tous les moyens pour cesser ces actes.

The meeting rose at 8 pm.

EIGHTH DAY – Monday, 2 July 2012

FIFTEENTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: SouthAfrica

**INFORMATION ON DESTRUCTION OF THE CULTURAL HERITAGE IN MALI
(continuation)**

The **Chairperson** informed that the UN Secretariat General, Mr. Ban-ki Moon released a statement related with the humanitarian situation on Mali and reported on the destruction of heritage. The Secretary General called on all parties to preserve the cultural heritage of Mali, including ECOWAS, the African Union and the countries of the region to resolve the current crisis based on dialogue.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

B.3 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

B.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Lena Pillars Nature Park
Id. N°	1299
State Party	Russian Federation
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)

IUCN presented the evaluation of the nomination. As the nominated property did not meet either of the natural criteria, the conditions of integrity and the management requirement, IUCN recommended a deferral

La Délégation de la **Suisse** note que la nomination ne remplit pas les critères de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et fait rappeler au comité qu'un autre site en Chine contenant les mêmes attributs avait été inscrit suite à une recommandation d'inscription de l'UICN lors de cette même session du comité. La Délégation explique que l'UICN fait des recommandations pour renforcer la nomination afin qu'elle soit représentée plus tard, dans un format plus robuste, et suggère que l'état partie poursuit cette suggestion. La Délégation fait aussi rappeler aux membres du comité

que la Suisse avait retiré une nomination semblable en 2005 sous les mêmes conditions, et que suite à cela, avait pu retravailler la nomination, qui a été ensuite inscrite. Elle propose que le Comité et l'état parti fasse la même chose.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** note qu'elle a soumis un amendement avec la Délégation du Sénégal. Elle note que le territoire en question comprend plusieurs facteurs qui justifient son inscription sous critère (viii), ajoutant que l'UICN fait part du potentiel de la VUE. La Délégation propose que suite à son inscription, des informations supplémentaires soient fournies sur les questions d'intégrité soulevées pour l'UICN. Elle explique que les recommandations de l'UICN avaient déjà été remplies par l'État partie, et explique ce qui a été fait – notamment le plan d'aménagement du parc, un plan de tourisme entre autres. Elle pose une question à l'État partie sur les zones tampons et les limites du parc. La Serbie considère que le site devrait être inscrit.

The Delegation of **Estonia** asked why valuable components of this property had been excluded from the nomination as it was part of the previous one. Current boundaries did not include areas that allow the appreciation of the main Pillar areas

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed at the permafrost conditions and fossil reefs to be of crucial importance for the Outstanding Universal Value in global comparison. The subterrestrial and permafrost karsts were formed by cryogenic processes. These unique phenomena could develop under the extreme conditions of permafrost, low precipitation and distinct continental climate. Therefore the frozen karst was of outstanding importance for the definition of Outstanding Universal Value and regarding criterion (viii). To focus only on fossil aspects would not appropriately reflect the attributes of OUV. Therefore IUCN and the State Party should answer how the subterrestrial and surface permafrost karst was considered in the justification for inscription as well as information on the special conditions of karst development in the Lena Pillars Nature Park. A second question referred to the Cambrian explosion.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** prend note du commentaire de la Délégation de l'Allemagne, et observe que les critères qui forment la VUE doivent forcément exister, ou ne pas exister – et ne voit pas comment ceux-ci peuvent être renforcés ni dans un cas ou dans l'autre. Elle note que seule la rive droite est incorporée dans la nomination, et aimerait savoir pourquoi.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that the revised nomination was more convincing and asked why the Sinyaya area had been excluded from the nomination and if it would be feasible to include this area in the nomination.

La Délégation de la **France** note que le site est exceptionnel avec un potentiel de VUE, et demande à l'état parti comment les inquiétudes notées par l'UICN auraient été adressées.

The Delegation of **India** underlined that the State Party provided a justification for the revision of the boundaries of the nominated site and that OUV was present.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** demande des précisions de l'État partie, et se joint à l'Estonie sur les questions de la rivière.

The Delegation of **South Africa** also supported that the Sinyaya area should be included to ensure integrity and asked the State Party for more information on the legal protection.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that the size of the property in this revised nomination had been reduced from over 4M ha in a serial nomination to a single 1.2 M ha nomination and wonders why. It asked the IUCN and the Delegation of Russia about this issue, as well as asking how the attributes contributing to fulfilling the criteria requirements.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** partage le point de vue de la Délégation du Sénégal et demande si la VUE existe, ou n'existe pas.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** responded that it had taken into account the recommendations made by IUCN when the nomination had first been considered by the Committee at its 33rd session. It added that the current boundaries reflected the need to preserve the property's integrity and noted that legally, the property was well protected by relevant legislation, both at the federal level and at the local republic level. The Delegation stated that a management plan to 2016 was being finalized.. The scientific expert noted that the original nomination, being a serial one, had had an element on either side of the river but that now only one side of the river was proposed and made further statements on the Cambrian explosion and the karst, indicated that OUV criteria had been met. Further explanations were provided on the climatic conditions of the area, and how these had affected karst development, further differentiating the site from other karst areas, notably Nahanni National Park in Canada.

IUCN explained that the opinions differed regarding the importance of karsts as a component of OUV. This was due to the concern that the karstic process of the dissolution of rocks was widespread in this area, restricted but that the karstic values were not exceptional. The site represented important values related to fossil sites for the representation of the Cambrian explosion but did not figure in the list of the most exceptional preservation. The aim of the list was to be selective. In terms of the fossil values, the site was significant but was not outstanding. The Outstanding Universal Value could be identified through the presence of the pillars. There was potential of the criteria to be met in this region. In the Sinyaya region there was one of the most significant expressions of this pillar phenomenon and with its exclusion there was a key question on the integrity. The conclusion was that the criteria were not fully met because integrity requirements were not fully met by the boundaries as put forward.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note que l'État partie et l'IUCN avaient eu la chance de répondre aux questions. Se rapportant au critère (viii), elle note que la récurrence d'un attribut n'est pas une objection à l'exceptionnalité – si les attributs existent ailleurs, cela ne devrait pas nuire à la découverte de la VUE. Étant donné la superficie du bien, la Délégation note que le site devrait être inscrit, avec des recommandations pour renforcer l'intégrité.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision with amendments by the Delegation of Serbia to inscribe the site in the World Heritage list.

The Delegation of **Mexico** sought to clarify the official name of the property, noting different versions of it in different documents.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se déclare en faveur de différer la nomination.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** se joint aux Délégations du Sénégal et de la Serbie pour l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that it would have preferred a deferral, but added that if the Committee calls for an inscription, a clarification was requested if this was for both criteria (vii) and (viii).

La Délégation du **Sénégal** explique que si l'UICN ne conteste pas les critères, on pourrait lui demander de travailler avec l'État partie afin d'améliorer les lacunes de la nomination.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** comprend l'explication de l'UICN différemment, expliquant que l'UICN s'oppose à l'inscription parce que la justification des critères n'est pas encore établie.

La Délégation du **Mali** explique que le potentiel pour la VUE existe selon le rapport de l'UICN et recommande que l'UICN travaille avec l'État partie pour mieux la confirmer, tout en appuyant l'amendement pour inscription.

The Delegations of **Germany, India, Iraq and Qatar** stated that an inscription should be made under criterion (viii).

The Delegation of **Mexico** explained that it believed that only the necessary elements for inscription under criteria (viii) were present.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** est d'accord avec la proposition d'inscription sous le critère (viii) exclusivement.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, note qu'une décision rappelle article 11, para 2 de la Convention – les biens sont inscrits lorsqu'un des critères de la VUE est remplie, et que ceci va à l'encontre.

The **Legal Adviser** pointed out that this was a matter of interpretation of the Convention and it was up to the Committee Members to interpret how they wanted to define the provisions of the Convention.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** renforce son point de vue que les recommandations des autres membres du Comité allaient à l'encontre du paragraphe 11 de la Convention.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** avoue que sur ce point, la Convention est très encadrée – mais que puisque le Comité accepte un des critères, il n'y avait pas de problèmes.

The Delegations of **Mexico and Switzerland** noted that paragraph six of the Draft Decision no longer makes sense since the property had been inscribed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** note que le site est maintenant inscrit, et qu'il y avait énormément de recommandations, que le critère n'est que provisoirement reconnu, que nos moyens étaient limités, donc suggère que la considération d'un rapport sur son état de conservation devrait attendre jusqu'en 2015 au lieu de 2013.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.11** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** provided a statement in response to the inscription.

Chairperson: H.E. Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

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

5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** explained that a working group had been set up for discussion on this agenda item. The drafting group had met several times and proposed that matters related to this Item should be discussed under Item 12C of the agenda. The Chair proposed to adopt the Draft Decision 36 COM 5B without discussion.

Les Délégations de la **Suisse** et de la **Colombie** suggèrent de ne pas confondre les éléments et recommandent qu'on revienne à cet item plus tard dans la réunion.

The Delegation of **Mexico** clarified that it did not chair this group, but informed the Bureau that no other participants had been at the table. The proposal was to complete item 5, but if the group does not want to close item 5B, it had no objections.

The **Chairperson** informed that having no objections to this proposal, the item remained open.

ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST *(Continuation)*

9A. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THE PACT INITIATIVE

Documents: *WHC-12/36.COM/9A*

Decisions: **36 COM 9A**

The **Chairperson** proceeded with this item concerning the Progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative. In this regard, she gave the floor to the Representative of **St Lucia**, who acted as Vice-Chairperson of the open-ended working group, established by the 18th General Assembly, on this matter.

The **Vice-Chairperson** of the working group explained that the working group met on 15 and 16 May 2012 under the Chairmanship of Mr David D. Hamadziripi (Zimbabwe) as Chairperson, Ms Vera Lacoeylthe (Saint Lucia) as Vice Chairperson and Ms Kristien Dubois (Belgium) as Rapporteur. The group discussed the implementation of the recommendations of the external auditor of the Global Strategy endorsed by the 18th General Assembly. The plan indicated how to implement the recommendations, by whom, when and what funding would be necessary. Recommendations were discussed according to their priority as indicated in the document WHC-12/36.COM/9A. The working group decided to meet again at the end of January to discuss the PACT initiative. The group confirmed that conservation lied at the heart of the convention and focus should lie on conservation instead of inscription. A global conservation strategy should be defined to review the State of Conservation processes and priority should be given to assistance for conservation and management instead of preparatory assistance. The need to change the negative image of the Danger List was underlined. An action plan should be developed to monitor the progress towards removal from the danger list and Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre should formulate more standards for removal. Capacity building for the preparation of tentative lists and nominations should be strengthened and there should be an appropriate management plan for each site in

the nomination file. Alternative tools like Biosphere Reserves and Geoparks in the upstream processes should be taken into account. The Statements of OUV should be finalized at the moment of inscription and the provisions of the Operational Guidelines should be strictly implemented for referral or deferral. Any potential conflict of interest of the Committee Members should be avoided with regard to a State Party not presenting nominations during its mandate. The working group confirmed a transitional period on a voluntary basis for present Members of the Committee. Members of the Committee should give place to scientific and heritage expertise and include cultural and natural experts in their delegations. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should continue to define clear division of labour, reduce overlap and strengthen the dialogue with States Parties in order to strengthen the efficiency of their work. These recommendations were timely and should be implemented before the next session of the General Assembly, some required changes to the Rules of Procedures and the Operational Guidelines. The final report of the working group will be presented to the 19th General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Estonia** commented on issues highlighted in Document of 9A. It referred to the premature inscription which pose problems immediately afterwards and adds workload to the World Heritage Centre, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. It further stressed the issue to avoid the conflicts of interests and noted the Committee members got highest level of sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, 13 in 2011 and 12 in 2012. The Delegation supported the proposal of Committee members should refrain from submitting nominations during their mandate.

The Delegation of **Mexico** was extremely concerned with the resources being devoted to inscription process, rather than giving priority to conservation of inscribed sites. It endorsed the Delegation of **Estonia's** concern on the conflicts of interest and lack of credibility.

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated the efforts made to ensure the credibility of the Convention. It reiterated the rights of the States Parties in submitting nominations and provided its observations on Recommendation 12 of the Implementation Plan:

- To forbid a State Party to present nomination during its mandate;
- Questionable on the Rules of Procedures; further discussion is needed;
- The outcome be shared and approved by all States Parties at the General Assembly before its adoption.

The Delegation was of the view that this is a legal issue and the report on the revision of the *Operational Guidelines and Rules of Procedures* should be presented to the Committee at its 38th session, after the solution being shared by the 19th General Assembly in 2013.

The Delegation of **Colombia** was of the view that the revision of the Operational Guidelines and the Rules of Procedures should not affect the standards. The objective decision must be made by the Committee with rigorous.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite le groupe de travail et salue le plan d'action. Elle note que certains biens naturels sont inscrits depuis 20 ans mais que les états africains manquent les moyens pour les maintenir. Ils ont besoin de partenaires pour leur réhabilitation.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** également salue les résultats mais note les contraintes budgétaires qui sont en contraste avec les demandes. Elle pense qu'il faut prioriser les activités et notamment mettre l'accent sur l'amélioration du dialogue entre les Etats parties et les Organes consultatives. Concernant la recommandation 12, elle note qu'il est impossible d'être sûr d'être élu ou combien de temps il faut pour préparer un dossier de nomination.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souscrit à la mise en œuvre des recommandations et partage les inquiétudes quant à la crédibilité de la Convention. Elle propose une révision responsable des Orientations pour rééquilibrer les ressources en faveur de la conservation.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle les difficultés financières et soutient la proposition de la Serbie et du **Japon**.

The **Vice-Chairperson** of the working group provided clarifications on the background of the recommendations adopted by the 18th General Assembly. Regarding Recommendation 12, it was discussed at the Committee since 2000 and does not intend to prevent Members from presenting nomination files. The Committee may postpone the examinations until a State Party leaves the Committee. Also, the working group discussed and proposed a transitional period. Further, exceptions will be given to referrals and transboundary nominations.

ICOMOS welcomed the Implementation Plan which encourages dialogue between Committee and the Advisory Bodies. It was of the view that priority should be given to conservation. In fact, several actions were proposed to move forward, with the support of UNESCO Category 2 centres and different Scientific Committees of ICOMOS. As a sustainable way forward, ICOMOS suggested the use of resource manuals, enhancing existing processes such as Periodic Reporting and upstream process to address the gap between the aspiration so States Parties and the lack of resources.

IUCN recalled the Global Strategy and the five (5) Strategic Objectives adopted by the Committee. It further stressed the need to maintain the credibility of the Convention. IUCN suggested several points of Action:

- 1) Prioritized efforts for conservation;
- 2) Respect the *Operational Guidelines*, the *Rules of Procedures*, and establishing proper procedures *in line with OG* to address *inconsistency* in decision-making;
- 3) Focus on Natural Heritage. The importance of natural heritage for human livelihood and sustainability;
- 4) Balancing short-term benefits and long-term conservation.

IUCN further reiterated the need to address priorities in view of the current 211 natural heritage sites which are facing the threats of mining, gas, poaching, dam's construction and oil exploitation. It indicated that the budget implications must be resolved.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked firstly how to implement the Plan with a specific timeframe. Further, it stressed the need to discuss the Plan amongst all States Parties to seek the way forward in order to avoid conflicts on Recommendation 12. It was of the view that the revision of the Rules of Procedures by setting up conditions to the Committee members has a legal implication and would like to seek the view of the **Legal Advisor**.

The **Legal Advisor** reflected that the issue relating to the right of a sovereign State, and it should go to the revision of *Operational Guidelines*, rather than change the *Rules of Procedures*.

La Délégation du **Mali** revient sur l'aspect de l'insuffisance du dialogue et considère qu'il faut prendre cela en compte lors des discussions du budget.

ICCROM welcomed the Plan and was in fully agreement with other sister Advisory Bodies It stressed the need to improve situation for conservation, Capacity-building, Tentative Lists, using existing tools such as resource manuals and others. It reminded the Committee that the

next Item 9B would be focusing on Global Training Strategy and concrete proposals for support from Extra-budgetary sources are needed.

The **Chairperson** announced that the open-ended working group would continue its work and moved to Draft Decision 36 COM 9A.

The Delegation of **Japan** proposed a short Amendment to paragraph 10 of the Draft Decision, concerning the Revision to the OGs and Rules of Procedures at 38th session, instead of 37th.

The **Rapporteur** clarified the procedures and indicated that an Item needs to be included for the 37th session of the Committee.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient les propos du Rapporteur et considère qu'on se limite à la mise en œuvre de la décision de l'Assemblée générale.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the matter will be discussed at the 19th session of the General Assembly but that it first it should be dealt with by the 37th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that this issue is very important and considered that as it was the General Assembly who had set up the working group, any decisions should be made at the next session of the General Assembly and not the Committee.

The **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to clarify the issue.

The **Secretariat** noted that the working group was set up by the General Assembly at its 18th session. The working group met in May and will meet again in January 2013 and its results will be presented at the 37th session of the Committee before going to the 19th General Assembly in 2013.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 9A** was adopted.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST *(continuation)*

III. Examination of minor boundary modifications of natural, mixed and cultural properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add

The **Chairperson** announced that the discussions on the Draft Decision of the proposed boundary modification of the Natural Property of Selous Game reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) were still on-going and that the Item would be presented at a later stage. Therefore, she indicated that the Committee would now examine remaining proposals for minor boundary modifications for mixed and cultural properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. She invited ICOMOS and IUCN to be very concise in their presentations.

ICOMOS read out the list of mixed and cultural properties where minor boundary modifications were proposed.

IUCN noted that the only natural site under discussion was the proposal for Selous Game Reserve (Tanzania) which would take place in the afternoon.

In the absence of any comments from the Committee; the Draft Decisions **36 COM 8B.45, 36 COM 8B.46, 36 COM 8B.47 and 36 COM 8B.48, 36 COM 8B.51, 36 COM 8B.57, 36 COM 8B.58, 36 COM 8B.59, 36 COM 8B.60, 36 COM 8B.61, 36 COM 8B.62, 36 COM 8B.63 and 36 COM 8B.64** were adopted.

IV. STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE OF THE TWELVE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED AT THE 35TH SESSION (UNESCO, 2011) AND NOT ADOPTED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/8B.Add

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Committee should proceed with adoption of the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of twelve properties inscribed at the 35th session at UNESCO last year, statements which were only provisionally adopted at that time.

The Secretariat read out the following list

- Ethiopia: Konso Cultural Landscape;
- Kenya: Fort Jesus, Mombasa;
- Jordan: Wadi Rum Protected Area;
- Sudan: Archaeological Sites of the Island of Meroe;
- United Arab Emirates: Cultural Sites of Al Ain (Hafit, Hili, Bidaa Bint Saud and Oases Areas);
- Mongolia: Petroglyphic Complexes of the Mongolian Altai;
- Viet Nam: Citadel of the Ho Dynasty;
- Germany / Slovakia / Ukraine: Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany
- Spain: Cultural Landscape of the Serra de Tramuntana;
- Ukraine: Residence of Bukovinian and Dalmatian Metropolitans;
- Barbados: Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison;
- Colombia: Coffee Cultural Landscape of Colombia.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.65** was adopted.

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

7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*World Heritage properties of Mali - continuation*)

36 COM 7B.107

The **Delegation of South Africa** proposed to the Committee that a Resolution on Timbuktu be adopted at the current session. It consulted other members of the Committee and proposed a Draft Decision which was distributed.

A very rich debate on the proposed text took place. Several amendments were proposed to the draft text notably by the Delegations of **India, Mexico Germany, Algeria, France, Ethiopia, Senegal and South Africa** condemning strongly the destruction of the mausoleums which are part of the World Heritage property of Timbuktu and called upon the perpetrators responsible to immediately halt these unacceptable actions. The members of the Committee also rejected any correlation between the recent inscription of the property of the Timbuktu shrines on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the acts of vandalism perpetrated. They called upon the international community to provide the support required at the request of the State Party of Mali in ensuring that its cultural properties are conserved and protected for present and future generations and requested the Director-General of UNESCO to consider the creation of a Special Fund to assist Mali.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.107** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation du **Mali** remercie la Présidente du Comité et tous les participants de la 36ème session du Comité du Patrimoine mondial. La Délégation se réjouit de la Déclaration commune des membres du Comité et du Fonds d'urgence. Rappelant l'engagement du Mali par rapport à la Convention de 1954 qu'il a signée le 18 mai 1961, la Délégation informe le Comité que le Mali a jugé nécessaire d'adhérer le plus vite possible au 2ème protocole de cette Convention. Le projet de loi autorisant l'adhésion du Mali au 2ème protocole a été approuvé par le conseil des ministres le 23 mai 2012 et la loi a été adoptée par acclamation par l'assemblée nationale le 21 juin 2012. Le processus de saisine de la Cour pénale internationale a été enclenché par le gouvernement et ainsi les criminels seront poursuivis. La Délégation attend de l'UNESCO la mise en œuvre des dispositions prises et remercie à nouveau tout le monde au nom du Mali.

The **Chairperson** concluded by expressing her sympathy and solidarity.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8D CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE INVENTORY

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/8D

Decisions: **36 COM 8D**

The **Secretariat** introduced Item 8D concerning the Retrospective Inventory of nomination files of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List between 1978 and 1998 and, in particular, fifty-five boundary clarifications received from twenty-five States Parties between 2011 and 2012.

In the absence of comments or objection, the Draft Decision **36 COM 8D** was adopted.

8E ADOPTION OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/8E

Decisions: **36 COM 8E**

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that no amendment had been received to the Draft Decision and therefore it might be adopted without discussion. She also informed the Committee that the text of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of the concerned properties is attached in **Annex I** of working document **WHC-12/36.COM/8E**.

The Draft Decision **36.COM 8E** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Japan** informed the Committee that the Observer Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** wished to make a statement.

The Observer Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** made a statement on the wording of the text of SoOUV relating to the *Capital Cities and Tombs of the Ancient Koguryo Kingdom* located in the People's Republic of China. It stated that a bilateral verbal agreement between China and the Republic of Korea was reached in August 2004 and an official letter will be sent to the Government of China with a copy to the World Heritage Centre for follow-up on this issue.

The **Secretariat** clarified that minor corrections had also been received from Vietnam and the changes would be made accordingly.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

EIGHTH DAY – Monday, 2 July 2012

SIXTEENTH MEETING

3 pm – 5 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*Continuation*)

MINOR MODIFICATION TO THE BOUNDARIES OF PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1 Africa

Property	Selous Game Reserve
Id. N°	199 Bis
State Party	United Republic of Tanzania

IUCN presented the details of the proposed extension of **Selous Game Reserve, United Republic of Tanzania**.

The **Chairperson** presented the amended text approved by consensus to be adopted without discussion.

The **Secretariat** confirmed reception of the letter the day before from the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism of the United Republic of Tanzania, stating the State Party commitment to apply to recommendations.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8B.43** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** thanked the Committee for taking the decision to approve the boundaries modification. He recalled that the State Party was facing significant challenges in conserving this important and very large site. With this decision the State Party will be able to undertake the necessary measures, for which there is clear commitment towards the conservation of the site. The State Party, which has been waiting anxiously for this approval, committed to striking a balance between sustainable development and preservation. The Representative acknowledged the involvement of all actors in the process, and declared his gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee. The State Party wished to assure both the national and

international community about its commitment to preserving the values of this precious World Heritage site.

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

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Selous Game Reserve, United Republic of Tanzania (N 199)

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation of the property, noting that multiple threats were affecting the property's Outstanding Universal Value: poaching, with a marked decline in the Selous elephant population. The surge in poaching seemed linked to a decrease in funding, as a result of the discontinuation of the Revenue Retention Scheme. It was noted that the State Party had made a commitment to restore the retention scheme via the creation of an autonomous wildlife authority and that this work was on-going. Two dam projects, the proposed Stiegler's Gorge hydropower dam inside the property and the Kidunda dam, were likely to cause serious and irreversible damage to the property's OUV if approved. While the State Party report noted that no final decisions on these projects had been taken, recently there had been declarations by the Minister for Energy that the Stiegler's gorge dam construction will start this year.

IUCN also noted the range of threats to this site; once filled, the Stiegler's Gorge dam reservoir would cover 120,000 hectares, flooding 2.4% of the entire property. This includes key areas for rhinoceros as well as key habitat for several other species. The construction of the dam would also open up a previously poorly accessible area, which would likely result in secondary impacts such as additional poaching and illegal resource use. IUCN considered that if this project was approved, and as long as the remaining actions requested by the Committee at its 35th session remain unimplemented, the property could soon meet the criteria for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN noted the importance of sustainable finances, and emphasized the importance of the reinstatement of the Revenue Retention Scheme to ensure adequate funding for the property's management.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** recalled the country's commitment towards conservation.

The **Rapporteur** stated that no amendments had been received.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed taking note of the statement by the State Party.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 7B.5** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed item 7 of the Agenda.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8C UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/8C

Decisions: **36 COM 8C**

The **Secretariat** provided a summary of the Decisions taken by the Committee concerning inscriptions on the World Heritage List and on the List of World Heritage in Danger: 26 new properties were on the World Heritage List, 5 natural, 20 cultural and 1 mixed. 4 proposed properties were referred and 3 deferred. In 17 cases the Committee changed the Advisory Body recommendation presented in the Draft Decision: 7 Referrals became Inscriptions; 4 Deferrals became Inscriptions; 2 Deferrals became Referrals; 2 Non Inscriptions became Referrals; 1 Non Inscription became Deferral; 1 proposal for non-inscription on an emergency basis was inscribed. The World Heritage List now consists of a total of **962** properties of which 745 are cultural, 188 natural and 29 mixed. The Secretariat also gave the breakdown of inscribed properties by region: Africa: 4 properties, Arab region: 3 properties, Asia-Pacific: 8 properties, Europe/North-America: 10 properties, Latin America/Caribbean: 1 property. The States Parties of Chad, Congo, Palau and Palestine had their first properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

5 properties were inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger: Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland); Timbuktu (Mali); Tomb of Askia (Mali); Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama); and Birthplace of Jesus, Church of the Nativity and the pilgrimage route, Bethlehem (Palestine). Two properties had been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger: Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) and Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan).

There were now **38** properties inscribed on the **List of World Heritage in Danger**.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 8C** was adopted.

ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

9B FOLLOW-UP TO THE CAPACITY BUILDING STRATEGY

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/9B

Decisions: **36 COM 9B**

The **Chairperson** invited ICCROM to present the item.

ICCROM recalled that the Capacity Building Strategy and Programme adopted at the 35th session of the Committee, stressing the two key paradigm shifts: training to capacity building and creating better relationships between cultural and natural heritage, and the focus on the 5Cs. It stressed that implementation is not only by ICCROM but by a wide range of institutions at all levels. It reported on progress made in the implementation: the Resource Manual on Managing Natural Heritage had just been published by the World Heritage Centre. The Managing Cultural Heritage will be available by end 2012 / early 2013. It recalled the range of activities undertaken by ICCROM and activities by other partners, such as the Category 2 centres, university programmes, master courses, UNESCO Chairs, as well as the Periodic Reporting process conducted by the Centre. It also drew attention to the thematic programmes, such as tourism and sustainable development. ICCROM has decided to join forces to develop a new capacity-building programme based on the strategy, but also on some other current discussions, notably the Global Strategy implementation plan. They have been incorporated in the global programme. ICCROM recalled the 3 Guiding principles: Integration and exchange between the culture and nature sectors; Promotion of engagement with communities and Promotion of engagement with those outside the heritage sector who have an impact on the conservation management of WH properties. The three target audiences are Practitioners; Institutions; Communities and Networks. The objectives: collect and develop information, strengthen existing/create new networks, delivery of information and capacity building.

Finally ICCROM presented the budget figures for 6 years: 4,265,000 Euros (Approximately 700,000 each year for 6 years). The expected ICCROM contribution was 300,000€, the biennial request to the WHC: 240,000€, thus the amount needed through fundraising was 3,725,000€.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que ce programme mérite d'avoir une place centrale, afin que la gestion et la protection du patrimoine soit efficace. Il accentue le fait que le travail et des échanges sur le terrain sont essentiels pour développer un programme adapté. Il précise qu'il est nécessaire de garantir la continuité de ce programme et il soutient des activités qui visent à la mise en œuvre de la Convention de 1972.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie des organisations consultatives mais attire l'attention sur des points suivants. Il note que beaucoup de discussions sont consacrées au renforcement des capacités et que parfois on se trompe de la stratégie. Il précise qu'il faut d'abord créer les capacités avant de les renforcer. Il est nécessaire de faire l'inventaire, le répertoire et les mettre en réseau au niveau mondial.

The Delegation of **South Africa** welcomed the progress made but expressed concern about the budget cuts in the Advisory Bodies' funding. As Senegal, it encouraged the Advisory Bodies and the Centre to consult States Parties when developing capacity-building programmes in order to avoid duplications with already existing programs.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne que ce programme développé par les organisations consultatives est fort intéressant. Il remarque cependant l'insuffisance du dialogue entre les membres du Comité et les Organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stressed the importance of this programme and paid tribute to efforts made by the Advisory Bodies. Links with the Advisory Bodies should be strengthened in the framework of developing working methods. Without strengthened capacities we cannot guarantee the presentation of proper nominations nor protect our heritage. It also supported Senegal about the need to prioritize and focus on States which have the greatest need to create capacity, rather than those who already have programmes going on.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that capacity building was addressed to local stakeholders who required knowledge on the Convention and the *Operational Guidelines*. This kind of knowledge was best transmitted by local partners and experts, and was not possible without research; therefore universities need to be involved. Germany wished to propose amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Mexico** reiterated on behalf of the Latin America and Caribbean region, two fundamental issues: the harmonization of Tentative Lists to work with Advisory Bodies and training of experts. It thanked the Swiss government for having supported training expert workshops in the past; however this has not been repeated except with ICCROM and Category 2 Centres. There is urgency in the LAC region for such workshops.

The Delegation of **Colombia** also thanked ICCROM for their work and proposed strategy, and for stressing the importance of capacity building for conservation. Management of tourism and preparedness for natural disasters are essential. Better training for experts was needed and the role of the Category 2 centres was very important.

The Delegation of **India** complimented the Advisory Bodies for their very comprehensive work, stating that there is a clear need to move to implementation, while recognizing the essential role of the category 2 centers. As priority, States Parties need guidance on serial nominations, and for removing sites from the List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and all institutions, including the universities, for progress made. Capacity building is indispensable for implementing the Convention and preserving World Heritage sites. Japan has been extending cooperation in this field and will continue to do so.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** joined other speakers in expressing its appreciation to the Advisory Bodies, in particular to Switzerland and Japan for their offer of support. It also recognized the big differences between States Parties' needs, thus one should first analyze capacities within the countries. The Delegation also recalled the role of

Africa 2009 in building capacities in Africa. That capacity did not last long as people have since left their positions, so sustainability is a concern.

The Observer Delegation of **Yemen** joined the previous speakers in congratulating the Advisory Bodies for their work in the conservation of World Heritage. It stated that capacity building was cruelly lacking in Yemen for the preservation of its rich heritage.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** explained its continued interest in establishing a clear strategy associated with taking up World Heritage processes in the region. It was grateful to see this document assessing all levels involved. It pointed out that there was no differentiation of status, but rather a difference in stages of capacity building. All efforts should now be put together into a strategy, with focus on process and establishing guidelines that will pull all activities and actors together: universities, category 2 centres, Advisory Bodies and States Parties.

ICCROM thanked all delegations for their comments. It noted that capacity building was for both regional and international levels. There were many activities in Sub-Saharan Africa, as well as in Latin America and the Caribbean and in the Arab regions. Needs were currently being identified together with Category 2 centres in order to develop complementary programmes to meet specific regional needs. These centres as well as UNESCO Chairs are important partners. There is a clear need to create networks and dialogue. Priorities such as danger listing will be taken into account when developing future activities. It responded that Orientation sessions were organized on a yearly basis but was open to dialogue with States Parties about how to make these sessions more effective for the Committee's decisions making, possibly at the General Assembly, or at other venues where it would be useful.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Germany if they wished to integrate their amendment.

The Delegation of **Germany** responded that this had already been integrated.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** propose, compte tenu des discussions, un amendement au paragraphe 7bis et demande au Centre du Patrimoine Mondial, en collaboration avec les organisations consultatives d'inventorier les offres dans le domaine du patrimoine dans toutes les régions en vue de partager les expériences et utiliser les expertises.

The **Rapporteur** read the Decision paragraph by paragraph. A brief discussion followed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande le Secrétariat de clarifier certains points et notamment d'indiquer la faisabilité de ce type d'inventaire. Il précise que cela nécessiterait la disponibilité de moyens financiers importants. Faut-il réserver une personne à plein temps ? – cela lui paraît impossible. Il souligne qu'il faut uniquement compléter des inventaires des institutions et des centres de formation déjà existants.

The **Secretariat** indicated that an updated inventory of institutions and training centres already involved in capacity building was already being prepared, thus this should not be a major exercise.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that such a list had already been provided to the Committee 2 years ago in the context of capacity building and suggested to make the list available officially available.

The Delegation of **Mexico** agreed that a large extent of the material may already be available and also made a few minor suggestions for the decision.

ICCROM clarified that a training directory already existed, and that ICCROM was in the process of updating it. It contained information both on World Heritage and cultural heritage in general. ICCROM will be happy to continue working on that.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise que cette explication l'a rassuré. Il souligne qu'il y a tellement d'endroits qui proposent des formations – il faut juste les connaître et promouvoir.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested that its own amendment in paragraph 9 be deleted as UNESCO Chairs are not allowed to report to World Heritage Committees.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 9B** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 9 of the Agenda.

ITEM 10 PERIODIC REPORTS

10A FINAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/10A

Decisions: **36 COM 10A**

The **Secretariat** made a presentation on the achievements and the Final Report of the second cycle, as well as Action Plans developed at the regional level for Asia and the Pacific. He informed the Committee that some countries in the region offered to organize sub-regional workshops to continue the work. He called upon Asia-Pacific countries to mobilize follow-up actions.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the focal point from India.

The **1st Focal Point, Mr Johnwij Sharma (India)** provided a short report on the exercise conducted in three phases, between June 2010 and July 2011 in India, as well as the challenges encountered such as the quantity of the information sought, the coordination of the site managers and delivering within the deadlines. He indicated that issues highlighted through the PR exercise had already triggered setting up an internal regulatory mechanism involving various stakeholders, experts and local communities. The Ministry of Culture has constituted an Advisory Committee mandated to examine such issues, provide guidelines and work on a policy for reviewing Tentative Lists and future nominations.

The **2nd Focal Point, Ms MA Joycelyn B. Mananghaya (Philippines)** presented the experiences and challenges encountered, however the active collaboration of national and local government agencies and most particularly the local communities who closely cooperated in the preparation of the RSOUVs and the core and the buffer maps helped complete the exercise successfully. The Questionnaires were

seen as an instrument to bring out good practices as well as for assessing and mitigating threats facing our WH properties. Participatory and consultative processes were essential to the success of this exercise in the Philippines. The meaningful dialogue between all produced valuable coherent documents that conveyed the true values of the WH sites presented. She emphasized the regional cooperation that resulted from this important exercise in the Asia and the Pacific through which awareness was fostered of WH good practices. She thanked the Committee, the Centre and the UNESCO field offices, the mentors for WH heritage and the Advisory bodies for their expert guidance.

ICCROM warmly welcomed the results of the Periodic reporting of the Asia Pacific Region, congratulated the World Heritage Centre and thanked all the States Parties of the region for their active engagement in the process. ICCROM was pleased with the high level of engagement of the Advisory Bodies in the PR process through which we were able to provide training towards the development of retrospective Statement Outstanding Universal Value and analyzing various factors affecting heritage. In its view, the report has highlighted a number of areas where capacities need to be developed such as disaster risk management, sustainable development and engaging communities, underscoring the themes identified in the Global Capacity Building Strategy adopted by the 35th Committee. It noted with satisfaction that the category 2 centre WHITRAP has already begun a process with its regional partners to elaborate a regional strategy to address these issues in keeping with the objectives of the Global Capacity Building Strategy. ICCROM reiterated its commitment to continue to work on activities related to capacity building with the other Advisory bodies, our partners and the States Parties.

ICOMOS welcomed the completion of this important process for the region of Asia and the Pacific. The growth of the participation from Asia and the Pacific in the Convention since the first Periodic Report – both in terms of the number of States Parties and inscribed properties - means that the 2nd cycle is timely for highlighting regional achievements and issues. ICOMOS had been pleased to participate in all the meetings held to support the Asia-Pacific regional process, and considered that the experience has enhanced regional networks and understanding of World Heritage. ICOMOS therefore congratulated the States Parties of the region for this work, as well as the achievement of the critically important retrospective Statements of OUV. These achievements should strengthen the implementation of the Convention in the region. ICOMOS noted the increase in the number of State Parties that have submitted Tentative Lists, but that a large number of these still require updating and improvement, and welcomed the continued efforts by States Parties on Tentative Lists, as this can be a step in the direction of the objectives of the Global Strategy and the need to address gaps in the thematic, geographic and cultural representivity of the World Heritage List. ICOMOS also considered that further work on thematic studies would be desirable to facilitate the work of the States Parties in this region. ICOMOS noted especially the issues regarding the strengthening of regional networks, enhancing community engagement, capacity building and the urgent need for risk preparedness in the region.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their support in the process. It was important, especially in the implementation phase, to put more focus on the conservation, as well as to identify needs and concrete activities. Japan will continue to support these activities, notably through the Japanese Funds in Trust for the dissemination of the results from the Periodic Reporting process.

IUCN acknowledged the tremendous effort made by State Parties through the Periodic Reporting exercise. It stated that IUCN will continue through its network to support the following-up of the action plans together with other Advisory Bodies as well as the Category 2 Centre (WHITRAP).

The **Rapporteur** informed there are some factual modifications to the Draft Decision proposed by the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **India** proposed an amendment on paragraph 9 of the draft decision which changes the deadline for submission for the significant modifications to boundaries and changes to criteria as a follow-up of the Periodic Reporting exercise which will not fall within the limit of two nominations.

The **Secretariat** replied that it was not possible as there is an established cycle which applies for all regions.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 10A** was adopted as amended.

10B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE FOLLOW-UP OF THE FIRST CYCLE AND PREPARATION OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/10B

Decisions: **36 COM 10B**

The **Secretariat** provided information on the activities which had taken place in the framework of the follow-up of the first cycle of the periodic reporting exercise in the Europe and North America region, as well as information on strategy and preparation of the second cycle, which will be over two years as agreed. It noted that the Secretariat has been actively working to follow up the first cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise as well as preparing for the next cycle. It thanked the States Parties which have hosted/offered relevant meetings. Having thanked States Parties for their contributions, it highlighted the fact that the Europe and North America Unit does not have a lot of extra-budgetary assistance therefore it needs to rely on supports from the State Parties so that the region achieves good results.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its concern about the fact that the budget is insufficient to complete all Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value in the region and asked ICOMOS for its comment on the issues.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked in which framework the capacity building activities in Central, Eastern and Southern Eastern Europe are being carried on. It also asked the Secretariat for comment on the difficult financial situation.

The **Secretariat** replied that as for Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the Centre and ICOMOS are in the process of discussing how they proceed with them. As for capacity building, it has been carried out mainly in the framework of the preparation for the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting.

ICOMOS stated it could provide human resources for reviewing Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value but the problem is a shortage of financial resource.

IUCN stated it does not have the same issue as ICOMOS has given that the volume of natural properties is smaller than cultural properties and that the budget is sufficient, but there is a need for extra-budetary resources.

The **Chairperson** moved on to examination of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested paragraph 7 to be amended to mention each sub-region.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 10B** was adopted as amended.

10C PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/10C

Decisions: **36 COM 10C**

The **Secretariat** provided a brief report on the progress on the Periodic Reporting exercise for Latin America and the Caribbean: The first sub-regional meeting for States Parties from the South America sub-region was held in Ouro Preto (Brazil) from 9 to 11 February 2012. The second sub-regional meeting was held in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, from 15 to 17 February 2012. The third sub-regional meeting of the first cycle was held in Zacatecas (Mexico) from 12 to 14 March 2012. A Meeting is foreseen to be organized with Permanent Delegations of the Latin American and the Caribbean Group (GRULAC) in order to keep them informed of the results of the various meetings held in the framework of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the LAC Region. A final meeting for the assessment of the exercise will be held in Santiago de Chile at the end of 2012.

The Delegation of **Colombia** announced that the regional meeting, which brings together almost all State Parties in the region, will be held 20 – 28 July 2012.

The Delegation of **Chile** expressed its gratitude to host the final meeting for the Periodic Reporting exercise in December 2012. It also stated the meeting would be a landmark achievement not only for setting up platforms but also for ensuring cooperation through the region.

The Delegation of **Barbados** noted as only non-Spanish-speaking country in the region, having a regional meeting was a good opportunity to share views and expertise with other countries.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated the second cycle of Periodic Reporting contribute not only to the improvement the general cycles of implementation of the Convention but also to technical cooperation in the region.

ICOMOS emphasized the importance of Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It also noted the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the region will be a starting point to come up with a regional strategy which focuses on synergy building and working in line with other provisions of the *Convention*.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 10C** was adopted.

NINETH DAY – Tuesday, 3 July 2012

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 10 PERIODIC REPORTS

10D FOLLOW-UP OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR AFRICA

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/10D
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.10D

Decisions: **36 COM 10D**

The **Secretariat** provided an overview on the follow-up activities to the Periodic Report for the Region in accordance with Decision **35 COM 10A**. He then gave the floor to the Coordinator of the Periodic Reporting for Africa.

The **Coordinator** of the exercise, Mr Georges Abongu, gave an overview of the regional Action Plan 2012-2017 which forms the foundation for the implementation of the recommendations and results of the Periodic Report. He also presented the implementation strategies and, five objectives of the Action Plan, with particular focus improved representation of African heritage sites on World Heritage List, effective risk management, increased involvement and direct economic benefits to local communities. Also, he stressed the importance of formalizing traditional management systems in Africa and effectively addressing the challenge of balancing heritage conservation and development needs. Further, he indicated the needs for heritage protection management in pre-conflict, post conflict and post disaster (PCPD) situations in Africa (Mali and DRC).

Finally, the **Secretariat** provided information on the special activities to be held in the Africa Region as part of the celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the Convention.

L'ICCROM note que le rapport confirme les préoccupations sur les sites que le Comité a évoquées ces jours derniers et que l'insuffisante dotation en personnel est une des faiblesses signalées. Il exprime sa reconnaissance à son prédécesseur Professeur Cevat ERDER qui a lancé le premier programme PREMA, et rappelle l'action de l'EPA au Bénin et du CHDA à Mombassa, ainsi que le programme Africa 2009. L'ICCROM considère que l'EPA et le CHDA sont des organisations véritablement internationales, ayant une vision large du patrimoine et regrette les difficultés que connaît le CHDA qui a dû se priver de son directeur. Il informe qu'il a écrit aux pays concernés demandant leur soutien et assure le Comité que l'ICCROM est prêt à poursuivre sa coopération dans son domaine. Il demande ensuite à ce que la parole soit donnée à son prédécesseur pour donner des précisions. L'ICCROM ajoute que la situation en matière de formation repose uniquement sur ces deux institutions et remercie la France qui a mis à disposition une experte associée pour les soutenir. Il rappelle également que tant la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO que la Sous-Directrice générale pour l'Afrique apportent tout leur soutien à ces deux centres et que le Département d'état américain l'a assuré que le fonds des ambassadeurs américains en Afrique était à la disposition des Etats qui le demanderont.

IUCN assured the Committee that had been it fully engaged in the process and recognized the challenges of natural heritage protection Africa. For instance, 40% sites on List of WH in Danger located in Africa. It further confirmed that issues of governance and emergency action plans are required and linkage with other international instruments. **IUCN** also suggested some concrete follow-up action:

- 1) Investing in regional network such as offices in Nairobi and Burkina Faso;
- 2) Improvement of natural heritage representation of Africa on the WH List through upstream process and training for preparing nominations as well as management plans with focus in Lesotho and Namibia;
- 3) Strengthening Africa Nature as a bigger cooperative programme and linking cultural and natural heritage.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et le coordonnateur du rapport périodique africain pour le travail accompli, ainsi que tous ceux qui y ont participé. Sa première observation porte sur le terme « domestiquer la Convention », indiquant qu'effectivement beaucoup de « sous-entendus » restent à éclaircir. La Délégation du Sénégal souligne qu'il est nécessaire de mettre l'accent sur les questions de pré- et de post-conflit. Par ailleurs, elle considère que bien que l'EPA et le CHDA fasse des choses importantes, c'est dans les universités que la formation se fait et qu'il est indispensable de les soutenir. La Délégation du Sénégal indique qu'elle n'est pas en accord avec l'ICCROM et qu'il n'est pas recommandé de ne soutenir que deux organisations à statut quasiment privé, qui n'ont pas les ressources humaines nécessaires, lesquelles se trouvent dans les universités.

La Délégation du **Mali** se réjouit du rapport et se félicite de la formation intitulée « pré-conflit ». Tout en reconnaissant les progrès des deux centres mentionnés, souhaite également un accompagnement des institutions publiques. La Délégation du Mali voudrait également mettre l'accent sur la question du développement durable, soulignant la difficulté de trouver un équilibre entre la nécessité de préserver et la nécessité de se développer.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stressed the need for enhancing synergies between 1972 Convention and other international Conventions (CBD, Ramasar, UNCSD and others. It further confirmed the emergency on issues relating to governance. The Delegation also emphasized the active participation of NGO, communities and other stakeholders. It was of the view that States Parties should reflect the pressures from inscription and a guidelines in this regard is needed.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated the importance of capacity-building and suggested that the strategy should also accommodate other World Heritage issues. Universities and other training institutions should also be involved.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stressed that support should be provided to universities and the Committee should give priority to Africa.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated the involvement of UNESCO Category 2 Centres and offered that those centres in the Latin America could establish some good exchanges programmes with Category 2 Centres in Africa.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne la nécessité d'une meilleure intégration des instituts africains spécialisés sur le patrimoine naturel africain.

The Delegation of **Mexico** endorsed South Africa's proposal of building synergy between different Conventions and legal instruments and indicated that it should also be taken up by other regions.

La Délégation du **Mali** note qu'elle ne tient pas à contredire la Délégation du Sénégal, mais souhaite souligner que l'EPA et le CHDA ont fait un travail remarquable. Ils ont surtout réuni les gestionnaires de sites. Toutefois, la Délégation du Mali considère que les universités sont très importantes et indique que le Mali est prêt à créer un institut du patrimoine, avec un accent sur le pré- et le post- conflit et la coopération pour le développement. Elle considère que la gestion du patrimoine doit être partie intégrante du développement et annonce la création de trois musées au Mali. La Délégation précise qu'elle a introduit un amendement dans le projet de décision.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** fully endorsed the elaborated Action Plan. It hoped that training institutions in Kenya, l'EPA and CHDA should get support from the World Heritage Centre and African World Heritage Fund. The Delegation wishes to speed up the process for establishing these institutions as UNESCO Category 2 Centres.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** stressed the need to establish synergies between Africa and the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS), particularly those in the Caribbean region.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** (Observateur) souhaite attirer l'attention sur les pays africains qui ne sont ni anglophones ni francophones et demande de prendre en considération les pays lusophones. Elle rappelle que la Délégation de Colombie a mentionné le centre de catégorie 2 de Rio de Janeiro et qu'une coopération est souhaitable avec les centres de ressources en Afrique et les universités.

Le **Secrétariat** souhaite donner une clarification en ce qui concerne les partenariats pour le renforcement des capacités, et rappeler que le Plan d'action prend en compte les rapports soumis par les Etats parties, indiquant qu'outre le soutien à donner aux deux organisations ci-dessus, les universités doivent être renforcées.

The **Coordinator** of Periodic Reporting for Africa reconfirmed the issue of language in organizing training activities. It suggested that further efforts should be sought from universities. The Coordinator further highlighted issues on the balance between development and protection, traditional management systems, and synergies amongst different conventions as identified in the Periodic Reporting process.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande des informations concernant les résultats de la réunion sur les industries extractives en Afrique organisée à Johan. Elle s'interroge si les membres du Comité sont-ils bien informés pour prendre cette décision. Il précise que le Comité n'a pas eu de connaissance de ce rapport et demande quand ils vont le recevoir.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the Draft Decision should not make a reference to a report that was still not known.

The Delegation of **South Africa** underlined that this reporting exercise in the African region was of relevance for other regions.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise qu'ils vont revenir sur cette question. Il cite un extrait du roman « Germinal » d'Emile Zola. Elle souligne que le Comité a inscrit un site « minier » en précisant qu'aujourd'hui les européens ont de la chance de pouvoir inscrire les territoires déjà aménagés. Elle précise qu'en Afrique cet aménagement reste à venir et qu'il faudra en tenir

compte dans les décisions sur l'EDC. Elle termine, en précisant que ce débat sur la sauvegarde du patrimoine mondial et l'aménagement du territoire doit avoir lieu et que « la Convention 1972 est une Convention pour l'homme d'avenir ».

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed the new approach by the African region but stated that this new approach was still unknown to them and thus could not serve as an example for other regions before knowing more details about it.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie la déclaration du Sénégal en soulignant que c'est un sujet fondamental pour la réflexion au sein de l'UNESCO. Elle déclare qu'elle doit être l'un de nos objectifs majeurs pour les années à venir.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que le débat ne porte pas sur ce sujet et qu'à ce stade il est encore prématuré. Elle propose des amendements au projet de décision tels que suit :

- « ... prend note de la tenue de la réunion consacrée aux activités ... »
- « ... et que le point soit revu à la prochaine session... »

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie la déclaration du Sénégal en invitant tous les pays d'Afrique à ce joindre à cette cause.

The Delegations of **South Africa** and **India** proposed to take the discussions and not the results as a reference for a common and global discussion on similar opportunities and challenges on this issue.

The Delegation of **Germany** repeated that the results of the discussion were not known and could therefore not serve as the basis of a common approach.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie la proposition d'Allemagne en reconnaissant l'importance de ce débat. Cependant, elle maintient sa position de ne pas pouvoir prendre note d'un document que le Comité ne connaît pas.

The Delegation of **South Africa** clarified that the proposal by the German delegation to refer only to some African countries was not correct because all African countries discussed this.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose de prendre note des discussions qui ont eu lieu et suggère que cela soit bien refléter.

The Delegation of **India** emphasized that important and relevant discussions took place irrespective of the content and the outcome and that this fact should be reflected in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise qu'elle ne remet pas en cause cette activité, mais qu'elle ne peut pas se prononcer sur la qualité du rapport sans connaître son contenu.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie la position de la Présidente que les discussions sont importantes et qu'ils devraient être bien reflétées.

The Delegation of **Germany** stressed that any judgment of the discussion as describing them as relevant should be taken out of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **South Africa** underlined that the discussion that took place were very important to the African countries and that this should be reflected in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose une phrase suivante : « d'importantes discussions ont eu lieu ».

La Délégation du **Mali** précise que le plan d'action comporte des lignes générales avec les moyens de vérification. Chaque Etat partie doit mener les actions conformément à ce plan d'action en ajustement avec des plans nationaux. Elle souligne que les Etats parties doivent s'organiser sans attendre le prochain cycle des Rapports Périodiques.

La Délégation de la **France** précise que cette discussion n'a pas lieu d'être.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the collaboration should take place with interested State Parties instead of States Parties in general.

The Delegations of **India, Serbia, Estonia** and **Japan** supported the proposal by South Africa and stated that such kind of discussion should not take place.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** appuie la proposition de l'Afrique du Sud.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out that standard terminology in the Draft Decision should not include any judgment. Therefore the wording in the Draft Decision should be "interested countries".

The Delegation of **South Africa** explained that the collaboration was between African countries that were all interested.

The **Chairperson** underlined that this Draft Decision dealt with the regional capacity building in Africa.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande de remplacer « réfléchissant » par « veillant ».

The **Rapporteur** introduced amendments made to Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 10D** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10 of the Agenda

ITEM 11 PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/11
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.11

Decisions: **36 COM 11**

Le **Secrétariat** présente un bref résumé des activités accomplies. Le Secrétariat remercie l'ensemble des Etats Parties pour leur soutien accordé depuis la 26^e session du Comité à l'élaboration des plans de gestion et de conservation des sites concernés. Le Secrétariat précise que depuis le mois de mars 2012, la Palestine est devenue partie à la Convention du patrimoine mondial et qu'à la prochaine session il n'y aura plus de document séparé concernant ce point.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 11** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** stated that a lot of Committee time was dedicated to one Middle East issue while other bigger and more emergency-drawn issues such as the State of Conservation of sites in Syria and Libya were ignored. The Director General made a statement that this situation became more crucial by the hour but still the Committee did not make any decision or discuss the situation of those sites. Politics would run over substance again and danger in this way the credibility of the Convention which may again turned to be an Alice in Wonderland reality instead of the real reality

La Délégation de la **Palestine** (Observateur) attire l'attention des Membres sur le temps passé pour adopter des décisions concernant cette région. Par exemple, le Soudan du Sud a été admis en tant que l'Etat Membre en 22 minutes, la Palestine a attendu 22 ans. L'adoption de la décision concernant le premier site palestinien a pris de longues heures alors que la décision concernant le site israélien qui l'a suivi est passée comme « un éclair ». Cependant, il précise que l'essentielle n'est pas là. Il attire l'attention des Membres que la Palestine, un pays qui compte 92 % de musulmans, a choisi d'inscrire le site chrétien. La question se pose – qui a pu apprécier à sa juste valeur ce symbole ? Il informe qu'un grand « chantier » se met en place. La Charte pour la préservation du patrimoine culturel et naturel est en cours de préparation. Il remercie tous les Etats parties qui soutiennent cette démarche et fait souligner l'aide accordée par le Malte a la préparation de cette Charte.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 11 of the Agenda

ITEM 13 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (*Continuation*)

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/13
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.13

Decisions: **36 COM 13**

L'Ambassador de la **Suisse**, S.E. Rodolphe Imhoof en sa qualité de Président de cette groupe de travail informe que celui-ci était ouvert à toutes les Délégations et s'est réuni cinq fois pour examiner l'ensemble des points relatif à ce sujet. Il précise que la proposition de l'amendement proposée par la Jordanie sur le paragraphe 68 n'a pas été retenue et que cela est refléter dans la décision qui a été soumis aux Membres du Comité. Il fait le point sur des réunions organisées sur les questions de l'intégrité et sur le critère (vi). Des clarifications concernant l'assistance internationale ont été effectuées et quelques erreurs de traduction en français ont été corrigées. Il souligne que la langue française reste toujours malmenée à l'UNESCO. Les résultats des débats sur l'avenir de la Convention, ainsi que les recommandations de l'audit extérieur ont été également pris en compte. Il informe que le groupe a proposé de mandater le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour faire la révision de certains articles. Il note que d'autres documents pourraient être développés d'avantage avant d'être intégrés aux Orientations.

Il souligne que les Orientations et le Règlement intérieur doivent être révisés. Il souligne la nécessité de clarifier les liens entre les documents et de coordonner les stratégies, et notamment sous un aspect budgétaire. Il propose de réviser les Orientations tous les 4 ans au lieu de les réviser en boucle. Les résultats des travaux du groupe sont annexés au nouveau projet de la décision. Il informe que le plan de la mise en œuvre de l'audit externe sera reproduit lors de la réunion du groupe qui s'occupe de la finalisation des Orientations, prévue à la fin du mois de janvier 2013.

The Delegation of **India** commended the Ambassador of the Delegation of Switzerland for his leadership. The great interest in the open-ended working group would be based on the interest in fundamental issues of the relationship and the role of the Advisory Bodies, the Member States and the World Heritage Centre. The Convention should respond in its 40th year to the changing demands, expectations and aspirations. It had broadened geographically, thematically and conceptually. The Convention and its implementation had received more attention from peoples and areas that were previously underrepresented. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre should respond to the concern by Member States outside of the Operational Guidelines, rules and procedures. The delegate asked whether the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies had noted the concerns related to accountability, streamlining of processes, up-streaming and the assistive role that each of them had.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the open-ended working group had extensive discussions on this kind of questions, that the consultations would continue and that therefore the discussion should not be reopened again.

The Delegation of **India** required a statement from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

ICOMOS underlined that they had listened with great interest at the various points that had been taken on issues such as accountability, up-streaming and transparency as well as ways that the Advisory Bodies could assist State Parties. They were ready and willing to discuss these points and welcomed a discussion on how the three pillars of the Convention, the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, could refine and streamline their working arrangements in order to optimize available resources for the benefits of the State Parties and the benefits of the Convention.

IUCN explained that this was not a new discussion. IUCN made two statements on Item 5B and Item 8B which provided a range of points of substance. In Item 12C there would be a discussion on the up-stream process. IUCN also explained that changes to practices would have to be codified in the Operational Guidelines. There were key issues to be explored about working methods, calendar, and the role of tentative lists where the Guidelines might be refined. The working group had some strong consensus about the preparatory work ahead of nominations and there was further elaboration under Item 12C.

ICCROM emphasized that this discussion was touched in a number of agenda items starting from Item 9A and going through Item 12. ICCROM was happy to listen to the Committee, was involved in the capacity-building process and offered its services to State Parties.

The Delegation of **India** stated that there was a problem that should be addressed and that UNESCO should be listening and acting similarly.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** rend hommage à l'Ambassadeur suisse qui dirige les discussions sur ce sujet. Il appuie l'intervention de l'Inde et précise que les résultats des discussions seront également présentés lors de la 37^e session. Un consensus a été obtenu quant à la demande faite par la Jordanie, afin de laisser une marge de manœuvre et poursuivre les discussions sur cette question.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise en tant que le Président du groupe de travail, qu'ils ont conclu qu'à ce stade il n'y a pas lieu de revenir sur le paragraphe 68. Il est vrai que la Jordanie n'a pas appuyé cette décision. Il propose de procéder avec ce projet de décision.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 13.I** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Germany** referred to Paragraph 10b about factual error letters and required that the replies of the State Parties would be uploaded as well in order to ensure highest transparency. The delegation invited the Observer Delegation of Poland to suggest some changes in Paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the Decision was adopted and could not be reopened again.

Concernant le **projet de décision 36 COM 13.II**, la Délégation de la **Colombie** note que le document aborde le sujet des villes historiques et souligne que l'inscription de Rio de Janeiro offre la possibilité de poursuivre le débat sur ce sujet. Il rappelle que le Brésil a offert une possibilité d'organiser une réunion au sien du Centre de la Catégorie 2 à Rio.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** pointed out that the Committee started in 2005 the reflection on the tools and definition of historic cities and UNESCO developed processes which led to the approval by the General Conference of the Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape. Those were not restricted to World Heritage but could be seen as an approach to urban conservation. Now it should be looked at how the recommendation could be reflected in the Operational Guidelines in order to find better language and context for this important category.

ICOMOS stated that the approach for the management and the protection of historic urban landscapes in general and historic urban landscapes that were World Heritage Sites in particular brought up issues related to sustainable development, protection, conservation, visual integrity, the role of stakeholders and local communities. It was timely for further reflections on this issue to see how the methodologies had practical implication and that therefore the meeting should take place.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** stated that a revision of the Operational Guidelines was not necessary at this stage but perhaps in one year time or later on. The discussion should be held on the concept and directions to take and then decide later on how this could be reflected. This would take more than one cycle.

The Delegation of **Japan** emphasized that the issue of historic urban landscape was a very critical point for many Member States and that it needed more time for the revision of the Operational Guidelines.

Les Délégations du **Mexique** et de la **France** appuient l'intervention de la **Colombie**, ainsi que la proposition de l'ADG/CLT d'organiser une réunion sur ce sujet.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 13.II** was adopted without amendments.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 13 of the Agenda.

The meeting rose at 1 pm

NINETH DAY – Tuesday, 3 July 2012

EIGHTEENTH MEETING

3 pm – 5.15 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 14 EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Documents: WHC-12/36.COM/14
WHC-12/36.COM/INF.14

Decisions: **36 COM 14**

The **Secretariat** introduced the item concerning the status of the International Assistance budget for the biennium 2010-2011 as of 6 May 2011 and the International Assistance requests approved for the biennium 2010-2012.

The **Rapporteur** informed that it is proposed to modify slightly the Draft Decision due to a modification in submission of the International Assistance requests concerned.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 14** Rev was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed item 14 of the Agenda.

ITEM 12 FUTURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

12A FUTURE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/12A

Decisions: **36 COM 12A**

The **Secretariat** recalled that the Strategic Action Plan and Vision to guide the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* over the decade 2012-2022 had been adopted by the 18th session of the General Assembly of States Parties (UNESCO 2011), Resolution **18 GA 11**; and that Discussions on the Implementation Plan had taken place at the January 2012 meeting between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, where the close links between the Report on the Evaluation of the Global Strategy and PACT Initiative carried out by the External Auditors in 2010-2011 and adopted by the General Assembly in Resolution **18 GA 8** and the Strategic Action Plan and Vision to guide the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* adopted by the General Assembly by Resolution **18 GA 11**, were noted. The Secretariat also reminded the Committee about the work of the Open-ended Working Group which was made available on 24 April 2012 on the web-page created for this purpose. The Secretariat informed that a second meeting of the Open-ended Working group is scheduled to take place end of January 2013 and that the Implementation Plan is to be updated biennially, with outcomes against the

Strategic Action Plan and will be also reported to the General Assembly of States Parties.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** raised a point concerning the work of the external auditor which seemed to reflect similar issues that emerged in the reflection process of the States Parties. It underlined that some of the priority activities identified require additional budget allocations. The Observer Delegation reminded that many of the recommendations of the 20th and 30th anniversary had never been taken up and indicated that, with the current constraints and the conclusions from the external auditor, it should be seen as a real opportunity to address these issues now.

IUCN made a joint statement to reflect on outcomes of the 3-year process of Reflection on the Future of the *Convention* on behalf of the Advisory Bodies confirming that in many ways the Convention can be judged a 'success' and but at the same time also identifying the many long standing and emerging challenges to meet its objectives for the conservation of the world's cultural and natural heritage. It underlined that the Advisory Bodies welcomed the Strategic Plan as a means to bring together in one place an instrument that can lead to a much better managed and more effective Convention, to track progress, and to see priorities. They further highlighted the range on conflicting demands within the Convention and the pressured and under-resourced Secretariat and Advisory Bodies. The Strategic Plan is therefore very much welcomed. The Advisory Bodies noted the significant progress to implement some of the recommendations already made by States Parties in drafting Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for their World Heritage properties and in addressing the retrospective inventory, both crucial tools for the conservation and management of inscribed properties. The Advisory Bodies also highlighted importance of the link with the Implementation Plan for the Recommendations of the Evaluation of the Global Strategy.

The Delegation of **Germany** concurred with Advisory Bodies and highlighted further the importance of the link with the two thematic programmes of World Heritage and sustainable tourism and sustainable development initiatives in order to save resource and link priorities.

The **Secretariat** reminded the participants that in the elaboration of the Action Plan the guidance documents and recommendations developed over time have been taken into account. This Action Plan will be discussed and activities prioritized every two years also to avoid the overlaps identified by the external auditor.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 12 A** was adopted.

12B DECISION-MAKING PROCEDURES OF THE STATUTORY ORGANS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/12B

Decisions: **36 COM 12B**

The **Secretariat** recalled that the document provided an update on the follow-up to the recommendations of the expert meeting on the decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (15-17 December 2010, Manama, Bahrain). These has been adopted by the Committee in Decision **35 COM 12B**, requesting implementation to improve the conduct of statutory meetings, the capacity-building related activities, including the orientation session and numerous

briefing meetings with the Chairperson on critical cases involving also other parts of the Secretariat including the Legal Advisor, the transparency of documents and statutory meetings (reflected in this year's live webcast) and the public access to the working documents of the Committee, as well as to provide clarification on some World Heritage processes.

ICCROM made a joint statement on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, reporting that they have participated in several reflection meetings, but indicating that costs in Annex do not include actual costs from the Advisory Bodies to participate in these.

The Delegation of **India** indicated that point 22.5 in the Annex limits the Chairperson as to when to give floor to States Parties to speak out in discussion. This should be reviewed in order to bring facts to the attention of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Japan** highlighted the difficult situation of the World Heritage Fund which has not been emphasized enough. It also questioned the feasibility of the third ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee in view of the difficult financial situation.

The Delegation of **Estonia** agreed with the Delegation of India that there is a question with the calendar concerning the feedback from the concerned States Parties, pointing out the difficulty to receive new information from the concerned States Parties during the Committee session which cannot be verified by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation proposed to move forwards the date of publication of the state of conservation experts to allow the concerned States Parties to react in time.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime deux préoccupations majeures : économiser les ressources et être plus efficace dans les débats. Le travail des Organisations consultatives est très important, mais ce n'est pas la « Parole d'Évangile ». La Délégation est d'avis qu'il ne faut pas se précipiter dans l'adoption, mais pousse à la prudence.

The **Secretariat** clarified rule 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure which states that Representatives of a State party, whether or not a Member of a Committee, shall not speak to advocate for their own property during the items on the state of conservation and the nominations. It also asked concerned States Parties not to provide new information after the statutory deadline. The Secretariat agreed with the concerns of the Delegation of Japan about the extra costs of the third session of the World Heritage Committee. The Secretariat also addressed the comments by the Delegation of India concerning the paragraph 22.5 and informed that the changes have been undertaken as a result of the reflection process of the three last Committee sessions but that the Committee is of course free to change its rules. The Secretariat further explained that the provisional agenda of the next session will be adopted tomorrow and items may be included in it and informed the Committee members about the rationale of the policy guidelines to be elaborated.

The **Chairperson** drew the attention of the Committee members to the fact that the Annex is not part of the draft decision as this has been adopted by the Committee at its last session.

The Delegation of **Serbia** underlined the importance of the reflection of the decision procedures to improve efficiency and transparency of the Committee, supported the

Delegations of India and Estonia, and underlined that the policy guidelines are crucial.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated its criticism of point 22.5 that it is restrictive to the discussions and that it should be the role of the Chairperson to decide when to give the floor to State Party.

La Délégation de la **France** fait écho à la Délégation de l'Estonie concernant une réflexion plus avancée sur le calendrier. Il est nécessaire d'y accorder plus d'attention; c'est un thème qui doit rester à l'ordre du jour.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed by Switzerland to paragraph 7

The Draft Decision **36 COM 12B** was adopted as amended.

12C PROGRESS REPORT ON THE REFLECTION CONCERNING THE UPSTREAM PROCESSES

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/12C

Decisions: **36 COM 12C**

The **Secretariat** explained the origin and process of the Upstream Process for the nomination process and thanked the States Parties of Thailand and Japan for the support to the Phuket meeting during which the procedures for the upstream process had been elaborated. The Secretariat underlined that the basic principle remained the absence of a conflict of interest as it is in the interest of all sides to work with the States Parties from the beginning to provide assistance in the nomination process and advice on when to present the nomination file. The Secretariat informed on the Pilot Projects that were selected from each regional group. The first step of each Pilot Project is to undertake a feasibility study on the potential of Outstanding Universal Value. The Secretariat reported that the results are currently mixed with some Pilot Projects having advanced significantly and others not having started.

ICOMOS underlined that many of the issues discussed in relation with nominations and state of conservation reports have emerged as the recommendations from the Advisory Bodies have not been followed. ICOMOS considered that there is a widely acknowledged need for dialogue at an early stage in the development of nominations. Gradually this upstream process is being formalized. ICOMOS considered that there is a need to extend this formalization to develop a firmer context for upstream work and consider what tools might be needed to optimize success. In terms of State of Conservation reports, if more dialogue is needed with States Parties, ICOMOS suggested to formalize arrangements for advisory missions. Upstream work does involve resources, not always available. ICOMOS participated in many of the processes without payment. ICOMOS would welcome the opportunity to consider how upstream work could become a formal tool of the world heritage process, perhaps recognized within the Operational Guidelines.

IUCN reiterated its commitment to this process and noted that IUCN considers the upstream process as one of the priority in the next four years focusing in particular on sites important for biodiversity, noting the extreme and growing global threat to these places, increasingly from extractive industries. IUCN noted that the Upstream process addressed key issues such as transparency, openness and dialogue but that the issue of conflict of interest is a delicate one as the Advisory Bodies are expected

to provide objective independent advice which is difficult in case they are directly involved in preparing the nominations they later evaluate. Modalities have to be found to address this key issue. IUCN reported that they have been using members of the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) to avoid or minimize the conflict of interest. IUCN further noted the significant progress with the Pilot Projects concerning natural properties, highlighting the two successful missions for the Pilot Projects “Dinaric Karst Serial Nomination” and the “Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region”. An important component for these missions was not only the expert advice but also the capacity-building in this process which was highly appreciated by the States Parties. IUCN considered, however, that IUCN efforts go beyond these pilot projects and in particular concern the following: joining the World Heritage Centre’s informal technical check, as well as continuing contribution to the completeness check; Africa Gaps, providing assistance to the submission of Bijagos, currently for inscription; thematic studies on criterion (vii), (ix) and (x), and marine sites, work with the African World Heritage Fund; providing contacts for mentors and advisers who the State Party can draw on to support and advise nominations. IUCN stated that it continued to explore other options, particularly emphasizing the work with the Tentative Lists.

IUCN highlighted the primary role of the States Parties in the nomination process and that the Advisory Bodies’ assistance by no means substitutes the role of experts put forward by the States Parties. IUCN also noted that the work in the nomination process often comes on top of the regular work load and budget of Advisory Bodies. IUCN further emphasized the conflict of interest of the Committee being both simultaneously the decision taking body and also nominating. Therefore the whole nomination process should further be improved over time.

The Delegation of **Serbia** underlined that few properties are proposed for inscription each year since the work load involved in the preparation of a nomination file is very heavy. The Delegation therefore called for a continuing improvement of the process. The Delegation also expressed its support to the Pilot Upstream Project Dinaric Karst Serial Nomination with the participation of Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Montenegro.

The Delegation of **India** stressed the importance of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties and requested further details concerning the Pilot Project in the Maldives.

ICOMOS clarified that no meeting has taken place since the selection of the Pilot Project, but that communication has continued in this period.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** observe que les Organisations manquent parfois de moyens, de temps et souvent de bras. La Délégation pose la question du conflit d’intérêts des Organisations consultatives à la fois « porteuses » et évaluateurs des dossiers de nomination présentés par les Etats. Qui va juger de la validité des dossiers de nomination s’ils sont préparés en amont déjà par les Organisations consultatives ? La Délégation suggère un accompagnement renforcé pour des sites spécifiques à la demande des Etats Parties ou même du Comité, plutôt que de généraliser la règle du processus en amont. La Délégation propose un dialogue constant et fluide entre les Etats préparant des dossiers de nomination et les Organisations consultatives. Si plus de ressources étaient mises à la disposition des Organisations consultatives, ces dernières seraient plus proactives par rapport aux propositions des Etats, qu’elles conseilleraient de manière plus efficace, et cela renforcerait en même temps les capacités locales.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que le processus en amont existe depuis la naissance de la Liste du patrimoine mondial; les Listes indicatives des Etats parties étant le « upstream process » de chaque Etat partie. Il est nécessaire d'en appeler à la responsabilité des Etats parties de préparer leur Liste indicative avec le soin nécessaire, en travaillant avec toutes les ressources, les documents qui existent, afin d'éviter d'avoir des biens sur cette liste qui ne pourront pas être inscrits.

La Délégation **d'Algérie**, tout en étant en faveur du processus en amont, demande des éclaircissements sur la valeur de l'expertise du représentant (membre du panel) des Organisations consultatives. Son expertise pourrait-elle constituer un avis favorable et préalable à la proposition d'inscription à soumettre à la délibération du Comité ? La Délégation demande si, avec ce nouveau processus en amont, un dossier, dont le bien a été identifié par l'expert comme ayant une Valeur universelle exceptionnelle lors de la préparation de la Liste indicative, pourrait faire l'objet d'un avis défavorable par les organisations consultatives ?

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its appreciation for the progress in the improvement of the nomination process including the capacity-building elements, especially in view of the financial and human resource constraints. The Delegation stressed as a key aspect the improvement of the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties, including the informal dialogue with the Advisory Bodies during the session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Estonia** reminded the Committee that the idea of the process was to reduce the number of unsuccessful nominations and to also produce model nomination files and that however the discussion has now turned to the improvement of the communication between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and States Parties before the Committee session. The Delegation reiterated that the calendar set out in the Operational Guidelines should be improved in the future. The Delegation drew attention to some simple measures to improve the nomination process such as the carrying out of a feasibility study on the potential Outstanding Universal value of a property with early feedback on this matter. In addition, States Parties should take time to prepare sound and robust nomination file and use the preliminary deadline of 3 September for the checking of technical details of the nomination file as an extra option and tool that might be helpful in this process.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne qu'en aucun cas l'Organisation consultative ne peut être considérée comme l'auteur ou le directeur de la proposition d'inscription. Dans ces conditions, un conflit d'intérêt n'a plus lieu d'être. La Délégation voit dans le processus en amont plutôt un processus de validation à long terme, suivant les différentes étapes méthodologiques de l'établissement d'une proposition d'inscription, qui permet dans le cadre d'un dialogue scientifique d'assurer la progression de la demande vers le résultat souhaité. Ce dialogue peut aussi permettre à l'Organisation consultative d'avoir un jugement plus approfondi sur la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the upstream process but pointed out that the feedback between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies does not seem the proper feedback that is expected.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the dialogue process but highlighted that especially in the Pilot Project phase a conflict of interest is easily possible as one would want to see the Pilot Projects being successful. The Delegation pointed out

that Advisory Bodies do not seem to see this activity as an additional burden and enquired if this is really so.

The Delegation of **United Arab Emirates** highlighted the importance of this process and this additional opportunity of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. The Delegation reported that constructive dialogue with Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre already exists, but that that the Delegation lent full support to this new approach.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** supported the perspective of the Delegation of Estonia, and stressed that in the context of the establishment of the potential of the Outstanding Universal Value the comparative analysis is very important. In addition, the Observer Delegation stressed the importance of bilateral or regional group support as until recently many States Parties seemed to be isolated. The representative advocated mutual support among the States Parties be it financial or technical assistance. The role of the Advisory Bodies as advisors to the World Heritage Committee and not to the States Parties was underlined. The Observer Delegation also commended the mentoring initiative for the nomination process which has brought some good results.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** also expressed support to the upstream process and concurred with the Observer Delegation of Barbados. The Observer Delegation raised the issue of fundraising and the unclear identification of roles between States Parties, World Heritage Centre and the States Parties in the fundraising process and called for the World Heritage Centre to develop a fundraising strategy together with the States Parties from the Africa region. The Observer Delegation also stressed the issue of focal point who should be institutions rather than individuals for the sake of efficiency. The Observer Delegation thanked the African World Heritage Fund for the support.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 12C** was adopted as amended.

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

5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES *(Continuation)*

The **Chairperson** reopened item 5B in order to finalize the adoption of the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** explique que le groupe de travail a été difficile à mettre sur pied, et qu'au final il n'y en a pas eu à proprement parler. Il y eu simplement des discussions de couloir ainsi qu'un dîner organisé par la Délégation de la Colombie, qui a réuni un certain nombre de Délégations intéressées par le sujet. Deux heures de discussions informelles, franches et ouvertes, ont permis de dissiper un certain nombre de malentendus. Des clarifications sont venues également de la part des Organisations consultatives lors des discussions sur le point 12C. La Délégation de la Suisse conclut qu'à ce stade aucun projet de décision ne pourra entrer dans les détails. Elle s'excuse que la tâche donnée par la Présidente n'a pas été remplie, mais souligne que le travail accompli a néanmoins été fructueux.

The **Chairperson** proposed the members of the Committee to adopt the original proposal of the Draft Decision since there was not a concrete amendment.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the Committee could approve Decision **36 COM 5B**, a decision with four paragraphs and no amendments.

The Decision **36 COM 5B** was adopted.

The Delegation of **South Africa** suggested that Documents 5B and Document 12C should be articulated as to clearly identify the way to discuss the pending issues before the 37th Session.

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

The **Chairperson** outlined the pending items of the agenda, namely Item 15, celebrations of the 40th Anniversary in Japan, the election of the Chairperson and the approval of the provisional agenda for the 37 COM. Upon the agreement of the Committee, she announced that the Committee would adjourn discussions and meet at 2 p.m. the following day.

The meeting rose at 5.15 pm.

TENTH DAY – WEDNESDAY, 4 JULY 2012

NINETEENTH MEETING

2 pm – 5 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 12 FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

12D CELEBRATION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE *CONVENTION*

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/12D

Decisions: **36 COM 12D**

The **Secretariat** provided a progress report on the celebration of 40th anniversary of the Convention: The 40th anniversary year was launched by the UNESCO Director-General on 7 November 2011 at the 18th General Assembly of States Parties to the Convention; a dedicated website has been launched providing information on the theme of the anniversary: “World Heritage and Sustainable Development: the role of local communities”; Since its official launch, numbers of related activities have taken place not only by States Parties but also by Advisory Bodies and World Heritage partners. The Secretariat thanked the above mentioned entities for their active involvement, especially the government of Japan for the generous contribution which enable the World Heritage Centre to prepare a publication as well as carrying out related activities. The Secretariat announced that the Government of Japan and the World Heritage Centre were co-organizing the final event in Kyoto on 6-8 November 2012.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its gratitude to host the final event of the 40th anniversary year. It announced a symposium to be held in Japan during the final event which focuses on the current status and the future of the Convention reviewing the meaning of the Convention bringing together experts from all over the world. It concluded by inviting all States Parties as well as Advisory Bodies to join the event.

The Delegation of **Mexico** congratulated Japan on doing an excellent work. It also informed the Committee about the meeting to be hosted by the State Party from 18-20 July in Queretaro to discuss key issues concerning the preservation and conservation of World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** thanked the Secretariat for the report. It requested to add 2 events hosted by the Russian government in June and July 2012 to the list of the 40th anniversary related activities.

The Delegation of **India** thanked Japan for organizing the closing event as well as its cooperation.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that there was no amendment proposal for the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 12D** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 12 of the Agenda

ITEM 15 PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2010-2011, THE INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND THE STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET (*continuation*)

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/15.Rev

Decisions: **36 COM 15**

The **Chairperson of the Budget working group** reported the outcome of the discussions held during the 10 sessions of the Working Group. He emphasized the serious budgetary situation due to the financial shortfall since last year and acknowledged the difficulty the World Heritage Centre was facing. He expressed his concern about the World Heritage Fund which was not to be sustained without further voluntary contributions. He also referred to the increasing work load of the World Heritage Centre as well as of Advisory Bodies which was generated by the Committee's decisions. He noted that those tasks might not take place due to the financial short fall. He stated the Committee should reflect this serious budgetary situation in each decision. He concluded by thanking State Parties as well as the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked all States Parties involved especially South Africa which had chaired the working group. The Delegation wished to alert the Committee vis-à-vis the situation and the workload increase. It stated the emergency fund established last year did not work for World Heritage issues. It highlighted the necessity of seeking the way to work more efficiently and properly.

The Delegation of **Mexico** expressed its gratitude to the excellent chairmanship of the Delegation of South Africa. It noted the findings through the analysis would be taken into account when the Committee takes decisions.

La Délégation de la **France** félicite le représentant de l'Afrique du Sud pour son travail en tant que Président du groupe de travail concernant le budget. Elle signale quelques petits problèmes de traduction du projet de décision, qui seront réglés ultérieurement.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie le représentant de l'Afrique du Sud pour son travail remarquable en tant que Président du groupe de travail. Elle indique que la défaillance d'un Etat partie a causé un grand problème à l'UNESCO. Elle souligne que l'Algérie a déjà payé sa contribution et s'interroge sur ce qu'il est possible de faire avec le faible budget. Elle suggère que l'on ne peut demander aux Etats du sud de sauver la situation au moyen des Fonds-en-dépôt et remercie le Japon pour sa générosité envers la conservation du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the difficult situation and noted that it was important to draw all States Parties' attention to this problem as it concerned all States Parties.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se joint aux félicitations adressées au représentant de l'Afrique du Sud et souligne que la situation est difficile et que chacun doit faire des

sacrifices. Elle ajoute qu'il faut rester optimiste car cette situation ne devrait être que temporaire.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que la situation est extrêmement grave et indique son désaccord avec la Délégation du Sénégal. Elle insiste sur la nécessité de ne pas attendre, il faut prendre le taureau par les cornes. Notamment, le Comité doit se rendre compte des incidences de ses décisions qui augmentent la charge de travail non seulement pour le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives, mais également pour les autorités nationales et les communautés locales. Elle suggère que le Comité devrait saisir cette opportunité en vue d'assurer la gestion durable de la Convention, en déterminant des priorités. Elle rappelle que selon le Comité lui-même, la conservation et la protection des sites du patrimoine mondial devraient être prioritaires, et non les nominations. Il en est de la crédibilité de la Convention.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the Draft Decision without debate as it had been extensively discussed and agreed by the working group.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 15** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 15 of the Agenda

The meeting rose at 5 pm

ELEVENTH DAY – Friday, 6 July 2012

TWENTIETH MEETING
2 pm – 5 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova (Russian Federation)

ITEM 16 OTHER BUSINESS

No Document

Algeria announced orally the intention of the Algerian authorities to host the 38th session of the World heritage Committee in **2014**.

Germany announced orally the intention of the German authorities to host the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee in **2015**.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 16 of the Agenda

ITEM 17 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND
RAPPORTEUR OF THE 37TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE (2013)

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/17

Decisions: **36 COM 17**

The **Chairperson** indicated that it was now time to elect the new Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and to also proceed to the election of the Vice-chairpersons and of the Rapporteur of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013.

The Delegation of **Japan** proposed Cambodia as Chairperson for the 37th session. This proposal was supported by the Delegation of **France** which proposed the candidature of His Excellency SOK An, Vice-Prime Minister of Cambodia as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee whose mandate will begin at the end of the 36th session of the Committee (Saint Petersburg, 2012) until the end of the 37th session of the Committee (June/July 2013).

This proposal was adopted by acclamation.

The **Chairperson** congratulate **His Excellency SOK An (Cambodia)** for his election and expressed all her best wishes for his task ahead.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** took the floor on behalf of the new elected Chairperson to thank the Committee and presented the venue of the next session of the Committee (Phnom Penh)

The Committee furthermore elected **Algeria, Senegal, Colombia, Thailand and Switzerland** as Vice-Chairpersons of the World Heritage Committee, whose mandates will begin at the end of the 36th session of the Committee until the end of the 37th session of the Committee.

Ms Jasna ZRNOVIC (Serbia) was elected as the Rapporteur of the World Heritage Committee, whose mandate will begin at the end of the 36th session of the Committee until the end of the 37th session of the Committee.

The Committee also decided that the Bureau of the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (June/July 2014) will be elected at the end of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (June/July 2013) in accordance with Rule 13.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the World Heritage Committee.

The Draft Decision **36 COM 17** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 17 of the Agenda

ITEM 18. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 37TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2013)

Document: WHC-12/36.COM/18

Decisions: **36 COM 18**

The Director of the Centre introduced document 36 COM/18. In the absence of any comments, the Draft Decision **36 COM 18** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 18 of the Agenda

ITEM 19 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

The **Chairperson** indicated the way to proceed for the adoption of the report of the decisions of the 36th session. He indicated that Decisions included in the report had already been adopted by the Committee and that therefore the task in front of the Committee was essentially an editorial one, and that the debate will not be reopened on the content of the Decisions. She gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** explained briefly the process of preparation of the Report and give additional guidance to consider it.

The Report of the Decision was adopted with a minor editorial modification.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 19 of the Agenda

Furthermore, the **Director of the Centre indicated that the Secretariat** has been trying to take stock of the financial implications of the various decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee (241 decisions) and tried to work out an indicative cost based on the modular costs indicated in Document WHC-12/36.COM/12B, which comes to 4.3M out of which about 1M is from the World Heritage Fund – the rest being taken by States Parties or through fundraising of extrabudgetary funds. These costs for meetings, missions, capacity building activities are provisional as they are not discussed and agreed with Advisory Bodies.

ITEM 20 CLOSING CEREMONY

In his closing remarks, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked all the members of the Committee for the hard work done during the past 10 days in

adopting 241 Decisions. He indicated that the Secretariat produced more than 50 documents, with several documents at this session, including this Decisions Report. He underlined that the production of the report was considerably improved as we had a reduced schedule and no evening sessions. He underlined that, for the first time, live streaming enabled all stakeholders to follow and make processes more transparent and that documents were all uploaded and are now available for the public.

The **Director of the Center** indicated that the Committee discussed a number of very critical issues including the budgetary crisis and he made an appeal to States Parties and institutions to help preserving World Heritage at all levels, cooperation with World Heritages sites and national authorities, and keeping a strong secretariat at UNESCO to serve the Committee in all its activities. He underlined that 962 sites are now inscribed on the World Heritage List – many of which are under serious threat and that they need attention and support. In this regard, he refers to the case of cultural heritage in Mali and to the one of Okapi Wildlife Reserve for which the Committee has to take strong and urgent decisions.

The **Director of the Centre** assured that, as indicated several times by members of the Committee, transparency and dialogue has to be and will be improved and that the upstream process will be an important tool in this regard. He thanked the Committee members, Observer State Party Delegations colleagues from UNESCO and specifically WHC and other observers for their contributions

The Delegations of **Colombia, Estonia, Algeria, France, South Africa, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Mali, India, Irak and Russian Federation** took the floor to congratulate the Chairperson for her high diplomatic skills and her very good conduct of business of this 36th session, recognizing that this task was not an easy one. They all also thanked the Russian authorities for the remarkable organization of the session and the perfect welcome to the participants.

The **Chairperson** pronounced her closing speech, by which she underlined the importance of the very hard work accomplished by the Committee during this session. She mentioned that the Convention was mainly being there to contribute to a better understanding of the cultural and natural diversity of the world, and that we had to look forward to hearing about how effectively and timely the decisions taken during the present session will be made operational, which is a pledge of the successful conclusion of this 40th anniversary celebration year.

The **Chairperson** underlined that the tragic events in Mali gives a wider dimension to what is still to achieve toward the protection, conservation and rehabilitation of the natural and cultural heritage of the humankind. She mentioned that by the solid appeal to the international community launched by the Members of the Committee on 3rd July last from Saint-Petersburg have strongly condemned the acts of destruction of mausoleums in the World Heritage property of Timbuktu and that, by this decision, the Committee called on the Director-General of UNESCO to create a special fund to help Mali in the conservation of its cultural heritage. She underlined that the international community as a whole has a duty to monitor the situation and must do everything possible to prevent such cases. On behalf of the Committee Members she conveyed once again the deepest solidarity to the government and people of Mali.

The **Chairperson** underlined that still much has to be done in regard to the considerable number of designated sites and that inscription of new properties is only the beginning of a long process of ensuring that these sites retain the Outstanding

Universal Value for which they have been inscribed. She reaffirmed that it is the obligation of all States parties that all decisions are implemented and to take in the future results from a collective process of transparent and confident consultations involving every single body of the Convention.

The **Chairperson** mentioned that if the ultimate goal of heritage conservation is to improve the quality of our collective existence, it must be ensured that the work of the Committee is business-focused and development-oriented and the measures for the preventive action are proactive.

The **Chairperson** expressed her sincere thanks to the members of the Committee for their trust during her office Chairperson as well as her deepest gratitude to the Government of the Russian Federation, to the city of Saint-Petersburg and to its Organizing Committee, to the Government of the Republic of Tatarstan, to the Russian National Commission for UNESCO, and to all young volunteers for the dedicated efforts in making this wonderful and touching experience possible.

Finally, the **Chairperson** requested the Members of the Committee to join in congratulating her successor, the new elected Chairperson of the Committee as well as the new Members of the Bureau. [The text of the closing speech of the Chairperson is attached in Annex IV]

The **Chairperson** closed the 36th session of the Committee.

**36th Session of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee of
UNESCO
Opening Plenary**

Address

by H.E. Ms Eleonora Valentinovna Mitrofanova

**Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
Permanent Delegate of the Russian Federation to UNESCO**

Tavrisheskiy Palace, Saint-Petersburg

24 June 2012

Mr Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation,
Mr Governor of Saint-Petersburg,
Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee,
Madam Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO,
Madam Director-General of UNESCO,
Mr Assistant Director-General for Culture,
Mr Director of the World Heritage Centre,
Your Excellencies,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is my pleasant task to welcome you to the work of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee!

I also have pleasure in welcoming all representatives from the non-member State Parties, the Advisory Bodies, the UNESCO Secretariat, the non-governmental organizations and the mass-media.

The presence of such a significant number of experts and observers on this tremendous occasion demonstrates explicitly the high international commitment and public concern for the safeguarding and promotion of our common heritage.

This is the first ever session of the World Heritage Committee taking place in the Russian Federation, the country well-known for its diversity of cultural and natural heritage providing a stunning setting for this meeting.

The marvelous historic city of Saint-Petersburg has generously offered to host this session.

It would not be an overstatement to say, by quoting the famous Russian historian Karamzin, that in the streets and walls of this city was completed the "History of the Russian Nation".

One of its most remarkable architectural landmarks – the Tavricheskiy Palace, named as such by Catherine the Great – has opened its doors for the duration of our work.

First used for royal festivities and receptions for high-level personalities and ambassadors, the Palace became later the place for major national and international exhibitions, and for sessions of the State Duma.

Further it successively housed the Provisional Government of Russia, the Petrograd Council of Workers' Deputies, and the Central Executive Committee of the All-Russian Soviets.

Now the Tavricheskiy Palace serves as Headquarters for the Interparliamentary Assembly of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Through the time and main events that changed the country and the world the Palace has been the stage for number of eminent leaders and personalities addressing the history.

It has kept their memory and legacy.

Today in these premises I have a singular feeling and am very happy to declare the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee open!

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We will go through an important and dense working agenda for the two weeks before us.

We will look into many critical and complex issues, above all the revision of the operational guidelines, the state of conservation of properties and the nominations to the World Heritage List.

Remaining fully respectful of our key strategic objectives, the famous 5 Cs – Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication and Communities, we will have to show our best for the maintaining the integrity, standards and technical aspects and management of Heritage and the Convention.

United in our diversity we will enrich the essence of one of the most effective legal instruments of conservation of the planet, ratified by 189 countries and covering 936 sites around the world.

Our decisions and actions will then have to further favor intercultural dialogue, promote appropriate educational approaches and advance a culture of peace in the service of the properties of outstanding universal value, which transcend time and borders.

As Chairperson of the Committee, I have the honour to lead this task, together with the Vice-Chairs, and I am in no doubt that the Committee will efficiently take all necessary measures to further ensure the rational and successful implementation of the Convention and reflection on its future.

Since its adoption in 1972, the Convention initiated a global response to the fundamental need to preserve the balance in the interaction between the conservation of nature and of cultural properties.

The celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the World Heritage Convention going through this year 2012 puts the special emphasis on the close linkage between the World Heritage and Sustainable Development, and the Role of Local Communities in this interface.

The diversity of cultures and ecosystems of the world represent the rich and vital heritage to pass on to our children.

Likewise, the action of local stakeholders, including the considerable role played by the indigenous people, are the frontline force for the future sustainability and well being of our societies.

Therefore, the community involvement, responsibility and empowerment are indispensable for successful management of heritage properties.

It has a potential to contribute substantially to the effective heritage protection and education, and to the sustainable management of tourism at World Heritage destinations.

The existing operational links between the World Heritage Convention and national heritage policies should obviously be enhanced, including through the consistent empowerment of the local communities.

This action will improve the lives of communities and ensure their participation in the process of international cooperation on heritage conservation in the name of sustainable development.

Unfortunately, for a number of countries this is a heavy task to deal with.

All through, we must keep in mind the indisputable reality that the outstanding universal value of the World Heritage sites is based on local values, local experiences and most importantly on local conservation efforts.

In one word, local and indigenous people are the key actors who make this global heritage possible!

Dear friends,

I would also like to remind us that we borrow our inheritance from the future generations.

Part of our responsibility is to help prepare the decision-makers of tomorrow, to take over responsibilities for the long-term conservation of heritage sites in our planet.

It is in consideration of this mission that I am happy to extend, on behalf of all of us, a particular welcome to the participants of the three parallel international youth events.

The 4th Iberoamerican World Heritage Youth Forum, the Commonwealth of Independent States and Baltic States International Youth Forum "Water and World Heritage", and the Youth Model of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee will all be reporting to us on their outcomes later during the session.

In this connection, I would gladly recall that the first International World Heritage Youth Forum organized in Russia took place in 2002 in Novgorod whose historic monuments and surroundings are also inscribed on the World Heritage List.

It was held in the context of the commemoration of the 30th Anniversary of the adoption of the Convention.

In my opinion, one of the Novgorod Youth Forum recommendations to declare November 16 as the International Day of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage remains relevant at the present time.

Distinguished colleagues,
Life is progress! It is a permanent course for the revival, rebirth, new things and innovation.

Despite the existing challenges which currently face many countries and the United Nations agencies, I am proud to note that the Russian Federation and UNESCO have managed to revitalize this meeting with the highest level of professionalism and dedication in pushing forward the noble mission of the World Heritage Convention.

That was done not without some original findings as it was the case with this new and fresh initiative to establish the Youth Model of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, taking place in Kazan, capital of the Republic of Tatarstan.

Also, the International Forum “NGOs in Support of the World Heritage Properties” was held for the first time on the margins of the Committee session. The final resolution of the Forum is now available for the Members of our Committee and for the observers.

The Committee session will also be held for the first time in public, with the specific media-coverage and the live transmission of debates through on-line and screening facilities.

In addition to our working agenda the present Committee session provides us with an extensive cultural program; the schedule of side events proposed to your attention is as intense as it is impressive.

It is filled with enriching visits and excursions to some remarkable places of the city of “white nights” and its suburbs.

It offers a memorable occasion to admire its beauty and greatness, and to meet the hospitality of its people.

Dear friends,
I sincerely hope that your stay and work on the banks of the Neva River will give to your minds the feeling of duty most productively done and will give to your hearts a collection of greatest emotions and impressions.

I wish each of you a constructive, fruitful and inspiring session!

Welcome again and thank you!

Address
by Ms Irina Bokova,
UNESCO Director-General, on the occasion of the opening of the 36th session
of the World Heritage Committee

Let us rejuvenate the World Heritage Convention

24 June 2012, St Petersburg, Russian Federation

Your Excellency, Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova, Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO and Chair of the World Heritage Committee,

Excellencies,

Distinguished Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Good afternoon, it is a pleasure to be here and to welcome you all.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Russian Federation authorities for hosting the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee.

This country adhered to the World Heritage Convention more than 20 years ago and now boasts 24 sites on the famous World Heritage List.

St Petersburg is one of them -- this "Venice of the North" embodies the values and the concepts underpinning the World Heritage Convention.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Russia's old capital, St Petersburg is a world capital today.

Our cooperation carries lessons useful for all.

The renovation of the Rubens collection gallery at the Hermitage Museum, with the support from the Government of Flanders, shows how World Heritage brings people together.

This year, we celebrate the 40th anniversary of the World heritage Convention.

For 40 years, World Heritage has sketched out a new map of the world - a map for peace, a network for cultural exchanges that takes in close to 1000 sites across the world.

Over 40 years, 189 States have ratified the *World Heritage Convention* – including recently Singapore – making it one of the most universally ratified legal instruments. For over 40 years, countries have come together around a simple but revolutionary idea – the idea there are places of “*outstanding universal value*” we must protect together.

This has not been easy – and there is no reason to believe it will become so in the future.

As we meet today, an ever greater number of sites are threatened.

In May, an earthquake in northern Italy struck Ferrara -- a vibrant city, one of the birthplaces of the European Renaissance.

Violence in Syria is threatening lives and destroying the memory of people engraved in the stones of World Heritage sites.

We all followed events in Mali, where I dispatched a technical mission to examine the World Heritage properties of Timbuktu and the Tomb of Askia threatened by armed groups.

On its 40th birthday, the *World Heritage Convention* faces these threats, and also a more fundamental challenge -- that of its credibility and its future.

In recent years, some developments within the inscription process have weakened the principles of scientific excellence and impartiality that are at the heart of the Convention.

It is my responsibility to ring the bell.

The credibility of the inscription process must be absolute at all stages of the proceedings -- from the work of the advisory bodies to the final decision by the States Parties, who hold the primary responsibility in this regard.

Today, criticism is growing, and I am deeply concerned.

I believe we stand at the crossroads, with a clear choice before us.

We can continue to gather, year after year, as accountants of the World Heritage label, adding more sites to the list, adhering less and less strictly to its criteria.

Or we can choose another path.

We can decide to act and think as visionaries, to rejuvenate the *World Heritage Convention* and confront the challenges of the 21st century.

The World Heritage is not a beauty contest.

It is not a race for the greatest number of sites.

The moment of glory that comes with the inscription of a site is short – it can only endure through the commitment by States, local authorities and local communities to conservation and safeguarding for the long run.

This is the mission of UNESCO – this must remain our first objective.

UNESCO must ensure the protection of sites against natural disasters and mass tourism, as well as the more insidious pressures of climate change.

How many sites on the list are neglected or pillaged, victims of time, poor planning and ill-conceived infrastructures?

Too often, UNESCO is alerted by civil society about imminent threats to World Heritage sites: construction projects are launched, prospection permits are delivered without proper consultation of UNESCO's World Heritage Center, or in violation of the 1972 Convention.

This is not acceptable.

50 years ago, UNESCO showed strong leadership and saved the temples in the desert of Egypt and Sudan.

We need the same leadership today.

We have all a role to play, and ultimate responsibility rests with Governments. This is why we are here.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

UNESCO was created with the aim to further peace and development.

The world's heritage stands at the heart of this vision, and we have to look at its role to bolster peace in the 21st century.

This heritage has built bridges and forged connections between continents that can now be materialized.

I have in mind inscription projects in numerous countries, which mobilize entire continents and bring together their people. They open the pathways to peace.

Many world heritage sites, already inscribed individually, can become part of a stronger network from now – in the Mediterranean basin, in sub-Saharan countries, in Asia, all the way along trade routes and further.

Global heritage is a map of the world's cultural interdependence.

It must be more than a list of national exceptional heritage.

World heritage can be an instrument of sustainable development in the 21st century. We have seen how restoration projects can unite a community and revive a local economy -- in Borobudur, for instance.

People the world over are deeply attached to their heritage -- ever more so today, as they search for a place in a globalizing world.

Heritage is a force for liberating creativity and for social innovation. It provides a wellspring of confidence for development.

Heritage provides levers to mobilize communities, starting with those who live on the sites.

Local communities are at the very heart of heritage, and I was at Rio at the beginning of the week to raise the profile of culture as a motor of sustainable development.

Together, we can ensure that access to culture for all, and the power of culture for development are an integral part of the post-2015 agenda.

For this, I need your support.

This will not be easy. We have to build up capacities of states and better prepare sites against gathering risks, through sustainable management plans.

The challenges may be great, but so are our resources.

This year, in Russia, Spain, in the Republic of Korea and Japan, we have seen many innovative solutions for conservation, involving civil society, local authorities and youth.

The 40th anniversary celebrations showcase the dynamism of local communities, and I know they will be at the center of the ceremonies in Kyoto in November.

World heritage is constantly renewing itself, and the recommendation on the conservation of historic urban landscapes, adopted unanimously last year, highlights this.

We have a strategic vision and plan of action for the next ten years – I have created an Emergency Fund to face the current financial situation, and states are also mobilizing support through direct financing and contributions.

I wish to thank once again the Russian Federation for the organization of this session, and I look to other states to follow this example.

The World Heritage Committee must also, for its part, examine critically its working methods, in order to reduce costs.

But the most important point – on this I insist – is that our greatest strength, our credibility, does not depend on any material or financial resource.

This credibility is the motor of UNESCO's influence, and it depends simply on the political will of states to preserve it in the long term.

As long as we remain faithful, together, to this ideal, I know that we can give a new youth to world heritage.

Thank you.

**36th Session of the
World Heritage Committee**

Opening Remarks

H.E. Ms Alissandra Cummins

Chairperson of the Executive Board

St. Petersburg, Russian Federation

24 June 2012

Madame Director-General of UNESCO,
Madame Mitrofanova, Ambassador of the Russian Federation to UNESCO and Chair
of the World Heritage Committee,
Excellencies, Ministers, Ambassadors,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you to observe the proceedings of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Government of the Russian Federation for hosting this session of the Committee in Saint Petersburg, and to especially applaud the tireless efforts of Her Excellency Madame Eleonora Mitrofanova in this regard.

Distinguished Delegates,

I note with interest that in addition to the 36 nominated sites, the Committee will also be considering a number of other items that will impact the operationalisation of the World Heritage Convention in the coming years, one of which concerns sustainable development. Taking cognizance of the conclusions of the UN Conference on Sustainable Development which ended just two days ago in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and considering that this year is the 40th anniversary of the World Heritage Convention, it is very timely indeed to underline the crucial contribution that World Heritage plays in promoting sustainable development. The outcome document of the Rio + 20 Conference highlights the inter-linkages of economic, social and environmental aspects in achieving holistic sustainable development; calling for the definition of a set of Sustainable Development Goals, or SDGs, that address and incorporate these three dimensions and their inter-linkages. These SDGs should be coherent with and integrated into the post-2015 development agenda of the UN system. Furthermore, we should be aware that inherent within this document is the recognition that the preservation of natural and cultural heritage is an important element for sustainable development. These conclusions are very much in line with the assertion that the conservation of heritage sites and the promotion of related intangible cultural heritage could provide a sound and sustainable platform for economic growth, social transformation and environmental protection. As such, it is important for UNESCO, with the support of the Committee and States Parties to the Convention, to ensure that development policies at global and national levels consider and invest in heritage assets; and to explore how the mechanisms of the

Convention could adapt to a rapidly changing world, and contribute to the realization of the SDGs.

On this topic, I have noted with great interest the initial outcomes from the various conferences and events which have taken place around the world thus far on the occasion of the 40th anniversary, especially the Consultative Meeting on World Heritage and Sustainable Development in Ouro Preto, Brazil; the Interregional Conference Connecting Europe and Africa in Røros, Norway on “Living with World Heritage”; and the South East European Conference on “Celebrating World Heritage and Sustainable Development: the Role of Local Communities” in Kotor, Montenegro. I look forward to hearing about the results of many other official or related events and celebratory activities in over 40 countries which are scheduled throughout 2012, culminating in Kyoto where, to conclude the 40th anniversary year, the World Heritage Centre and the Government of Japan will co-organize the final event from 6 to 8 November 2012, and where the year’s activities and conclusions drawn from the related regional and thematic events will be presented.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I would also like to take this opportunity to reiterate the importance of world heritage sites and the role of culture in the sustainable development of Small Island Developing States (SIDS). The Barbados Programme of Action states that:

“The survival of small island developing states is firmly rooted in their human resources and cultural heritage, which are their most significant assets; those assets are under severe stress and all efforts must be taken to ensure the central position of people in the process of sustainable development.”

It is clear that the inscription of heritage sites from SIDS is not only important to ensure a balanced, representative and credible World Heritage List, but also directly improves the sustainability of these communities and strengthens the protection of humankind’s most vulnerable common heritage from the destructive effects of global environmental change. I am heartened to see that there are two nominations from SIDS for this session, one from Bahrain and the other from Palau. If the Committee should approve these nominations, it would be Bahrain’s second inscription and Palau’s first inscription on the World Heritage List.

At this time, I would like to thank the Government of Japan for its steadfast support of capacity building efforts to conserve heritage sites and to enhance sustainable development in Pacific, African and Caribbean SIDS. Using the funds provided by Japan, UNESCO was able to organise, so far, a training course on the preparation of nomination dossiers, two capacity building workshops, and a community consultation session for the SIDS of these regions.

Distinguished Delegates,

During the 35th Session of the Committee in Paris last year, a discussion was held with States Parties on using the World Heritage mechanism to highlight the Slave Route and to sufficiently reflect the slave trade’s unquestionable effect on human development on the World Heritage List. This is an important step in breaking the silence that has long surrounded the slave trade, and as I had emphasized during that discussion, the slave trade, slavery and freedom are a fundamental part of several World Heritage narratives which must be discussed in the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value of these sites. Since then, an international working

group has been created to examine the proposal, and I would like to urge the Committee and States Parties, as well as the Secretariat, to ensure that the incorporation of this critical aspect of human history into the World Heritage narrative is moved forward quickly.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Another item of interest on your agenda is the progress made on the 10 pilot projects to explore creative approaches and new forms of guidance to States Parties in the primary stages of preparing a nomination. This is in line with the Committee's proposal during its 32nd Session in 2008 for an in-depth reflection on the Upstream Process, to find options for improving and strengthening the current nomination process. As a consequence, the nomination dossier for South Namib Erg in Namibia is the first of the 10 selected pilot projects to be evaluated and examined by the Committee during this session. In addition, assistance continues to be provided to the Philippines; Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro; Grenada, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; and Uruguay in the preparation of their respective dossiers. Speaking as someone who has participated in the preparation of Barbados' nomination dossier, it is evident that the improved upstream decision making process is particularly important for States Parties with limited resources, especially developing countries and SIDS, to successfully navigate the nomination process, and this will ultimately lead to increased diversity on the World Heritage List.

Finally, as Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO, I have followed the debates on budgetary constraints very closely, and I am very interested in your discussions on this matter, taking into account both the situation of the Regular Programme and the World Heritage Fund. I would also like to share with the Committee that the sustainable management of all UNESCO Conventions is of prime importance to the Executive Board. The Board has consistently stressed the need to ensure that adequate resources are allocated to operationalise the Conventions, and that scrupulous efforts be made to ensure that any new arrangements in this regard ensure complementarity rather than competition in their scope of operations as a whole. I am pleased to say that the Director-General has been very responsive in this regard.

In closing, I am especially pleased to see the progress made in finally opening up and making accessible the proceedings of the World Heritage Committee to people everywhere who could not attend, through live streaming of these events on the Internet. I do consider this mechanism to be one of the best means for capacity building and global comprehension about the meaning and intent of the World Heritage Convention.

I wish you all a successful meeting and fruitful deliberations.

Thank you.

Statement
by H.E. Ms Eleonora Valentinovna Mitrofanova
Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee
Permanent Delegate of the Russian Federation to UNESCO
Tavrisheskiy Palace, Saint-Petersburg
06 July 2012

Dear Colleagues and friends –
Members of the World Heritage Committee,
Representatives of States Parties,
Representatives of ICCROM, IUCN and ICCOMOS,
Representatives of the local communities and non-governmental organizations,
Members of the World Heritage Centre,

Two weeks have past; the Committee session is now going to the close.

Today I would like to note that our work was hard and intense, constructive and flexible, inspiring and historic, sad and solemn, enriching and cultural, youth-friendly and politically correct, in a spirit of solidarity, cooperation and tolerance. All of this, in the name of the noble mission of the World Heritage Convention.

Having the session held for the first time in Saint-Petersburg, the city with the unique destiny and history, in such a symbolic place as this Tavrishesky Palace, gave us a framework to reach the most appropriate decisions serving the interest of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List, which has to become more representative.

The tragic event in Mali, one of the Committee Member States, gives a wider dimension to what we still have to achieve in advancing our strong commitment to the protection, conservation and rehabilitation of the natural and cultural heritage of the humankind. I deeply regret this as do all members of the Committee.

By the solid Appeal to the international community launched from Saint-Petersburg on 3rd July last we, Members of the Committee, have strongly condemned the acts of destruction of mausoleums in the World Heritage property of Timbuktu. By our decision, we called on the Director-General of UNESCO to create a special fund to help Mali in the conservation of its cultural heritage. The international community as a whole has a duty to monitor the situation and must do everything possible to prevent such cases.

On behalf of the Committee Members, I would like once again to convey our deepest solidarity to the government and people of Mali, through their distinguished representatives and our fellow colleagues and friends from the Delegation.

Even in the current context of complex international crises and social tensions and with an increased demand for international assistance from different parts of the world we do not have other choice then to prevail in eradication of all kind of crimes against history, culture and diversity.

Ladies and Gentlemen, there is also still much more to be done in regard to the considerable number of designated sites and their potential that we have to reveal for the future. We have to constantly monitor the process that each World Heritage

property is credible as such and meaningful in terms of its management and protection.

This time the Committee has inscribed to the World Heritage List 26 properties – 5 natural, 1 mixed and 20 cultural – of which 4 are from unrepresented countries: Chad, Congo, Palau and Palestine. Let us express to these States Parties our warm congratulation and give an affectionate applause.

As we all know, the inscription of these new properties is only the beginning of a long process of ensuring that these sites retain the Outstanding Universal Value for which they have been inscribed. This is a heavy responsibility that weighs on the shoulders of the Committee as well as the relevant States Parties. All nominations were naturally done in strict compliance with the Rules of Procedures and the Operational Guidelines which are regulating the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

The Convention mainly being there to contribute to a better understanding of the cultural and natural diversity of the world, I now look forward to hearing about how effectively and timely our today decisions will be made operational which is a pledge of the successful conclusion of this 40th anniversary celebration year.

It is also our obligation that all decisions we will have to implement and to take in the future are resulting from a collective process of transparent and confident consultations involving every single body of the Convention. Among ourselves, among all States Parties, together with the Advisory Bodies and all relevant communities on the ground, we have to steadily continue to promote the role World Heritage plays in the sustainable development on our planet.

Local and indigenous people are always to be considered the key actors who make this global heritage possible. In this regard, I would like to bring your attention to the outcomes of the First International NGO Forum entitled *Protection of the World Heritage Properties* and which took place in Saint-Petersburg, on the margins of our session, from 22 to 24 June last. Its proposal to create global network of non-governmental actors called *World Heritage Watch* focusing its work on the protection of World Heritage Properties is in my view a very interesting finding.

Dear friends, if the ultimate goal of heritage conservation is to improve the quality of our collective existence, we must ensure that our work is business-focused and development-oriented and our measures for the preventive action are indeed proactive.

Our ultimate goal is also to transmit to future generations the diversity of our world. It is in consideration of this mission that the new initiative of the Youth Model of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee was organised in parallel to our meeting in Kazan, capital of the Republic of Tatarstan. Few days ago many of us could help prepare the decision-makers of tomorrow coming from each of the Committee Members` countries through the direct dialogue by special teleconference. This was an exciting and very interesting experience. Many of us, including myself, will have the pleasure to go to Kazan to continue to interact with our young counterparts on how to better take over collective responsibilities for the long-term conservation of heritage sites in our globe.

We consider that this format opens up great opportunities for the involvement of the young generation in activities aimed at conservation of natural, cultural and spiritual properties of our countries and peoples. We all hope that this initiative has a big future, because young people with their natural enthusiasm and understanding of progressive ideas, built on the experience and knowledge of their elder colleagues, will provide a fresh contribution to the work of our Committee.

Dear colleagues, in conclusion, I would like to express my sincere thanks to you all for your trust in me during my office of chairing the work of the Committee. With your confidence and recognition I have humbly exercised my duty over the last year and I can truly say it was a big challenge!

I cannot fail to draw attention to the great honour paid first and foremost to my country in appointing me to this important post. Following its first-time leadership of the UNESCO World Heritage Committee, the Russian Federation will continue to express its commitment to its work and to provide comprehensive support to its values and priorities. I am especially pleased that the World Heritage "label" has been associated with many exceptional Russian sites, and particularly those located in Saint-Petersburg.

It is natural that I express, on your behalf and on my own, our deepest gratitude to the Government of the Russian Federation, to the city of Saint-Petersburg and to its Organizing Committee, to the Government of the Republic of Tatarstan, to the Russian National Commission for UNESCO, and to all young volunteers for the dedicated efforts in making this wonderful and touching experience possible.

I am very grateful to all of you, my dear colleagues, for your incessant and concerted efforts, assistance and support in making a lot of progress for the future of the World Heritage. It was a pleasure for me working with you, the Committee Members, its Bureau, the States Parties and Advisory Bodies in the implementation of such a prestigious instrument as the World Heritage Convention. I also very much appreciated the continuous commitment of the Director-General of UNESCO, the Assistant Director-General for Culture, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his devoted staff, without to forget my Personal Assistant. Remaining objective right to the end means neither forgetting to mention the role of interpreters, technicians, media-centre, restaurant and all other related services.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I now shall relinquish my authority in order to join you in congratulating my successor to whom I shall gladly pass the wealth of experience I have gained in this post. I would like that we warmly welcome the newly elected Members of the Committee's Bureau – Cambodia as the Chair; Algeria, Colombia, Senegal, Thailand and Switzerland as Vice-Chairs, and Serbia as Reporter.

Now, my greatest hope is that each of you will return home with high level of motivation, energy and enthusiasm to apply the Saint-Petersburg experience in heritage conservation to your own communities at national and local levels. May the artistic programme of today closing evening leave in your hearts the vivid souvenir of the white nights city's exceptional heritage!

I wish us peace and success in all our future undertakings! And I solemnly declare the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO closed!

