



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

**World Heritage**

**38 COM**

**WHC-14/38.COM.INF.16**

**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-eighth session**

**Doha, Qatar  
15-25 June 2014**

**SUMMARY RECORDS**

**RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS**

## Table of content

### OPENING SESSION

1. Opening session
2. Admission of Observers
3. Adoption of the Agenda and the Timetable
  - 3A. Adoption of the Agenda
  - 3B. Adoption of the Timetable

### REPORTS

4. Report of the Rapporteur of the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (Phnom Penh, 2013)
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 the World Heritage Committee's decisions
  - 5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies
  - 5C. Follow-up to the Director-General's meeting on "The World Heritage Convention: Thinking Ahead" (UNESCO HQs, 2-3 October 2012)
  - 5D. *World Heritage Convention* and Sustainable Development
  - 5E. Report on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes
  - 5F. Follow-up to the Audit of the Working Methods of Cultural Conventions and to the Evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-Setting Work of the Culture Sector
6. Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity-building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage-related Category 2 Centres

### EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

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

## **ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

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 2014
  - 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List
  - 8C. Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
  - 8D. Clarifications of Property Boundaries and Areas by States Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory
  - 8E. Review and Approval of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

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

9. Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
  - 9A. Progress report on the Upstream Processes
  - 9B. Reflections on processes for mixed nominations
  - 9C. Recommendations of the evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative: Follow-up to Resolution 19 GA 9.

## **PERIODIC REPORTS**

10. Periodic Reports
  - 10A. Final report on the results of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for North America and Progress report for the Europe region
  - 10B. Progress report on Periodic Reporting in all other regions

## **FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

11. International Assistance
12. Presentation of the final accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2012-2013, the interim financial statement and the state of implementation of the 2014-2015 budget

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

13. Other Business

## **CLOSING SESSION**

14. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee (2015)
15. Provisional Agenda of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee (2015)
16. Adoption of Decisions
17. Closing ceremony

**SUNDAY, 15 JUNE 2014**  
**OPENING OF THE SESSION**  
**7 p.m – 8 p.m**

**ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION**

*Document: WHC-14/38.COM/INF.2*

An Opening Ceremony of the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee was organized at the Qatar National Convention Centre on Sunday 15 June 2014 in **Doha**, Qatar.

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

Algeria, Colombia, Croatia, Finland, Germany, India, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Lebanon, Malaysia, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Serbia, Turkey, Viet Nam.

The following **108 States Parties** to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

Andorra; Angola; Argentina; Armenia; Australia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Bahrain; Barbados; Belgium; Belize; Benin; Bolivia (Plurinational State of); Bosnia and Herzegovina; Botswana; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Bulgaria; Côte d'Ivoire; Cambodia; Cameroon; Canada; Chad; Chile; China; Congo; Cook Islands; Costa Rica; Cuba; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Egypt; Eritrea; Estonia; Ethiopia; France; Georgia; Greece; Guyana; Holy See; Hungary; Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Jordan; Kenya; Kuwait; Kyrgyzstan; Lesotho; Liberia; Libya; Lithuania; Macao; Madagascar; Mali; Mauritania; Mauritius; Mexico; Mongolia; Montenegro; Mozambique; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Netherlands; New Zealand; Niger; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Palau; Palestine; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Republic of Korea; Russian Federation; Saudi Arabia; Singapore; Slovakia; Solomon Islands; South Africa; Spain; Sri Lanka; Sudan; Sweden; Switzerland; Tanzania, (United Republic of) Thailand; The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Togo; Trinidad and Tobago; Tunisia; Uganda; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Yemen; Zambia; Zimbabwe.

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

Speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

- His Excellency Mr Abdullah Bin Nasser Bin Khalifa AL THANI, Prime Minister of Qatar
- Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa AL THANI, Chairperson of the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee
- His Excellency Mr HAO Ping, President of the General Conference of UNESCO
- His Excellency, Mr Mohamed Sameh AMR, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO
- Mr Francesco BANDARIN, UNESCO Assistant-Director General for Culture

A cultural performance and a reception followed.

**FIRST DAY – Monday, 16 June 2014**

**FIRST MEETING**

**9.00 a.m. –1 p.m.**

**Chairperson : Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al  
Thani (Qatar)**

**ITEM 2 ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS**

*Document: WHC-14/38.COM.2*  
*WHC-14/38.COM.INF.2*  
*Decision: 38 COM 2*

Before presenting Item 2 of the agenda, the **Chairperson** announced that the session would be live streamed, as per **Decision 35 COM 12 B** and that the meeting would also be open to accredited journalists. The Chairperson thanked Qatar, Spain and the Russian Federation for the financial support provided for Arabic, Spanish and Russian interpretation. She underlined that however no interpretation from others languages will be provided into Spanish or Russian. She pointed out that Arabic, Spanish and Russian speaking Delegations should indicate in their first intervention in which language (English or French) they would wish to be recorded.

The Draft Decision **38 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-14/38.COM/3A.Rev*  
*WHC-14/38.COM/INF.3A.Rev*  
*WHC-14/38.COM/3B.Rev*  
*Decisions: 38 COM 3A*  
*38 COM 3B*

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

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that the agenda adopted at the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee had been amended and that new

items were added, namely items 5F and 9C concerning the follow-up to the Audit of the Working Methods of Cultural Conventions and to the Evaluation of UNESCO's Standard-Setting Work of the Culture Sector. He also informed that the Bureau meetings would take place from 8.30 to 9 am, except on Friday 20 June where it was foreseen from 2.30 to 3 pm. The plenary session would be held from 9 am until 1 pm and from 3 pm until 7 pm and the final adoption of the Decisions report as well as the closing ceremony are foreseen for the 25 of June.

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

The Draft Decisions **38 COM 3A** and **38 COM 3B** were adopted.

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

#### **ITEM 4           REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 36<sup>th</sup> SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (ST PETERSBURG, 2012)**

*No document*

La **Présidente** informe les membres du Comité que Madame **Jasna ZRNOVIC** Rapporteur de la 37<sup>e</sup> session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Phnom Penh, 2013), n'a pu, malheureusement, être présente à Doha pour la 38<sup>e</sup> session du Comité mais que la présentation de son Rapport a pu être enregistrée. Elle invite les membres du Comité à regarder cette présentation. Dans son intervention enregistrée, Madame ZRNOVIC remercie les membres du Comité pour leur soutien apporté dans le cadre de sa fonction de Rapporteur de la 37<sup>e</sup> session et plus particulièrement Son Excellence Dr SOK AN, Président de la 37<sup>e</sup> session du Comité, et les autorités cambodgiennes pour leur chaleureux accueil. Le Rapporteur souligne la participation importante à la 37<sup>e</sup> session du Comité, suivie par plus de 1400 personnes provenant de 121 pays, au cours de laquelle 234 décisions ont été prises. Elle rappelle que le Comité a insisté sur le besoin urgent de s'occuper du patrimoine en danger, notamment au Mali et en République Centre Africaine. Mme Zrnovic note que le Comité a adopté la stratégie révisée pour le développement de partenariats avec le secteur privé. Elle souligne également que le Comité a également adopté le rapport concernant la célébration du 40<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de la Convention dont le thème principal portait sur le rôle des communautés locales dans le cadre de la stratégie de renforcement de capacités. Elle indique également que des décisions ont été prises sur les résultats d'actions menées par Centre du patrimoine mondial dans la poursuite des 5 objectifs stratégiques. Elle mentionne que le Comité a également amendé son Règlement intérieur au cours de cette session. Elle rappelle que 19 biens ont été inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, lors de la 37<sup>e</sup> session du Comité - dont 14 culturels et 5 naturels - notant que le Qatar et Fidji ont inscrit leurs premiers biens sur la Liste. En conclusion, Mme Zrnovic remercie les Etas Parties, le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les Organisations consultatives, les observateurs et les ONGs qui ont contribué au succès de la 37<sup>e</sup> session du Comité du patrimoine mondial.



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

**ITEM 12 PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2012-2013, THE INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND THE STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2014-2015 BUDGET [CONSTITUTION OF CONSULTATIVE BODY]**

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee established, by Decision 35 COM 12B, a standing consultative body for review of the Committee's biennial budget in conformity with Article 20 of the Rules of procedure, opened to all States parties that wishes to, including States non-members of the Committee. She also recalled that the Advisory bodies will have the possibility to attend this working group as Observers.

The Chairperson indicated that, as per Rule 20.2 of the Rules of procedure, it is of the responsibility of the group to elect its Chairperson. She informed that she was informed that some consultations already took place in this regard and that the Delegation of Germany would like to make a proposition.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed Ms Anne Huhtamäki, from the Delegation of Finland as Chairperson of the consultative body. The Delegation of **Senegal** supported this proposal.

The **Chairperson** announced that the Deputy Permanent Delegate of Finland, Ms Anne Huhtamäki, would chair the Budget Working Group.

The Delegation of **Finland** took the floor to thank for the election.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that the Budget Working Group would meet during lunch time from 2 to 3 pm. He also presented Document WHC-14/38.COM/12 which consisted of three parts: One part of the document contained the Financial Report relating to the World Heritage Fund for the biennium ending 31 December 2013, established by the UNESCO Bureau of Financial Management. The second part listed the consolidated table of allotments and expenditures for 2012-2013 activities and the interim Financial Report relating to the World Heritage Fund for the current biennium covering the period from 1 January 2014 to 31 March 2014. In the last part of the document, the table of modular costs for core activities under the World Heritage Fund could be found. The Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled that further to the 19<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly of the States Parties (2013), a subaccount of the World Heritage Fund was created to which States Parties could contribute on a voluntary basis. He thanked Finland, Monaco, Norway, Qatar and the Republic of Korea for their contributions. He also indicated that Turkey and the Finish National Commission to UNESCO had provided other kind of contributions to reinforce the World Heritage Centre. The Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled that the General Assembly also presented seven options for States Parties to contribute voluntary to the Fund. The first that responded to this request was Australia which doubled its contribution to the World Heritage Fund. He concluded that the Budget working group would have to look into the question of the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund as the workload increased with additional inscriptions each year and requirements on advisory missions.

## 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-14/38.COM/5A

*Decisions:* **38 COM 5A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the report of the World Heritage Centre and explained the five annexes: Annex 1 showed the implementation of the decisions adopted by the 37th World Heritage Committee. Annex 2 contained a list on World Heritage expert and other meetings as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session. A report on the authorization of the use of the World Heritage Emblem could be found under Annex 3. The summary of the expert meeting on the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape and World Heritage (Brazil, September 2013) was available under Annex 4. Annex 5 contained the inventory of World Heritage partnerships. The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed that the format of the document had changed and was aligned with the established programme of UNESCO and the expected results of 36C/5. For the current biennium 2014-2015, one expected results for the World Heritage Convention had been defined but in the previous biennium three expected results with performance indicators and benchmarks had been listed. These three expected results and benchmarks had been exceeded in all cases.

The number of States Parties to the Convention was increased with the State Party of Bahamas whose ratification would become effective on 15th of August. The number of States Parties stood at 191 with the exception of Somalia, South-Sudan, Tuvalu, Timor-Leste and Nauru that had not yet ratified the Convention. The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed that the table of activities was based on the five Cs: Credibility, Conservation, Capacity-building, Communication and Communities.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** welcomed the ratification of Barbados and underlined that the Caribbean region and Small Island Developing States (SIDS) were undertaking efforts in the implementation of the five Cs. The Delegation recalled that 2014 was the year of SIDS.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the report and expressed its concern on the sustainability of funding taking into account the reduction in financial and human resources at the Centre. The Delegation underlined that natural heritage experts were needed in the Centre to continue the work.

La Délégation du **Liban** évoque le devoir éthique du Comité par rapport aux partenaires privés et sans visibilité de façon à améliorer leur participation dans les actions pour les biens du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Philippines** stressed the importance of disaster risk reduction and prevention in cooperation with local communities and of promoting gender

empowerment in the implementation of the Convention and appealed that further work in these areas should be done.

The Delegation of **Croatia** thanked the Secretariat for the extensive report.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Centre for the excellent work and regretted that UNESCO's governing bodies did not take into account the decisions 37 COM 15.I and 37 COM 15.II on the staffing and the financial situation of the Centre. Concern was expressed on the human resource situation that had led to a loss especially of the natural experts at the Centre. The Delegation urged the Director General to ensure natural expertise in the Centre.

The Delegation of **India** appreciated the efforts of the Centre to meet all deadlines and welcomed the Memorandum of Understanding with Underwater Earth as India was focusing on underwater archaeology in the oceans.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked States Parties for their support and explained that the natural experts had moved away to other positions or were leaving the organization. He ensured that any vacant position would prioritize natural heritage experts. Furthermore, the close collaboration with the Natural Sciences Sector of UNESO would be continued. The Director of the World Heritage Centre informed that since the Secretariat's report was published, the organigram of the World Heritage Centre had been approved with 29 established posts out of which 19 were Professional posts and 10 General services staff position. Additionally 27 extra-budgetary funded posts existed, 23 of which were at a Professional grade and 4 at General services. He underlined that the resources of the Centre were enhanced in comparison to the previous budgets and that the focus lied on long-term strategic partnerships as short-term partnerships were too cost- and staff-intensive to manage. He thanked Qatar for its very generous contribution that would allow enhancing resilience and risk preparedness for World Heritage properties, responding to emergencies. It was underlined that gender issues were a global priority of UNESCO and that the participation of women should be enhanced. The Director of the World Heritage Centre concluded that synergies with other Conventions were strengthened through the Culture Conventions Liaison group within the Culture Sector.

The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked Qatar for its contribution and expressed concern regarding the staffing situation. The Delegation announced that Turkey would contribute as of 1 July through the secondment of two experts, of which one would be a woman.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked Turkey, the Republic of Korea, Japan, Singapore, Germany, Spain and Finland for their secondments.

The **Rapporteur** informed about the amendments received to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 5A** was adopted as amended.

## 5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/5B

*Decision:* **38 COM 5B**

**ICOMOS** informed that they had endeavoured to use the totality of their resources to provide the Committee with the best and most professional advice regarding the new nominations as well as issues concerning the conservation and protection of heritage properties. ICOMOS used professional expertise from all the pertinent disciplines and from cultural regions even though this meant a considerable drain of the scarce financial resources.

ICOMOS remained committed to increased and more direct downstream, midstream and upstream assistance to States Parties in the development of robust nominations, in addressing issues about the state of conservation, as well as in the development of tentative lists. The overarching objective of ICOMOS was the protection of all the heritage resources in every country and every cultural context.

ICOMOS welcomed the increasing concern for protecting the intangible cultural and social attributes that give life and meaning to the tangible elements in heritage sites and thanked the Government of Japan and ICOMOS Japan for providing scholarly forums for studying the convergence of tangible and intangible heritage. ICOMOS informed about the study on human rights and World Heritage undertaken thanks to the support of the Government of Norway and of ICOMOS Norway and underlined its commitment to work in cooperation with States Parties.

ICOMOS concluded that the Committee did not always agree with their advice and underlined this was a normal aspect when it happened in the spirit of mutual respect and professionalism.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** suggère à l'ICCROM de faire attention à la grande gamme d'universités et facultés récemment ouvertes dans différents pays africains, lesquelles se sont engagées dans la formation des compétences professionnelles. La Délégation rappelle la synergie qui doit exister entre les centres de formation universitaires de l'Afrique et l'ICCROM.

**ICCROM** reiterated its commitment to its role as focal point for capacity building activities within the Convention. The Capacity Building Programme begun in 2012 in partnership with IUCN, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre and achieved concrete results as reported under Item 6 of the agenda. ICCROM thanked the Government of Switzerland for its support over the past 5 years, informed about current discussions with the German Government and called upon States Parties to provide the means to develop more and better activities at both the regional and international levels.

The capacity building developed within the framework of the World Heritage Convention benefited not only World Heritage properties, but a wider range of cultural heritage. The ATHAR programme, an ICCROM capacity building programme in the Arab States region based in Sharjah, aimed at improving the conditions for conservation not only of World Heritage properties, but also for immovable, movable, and intangible heritage.

ICCROM informed about discussions with the other Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre on the Scoping Study for the Policy Guidelines and reminded the Committee members that the work on the scoping study could only be completed properly if the necessary extra-budgetary funds were committed as per Decision 37 COM 13.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its concern that nominations became increasingly complex and that this had an impact on the clarity and coherence of the nomination dossiers. Some nominations could benefit from a longer period of preparation of nomination dossiers. There should be a clearer definition of expectations to avoid a great number of deferrals.

**ICOMOS** agreed that the nominations became more complicated and underlined that the attention given by ICOMOS was proportionate. Serial nominations became more complex. ICOMOS gave recommendations on referral, deferral and inscription in a clear manner and had not changed the way of dealing with these decisions. ICOMOS tried to ensure that nominations did not entail problems that remained unsolved at the time of inscription and this concern drove the recommendations on referral and deferral.

The Delegation of **Qatar** appreciated the work of ICOMOS and stated that sometimes experts did not have the necessary expertise and the narrow specialization that was needed for the evaluation of a proposition. The Delegation appealed to take into consideration the possibility of selecting experts from the Arab region for Arab nominations.

**ICOMOS** affirmed that a lot of time was spent to choose the perfect and ideal expert and attention was paid to choose an expert from the region that would not only know about World Heritage but also about the cultural context in order to avoid imposing external models in regions where they did not belong.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its satisfaction that over the last two years, ICOMOS had used regional experts for Indian nominations. India was concerned if the comments of the regional experts were incorporated in the evaluation and about the working methods of ICOMOS when experts had the mandate not to look at the Outstanding Universal Value. As a result, the desktop review and the field report showed inconsistencies.

**ICOMOS** was aware of the apparent contradictions that existed. The determination of Outstanding Universal Value is complex and should not lie in the hands of one individual person. Experts gave their opinion on the Outstanding Universal Value and this was taken into consideration. But many other sources were consulted and the determination of the advice of ICOMOS on the nomination was more complex than one single mission.

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated the efforts to strengthen the cooperation with States Parties and suggested that ICOMOS used the expertise of Member States to further improve the functioning of ICOMOS.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** commented that the Outstanding Universal Value was sometimes changing in developing countries and should not contradict

local interests such as economic and political growth. It concluded that in Indonesia, the economic and political growth was a challenge for heritage.

**ICOMOS** underlined that heritage should be at the service of communities. Therefore heritage was an important instrument in social and economic development. This duty as advisors in the spirit of the Convention were to ensure that development did not occur at the expense of the Outstanding Universal Value of heritage. Values fluctuated in time and space but the Outstanding Universal Value was defined at the time of inscription.

The Delegation of **Iraq** expressed its concern about the clarity of methodologies used by ICOMOS. In this sense, it stressed that even though the evaluators from ICOMOS should envisage a deeper dialogue with the State Party, their identities were veiled for unknown purposes. The Delegation insisted that more openness and transparency would improve considerably the evaluation and advisory work of ICOMOS.

**ICOMOS** informed that it worked hard over the past years to achieve greater transparency, but this could not imply a complete sharing of information. Some people would hesitate to express their true opinion if their name was made public because it could harm their position so certain things need to be kept confidential. ICOMOS was willing to share the recommendations of the panel and the expressions of opinions in the final report. Greater and direct dialogue and openness with the States Parties was welcomed but ICOMOS had also to abide to certain dates that were fixed by the Committee. ICOMOS underlined that it gave an advice and that the decision was taken by the Committee that could always disagree with this advice.

**IUCN** underlined in its report that World Heritage was of utmost importance to their work. World Heritage Sites had an iconic status as the beacons of conservation globally. This year had been significant with the launching of the new IUCN World Heritage Outlook website, where the conservation prospects for 222 World Heritage Sites would be assessed for the first time. IUCN had launched a major independent evaluation of its work on World Heritage that was publicly available and that showed that the Convention had the potential to contribute more to global conservation but needed to change to be fully effective. Firstly, the Convention needed to retain its credibility, through an irreproachable technical quality. The relationship with States Parties on nominations and monitoring issues was strong and collegiate and there was a need to get beyond general agreement on principles. IUCN invited a small group of interested States Parties to IUCN Headquarters to discuss this issue. The Upstream Process should be formalized in the Operational Guidelines and the position of civil society in the Convention should be strengthened.

IUCN underlined that the workload associated with the World Heritage Convention was unsustainable and was the worst encountered in 16 years of evaluating IUCN programmes. IUCN believed that the root cause of this issue was the annual rhythm of the World Heritage Committee as this left no time for States Parties to follow-up on decisions of the Committee, no time for dialogue in the evaluation process, inadequate time to prepare and read Committee papers. And it resulted in an unacceptable human cost on the professional staff of the Convention. IUCN considered that the World Heritage Convention would be much more effective if this Committee met only once every 2 years. Much more needs were to be done on the relationship between World Heritage and development. The leadership of the

Convention on the 'no-go' commitment for extractive industry in World Heritage Sites needed to be maintained as well as adequate measures to secure positive results for people in and around WH sites. All of these points would be raised at the IUCN World Parks Congress, to be held in Sydney in November 2014.

The Delegation of **Croatia** underlined that it represented a problem to all experts to handle the heavy workload as the number of Nominations and Conservation reports was significant.

The Delegation of **Philippines** welcomed paragraph 43 of IUCN report on complementing its advisory role to the World Heritage Committee with proactive programmes to support the States Parties. It underlined the importance of strengthening IUCN regional capacity and working on the benefits of World Heritage Sites for local and indigenous people. This proactive approach should be further cultivated.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the Conservation outlook assessment could help to achieve a broader based input on the implementation of the Convention and asked how information received would reach the Committee Members. The Delegation stated that the conservation outlook assessment could raise awareness on World Heritage properties through communication tools and could highlight success and benefits of sites. Germany was funding a project to better assess benefits as this was linked to development and local communities.

**IUCN** stated that in times of budgetary constraints all had the responsibility to look for additional sources of funding as it had been done for the funding of the conservation outlook assessment. IUCN looked into all sites including the ones that needed help. Regarding the relation of the conservation outlook assessment and the statutory processes on reactive monitoring, IUCN would keep a clear separation. New relevant information would be transmitted to States Parties.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thanks Qatar for the organization of the Committee and concurred with Germany concerning the importance given to the Conservation outlook assessment made by Germany. It affirms that the current development of State of conservation reports and nominations are increasingly demanding experts to visit and explore each of the cases and sites that are assessed. The Delegation also recognized the current financial constraints that may hinder the improvement of this work.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated IUCN for the launching of its website and asked which were the existent tools and methods to ensure a sustainable development in World Heritage Sites.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked the Committee members, Qatar authorities and the Advisory Bodies for their excellent work. It acknowledged the constraint of resources, and hoped that the challenges could be overcome by the diverse opportunities that are also presented.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated IUCN on the launch of its website. It inquired measures and tools IUCN had undertaken to ensure contribution of World Heritage conservation to sustainable development.

**IUCN** acknowledged the obscurity of policy framework as well as approaches to link World Heritage protection with sustainable development goals. Therefore, it looked forward to the development of a clear policy document, which will be produced through the planned workshop.

Furthermore, IUCN proposed some key areas to focus on in the integration of cultural heritage conservation with sustainable development goals; firstly, to connect the work of World Heritage sites to a wider landscape by taking into account the role of buffer zone and its connectivity with the surrounding; and secondly, to learn from UNDP's successful program where small grants support were allocated to community's initiatives working towards conservation of natural heritage. IUCN reiterated its commitment to assist States Parties on this issue through dialogues, especially when the policy document has been developed.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note les questions cruciales concernant le dialogue, les ressources humaines, la charge de travail et autre. Elle invite à une réflexion globale pour examiner ces questions qui portent sur la crédibilité du Comité, soulignant que cette réflexion prendra son temps. La Délégation soutient la proposition de l'UICN de réorganiser le calendrier du travail du Comité et souligne l'importance de le réorienter vers les questions de conservation.

**IUCN** underscored its ongoing involvement through various opportunities to align heritage conservation efforts with sustainable development goals. It looked forward to working together with States Parties to further come up with ideas on how to link World Heritage sites with sustainable development goals, in particular from the natural heritage point of view.

La Délégation de **Vietnam** remercie l'UICN pour le rapport et souligne l'importance du processus en amont, qui a permis au pays de préparer un dossier de nomination de bonne qualité et ainsi soutient l'inclusion du processus en amont dans les *Orientations (devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial)*.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose, en vue de la charge importante du travail des organisations consultatives, ainsi que des délais très courts après la publication des évaluations des propositions des nominations, de communiquer les décisions des panels des organisations consultatives dès possible aux Etats parties, même avant la publication des décisions qui seront difficiles à reverser, afin de permettre un dialogue entre Etats partie et organisations consultatives.

L'**IUCN** remercie la Délégation d'Algérie pour cette invitation au dialogue plus approfondie.

The Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** thanked the Qatar authorities for hosting the meeting as well as the Advisory Bodies for their work. The Observer Delegation enquired how evaluation missions for proposed cultural landscape nominations are being organized as they should involve both cultural and natural assessments.

**IUCN** commented that it would depend on the nature of the nomination. It required above all a coordination with ICOMOS. IUCN involvement becomes stronger when the site involves a designated protected area. Bearing in mind that cultural landscapes are proposed under cultural criteria, IUCN usually assists ICOMOS from



the environmental point of view and it is ICOMOS who provides the final evaluation to the Committee. IUCN also noted that a separate item on the Committee agenda was dedicated to the evaluation process for mixed World Heritage nominations and also includes reference to cultural landscapes.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** congratulated IUCN on its report. It questioned the independency of evaluation that could affect the credibility and integration with sustainable development goals. Furthermore, it requested clarification in terms of time constraint for biennial monitoring evaluation and the difficulties IUCN faced.

**IUCN** assured its independency in undertaking missions for assessing both the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and new nominations, reaffirming the provision of adequate expertise to each particular case. In terms of difficulties, IUCN expressed the limited timeframe available for the elaboration of recommendations to States Parties, holding subsequent dialogue, as well as carrying out the upstream process, assessing new nominations, and undertaking evaluation. IUCN further informed the States Parties that it provided practical recommendations to the numerous multilateral Conventions in the field of nature.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 5B** was adopted.

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

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/5C

*Decision:* **38 COM 5C**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled the request from the Director-General of UNESCO to improve dialogue, communication and transparency of work under this Convention. With regards to Tentative List and new nominations, the Director of the World Heritage Centre stressed the importance of upstream process to reduce difficulties during the nomination phase. Experimental projects in ten sites have been conducted as pilot projects, and their success has resulted in the request to extend it to many more sites. In addition, the mentoring approach was also applied in the new nomination process, in particular in the regions of Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean. Constraints of resources and timeline for evaluation of new nominations were matters that needed to be considered, however, the Director of the World Heritage Centre assured a full commitment in this process. Timeline issues will also be discussed on a separate agenda in more detail.

Moreover, the Director of the World Heritage Centre informed about the increased dialogue as well as Advisory Missions that have taken place to enhance the state of conservation of World Heritage properties. Online information system for the state of conservation reports under the World Heritage Centre website has been setup. The Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled Paragraph 174 of the *Operational Guidelines* which stipulates prior fact checking with the States Parties before the inclusion of such information in the state of conservation reports.

In terms of capacity building, a number of efforts have been and continue to be made. Category 2 Centres have been working very closely with ICCROM in achieving the goals of capacity building. A number of capacity building meetings through orientation sessions have been held before the Committee meeting. He reminded the role of the Committee members in monitoring the governance. The Director of the World Heritage Centre also stressed the need to reduce the divergence between the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies' and the Committee's decisions.

The Delegation of **Philippines** highly appreciated this update as a follow up to the recommendation made during last year's Committee meeting. It recognized the importance of having training sessions, education and Upstream process, and welcomed more efforts made in this regard. The Delegation proposed to have this issue reported regularly during each Committee meeting in order to monitor progress, therefore it proposed amendments to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** remercie le Centre patrimoine mondial pour ce rapport intéressant qui passe en revue les défis majeurs de la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Elle note le grand nombre de problèmes d'état de conservation dans les pays en développement, notamment à cause de leurs rythmes d'aménagement accéléré. Parallèlement les pays développés sont en train d'inscrire les sites de caractère industriel qui témoigne d'une phase de développement accrue. La Délégation demande ainsi aux organisations consultatives de tenir en compte cette particularité dans leurs travaux.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked the Qatar authorities for its hospitality and appreciated the ongoing efforts of the Secretariat on this issue. It further supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Philippines.

On behalf of the Advisory Bodies, **IUCN** stressed the importance of the upstream process. Furthermore, it informed that it has completed a Guideline for Environmental Impact Assessments for use by State Parties and stressed the importance of Environmental Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment process. IUCN also proposed to take into account the audit results by UNESCO and the need to harmonize the plan of actions according to these evaluations. Dialogue has been taken forward in large meetings during Information Meetings, however, it suggested a better way forward to organize smaller consultation meetings. Lastly, a range of issues would also need to be considered by the budget working group.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Advisory Bodies for its efforts to assist the State Parties in their future endeavors.

The Delegation of **Qatar** thanked the Secretariat for its thorough report and enquired in what way the Danger listing could be considered a positive mechanism.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted the benefits for the sub-region of the Caribbean derived from the Upstream process and supported the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* to include this matter.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** appreciated the supportive comments and suggestions from the Committee members. He took note of the proposal by the Delegation of the Philippines for the regular reporting and explained in response to

the question raised by the Delegation of Qatar the number of support mechanisms that can be put in place by the international community when a property is put on the List of World Heritage in Danger and its benefits.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 5C** was adopted as amended.

## **5D. WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/5D  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.5D

*Decision:* **38 COM 5D**

The **Secretariat** reported on progress made in the implementation of Decision 36.COM.5C on the relation of World Heritage Convention with Sustainable Development, notably on the elaboration of a draft policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the Convention. It noted that a group of experts had been constituted, but that their work was hampered by the lack of resources. The methodological approach taken in the elaboration of the draft policy was presented, highlighting how this was based on the wider UN conceptual framework as emerged following the Rio + 20 Conference.

The Secretariat noted that at the moment each of the experts was working on one particular dimension of sustainable development, with the task of identifying the principles that would need to be mainstreamed within the processes of the Convention to integrate that specific concern. Should resources be available, the Secretariat stated that the draft policy would include also suggestions for the possible implication of the above principles in the *Operational Guidelines*, as well as for capacity building initiatives aimed at creating an enabling environment for the policy to be implemented.

The Secretariat also informed the Committee of its intention to organize an expert workshop, in collaboration with BTU Cottbus University, in October 2014, with the purpose to advance in the drafting of the policy. An online communication platform would be organized following the workshop to allow for more discussion. Depending on the availability of resources, the Secretariat planned to present the draft policy document to the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2015.

**ICOMOS** presented a statement on behalf of the Advisory Bodies. Noting the difficulties in balancing conservation and development, ICOMOS underlined the need to protect World Heritage properties from activities that often neglect conservation practices, rights of local communities, as well as sustainable principles. ICOMOS reiterated the Advisory Bodies' commitment on this issue and supported the plan to develop a robust policy document, for consideration during the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted that a concern for Indigenous Peoples had been included in the proposed methodology as a dimension of sustainable development, but wondered why no reference was made to local communities. It proposed to amend the Draft Decision on Paragraph 7 to include this.

The **Secretariat** clarified that a concern for local communities was implicitly included in all of the dimensions, from social inclusive development to gender equality, human rights and inclusive economic development, and that this was why no specific dimension was proposed for local communities. Indigenous Peoples, on the other hand, had often specific concerns that were not necessarily addressed by a generic reference to local communities, and this was why a dimension was proposed on this issue. However, the Secretariat stated that it would welcome the addition of a specific reference to local community, to reinforce further the policy in this regard.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Qatar authorities for their hospitality. Noting the importance of culture for sustainable development, the Delegation recalled that a number of seminars had been organized in its country on the links between culture and the “territories”, and expressed its interest in contributing this experience to the efforts underway. The Delegation also stressed how guidelines should have been developed to clarify the relationship between science and culture.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its wish to be involved in the upcoming workshop in Cottbus and offered its support to the Delegation of Germany for the successful implementation of the event.

La Délégation de **Viet Nam** félicite le Secrétariat sur la qualité de travail fourni dans les conditions difficiles et note que la Convention renforce la conscience vers le développement durable. La Délégation se déclare prête à soutenir ce dossier important.

The Delegation of **Philippines** enquired whether there could have been a readjustment of the budget of the World Heritage Fund to support this important activity which apparently suffered from a lack of resources.

The **Secretariat** responded that decisions on how to allocate the resources available within the World Heritage Fund was a prerogative of the Committee, but that the reason why no resources had been allocated to this particular initiative until now was that there were many competing demands and insufficient resources to address them all.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** enquired whether the Secretariat would develop an instrument to assess the progress made in the implementation of the future policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective in the processes of the World Heritage Convention.

The **Secretariat** responded that it would be a good idea to identify indicators that could measure the extent to which the Convention integrated a sustainable development perspective, and this would have been in line with the larger effort by UNESCO to integrate culture within the targets and indicators of future sustainable development goals within the post-2015 development agenda.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the Committee members about the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme which had sustainable development as one of its main pillars, as well as about the Biodiversity Convention, which focused on conservation, sustainable uses and access and benefits sharing. The Delegation

hoped that the frameworks developed within these environmental agreements would be taken into account in the draft of the policy which was being developed.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that the approaches in use by other mechanisms for conservation had been taken on board and that their representatives had been invited to contribute to past meetings on the subject of World Heritage and Sustainable Development.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 5D** was adopted as amended.

## **5E. REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE THEMATIC PROGRAMMES**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/5E

*Decision:* **38 COM 5E**

The **Secretariat** reported progress on each of the World Heritage Thematic Programmes. Strategic approaches have been taken to address the constraints of resources and make use of extra budgetary funding.

With regards to World Heritage Cities Programme, critical activities have been executed focusing on the strengthening of urban conservation, taking into account recommendations from the Historic Urban Landscape framework. This approach is planned to be integrated in the *Operational Guidelines*. Other commendable efforts include providing assistance to urban conservation, nomination files, identification of urban heritage as well as capacity building.

For what concerns World Heritage Forest Programme, the Convention has become an important instrument and has succeeded in providing protection to the world's most outstanding forests. Up to 20 World Heritage forest properties have been inscribed since its first adoption, with the total number now reaches 107 World Heritage forest properties. However, given the limited resources, the Secretariat recommended to terminate this programme.

Regarding World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme, main achievements referred to the follow up of the recommendations made during the Earthen Architecture Colloquium, as well as the establishment of network of experts in Earthen Architecture conservation. The Secretariat also recalled the upcoming workshop on Earthen Architecture which will take place in Lyon in July 2016.

Concerning Sustainable Tourism Programme, significant achievements have been made, with some of the work include networking, communication and outreach initiatives. Workshops on South-South cooperation have also been organized. A special issue of the World Heritage Review magazine has also been produced to support information exchange method.

With regards to Small Island Developing States (SIDS) Programme, 15 workshops and meetings have been organized over the past year in all SIDS regions with over 300 participants. The initiatives were held to support capacity building efforts.

Following the establishment of 2014 as the International Year of the SIDS, the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on SIDS will be organized in September 2014 in Apia.

With regards to World Heritage Marine Programme, progress included the establishment of network of experts that connects up to 46 sites. The programme also plans to develop a communication strategy for a considerable outreach.

For what concerns World Heritage Thematic Programmes on Prehistory and World Heritage Convention (commonly referred to as HEADS), major results have been achieved during 2009-2013 in raising awareness on the importance of human evolution and the origin of cultural diversity, by establishing links between science and culture. 17 international meetings have been organized and succeeded in creating a prototype of Rock Art World Archive (RAWA). Publications and awareness raising initiatives have also been developed through World Heritage papers. Follow up on the programme will be managed under the framework of extra budgetary projects through funding secured by UNESCO Mexico Office in coordination with Category 2 Centre on Rock Art in Spain.

For Astronomy and World Heritage Initiative, progress was made in the development of a science and culture network among designated focal points. Assistance could be provided to State Parties wishing to nominate a site in this area by the network of experts.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the report and outlined the benefit of thematic programmes in highlighting new underrepresented categories. Furthermore, it specifically commended the forest programme which is uniquely positioned and has made a noteworthy contribution. While noting the limited resources, the Delegation would like to inquire how this programme could continue and how the links can be maintained. Lastly, the Delegation proposed a similar structure in the upcoming reports for these programmes for better comprehension.

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed the progress made on the Tourism programme. It conveyed its disappointment as its successful contribution was not explicitly mentioned in the Draft Decision and proposed that an additional paragraph should be included. The Delegation highlighted also the importance of Forest programme, was not in favor of phasing it out and that limited discussion took place with the State Parties on this matter.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** souligne que la synergie des programmes est essentielle pour une question si complexe comme le changement climatique. Non seulement entre les différents programmes mais aussi entre les différentes institutions internationales. En particulier, la Délégation appui le Programme Forêt du Patrimoine mondial et demande plus d'information concernant les résultats atteint dans le cadre de ce programme.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its appreciation for the excellent report. It fully supported the Delegations of Finland and Germany not to phase out the Forest Programme. Furthermore, it underlined the importance of the World Heritage Cites Programme, pointing out the importance of Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) approach for city urban planning, conservation, and sustainable development. The Delegation underscored its ongoing commitment on this subject by hosting a conference on World Heritage Cities few years back. Sustainable Tourism

Programme was also stressed especially in its relation to the World Heritage properties facing tourism pressures. It also noted that the results of the activities dedicated to World Heritage of Portuguese origins have been published online.

The Delegation of **Philippines** acknowledged the Forest Programme and Climate Change at the World Heritage properties, and enquired whether a new climate change adaptation programme could be introduced.

The Delegation of **Qatar** enquired into the possibility to extend the activities of the Earthen architecture programme into the Arab states region and more specifically the sub-region of the Middle East.

The Delegation of **Turkey** further supported Finland and Germany on the continuation of these thematic programmes noting their positive contribution. Turkey offered to host the next meeting of the HEADs programme in Catahulik.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** pointed out the importance of projects in SIDS, one of which is the Slave Route project, and requested that the result of the SIDS programme should be better reflected in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Mexique** (Observateur) remercie le Secrétariat pour sa coopération dans la mise-en-œuvre du programme thématique de HEADS y compris pendant la rencontre de Puebla et apprécie la bonne coopération avec le bureau de l'UNESCO à Mexico.

The Delegation of **India** commented on the World Heritage City Programme due to its relevance to many World Heritage properties. Substantial work had been done by UNESCO field offices especially in the field of Historic Urban Landscape, which should also be taken note of in the Draft Decision.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** enquired into the link between the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and the economic development, and if there exist a programme on that.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled the initial idea behind thematic programmes was to address gaps in the World Heritage list with the aim to assist with the nomination process, and to initiate capacity building programmes to help with the conservation and the management of such properties. Given the resource constraints, not all of the thematic programmes could be continued. Therefore a sunset clause had been proposed by the Secretariat and States Parties were invited to continue the work. The Director further underlined that closing down a thematic programme would not mean that the work stopped entirely. The Secretariat stood ready to continue to assist with the works if called upon.

The Director further noted that work on the theme of Climate Change and World Heritage had started in 2007. A number of activities have been initiated, including the creation of guideline on adaptation planning (climate change adaptation tool kit), development of policy document on how to deal with the impact of climate change on World Heritage properties, publications of case study for information exchange, and so on. Therefore, there may not be a need to start another programme. He fully supported Jamaica's remarks on the importance of SIDS issues, and thanked the Delegation for the reminder.

In response to the Delegation of India on the collaboration between Headquarters and the Field offices, the **Secretariat** informed that the Centre has been working continuously with UNESCO Field Office in New Delhi and will continue to do so.

The **Secretariat** also reminded that the relationship between World Heritage and development had been discussed under Agenda Item 5D on Sustainable Development, and more discussions on development pressures on World Heritage properties will follow under Agenda Items 7A and 7B on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties.

The **Secretariat** further informed that it will continue to seek funding and opportunity to assist with the Earthen Architecture programme in the Arab region and noted that case studies from this region were included in the publication of the last meeting. She also welcomed the comment and support from Germany and Portugal on the Tourism programme, as well as from Turkey on HEADS programme.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur for new amendments before adoption of the decision.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 5E** was adopted as amended.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm*



**FIRST DAY – Monday, 16 June 2014**

**SECOND MEETING**

**3 p.m. –7 p.m.**

**Chairperson : Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al  
Thani (Qatar)**

**5F. FOLLOW-UP TO THE AUDIT OF THE WORKING METHODS OF CULTURAL  
CONVENTIONS AND TO THE EVALUATION OF UNESCO'S STANDARD-  
SETTING WORK OF THE CULTURE SECTOR**

*Document: WHC-14/38.COM/5F and WHC-14/38.COM/INF.5F*  
*Decisions: 38 COM 5F.1 and 38 COM 5F.2*

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine document 5F.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the document consists of two parts. It summarized the content of the Audit recommendations (Part I of the document) and the follow up measures already put in place by the Secretariat. It then presented the evaluation of the 1972 Convention (Part II of the document). He mentioned the creation of a subaccount to be filled by voluntary contributions to help finance human resources at the Secretariat. In this regard, special thanks were given to the State Parties of Finland and Monaco for their generous contributions to the subaccount. He also mentioned the recommendation to reduce the frequency, when feasible, of the duration and agenda of the World Heritage Committee sessions.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the progress that has been made to create synergies with other conventions especially through the creation of a Convention Common Services (CCS) Unit, as a part of the restructuring process of the Culture Sector of UNESCO. Regarding the evaluation of the 1972 Convention by the UNESCO's Internal Oversight Service (IOS) he explained that 15 countries were selected as case studies based on a number of criteria in order to analyze how the Convention was adapted in their legal frame work. He also outlined briefly some proposals for the consideration of the Committee.

- Convention' Secretariats could formulate proposals to the Governing Bodies of UNESCO and/or of the Convention.
- Convention' Secretariats, where applicable, could explore more efficient ways of the obtaining advisory services and consider potential chargeback mechanisms to the nominating State Parties and/or earmarked fund and formulate proposals to the respective Governing Bodies for possible economies and financial sustainability in the advisory service fees.
- The Culture Sector could expand its common logistics unit to include additional services that add value and provide cost-effective solutions to support the work of all Convention secretariats. The platform can function under the guidance of the Cultural Convention Liaison Group.

- The Culture sector to formulate, in consultation with BSP/CFS, a coordinated fund raising strategy for all Conventions secretariats and form a common resource mobilization team.

The **Chairperson** opened the debate.

La Délégation du **Portugal** souligne l'importance de l'évaluation, qui offre une vision poussée de l'impact de la Convention au niveau national. Il observe, en ce qui concerne l'impact des inscriptions sur la législation, que les plans de gestion sont mis en place et les plans de sauvegarde appliqués. Elle observe également que la collaboration entre organisations consultatives et autorités nationales portugaises constitue une bonne pratique ; en effet, la Liste indicative a été établie avec la collaboration de l'ICOMOS Portugal.

In response to the question of the Delegation of Finland, he **Secretariat** clarified that it was up to the Committee to decide if they should meet annually or to rationalize the duration of the session.

The Delegation of **Qatar** pointed out that given the number of nominations and items on the agenda it is difficult to reduce the number of days of the Committee sessions.

The observer Delegation of **Mexico** encouraged the Secretariat to further strengthen cultural conventions linkage to constitute an holistic corpus.

**The Assistant Director-General for Culture** expressed that beyond the normal legislative autonomy of each Convention, synergies have also been developed between the Secretariats and underlined the role of the Common Services Unit in this regard.

Draft Decisions **38 COM 5F.1** and **38 COM 5F.2** were adopted.

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

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

*Document: WHC-14/38.COM/6*

*Decision: 38 COM 6*

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to examine item 6 of the Agenda.

The representative of **ICCROM** presented the progress made in the implementation of the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, which was approved by the World Heritage Committee in 2011.

He indicated that regional strategies have been developed in close collaboration with category II centres, such as WHITR-AP and ARC-WH. Concerning activities to strengthen the capacities of the Advisory Bodies and extend their regional diversity, 7 workshops had taken place with 75 persons having been trained, including by taking part in missions as "second evaluators". He added that four resource manuals had

been translated into different languages and made available for experts around the world.

**IUCN** highlighted the importance of working in synergy with category II centres and mentioned a programme on natural heritage which had been launched in cooperation with ARC-WH. He also informed the Committee of a number of other capacity building initiatives at the international level, conducted in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, thanks to the support of the Swiss government.

The Secretariat presented the part of the document related to category 2 centres and noted that detailed information concerning the activities of these institutions could be found on the web site of the World Heritage Centre. Mention was made of the new category 2 centres to be established in India, as well as of the evaluations underway for the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF) and the World Heritage Institute for Training and Research in Asia and the Pacific (WHITRAP). A new integrated and comprehensive strategy for category 2 centres was adopted by the UNESCO General Conference foreseeing a review after six years and conditioning the renewal of their agreement to a decision by the Executive Board. The Secretariat also reported on the outcomes of a coordination meeting among category 2 centres related to World Heritage, which had taken place in Shanghai (China), hosted by WHITRAP.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** requested ICCROM to provide information on capacity building strategies in the Latin American and the Caribbean region noting that this was not mentioned during the presentation of ICCROM and was neither mentioned in the working document. Clarifications were also asked on how new training courses were conceived and developed, in relation to the needs identified.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that it was ready to put its knowledge at the disposal of all, as mentioned during the morning session, and expressed its readiness to assist, for example, in translating key documents and resource manuals into Portuguese.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recognized the efforts of UNESCO and other organizations to develop and implement capacity building, notably in Latin America and the Caribbean region, and encouraged UNESCO Chairs around the world to be more closely involved in this process and contribute, especially in relation to building capacities for natural heritage conservation and management.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stated that the recognition of best practices was an excellent initiative, and requested the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to continue in this direction. In this regard, the Delegation stated that it would be happy to consider a specific proposal, including a detailed budget.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** pointed out that capacity building was essential and welcomed the initiative to translate resource manuals. The Delegation thanked the States parties that had supported this important work, despite the budgetary constraints. It also expressed support for the best-practice recognition programme, recalling that the World Heritage city of Vigan, in the Philippines, had been recognized in 2012, in this category.

The Delegation of **Serbia** noted that a category 2 centre related to water management, climate change and sustainable development had been just established in its country.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** acknowledged the importance of the work accomplished in the field of capacity building, especially in the Caribbean region. It also informed the Committee of its intention to propose a category II centre focused on small islands, World Heritage and sustainable development.

**ICCROM** took the floor to respond to comments and questions. He apologized with the Delegations of Jamaica and Barbados for not including a reference to their region in the document, reassuring them, however, that considerable work had been accomplished there in the area of capacity building. With regard to how capacity building needs were identified and the related training courses developed, he explained that these reflected a deep analysis that had been conducted in the context of the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, adopted by the Committee in 2011. This included, for example, the idea of bringing together cultural and natural heritage approaches in capacity building initiatives. In thanking the Delegation of Portugal for its support to the translation of resource materials, he also noted that a detailed proposal for the development of a best-practice recognition programme, including costs, would be developed.

The Draft Decision **38.COM 6** was adopted.

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

## **ITEM 7. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

*Document:* WHC-14/38.COM/7

*Decision:* **38 COM 7**

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

The **Secretariat** explained briefly the content of document 7 followed by an introduction of documents 7A and 7B. The first part of the document was said to constitute a self-explanatory reminder of the standard processes and rules that apply to State of Conservation. It underlined that parts 2 and 3 included strategic issues to be addressed by the Committee, and follow up of issues which have been previously addressed by the Committee and the main trends emerging from SOC to be examined during this session of the Committee.

The **Secretariat** explained that the SOC online tool has helped to identify the main trends in the state of conservation of sites including management plans, development projects, tourism pressure, disaster, poaching and wildlife crimes.

The **Secretariat** further commented on the cooperation with the Inter Olympic Committee and IUCN and that a Draft Decision for this was prepared, as well as the 'no-go commitment' concerning oil and gas.

Finally, it explained the document proposed a new deadline to be examined for the cases of SOC reports. This change of submission date on an experimental basis would allow State Parties to have a minimum of 17 months to prepare reports and

would also allow the preparation of SOC reports by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and allow a longer period for dialogue.

**ICROOM** stated that conflict continues to be a constant threat in countries such as Mali and Syria. He explained the challenges faced in properties with large development projects. He pointed out that development projects were acceptable as long as the OUV was not compromised and that discussions with stakeholders to make development compatible with OUV are taking place. He explained that missions on management issues are regularly being conducted.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** affirme que, tout en reconnaissant la gravité des menaces concernant les sites culturels et ce qui s'est passé par exemple au Mali avec la dévastation de Tombouctou, il ne fallait pas oublier les problèmes auxquels sont confrontés les sites naturels, surtout transfrontaliers, à cause de la présence de combattants bien armés pour lesquels les animaux rares deviennent de la nourriture facilement disponible. La circulation des armes et de munitions est aussi un très grave problème pour le patrimoine naturel.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stated that an integrated managing plan is important but it is essential to identify the resources necessary for its implementation.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the report on the threats and challenges of the sites and highlighted there are also excellent practices that needed to be mentioned. The Delegation encouraged sharing information on best practices between State Parties. It also expressed concern on poaching.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed appreciation for the SOC documents and asked for clarifications on the timeframe for the proposed new timeline for SOC reports.

The Delegation of **Colombia** acknowledged the work of the World Heritage Center and manifested support for the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Poland** pointed out that dialog with State Parties should be strengthened and that changes in the SOC cycle may force some managers to use inaccurate information.

**Wildlife conservation society and WWF** (Observers) took the floor to address wildlife poaching and trading mentioned in document 7 and expressed their concern for the danger this represents for local communities. WWF underlined that poaching is the second largest illegal commerce after weapon trade and represented a major threat to sites, therefore it should be recognized as a criminal offense. It thanked the Committee for addressing the issue.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** affirme avoir regardé le document avec beaucoup d'intérêt et de satisfaction ; des progrès sont accomplis tant du côté des Etats que de la part du Secrétariat de l'UNESCO et des Organes consultatives. La Délégation s'exprime en faveur du changement du cycle des rapports sur l'Etat de Conservation. Elle souligne par ailleurs que d'autres questions, plus fondamentales ou structurantes, méritent d'être abordées. Il est bien que par exemple la compagnie Total reconnaisse certains problèmes, mais on peut difficilement avoir un véritable

consensus sur l'usage de ressources non renouvelables. Aussi, serait-il judicieux que dans le processus de classement et d'inscription soit inclus l'établissement d'un répertoire de ressources dont l'exploitation pourrait s'avérer dangereuse pour le site.

**Ramsar** (Observer) took the floor to thank the WWF and IUCN for carrying out activities in wetlands of Ramsar sites and manifested its intention to continue work in close relation with the World Heritage Centre. The Representative of Ramsar welcomed the collaboration between Ramsar Convention and the World Heritage Convention.

The **Secretariat** clarified questions raised on the new SOC cycle explaining the measure will be implemented progressively and will be reviewed by the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee in the framework of revision of the Operational Guidelines. This timeline will not apply in the case of sites on the Danger List for which the deadline will be maintained on 1 February. The Secretariat reaffirmed that this new measure will allow State Parties to have sufficient time for the submission of reports (17 months) and agreed with the Delegation of Finland on the importance of sharing good practices between State Parties.

The **Secretariat** explained that it had been working and discussing with the biodiversity liaison group, including Ramsar on how to increase cooperation in concrete actions to combat traffics, especially on poaching. On concrete cases like Madagascar a strong cooperation was developed.

The Draft Decision **38 COM.7** was adopted.

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

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

*Documents* WHC-14/38.COM/7A  
WHC-14/38.COM/7A.Add

*Decision:* **38 COM 7A.1 to 7A. 98**

The **Secretariat** presented the overview of the document 7A and reported that half of the State Party reports were received after the statutory deadline of 1 February, making difficult the preparation of the reports for the deadline for the document publication six weeks ahead of the session of the World Heritage Committee. The **Secretariat** reminded that the State Party reports should be written in working languages, i.e English or French followed by the Operational Guidelines. The **Secretariat** further reminded the Committee about paragraphs 22.5, 22.6 and 22.7 concerning the order of speakers and about the decision taken at the 35<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee concerning the difficulties to assess information received after the statutory deadline for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **ARAB STATES**

#### **World Heritage properties of Syria**

**Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20bis) - 38 COM 7A.12**  
**Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 22) - 38 COM 7A.12**  
**Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 23) - 38 COM 7A.12**  
**Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 21) - 38 COM 7A.12**  
**Crac des chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1229) - 38 COM 7A.12**  
**Ancient villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1348) - 38 COM 7A.12**

Le **Secrétariat** indique que les dommages que les biens du patrimoine mondial de la République arabe syrienne ont subis depuis l'année dernière varient d'un site à l'autre. Plusieurs réunions ont été organisées par le Centre du patrimoine mondial avec la collaboration de l'ICOMOS et ICCROM, et Interpol : sur l'Ancienne ville de Damas en 2013, Le Crac des chevaliers et Qal'at Salah El-Din en fin mai 2014.

Le Secrétariat indique ne pas disposer de photos des sites suivants : l'ancienne ville de Bosra et Qal'at Salah El-Din.

Le site de Palmyre a subi des destructions, des fouilles illicites et des pillages. Mais l'ancienne ville d'Alep est de loin celle qui a subi, et subit encore, des explosions qui ont détruit deux portions de son centre historique, mais aussi de pillage par des groupes armés d'éléments architecturaux caractéristiques de l'architecture domestique aleppine du XVIIe siècle jusqu'à la fin de la période ottomane.

Une réunion intitulée « Sauvegarde d'urgence du patrimoine culturel syrien » et financée par l'Union européenne a été organisée par le Centre du patrimoine mondial en mai 2014 et avait pour objectif de déterminer les mesures de consolidation et de conservation d'urgence pour le Crac des Chevaliers. Les résultats et les recommandations détaillées de cette réunion seront publiés sur la page Web de l'UNESCO dédiée au patrimoine syrien.

**ICOMOS** highlighted that the high-level technical meeting convened by the Director-General of UNESCO with the participation of the UN and Arab League Joint Special Representative, the Director-General of the DGAM, ICOMOS, ICCROM, ICOM, Interpol, the World Customs Organization and the European Union to monitor the situation of Syrian heritage was aiming at raising awareness on its protection, and the emergency actions needed to safeguard it. Under the current situation, where there is a lack of systematic information, it is considered that corrective measures are needed to be identify, practical guidelines and a road map which indicates recovery measures are to be established.

**La Délégation du Liban** remercie le Secrétariat pour la qualité de son travail actuel. Elle souligne que les photos datent de 2013 alors que d'autres destructions ont eu lieu à St Simeon, le Crac des chevaliers et la vieille ville d'Alep. Elle demande à

l'UNESCO de mettre en œuvre une initiative politique avec les Nations Unies afin de neutraliser les destructions surtout que le conflit s'éternise, et reconnaît le travail important fait par l'UNESCO, aussi bien par le Siège que par les bureaux régionaux. La Délégation regrette qu'il faille attendre le post conflit pour agir.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its sympathy to the Syrian people who are under the current conflict situation and its readiness to contribute to the reconstruction of Syrian heritage.

The Delegation of **Turkey** joined the Delegation of Croatia and expressed its concern on the illegal trafficking of cultural objects.

The Delegation of **Germany** drew attention to the Red List of Syrian antiquities by ICOM which was presented at the Museum Island in Berlin, and stated that it is ready to assist in the reconstruction of Syrian heritage as soon as situation would be stabilized.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed deep concern and sadness with regard to the situation in Syria. The Delegation stressed that awareness toward safeguarding heritage is crucial to protect heritage.

La Délégation du **Togo** s'associe aux précédents Etats-parties pour remercier le pays hôte. Elle exprime sa consternation face aux attaques permanentes sur les sites culturels.

La Délégation du **Portugal** rappelle que nous connaissons tous l'étendu de la tragédie et estime que c'est tout le pays qu'il faudra reconstruire dans le processus de retour à la paix en tenant compte de toutes les dimensions politiques économique. Elle rappelle qu'il y a aussi l'aspect lié à l'éducation. Il faudrait voir ce que l'UNESCO peut entreprendre pour l'éducation même si elle reconnaît que la dimension culturelle est aussi importante. Elle a constaté, comme son collègue du Liban que les photos présentées par le Secrétariat sont anciennes. Il faudrait actualiser l'information et préparer un calendrier et une estimation de coût afin qu'au moment venu on puisse faire face à la réhabilitation du patrimoine, mais aussi rétablir les structures éducatives en Syrie.

The Delegation of **India** and **Qatar** joined previous speakers in supporting the views expressed by the Delegation of Croatia.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique que ce qui se passe en Syrie est affligeant et rappelle que nous avons connu par le passé les boucliers humains, maintenant nous faisons face aux boucliers culturels. Elle se demande s'il ne faudrait pas demander aux belligérants de créer des couloirs de protection des biens culturels afin que les experts puissent se rendre sur les sites affectés.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** se joint aux précédents orateurs pour exprimer sa tristesse devant le drame de la Syrie ; elle rappelle que le Comité a classé l'année dernière les biens syriens sur la Liste en péril et se retrouve pour en classer d'autres. Elle espère une accalmie et que les biens n'ont pas perdu leur authenticité et leur intégrité. La civilisation syrienne est exceptionnelle. La Délégation d'Algérie souhaite rendre hommage à tous les conservateurs et gestionnaires travaillant sur les sites et



qui essaient de les protéger. Elle espère une prochaine accalmie afin de permettre rapidement une mission.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated the urgency to restore valuable heritage in Syria.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** souhaite exprimer, comme l'ont fait les autres membres du Comité, sa douleur et faire entendre la voix du Comité et lancer un appel à l'instauration de la paix dans le pays.

**Le Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture** répond à la question du Liban qui souhaite savoir ce que l'UNESCO peut faire pendant les conflits, en disant que l'UNESCO peut effectuer un immense travail post conflit mais malheureusement pas pendant le conflit : L'UNESCO a vu les images d'une destruction massive du patrimoine culturel sans pouvoir intervenir. Il est évident que la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO a fait des appels, l'UNESCO a mobilisé au plus haut niveau et les instances des Nations Unies sont intervenues : le Conseil de sécurité a adopté une Résolution appelant à la protection du patrimoine culturel bâti et immatériel. Il rappelle également que l'UNESCO a lancé plusieurs appels à l'opinion publique.

Il souligne le rôle spécifique de la Croix rouge qui, par exemple, a la possibilité, une fois qu'elle est sur le terrain, d'y rester sur le long terme. Il pense que l'UNESCO pourrait travailler avec cette dernière comme point d'appui pour renforcer les capacités de ses experts sur la protection du patrimoine. Lors de la réunion d'experts sur la Syrie, la situation a été examinée afin de limiter les dommages. A cause du manque d'informations, l'UNESCO a créé un observatoire du patrimoine syrien et travaille à la formation des fonctionnaires sur place. Elle a alerté les pays voisins pour la lutte contre le trafic illicite et des lignes rouges ont été mises en place et le grand public informé. Il mentionne également l'existence d'un projet important de l'Union Européenne de 2.5 millions Euros pour assister l'UNESCO à créer un réseau et en donnant du soutien à ceux qui sont sur place. Il souligne également la généreuse donation du Qatar qui aidera à faire de l'UNESCO une machine plus utile dans la prévention des risques en cas de conflit ou de catastrophe naturelle. Pour le moment seuls les constats peuvent être faits mais les solutions sont encore à identifier. Le cas du Mali qui était plus limité a été un exemple et la préparation se fait maintenant avec des outils plus adaptés.

La **Présidente** mentionne qu'il faut se donner les moyens de créer une émulation pour éviter la frustration.

**Le Secrétariat** souhaite apporter quelques précisions sur la date des photos : les rapports ont été soumis par l'Etat partie à la fin de l'année 2013. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a beaucoup de photos récentes car, dans le cadre de l'observation, elles sont collectées de manière méthodique mais le choix de ne présenter que les photos soumises par l'Etat partie est la pratique en vigueur. Il indique également qu'il est possible d'agir maintenant sur le trafic illicite en coopération avec les pays limitrophes (la Turquie et le Liban) car les efforts faits sont très intéressants. Le Secrétariat mentionne également qu'à Genève, les deux parties ont discuté du patrimoine afin de mettre en place un groupe qui négocie avec les acteurs directement liés à la destruction du patrimoine. Il existe aussi des groupes locaux qui participent à la protection du patrimoine. Le Secrétariat remercie également les délégués qui ont proposé leur expertise et informe que les travaux sont actuellement dirigés vers la prévention. Le Secrétariat les informe aussi que le

projet se capitalise actuellement sur la prévention afin d'être très vite opérationnel. Le Secrétariat note l'intervention du Qatar qui a mentionné le « safe haven » qui est déjà pratiqué de facto par la Turquie qui intercepte des objets volés et les garde en attendant la fin du conflit et assure que l'UNESCO est en contact avec les connaisseurs de cette pratique. Le Secrétariat répond également au délégué de l'Allemagne qui a parlé de la résolution de l'Union européenne pour empêcher le trafic illicite. En effet la réunion d'experts de fin mai dernier préconisait de demander au Conseil de sécurité une résolution qui empêcherait le trafic illicite de tous les objets syriens à l'instar de ce qui a été fait pour l'Irak en 2003, initiative qui est en cours d'étude.

**Le Secrétariat** répond à la question de la Déléguée du Togo en soulignant qu'en situation de conflit, les sites militaires historiquement construits en hauteur sont malheureusement des cibles faciles et qu'en général les tissus urbains très denses dans les centres historiques favorisent les combats de rue. Le Secrétariat répond également au Délégué du Portugal en affirmant qu'il œuvre pour l'actualisation des informations et que les réunions contribuent aux renforcements des capacités des fonctionnaires dans la sécurisation des objets culturels et concerne des personnes de tout bord et de toutes les régions de Syrie. Le Secrétariat informe la Déléguée de l'Algérie que le but n'est pas de classer plus de sites sur la Liste en péril. Le Secrétariat rend hommage à tous les professionnels syriens, sachant qu'ils y laissent parfois leur vie.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7A.12** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

### **Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611) - 38 COM 7A.13**

**Le Secrétariat informe** qu'une requête d'assistance internationale a été accordée récemment afin de mettre en place un programme de sensibilisation des communautés locales pour la préservation des bâtiments traditionnels.

**ICOMOS** noted the positive progress made by the State Party, however still new constructions continued. Community involvement should be maintained.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** stressed that the property is extremely important in the Islamic world and encouraged the State Party to implement a programme for awareness raising in the historic district.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** raised a question regarding the function of the Historic Urban Landscape programme in addressing the conservation of Zabid.

**Le Secrétariat** apporte une précision aux Philippines en expliquant que le cas de Zabid n'est pas concerné par une pression due au développement économique et urbain ; c'est un cas de conservation d'une ville avec une économie très modeste et dans laquelle les habitants ont besoin de place. C'est un problème de réglementation urbaine et de gestion de la ville. Les recommandations du programme de l'UNESCO sur les villes sont une source méthodologique et une approche de travail. Il s'agit à Zabid de travailler avec les communautés locales pour les sensibilisations à la valeur du patrimoine. C'est dans ce cadre que s'inscrit la demande d'assistance internationale que le Secrétariat a présenté au début.

**Le Sous-directeur général pour la Culture** fait remarquer que le cas de Zabid est complexe car la question des nouvelles constructions dans les maisons n'est qu'une composante. Le problème principal concerne la vie économique de la ville. Quand l'Etat a décidé de supprimer le souk il a créé un vide et automatiquement ceci a mené à la transformation de la ville en bidonville. La vie doit revenir au centre de Zabid.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7A.13** est adopté.

La Délégation du **Yémen** (Observateur) remercie les autorités Qatari de leur accueil. et attire l'attention du Comité sur les souffrances des sites arabes tout en soulignant que le Yémen n'est pas à l'abri. Il explique que le Yémen souffre également du terrorisme qui a causé des pertes. Malgré les difficultés, le gouvernement a accompli des exploits en renforçant les capacités. Le Délégué du Yémen remercie Sheikha Mai Bint Muhamad Al Khalifa, Présidente du centre de catégorie 2 de Bahreïn, qui, d'après lui, a été le premier à adopter une série de mesures que les autorités locales vont adopter.

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

**Abu Mena (Egypt) - 38 COM 7A.1**

**Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) - 38 COM 7A.2**

**Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) - - 38 COM 7A.3**

**Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem (Palestine) - 38 COM 7A.5**

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

#### **ASIA AND PACIFIC**

##### **Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev) - 38 COM 7A.14**

**Le Secrétariat** évoque l'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. En raison de la situation d'instabilité dans ce bien, le calendrier pour la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives n'est pas encore établi. Il indique avoir pris note de la requête de l'Etat partie concernant l'état de conservation du Minaret de Djam, particulièrement à la suite d'inondation récente. Conformément à la recommandation de la 3<sup>e</sup> réunion de travail du groupe d'experts qui s'est tenue à Turin en Italie (2012), un certain nombre de recommandations qui devaient être mises en œuvre à court et à long termes, a été formulé. Ainsi la réunion a permis d'engranger des fonds supplémentaires pour Herat, mais malheureusement cela n'a pas été le cas de Djam. Le Secrétariat fait remarquer que les fonds-en dépôt italiens et suisses de l'UNESCO destinés à la sauvegarde de ce bien étaient déjà épuisés en 2012/2013. Le Secrétariat mentionne qu'une demande d'assistance internationale reçue en 2012 pour la sauvegarde du bien d'un montant

de 28,000 US\$, est toujours en attente d'informations techniques supplémentaires à la suite de son examen et de la recommandation des organisations consultatives.

Noting that series of efforts were made by the State Party and the international community, **ICOMOS** stressed that it is crucial to establish a long-term conservation policy and action plan in line with the Recommendations adopted by the 3rd Expert Working Group Meeting for Herat and Jam World Heritage Property in 2012 and suggested the State Party to submit International Assistance request.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7A.14** est adopté

### **Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev) - 38 COM 7A.15**

The **Secretariat** informed that an ICOMOS Technical Advisory Mission to the Bamiyan valley took place from 26 May to 2 June last. The mission team has been sharing its findings with the State Party to finalize its recommendations. With regards to the implementation of corrective measures, the State Party reported a number of progress and the difficulties encountered but did not indicate the timeframe for the completion of the corrective measures.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that concern has been expressed at the appropriateness of the interventions at the lower gallery of the Eastern Buddha niche, particularly the construction of two pillars in cement and bricks in the position of the original Eastern Buddha's feet. The Technical review mission was conducted to make recommendations on any necessary remedial activities and/or other mitigation measure related to conservation, structural stability, and site security, including details of specific engineering advice and methodologies to be used. The report of the mission would be submitted to the State Party and ICOMOS would be ready to engage in dialogue to consider its recommendations.

The Delegation of **Japan** suggested an open discussion about this issue with participation of the local community and experts, since the issue is not only related to the ethics of reconstruction but also related to future vision and the overall plan of the property.

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported the Delegation of Japan's proposal by stressing involvement of the local community and experts would be important and encouraged the State Party to conduct feasibility study.

The **Secretariat** noted that several activities including the establishment of advisory board in the national level have been made thorough the contribution of Japan, Italy, Switzerland and the Republic of Korea. The vision of conservation and reconstruction should be reviewed by international as well as local community.

**Le Rapporteur** indique qu'aucune proposition d'amendement au Projet de décision n'a été reçue.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7A.15** est adopté.

## **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

### **Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis) - 38 COM 7A.18**

The Delegation of **Germany** requested the postponement of the discussion of this point to the next session of the Committee.

Les Délégations du **Portugal** et de la **Croatie** soutiennent la proposition de l'Allemagne.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.18** was adopted as amended.

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

**Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710) 38 COM 7A.16**  
**Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708) 38 COM 7A.17**  
**Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1150) 38 COM 7A. 19**

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

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

**Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) - 38 COM 7A.20**  
**Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178) - 38 COM 7A.21**  
**Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366) - 38 COM 7A.22**  
**Coro and its Port (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (C 658) - 38 COM 7A.23**

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

## **AFRICA**

**Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev) - 38 COM 7A.24**  
**Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139) - 38 COM 7A.25**

**La Présidente** informe le Comité que ces biens africains seront examinés le mercredi dans la journée, afin de permettre aux membres de la Délégation du Mali d'être présents.

### **Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022) - 38 COM 7A.26**

The **Secretariat** reported that an official launching ceremony of the important reconstruction project with the financial assistance of Japan Fund-in-Trust took place at the site on 13 May 2014 in the presence of notable guests including members of the Buganda Kingdom, government officials and the Ambassador of Japan. It also

reported that the ICOMOS technical advisory mission was conducted as part of the Japan-funded reconstruction project and that the mission raised concerns over a number of issues. The Secretariat together with the Advisory Body recommended the Committee to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS** highlighted the recent mission and informed that the result of the mission has not been reflected in the document since the mission report has been received recently. The mission recognized the risk fire reconstruction should be based on traditional materials and requested justification of using concrete block. Every effort must be taken following the recommendation by the reactive monitoring mission.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande si d'autres travaux sont envisagés et se demande si les experts ont proposé des solutions pour éviter l'incendie.

The Delegation of **Philippines** commented that the property contained tangible as well as spiritual value and encouraged the State Party to implement the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies which is vital to reconstruct the heritage.

La Délégation du **Portugal** soutien l'effort de reconstruction et de préservation de ce bien mais craint une certaine paralysie des autorités locales. Elle rappelle que L'ICOMOS avait tout d'abord proposé que ce bien sorte de la Liste en péril mais a dû reconsidérer sa position pour un maintien suite sa mission. La Délégation craint que la situation ne se répète l'année prochaine.

**ICOMOS** responded to the points raised by the Delegation of Senegal regarding reconstruction strategy. It indicated that it was decided to rebuild the last version of the building which was built not only with traditional material but also contemporary material. Bend steel that supported the weight of the roof is not traditional. It was a compromise since materials were closely related to symbolic value of the property.

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et le « African World Heritage Fund » ont commencé des sessions de formation sur la gestion des risques.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** insiste sur l'importance du traitement des matériaux qui permet d'éviter que ces derniers ne flambent afin d'éviter que ça se reproduise.

**ICOMOS** indicated that it will be happy to discuss this specific matter bilaterally with the Delegation of Senegal.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7A.26** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

*The meeting rose at 7 pm*

**SECOND DAY – TUESDAY, 17 June 2014**

**THIRD MEETING**

**9.00 a.m. –1 p.m.**

**Chairperson : Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al  
Thani (Qatar)**

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

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

**NATURAL PROPERTIES**

**AFRICA**

**Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of  
Tanzania) (C 144) - 38 COM 7A. 27**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre-ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission undertaken in December 2013 had concluded that significant progress had been made by the State Party in implementing the corrective measures for the property. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS were therefore recommending the Removal of this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS** stated that the property, inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2004 due to the extent of deterioration of historical and archaeological structures, had after 10 years of sustained efforts largely met the desired state of conservation and therefore removal from the Danger list was recommended.

The 2013 mission to the property was able to ascertain that 70% of the structures had been stabilized and that measures were in place for an adequate management system for the property. Planning tools, such as a Management Plan and Land Use Plans have been developed while other, such as Master Plans, were in the process of finalization. Other positive progress was noted in relation to actions undertaken to halt sea wave erosion and in strengthening relationships with local communities and awareness raising. The results from the mission, along with the state of conservation report, lead to the conclusion that the property is no longer facing threats that could lead to the loss of its Outstanding Universal Value.

This positive outcome and efforts will need to be sustained to ensure the effective and adequate conservation of the property in the long term. In this respect, the State Party needs to finalize the establishment of boundaries for the property and buffer zones, with adequate regulatory measures, so that encroachment does not become a factor in the long run. Updating and review of planning tools, particularly the

Management Plan, including provisions for sustainable tourism development, and Land Use Plans, needs to be finalised so that they are formally adopted to ensure implementation. In addition, other recommendations made by the 2013 mission should be implemented, particularly in regard to the protection under national legislation and the stabilization of other architectural heritage areas, such as Kilwa Kivinje, so that 100% of the attributes are conserved.

Other measures include the creation of on-site documentation services to facilitate monitoring of conditions to support the analysis of efficacy of interventions and to identify timely interventions based on a monitoring strategy. Actions centred on enhancing community engagement and on exploring options to strengthen social and economic development through the promotion of heritage sites should also continue. ICOMOS commended the State Party for the sustained efforts made to achieve the desired state of conservation. Work and resources committed through these years will need to be sustained to ensure the continuation of conservation and management measures currently in place. ICOMOS remained willing to continue to support the State Party in these efforts.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son appréciation pour les efforts accomplis par la République-Unie de Tanzanie et suggère que l'exemple tanzanien soit suivi par d'autres Etats parties.

The Delegation of **Japan** praised the efforts of the Tanzanian Government and hoped that this effort would continue in the future.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** complimented the State Party for its efforts in improving site conservation and management and stressed that the remaining recommendations should be implemented as well.

The Delegation of **Portugal** praised the State Party for this positive development and supported the Draft Decision. It also referred to the military architecture built by the Portuguese at this site which was a good example of a multicultural site.

The Delegation of **Germany** joined the previous speakers in commending the success of joint efforts of the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the State Party. This case shows that the Danger List is an instrument to resolve serious issues. It hoped that this success would be sustainable and the further recommended measures implemented.

The Delegation of **Finland** was pleased to see ten years of efforts bearing fruit. The Desired State of Conservation was met, however there was still work remaining, thus the Delegation encouraged the State Party to implement the action required.

The Delegation of **Turkey** applauded this success and the State Party's commitment. It also congratulated the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat for this outstanding success story which will set an example for others.

The Delegation of **Colombia** also congratulated Tanzania for the huge efforts invested. It stated that Danger Listing had demonstrated its effectiveness.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** tient également à appuyer le projet de décision. Elle félicite les autorités de la République-Unie de Tanzanie, le Secrétariat et les



organisations consultatives pour les efforts déployés pour atteindre ce résultat qu'elle espère durable et profitable pour le peuple de la République unie de Tanzanie.

The Delegation of **India** also supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** joined the previous speakers in commending the State Party and encouraged States Parties with sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger to use the corrective measures undertaken as models to be adapted to similar approaches.

The Delegation of **Qatar** congratulated the State Party, while looking forward to the decision on the buffer zone to be taken in 2015.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** se joint aux autres Délégations qui se sont exprimées pour appuyer le Projet de décision et félicite la Tanzanie pour les efforts qui lui ont permis de retirer le site en objet de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en danger. Elle encourage les autres Etats membres à suivre l'exemple de la République-Unie de Tanzanie dans la protection de leurs sites.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** was equally relieved by the synergy at play among the State Party, the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. It supported the Draft Decision and stressed that the remaining requirements should be met.

Draft Decision **38COM 7A.27** was adopted as proposed.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party of Tanzania in the name of the Committee and in her own name.

The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** expressed its appreciation to the Committee for the decision taken and stressed the country's determination to implement all necessary measures and in order to further improve the state of conservation as well as the life of the local communities. It highlighted the assistance received from Norway, Japan and the United States, as well as from International Organizations such as the World Monuments Fund and others. It also emphasized that international support was still important, asking partners to continue with their support.

## **ASIA-PACIFIC**

### **East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854) - 38 COM 7A.29**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) was in progress.

**IUCN** noted that since the publication of the State of Conservation report, reports in the media indicated that the State Party has granted a permit to a mining company to prospect for bauxite in the Rennell-Bellona Province, including in West Rennell. As the forest ecosystem of the property in East Rennell is functionally dependent on the forests of West Rennell, mining on West Rennell is likely to have similar impacts on the OUV of the property as logging, loss of wildlife habitat, and introduction of invasive species. A rigorous Environmental Impact Assessment of mining on West

Rennell was therefore recommended, including a specific assessment of potential impacts on the OUV of the property in conformity with IUCN's World Heritage Advice Note on Environmental Assessment, prior to starting prospecting activities, in order to demonstrate that these activities will not have an impact on the OUV. IUCN welcomed the study commissioned by the State Party noting that it provided, in addition to the 2012 mission report, a basis for the further development of a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN expressed its readiness to work with the State Party through its Oceania Regional Office, in order to propose a Desired State of Conservation and a set of Corrective Measures for adoption by the Committee at its 39th session in 2015.

The Delegation of **Colombia** emphasized that the removal of current threats would require more time for management techniques to be effective, in particular with regard to the problem of invasive species. It recommended that the State Party accept assistance proposed by IUCN.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the Draft Decision, stating that significant progress had been made and that the State Party had taken the recommendations seriously. Obviously most of the threats were outside the site, however prospecting activities could be a threat in particular to the outstanding wildlife. It looked forward to the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recognized the work of the State Party in such a short period. It highlighted the two factors presented by the State Party, i.e. climate change induced sea level rise and declared that the property should be included as a protected area under the Protected Areas Act 2010.

The Delegation of **Philippines** recommended that the State Party apply for international assistance to help prevent further introduction of invasive species.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that this property faced several threats, and that some progress had been made. But important tasks remained and corrective measures were essential. The property should remain in the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** appreciated the efforts made by the State Party but stressed that serious problems were remaining, such as mining, logging and invasive species. Capacity building could be organized by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to continue cooperating with all partners.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** asked the Secretariat for more information on the economic difficulties of the State Party to better understand the challenges in managing this site such as overfishing and overexploitation of resources.

The Delegation of **Qatar** fully supported the Draft Decision but requested more information from IUCN.

The **Secretariat** indicated that there had been constructive cooperation with the State Party on all matters including on international assistance requests.

**IUCN** indicated that careful balancing of economic development and preservation was required: local communities were affected by climate change, and while logging

was important for them, other sustainable activities needed to be introduced. The property was however poised to move forward in a constructive way.

The Observer Delegation of **Solomon Islands** stated that all threats mentioned were imposing challenges to the property. Support efforts had mainly been provided by local NGOs, and the assessment of threats to the property had been undertaken with support from the Government of Australia. The existing legislation did not provide sufficient support to the conservation of the property. Two to three years were needed for results to be visible. Partnerships and collaboration within the Asia/Pacific region were being sought. The State Party will work in close collaboration with IUCN and trusts that the Committee will provide the best guidance.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.29** was adopted as amended.

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

### **Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) – 38 COM 28**

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

## **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

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

### **Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76) - 38 COM 7A.30**

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

## **LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN**

### **Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)- 38 COM 7A.33**

The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation report. The Secretariat informed the committee that on 6 May 2014, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and acknowledged the good progress made in the implementation of corrective measures.

**IUCN** noted with appreciation the progress reported by the State Party, and the draft proposal submitted by Honduras for the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, currently under review by IUCN. It noted however that in order to facilitate the future implementation of the Desired State of Conservation, it was crucial to resolve the lack of clarity with regard to the property's boundaries in light of significant changes to these boundaries and zonation of the original Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve. The World Heritage

Centre and IUCN would stand ready to provide technical support to the State Party in this regard.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted that this property was inscribed under all four natural criteria and commended the State Party for developing a comprehensive management plan, to support the effective conservation of this site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recognized the significant progress made in land titling for communities surrounding the property in order to reduce deforestation, consolidate management to create a functional governing structure, cooperation with the communities, stating that this would lead to mitigating threats. However, supervisory efforts were lacking, and drug trafficking in the region was a serious threat. Staffing needed improvement. The Delegation urged the State Party to make use of the assistance proposed by IUCN.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.33** was adopted.

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

#### **Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764) - 38 COM 7A.31 Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711)- 38 COM 7A.32**

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

The Observer Delegation of the **Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela** thanked the Committee for approving the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) of Coro de la Vela and its Port. He pointed out that the implementation of these measures took more importance in the context of the project "Sustainable Conservation of Coro de la Vela and its Port" which is funded thanks to the support of the World Heritage Centre. It also emphasized how the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger would present the achievement of strategic and sovereign objectives defined by his country. The close cooperation with UNESCO will undoubtedly contribute to the sustainable management of the property, to strengthen the technical capacities of sites managers and to foster good practices of the traditional techniques in conservation, always taking into account the active participation of local communities.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that their government had requested the inscription of the site of Los Katios on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The work with communities has been promoted and agreements for management of fisheries have been signed. There was progress in zoning of the buffer zone to mitigate pressure on the property. Through joint measures with Darien Park in Panama, the State Party was looking to establish corridors, as a complementary strategy for conservation. It was fundamental to receive a monitoring mission to support Colombia's request to remove the Park from the Danger List. This mission should be planned and conducted as soon as possible.

## AFRICA

### **Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475)- 38 COM 7A.34**

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report, stating that the political situation in the Central African Republic remained very difficult, with 600,000 people internally displaced, as per reports from May 2014. Many government services had collapsed and over half of the total population of 4.6 million were said to be in need of immediate aid. This situation explained why no State of Conservation report had been submitted for this property and why the workshop to elaborate an emergency action plan could not be organized. Unfortunately no information was available on the current situation at the property but it was likely that the state of conservation had further deteriorated since the previous session, with an irreversible loss of the Outstanding Universal Value becoming more and more likely. The decision therefore called for the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission, as soon as the security situation allows, to assess whether the OUV of the property has been definitively lost and if a deletion from the World Heritage List should be envisaged by the Committee, in accordance with the procedure foreseen in the *Operational Guidelines*.

L'**IUCN** affirme que même si l'insuffisance des données disponibles ne permet pas une analyse complète de la situation, les informations reçues indiquent que des problèmes persistent sur le site, avec l'installation de braconniers lourdement armés. Cette situation a fortement affecté l'intégrité du bien. Les attributs selon critères (ix) et (x) ayant déterminé l'inscription du bien ne semblent plus être présents sur le site. Il est donc recommandé qu'une mission de suivi réactif conjointe UNESCO/IUCN soit envisagée sur le site, en vue d'une recommandation concernant son possible retrait de la liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que la situation en République centrafricaine est très compliquée. Les analyses des organisations consultatives sont, en l'absence de missions sur le terrain, rédigées au conditionnel. Il faut par conséquent, dans ces circonstances, être prudents. Dans ce contexte, la Délégation suggère d'amender le projet de décision, puisqu'il serait précipité de demander que le rapport soit remis au 1er février 2015, elle demande que le délai soit fixé au 1er février 2016. Il faut en effet se donner les moyens de contrôler la réalité de la situation.

The Delegation of **Germany** was deeply concerned with the situation created by such an outbreak of violence and conflict. The site's values are fragile and, according to community reports, the OUV has been considerably degraded, therefore a reactive monitoring mission is essential, provided that the situation would allow for such a mission. The Committee should follow the situation on a yearly basis.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed solidarity with the State Party in the conflict affecting the country. It supported Germany's proposal.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** partage la proposition faite par le Sénégal concernant l'amendement au projet de décision. Elle estime que le para 6 devrait aussi être reformulé de manière plus équilibrée.

The Delegation of **Turkey** concurred with the previous speakers, expressing hope that more information will be available next year.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the Committee in 2013 had concluded to a loss of OUV according to data available at the time. The situation had not improved, poaching continued and the Committee might come to a situation where delisting would need to be considered. It was important to monitor the conditions before such a decision was made.

**IUCN** pointed out that all sites on the Danger List are considered by the Committee on an annual basis.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** supported the previous speakers.

The **Secretariat** explained that it was very difficult to intervene. The humanitarian situation was very difficult and the government had little control of this area bordering Chad and Sudan. Already several years ago the OUV was largely threatened and since then it has not been possible to implement the emergency action plan. It was difficult for any partner to intervene in the region at this moment.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.34** was adopted as amended.

#### **Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) - 38 COM 7A.37**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the state of conservation of Virunga National Park.

The **Secretariat** listed out the threats to the Virunga National Park and indicated the insecurity caused by armed groups in the region affects the implementation of corrective measures. Sixteen park rangers have been killed in action since the 2010 monitoring mission and renewed skirmishes between the Congolese and Rwandese army have affected park protection measures. It said oil explorations continue in the property. However, the Secretariat informed that the SOCO oil company released a press statement that without UNESCO agreeing, it wouldn't undertake any more exploration for oil in the property; neither would it undertake any activity in the buffer zones which would jeopardize the OUV of the property; yet in a press statement, the SOCO CEO mentioned that the State Party might seek the modification of the boundaries of the property to make it possible for the exploration to go on.

L'**IUCN** s'inquiète de la volonté manifeste de l'Etat partie d'exploiter les éventuelles réserves pétrolières présentes sur le bien et note que cette position est contraire aux engagements pris dans la Déclaration de Kinshasa de protéger tous les biens des activités extractives. Elle souhaite par conséquent que le Comité réitère sa demande d'éliminer toutes les concessions pétrolières chevauchant le bien. L'engagement de la compagnie SOCO de ne pas entreprendre de forages exploratoires est à encourager, mais l'IUCN recommande néanmoins que le Comité réitère fermement sa position quant à l'incompatibilité des explorations / exploitations pétrolières avec

le statut de patrimoine mondial. La mission de suivi réactif a constaté que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien était maintenue, quoique dégradée. La compagnie SOCO ayant fait référence à une possible modification des limites du bien dans le futur, l'UICN souligne qu'une telle modification ne peut être effectuée dans le seul but de faciliter des activités extractives mais qu'elle doit être fondée sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, conformément à l'annexe 11 des *Orientations*.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the decision to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, given the security issues at the site. It would like to hear an update from the State Party on the management policy development at the property. It stressed that the issues of oil drilling and building of infrastructures needed to be addressed in order to minimize their impacts on the protected area. It also extended its condolences to the families of the rangers killed.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se déclare préoccupée par la situation du bien. Elle rappelle qu'au début, il s'agissait de problèmes d'insécurité, de guerre et de braconnage. Elle estime que l'Etat partie a fait beaucoup d'efforts dans ce domaine et mérite d'être encouragé. Mais elle souligne également que le Comité doit avoir conscience de la menace émergente que représente l'exploitation des ressources pour la conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation s'attend dans l'avenir à une augmentation du nombre de demandes de modifications de limites pour accéder à de telles ressources. Elle appelle à une réflexion afin de trouver des solutions vertueuses afin de concilier l'exploitation des ressources avec la préservation de la VUE. Elle rappelle enfin qu'il faut penser aux ressources présentes dans les sites avant de les classer.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and **Finland** fully supported the intervention by Colombia.

The Delegations of **Finland**, **Turkey** and **Qatar** conveyed their condolences to the families of the rangers killed. The Delegation of **Finland** also insisted that oil and gas companies should not exploit natural heritage sites and that their OUV had to be protected.

The Delegations of **Germany** and **Turkey** supported the Draft Decision. The Delegation of **Germany** said that the core of the discussion should be conservation of the property. It acknowledged SOCO and TOTAL's commitment but reiterated that the reference made to potential boundary changes were alarming. Through bi-lateral co-operation, it recalled it was helping the property and said it supported the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Qatar** extended its condolences to the families of the rangers killed. It recalled that the property was rich not only in terms of biodiversity, but also in terms of underground resources. It also noted that the duty of all governments was to ensure the well-being of the population, which required additional resources. It considered that the brainstorming for which the Delegation of Senegal rightly called for could bring some solutions in order to reconcile development with the protection of natural and cultural heritage, since the issues raised about Virunga were also raised in the previous years for other sites.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** raised the issue of to what extent could the State Party be persuaded to become signatories to Conventions and whether this could in some way assist in solving problems.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** observed that the tension between development and protection was a recurring issue. It recommended that a study be made to help in cases such as this.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** rappelle son attachement au mandat de l'UNESCO en ce qui concerne la formulation des décisions pour les sites en péril. Elle indique avoir des propositions d'amendements sur le Projet de décision et qu'elle espère un rétablissement rapide de la paix et de la sécurité dans le pays.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle que lors de sa 37<sup>e</sup> session, le Comité avait été informé que la majeure partie des compagnies pétrolières avaient signé un engagement écrit de ne pas mener d'exploration pétrolière dans les sites du patrimoine mondial. Elle note que Total a signé un tel engagement après la 37<sup>e</sup> session, et elle se demande où en sont les autres compagnies pétrolières.

Speaking about the efforts made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the **Secretariat** indicated that the situation has not improved but this does not reflect efforts made to manage the site. Various public-private partnerships signed by the Congolese government and several organizations had made a difference. While the situation over the last 2 years had been difficult due to war, it hoped that there would be more progress in the coming years to disarm rebel groups in the area. In response to Jamaica, it said Congo had ratified several Conventions but that the 1954 and 1970 Conventions pertained only to the cultural properties. It also said that in 2003, the mining industry and Shell made their first major commitment not to explore or exploit within World Heritage sites, but the follow up by other oil companies had been reluctant. It said IUCN had many discussions with concerned groups.

**IUCN** added that efforts on the ground in Virunga were truly heroic. It said that the State Party should ensure that there was a level playing field for all. It called upon a range of actors to work to advance the dialogue and appealed to the World Heritage Committee to provide clear leadership on the issue.

La **République Démocratique du Congo (Observateur)** note que plusieurs intervenants ont compris qu'il faut une réflexion qui permette de concilier le développement avec la protection de l'environnement. Il souligne que la sécurité des Virunga ne peut être assurée seulement par la RDC et que l'aide de la MONUSCO est nécessaire. En outre, il estime que l'Etat partie a besoin de se développer afin de mieux pouvoir protéger le parc, et que le budget national actuel de 5 ou 6 milliards n'était pas suffisant pour protéger les 5 parcs de la RDC. La mise en valeur des réserves pétrolières de la RDC pourrait changer cette situation Il affirme que parler de conservation sans permettre le développement du pays n'est pas réaliste. Enfin, il confirme que SOCO a mis fin à l'exploration pétrolière.

The Observer of **WWF** said that 750,000 people had signed a petition to support the park which was known for its beauty and the richness of its wildlife. It commended the bravery of the rangers and stressed that WWF respected nations' rights to work



towards development. It called on the Committee to adopt the Draft Decision proposed by the Secretariat.

The Observer of **RAMSAR** recalled that Virunga was one of 82 sites world-wide that was both a RAMSAR and a World Heritage Site. It reiterated the importance of Virunga and of its conservation and said it supported the amended Draft Decision.

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

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** justifie l'amendement qu'elle propose en estimant que le Comité n'a pas à entrer dans des considérations que l'UNESCO ne maîtrise pas, tel que le nombre de groupes armés en activité dans la région.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked whether the mention of the armed group in the Draft Decision was important.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that the threat from armed groups was indeed the major problem in the park particularly in the last 2 years. It explained that MONUSCO received the mandate last year to disarm armed groups and that it gave a detailed briefing to the team of the monitoring mission. The information on armed groups was therefore reliable.

La Délégation du **Portugal** partage le point de vue de l'Algérie et considère que l'amendement proposé donne plus de fiabilité au paragraphe.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose d'ajouter une mention se référant à l'insécurité due aux activités des groupes armés.

The Delegations of **Colombia**, **Germany**, **Senegal**, **Qatar** and **Finland** supported the position of the Delegations of **Algeria** and **Portugal**. The Delegation of **Colombia** added that a clear commitment of the State Party would be needed regarding oil exploration, not only for Virunga but for all the parks.

The Delegation of **Finland** asked whether SOCO had issued a written statement other than the press release.

The **Secretariat** responded that Total sent a letter to the World Heritage Centre in response to the appeal made by the Committee, but that no such letter had been received from SOCO.

The Delegation of **Colombia** would like the pressure to be put on any oil company operating in the area and not only on SOCO.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souhaite clarifier si il appartient au Comité de demander un engagement à SOCO ou si le Comité doit suggérer à l'Etat partie de demander un tel engagement à SOCO.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed that the commitment had to come from the State Party, and that the State Party had to ensure that it received the commitment from the oil companies.

The **Secretariat** recalled that the wording used in the past by the Committee was « calls on » or “launches an appeal” and not « requests ». It added that the Committee called on various companies in the past.

The Delegation of **Portugal** considered that since TOTAL had reacted to a request made by the World Heritage Committee, it did not see any problem in the Committee making such a request to SOCO.

#### **Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 718) - 38 COM 7A.41**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the state of conservation of the Okapi Wildlife Reserve.

The Delegation of **Germany** said that due to the current difficult situation, it had suspended assistance to the property but that it would resume it once the situation improved.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported the decision to retain the site on the Danger List and to put emphasis on the proposed roundtable which could help in finding synergies between stakeholders and improve the situation at the site. It wished to see a reinforced capacity-building for the management of the site. Finally it deemed that the initiatives undertaken by the State Party to ensure the governability of the area in cooperation with the local populations should be encouraged.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** requested additional information on the issue of uncontrolled migration of villagers.

The **Secretariat** responded that the Okapi Wildlife Reserve was not a national park. As several villages had been included in this Reserve at its creation, it had always been recognized that there was a need to control immigration into the reserve. There was a system of registration with local and traditional authorities so that resident populations could continue to live in the reserve, but these villages could not increase in size.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite que l'Etat partie réfléchisse à la mise en œuvre du plan de gestion afin que les Okapis puissent être protégés de façon durable. Elle estime qu'il est inutile d'être coercitif dans le cas de ce bien.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remarque que le fait que le travail s'effectue en dépit de conditions très difficiles doit être souligné dans la projet de décision.

The Delegations of **Qatar**, **Portugal** and **Croatia** supported the proposals made by the Delegation of Algeria.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted that uncontrolled migration was one of those threats that was often overlooked.

The **Secretariat** responded that in terms of measures, it referred to the road (RN4) crossing the property. It added that the road was un-crossable for many years. However, it was rehabilitated some years ago. The traffic had increased a lot since

then. It said there was a need for authorities to control vehicles passing through these roads just as there was a need to boost the immigration controlling system.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne à ce propos que la route existait avant l'inscription, qu'elle a été rénovée et pourrait être utile à la surveillance. Elle estime qu'on ne peut pas demander à un Etat de fermer une route nationale et préférerait mettre l'accent sur la surveillance et préconiser des mesures alternatives pour la circulation.

The **Secretariat** responded that several national parks in DRC were crossed by national roads. It said there was an agreement with Park authorities and the Ministry that roads could be closed during the night. In the case of the Okapi Reserve, since the rehabilitation of RN4 the provincial authorities put pressure to keep it open at night. This made it difficult for ICCN to control illicit trafficking of ivory and illegal mineral that happened here. It said that closing the road was one of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee.

La Délégation du **Portugal** propose d'intégrer la mention de la possibilité de fermer la RN4 à la circulation la nuit dans le texte du projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Colombia** would like to include a request to the State Party to also undertake preventive measures in addition to the corrective measures.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.41** was adopted as amended.

#### **Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) - 38 COM 7A.37** *(continuation)*

La Délégation d'**Algérie** souhaite savoir s'il est du mandat du Comité de demander à l'Etat partie le désarmement, en coopération avec la MONUSCO, des groupes armés opérant dans la région du bien.

The **Secretariat** said that the presence of armed groups was the key problem in the conservation of the site. It recalled the high level meeting in 2011 when the Kinshasa Declaration was signed and the fact that the Government said it would make all efforts to disarm armed groups in the region.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** préfère remplacer ce texte par « réitère la nécessité de mettre en œuvre la Déclaration de Kinshasa adoptée en 2011 ». Elle estime que cela serait plus en ligne à la fois avec le mandat du Comité et avec la volonté d'aider l'Etat partie à retrouver la stabilité.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Algeria.

The Delegation of **Portugal** considered that it was unnecessary to mention an intervention "at the highest level". It agreed with the Delegation of Algeria regarding the Kinshasa Declaration but considered it should not appear in this paragraph.

The **Secretariat** responded that the Kinshasa Declaration carried many points and that the Committee had recognized the commonality of issues among all 5

Congolese properties. The corrective measures in this paragraph refer specifically to the situation in Virunga.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** est d'accord avec la proposition de la Délégation du Portugal. Elle suggère par conséquent de déplacer le paragraphe 12c tel qu'amendé dans la décision générale sur les sites de RDC et de le supprimer de cette décision, puisque la sécurité est le défi majeur à relever pour tous les sites du pays.

The **Chairperson** requested that consultations be held with during the lunch break and closed the morning session.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm*

**SECOND DAY – TUESDAY, 17 June 2014**

**FOURTH MEETING**

**3 pm. – 7 p.m.**

**Chairperson : H.E. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani (Qatar)  
- and H. E. Mrs Fatima Gueye (Senegal)**

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

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

**NATURAL PROPERTIES**

**AFRICA (*continuation*)**

**Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) - 38 COM  
7A.37 (*continuation*)**

The Delegations of **Germany and Portugal** supported the proposal by Algeria.

The Delegation of **Turkey and Senegal** supported the proposal made by Portugal.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.37** was adopted as amended.

**General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo -  
38 COM 7A.42**

The **Secretariat** presented the Secretariat's view on the property's report, noting the improved security situation in and around the park. However, it informed about the illegal exploitation of natural resources, as well as elephant poaching; that still take place by many of the remaining armed groups. Utmost priority would be to secure the sites in order to support conservation and rehabilitation efforts, which requires active engagement of different parties as indicated through the Kinshasa Declaration. The Secretariat further expressed its concern about the new nature conservation law as it provides a loophole which would allow to waive conservation commitment presented through the Kinshasa declaration. In addition, a new draft on Hydrocarbons Code might allow oil exploitation activities in the national park that may affect integrity of the site.

The **Chairperson** invited Committee members to make comments and interventions, and in the absence of any new comments, it asked the Rapporteur for new amendments before adoption.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.42** was adopted as amended.

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

**Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227) - 38 COM 7A.35**

**Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155 bis) - 38 COM 7A.36**

**Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137) - 38 COM 7A.38**

**Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136) - 38 COM 7A.39**

**Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280) - 38 COM 7A.40**

**Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257) - 38 COM 7A.44**

**Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573) - 38 COM 7A.45**

**Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153) - 38 COM 7A.46**

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

#### **ITEM 7B. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

##### **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

##### **ARAB STATES**

##### **Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190) – 38 COM 7B.2**

Le **Secrétariat** informe que des constructions nouvelles au sein du site archéologique prolifèrent. Un plan indicatif du bien a été transmis par l'Etat partie, avec en rouge le site archéologique, en vert la zone tampon et en blanc les zones de constructions illégales.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation on the property. It welcomed the measures undertaken by the State Party in addressing recommendations made by ICOMOS following the conflict happened in Libya. However, it also expressed serious concern about the rapid increase of encroachment and proliferation of illegal constructions within the area. Furthermore, deterioration of property fabric has also been observed, contributed by the inefficient legislative and administrative framework. ICOMOS recommended undertaking reactive monitoring mission to assess factors currently affecting the OUV, integrity and authenticity and to identify follow up actions.

The Delegation of **Libya** thanked the Qatar authorities for hosting the event. In light of this evaluation, the Delegation assured the Committee of its utmost efforts to

ensure the ongoing cooperation between the Libyan authority and the Centre, as well as to safeguard the site. Capacity building programs continued to be implemented for actors responsible for the protection and safeguarding of the property, which also involved local community for raising awareness. The Delegation noted that the positive ICOMOS expert visit to the site was a positive step, and assured that it will continue to provide its full cooperation in order to produce joint strategies for the better protection of the site.

The Delegation of **Philippines** noted with regret the possible inclusion of the site to the list of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation recommended the State Party to undertake emergency measures and to initiate dialogue between relevant parties to address threats affecting the integrity of the site, including encroachment. It also recommended the State Party to invite reactive monitoring missions to the site in view of establishing strategies that can reduce negative impact to the site before the deadline of SOC submission in February 2015.

The **Secretariat** informed that the UNESCO Office in Libya has focused its work in organizing capacity building activities to help address management and legal issues.

Le **Rapporteur** lit les amendements proposés au projet de décision.

**ICOMOS** clarified that it will submit a report by 1 February 2015 after conducting a reactive monitoring mission later on this year.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.2** was adopted as amended.

### **Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) – 38 COM 7B.7**

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité du patrimoine mondial sur le rapport sur l'état de conservation de la Vieille Ville de Sana'a, Yémen. La vieille ville fait face à une dégradation des conditions de conservation due à plusieurs facteurs, qui sont détaillés dans le rapport de conservation, et nécessitant un soutien technique et financier. Concernant les nouvelles informations, une requête d'assistance internationale en faveur de la vieille ville de Sana'a a été approuvée pour une valeur de 30 000 dollars américains. Le projet financé permettra à l'Etat Partie de mettre à jour les relevés de la vieille ville, et de produire une cartographie qui permettra de définir les limites du bien, les niveaux de protection et les catégories d'intervention requis, ainsi que de contrôler les permis de construire, permettant ainsi de mieux protéger et gérer le bien, et préparant la base d'un plan de conservation.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation, noting the difficult condition of the country that prevented missions to the site. ICOMOS noted State Party's efforts to address conservation and management issues, by establishing legislative tools to ensure legal protection of the site and support conservation efforts. It is also seen necessary to restructure existing management system to foster larger synergy to ensure adequate protection to heritage resources when addressing developing needs. Cooperation between the implementing agencies and Gulf Sea will be crucial to reconcile development needs with heritage conservation.

The Delegation of **Philippines** expressed its concern on the difficult situation the State Party is facing. It also noted the dialogue and efforts undertaken by UNESCO and relevant parties to address negative impact to the site. Furthermore, the

Delegation would like to inquire on the planned infrastructure project in regards with this issue.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** souligne les efforts qui ont été faits dernièrement dans des conditions extrêmement difficiles. Elle exprime sa satisfaction que la loi sur la protection des sites, des monuments et des villes historiques et patrimoine urbain et culturel soit élaborée et approuvée. Finalement la Délégation demande des explications concernant un moratoire d'une année sur les constructions neuves à l'intérieur du bien et sur l'établissement des nouveaux contrats et sur la loi des constructions.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the efforts made by the State Party in the adoption of new laws to add legal protection of the site. The Delegation underscored its bilateral commitment to Yemen through the Turkish International Agency who has been helping with capacity building efforts on site, and encouraged the State Party to continue these efforts in the same direction.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its concern on the issues faced by the State Party in relation to urban heritage landscape. Moreover, it requested clarifications on what specific impact is taking place at the site.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** welcomed the bright future of Sana'a. The Delegation questioned on the possibility of requesting fund from the international community to help with the conservation.

The Observer Delegation of **Yemen** informed the Committee about the efforts made to reduce terrorism that hinder further work in the property and ensured its commitment to safeguard the heritage through the finalization of a draft bill for the conservation of the Old City. The Delegation informed about the close cooperation with the general prosecutor to improve the general security situation and concluded that further work needed to be done to restore the old city and to continue the collaboration with the World Heritage Centre. It thanked the WHC for that support. An international campaign for the protection of the old city was envisaged that would require financial support.

Le **Secrétariat** souligne que les constructions nouvelles sur l'architecture de Sana'a ne sont pas toujours réversibles. Donc la question du moratoire sur les nouvelles constructions est très importante. A part l'irréversibilité, les constructions ont un effet sur l'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien et causent une fragilité qui subit le tissu urbain à cause de ces additions. Le Secrétariat ajoute que la ville de Sana'a a besoin d'un travail à petite échelle comme celle entrepris par la coopération allemande GIZ avec les habitants qui a été conduit à Alep en Syrie, en utilisant des mesures techniques spécifiques pour restaurer les maisons grâce à des micro-crédits.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was received for the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.47** was adopted.



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

**Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (C 850) – 38 COM 7B.1**

**Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433) - 38 COM 7B.4**

**Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073) - 38 COM 7B.5**

**Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37) - 38 COM 7B.6**

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

**ASIA-PACIFIC**

**Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705) -38 COM 7B.9**

**The Secretariat** recalled the ongoing lift up project at the Yujen palace by 15 meters on the palace and the surrounding. No information was provided to the Centre and the Advisory Bodies prior to the construction. On March 2014, the State Party invited the Centre as well as the Advisory Bodies for a reactive monitoring mission to assess the palace condition and effectiveness of its management system. Based on the mission, it was noted that though no significant impact was observed to the palace's condition, however there was a change in relationship between the palace and the surrounding environment. Furthermore, the assessor recommended the State Party to take corrective measures based on the mission's evaluation.

**ICOMOS** indicated that given the vast coverage of the property, the reactive mission mainly focused on the Yujen Palace in addition to the overall SOC of the site. While noting that the raise of the palace structure managed to overcome water problem, the higher position of the palace affected the relationship with the wider landscape, including fengshui concept. Advance warning should have been given by the State Party prior to the construction to consider such impact that may affect OUV of the site. Moreover, ICOMOS commented on additional threat of increased tourism pressure, and concerned that the major visitor infrastructure development plan could disturb the inter-relationship between the cultural and natural elements attached to the site. In view of the situation, ICOMOS offered, in cooperation with the Centre, to provide its assistance in the development of Conservation Management Plan for the State Party, and to treat this as a matter of urgency.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the importance of the lift up project to safeguard the palace, although at the same time reducing value of the site. It questioned on the best communication structure that should take place between the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the State Party in order to avoid similar case in the future.

The Delegation of **China** thanked the experts for the reactive monitoring mission. It has noted down all comments and suggestions for future improvement. The State Party noted that in the Draft Decision, the number of components of the property is 49, instead of 62. The 49 components have been protected with the highest national

legislative protection. Lastly, the State Party requested the Committee to rectify the error indicated in the document.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** needed further clarification on the number of components mentioned in the document as fragile, and inquired whether all 49 components need to be assessed as priority.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged the numerous components attached to the landscape, however pointed out that all components connect with each other, and as a whole, it presents a relationship as a cultural landscape. Therefore all components need to be protected.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments were received but that, however, he proposed to correct the deadline, from February 2016 to December 2016.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.9** was adopted as amended.

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

**Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668) – 38 COM 7B.8**

**Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707ter) - 38 COM 7B.10**

**Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu (China) (C 704) - 38 COM 7B.11**

**Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C 1056rev) - 38 COM 7B.12**

**Sangiran Early Man Site (C 593) (Indonesia) - 38 COM 7B.13**

**Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy (Indonesia) (C 1194rev) - 38 COM 7B.14**

**Masjed-e Jame of Isfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1397) - 38 COM 7B.15**

**Mausoleum of Khoja Ahmed Yasawi (Kazakhstan) (C 1103) - 38 COM 7B.16**

**Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481) - 38 COM 7B.17**

**Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666rev) - 38 COM 7B.18**

**Fort and Shalimar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171) - 38 COM 7B.19**

**Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C 722) - 38 COM 7B.20**

**Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451) - 38 COM 7B.21**

**Golden Temple of Dambulla (Sri Lanka) (C 561) - 38 COM 7B.22**

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

#### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

**City of Dubrovnik (Croatia) (C 95bis) - 38 COM 7B.25**

**The Secretariat** noted that a substantial part of the report submitted to the Centre was not in the official working languages of English or French. The new information received by the Centre after the document was submitted, include the organization of an event focusing on tourism in Dubrovnik and Venice on 28 May 2014. The third part information concerning, among others, a construction project in Dubrovnik was

also received by the Centre, which according to Paragraph 174 of the Operational Guidelines, was being verified with the State Party.

**ICOMOS** further commented, that the State Party has informed the massive project plan of cruise ship tourism in the vicinity of the property. New recreational area, involving golf centre, hotels, parks, etc., has also been planned to be constructed in the vicinity of the property, in which approval has been granted. While the Dubrovnik Conservation authorities have assured about the alignment of the project with the conservation guidelines, the Advisory Bodies expressed their concern on the irreversible impact the project may have to the OUV of the site. HIA was proposed to be conducted before the project can commence. Given the situation, reactive monitoring mission was also seen necessary to assess current conditions, which could also give opportunity for a dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party to develop a tourism development strategy.

The Delegation of **Croatia** reiterated its commitment to the Convention despite being a new member of the Committee. Efforts coordinated by UNESCO have helped the removal of the property from the Danger list in 1998. Since its inscription on the World Heritage List, Dubrovnik has an increased tourism visitation. However, the Delegation assured the Committee that the project mentioned would not be constructed in the close vicinity of the protected area, and as such, the government would take all necessary steps to protect the property. Furthermore, the State Party invited the Centre and ICOMOS to organize a mission to assess current condition at the property before all construction works take place and welcomed the recommendations following the mission. The Delegation assured its full commitment to engage in a dialogue with all relevant parties in order to protect the city of Dubrovnik.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que les pays en développement ont demandé d'aménager leurs territoires et en même temps de respecter le patrimoine mais la vieille ville de Dubrovnik est un territoire bien aménagé où les actions posent problèmes. Les villes anciennes doivent être protégées sans perdre la vision prospective. Le patrimoine n'est pas quelque chose de statique. Si une vieille ville est mise sur la liste de patrimoine, elle doit être transmise aux futures générations. Le future du patrimoine est dans la dynamique et le passe doit être recomposé de manière intelligente et cohérente. Ce sont des questions de fonds et des périls émergentes. Autant qu'on doit réfléchir sur les questions lies aux ressources du sol et de sous-sol autant on doit réfléchir à la cohabitation vertueuse entre les paysages historique et l'apport de la communauté au patrimoine de demain. Le patrimoine va continuer à se recomposer mais ça doit se passer d'une manière intelligente et en respectant les valeurs exceptionnelles universelles.

The Delegation of **Philippines** joined Croatia's proposal to invite the Centre and ICOMOS for reactive monitoring mission to assess the current condition of the site as well as potential impact that might affect the OUV of the property. The Delegation also supported the Centre to request the State Party to submit the Management Plan.

The Delegation of **Germany** was of the view to have more information, including from the reactive monitoring mission, to better assess the situation before inscribing the property on the World Heritage List in Danger. The Delegation has prepared several amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** agreed with Germany concerning the need to have more information on the situation and supported the State Party's request to conduct a reactive monitoring mission.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que le développement de la région du Dubrovnik ne dérange pas le site et soutient la position croate.

The Delegation of **Finland** fully supported Germany's view and thought that a joint reactive monitoring mission would help resolve outstanding issues.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked ICOMOS for the presentation as well as colleagues for the statements. The Delegation commended Croatia's good will to invite reactive monitoring mission to the site. Moreover, the Delegation also needed more information and clarification before taking any decision for the site.

The Delegation of **India** endorsed the positive step taken by Croatia to invite for reactive mission.

The Delegation of **Turkey** acknowledged the complex situation of the site and would like to inquire whether the construction project would hamper the OUV. Therefore, it welcomed Croatia's initiative to invite a reactive monitoring mission to the site.

The Delegation of **Poland** joined the comments and expressed that a comprehensive assessment need to be conducted before putting a site in the World Heritage List in Danger. Seeing the inadequate information at this point, therefore such major decision should not be taken.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the position of Germany and Finland, and congratulate Croatia for the invitation of a reactive monitoring mission.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** commended the good spirit demonstrated by the State Party to organize a reactive monitoring mission in order to assess condition of the site. The Delegation is in the view that the city of Dubrovnik should not be included in the Danger list for now.

The Délégation of **Algérie** souligne que selon les informations dans le rapport il s'agit d'un projet important dont les détails ne sont pas connus à ce stade. Une mission conjointe est nécessaire pour évaluer l'impact potentiel. La Délégation appuie la proposition de l'Allemagne et des autres orateurs.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that it had looked thoroughly into the project and had had a discussion with the State Party. Further it supported Poland's suggestion to take a decision with more information after the reactive monitoring mission.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** encouraged the State Party to go ahead with its plan to invite a reactive monitoring mission to assess the current conditions of the site. Moreover, the Delegation looked forward to the amendment proposed by Germany.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** agreed with Germany as well as previous speakers. It expressed its wish for the State Party to elaborate further its management plan to the Centre and ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Croatia** thanked all colleagues for their support. It further reiterated that it is not the world heritage area being put under threat, and welcomed the planned reactive monitoring mission in order to provide proof for the statement.

**ICOMOS** welcomed the invitation for the reactive monitoring mission. Seeing that the construction project has not taken place yet therefore it would be easier to conduct the assessment and to come up with recommendations to prevent negative impact to the site. It looked forward to carrying out the mission.

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

The Draft Decision **38.COM.7B.25** was adopted as amended.

### **Venice and its lagoon (Italy) (C 394) - 38 COM 7B.27**

The **Secretariat** indicated having received new information from the State Party in April 2014 informing about its plan to construct up to 4 new maritime infrastructure projects (one project in the end being abandoned). These large scale projects have been approved by the Italian authorities; however, they have not been communicated to the Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies. The Secretariat further informed the Committee, following the instruction from the Italian government authorities, that construction project will be subject to a technical review and an Environmental Impact Assessment. Furthermore, the cruise ship control project has been suspended subject to the hearing of the appeal. Lastly, the Secretariat noted on the State Party's ongoing efforts to explore alternative solutions for the passage of large ships. As has been mentioned during the presentation for Dubrovnik, a side event had taken place at the UN Headquarters that discussed the tourism industry for both Venice and Dubrovnik.

**ICOMOS** stated that the SOC report submitted by the State Party has mentioned the plan to construct 4 large maritime infrastructure projects to allow large ships to dock at Venice port. ICOMOS has also provided its assistance in reviewing the Management Plan as well as the proposal to establish the buffer zones, and had taken a positive note on the ongoing construction of mobile gates to control the high water. ICOMOS reminded that information submitted by the State Party, including HIA, shall be written in one of UNESCO working languages. Regarding the upcoming and ongoing construction projects, ICOMOS further reminded the accumulated impact these upcoming or ongoing projects may have on OUV of the site, and stressed out the need for a proper assessment. Another issue pointed out by ICOMOS was the sustainable tourism strategy that should take into account development needs. ICOMOS' proposal to conduct reactive monitoring mission would provide the opportunity for further dialogue with the State Party to assess the project and the adequacy of the management system.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked for the appropriate and detailed information on the project and its impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation underlined that those in charge of the management of a property should be in mind aspects such as tourism. Large scale maritime projects should be carefully studied to ensure compatibility with outstanding universal value, important to maintain the natural attributes of the lagoon and not only of the city.

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported other recommendations for the State Party to undertake HIA. It also inquired ICOMOS to provide its evaluation on the visual impact of the site caused by these projects as well as structure of the foundation since tourism can present both challenges and opportunities for the conservation of the property.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** rappelle que des informations émanant de la société civile devraient être examinées. Elle salue le système de vannes mobiles dénommé MoSE (Module expérimental électromécanique) destiné à contrôler les hauts niveaux d'eau en isolant temporairement le lagon de la mer et le dialogue en toute direction.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed the similarity of issues faced by the Croatian government on Dubrovnik and the Italian authorities on Venice Lagoon, noting however that this one was on a larger scale. The Delegation agreed with Senegal that the last paragraph should be amended.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments were received.

The Draft Decision **38.COM.7B.27** was adopted as amended.

#### **Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215) - 38 COM 7B.34**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that no new information had been received. However, a meeting was held in mid-April between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to review the situation, which led to the revised Draft Decision suggesting the need of a reactive monitoring mission.

**ICOMOS** referred to the findings of the previous reactive monitoring mission that had taken place in October 2013, particularly to three development proposals that caused concern for their potential to negatively impact on the OUV of the property. It recalled previous decisions by the Committee that had requested the State Party to halt the proposed development at Hale Harbour and to explore alternative options, lest the property might be placed on the list of the World Heritage in Danger in 2014. The project was deemed inappropriate for its massive scale and adverse impact on the sense of place and integrity of the site, as also acknowledged by English Heritage. However, the implementation of the project had begun as initially proposed. The revised Draft Decision proposed danger listing and a reactive monitoring mission, aimed at helping the State Party identify a possible compromise solution.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** claimed that the information provided by ICOMOS was partial and incomplete. English Heritage had in fact stated that the project did not harm the heritage value of this serial and very complex property. Moreover, the intervention under way had a considerable positive effect to the area in that it helped reducing the risk of floods over the harbour, whose continued existence was the whole point of the nomination of this property. The State Party also noted that the project being implemented was 60% smaller than the one originally submitted and concerned an area representing a very small portion of the entire World Heritage property. It therefore urged the Committee not to adopt the proposed Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested ICOMOS to address the comments made by the State Party, particularly with regard to the opinions allegedly expressed by English Heritage on the development project being considered.

The Delegation of **Poland** did not understand the rationale for the danger listing. The Delegation stated that danger listing was a measure that had a purpose, however in its view this was not warranted in this case. Noting that the project under consideration had also a positive impact on the harbour, the Delegation was not in favour of the Draft Decision as proposed.

The Delegation of **Turkey** requested ICOMOS to comment on what was stated by the State Party and asked a clarification whether a heritage impact assessment had been carried out in this case, prior to authorizing the development project.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted that the State Party had given priority to addressing the previous recommendations by the monitoring mission of October 2013, and was fully committed to the conservation of this property. It did not support the Draft Decision as proposed.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** also noted the commitment of the State Party to the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** joined others in requesting ICOMOS to react to the statements made by the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** hoped that further dialogue could take place between the State Party and ICOMOS with a view to achieving a viable compromise. ICOMOS stressed that the information it had presented was based on the situation at the time of its mission. The massive scale of the project was the reason for the concern, as this was significant within the specific setting of the Hale Harbour. ICOMOS noted that it was not against development in principle; the question was the quality of the intervention, which did not appear to be sensitive to the context. Danger listing in this case was seen as a tool to bring about a reconsideration of the development underway.

The State Party confirmed that a heritage impact assessment had been conducted, according to the procedures, and had found that the project was compatible with the heritage significance of the site. It also explained that the authorities had been considering development options for this area during nearly forty years. The selected proposal, therefore, was the result of careful considerations of all the pros and cons, including the need to sustain development and protect the harbour from floods.

The Delegation of **Germany** asked the State Party if this type of development would be sustainable, considering that the project entailed the construction of a supermarket.

The Delegation of **Turkey** wondered if the State Party could make an additional effort, in consultation with ICOMOS, to amend the project so as to reduce its impact on the property. If this was possible, the Delegation did not see any need for danger listing at this stage.

The Delegation of **Japan** commented that planning for development within a landscape context was a very complex exercise. In this respect, it wished to ask ICOMOS what sort of dialogue could take place, in its opinion, with the State Party.

**ICOMOS** stressed that it would be ready to engage into a dialogue. In its view, the supermarket as it was being constructed and the protection of the harbour from the risk of floods were not inherently related. ICOMOS had suggested a reactive monitoring mission precisely to assess the impact of the project under implementation and to discuss with the State Party possible options to mitigate the negative impacts on the site. It felt that danger listing would have enabled this process more effectively.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments presented by the Delegation of Poland aiming at removing the reference to danger listing.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the Polish proposal.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.34** was adopted as amended.

#### **Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis) - 38 COM 7B.36**

The **Secretariat** reported on new information which had been received from the State Party on 12 June last, concerning development projects in the vicinity of the property. According to this information, the national authorities had granted permission to these developments based on an assessment that had established that these posed no threat to the World Heritage property.

**ICOMOS** recalled that, over a number of years, concerns had been expressed, in decisions by the Committee, regarding the impact of tall buildings on the visual integrity of the site. These had not been addressed within the regulatory planning framework in place at the property. What was necessary was a system to protect important views to and from the Westminster Palace and adjoining buildings. ICOMOS referred in particular to some projects that had been considered problematic by English Heritage, whose legal challenges to the applications had however been rejected. The Committee had asked that these interventions be not implemented, but they went ahead. Hence, the Draft Decision suggests danger listing for the property.

The State Party emphasized the major importance attached by British to this property, which was conserved in an exemplary manner. It noted as well that the proposed developments would have no impact whatsoever on the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List, as expressed in the original criteria of the nomination. The State Party informed the Committee that since the last monitoring mission, the planning and regulatory framework in the area where the property is located had been considerably strengthened. In conclusion, it stated that the inclusion of this property on the World Heritage List in Danger would be simply unacceptable by the British people.



The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** requested that more time be given to allow further discussion between the State Party and ICOMOS, and stated that it was not in favour of danger listing at this stage.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the efforts by the State Party and acknowledged the conservation measures implemented according to its national procedures. It noted however that World Heritage properties required an additional layer of protection and thus hoped that further consultation could be held.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that the State Party should have continued its efforts, in the framework of the national guidelines for conservation while addressing the recommendations made by the Committee. It stated that it was against danger listing in this case.

The Delegation of **Turkey** joined other members of the Committee in noting that danger listing was not justified in this case, having heard the information provided by the State Party.

This opinion was supported by the Delegations of **Germany, Japan, Jamaica and Indonesia**.

The Delegation of **Portugal** declared that the issue at stake was worthy of careful consideration precisely for the reasons explained by the State Party, and particularly since English Heritage itself had expressed reservations on the projects proposed. Danger listing was obviously not in question, but a new mission should have been organized with a view to finding, hopefully by the next year, an acceptable solution. The Delegation wished to know the point of view of the State Party on the opinions expressed by English Heritage.

The State Party, in response to the comments made by the Delegation of Portugal, noted that English Heritage was the advisor to the Government on issues related to heritage, but that the Government had to make decisions based on all points of views and interests expressed. It also explained that the new regulations in place would allow for a further review of the proposed development, where English Heritage would have the opportunity to express again its opinion.

**ICOMOS** recalled the concerns expressed by the Committee in its two previous sessions. It acknowledged the strengthening of the regulatory framework, but noted that those concerns were widely shared among heritage experts. The danger listing of the property would help those in charge of reviewing the proposals in making the right decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to the Draft Decision, submitted by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, removing the reference to danger listing.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.36** adopted as amended.

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

**Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80bis) - 38 COM 7B.26**  
**Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994) - 38 COM 7B.28**  
**Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125) - 38 COM 7B.29**  
**Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544) - 38 COM 7B.30**  
**Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C 1170) - 38 COM 7B.31**  
**Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632) - 38 COM 7B.32**  
**Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) - 38 COM 7B.33**  
**Tower of London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 488) - 38 COM 7B.35**  
**New Lanark (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 429rev) - 38 COM 7B.37**

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

**LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

**City of Potosi (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (C 420) – 38 COM 7B.38**

The **Secretariat** recalled the concerns related to this property, notably at one of its main components, the Cerro Rico Mountain. In the past four years, 2 reactive monitoring missions had visited the property, in 2010 and most recently in 2013 and 2014. The last reactive monitoring mission concluded on the necessity to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as a call for action and means to assist the State Party in the implementation of a series of indispensable conservation and management measures and to mobilize international cooperation. Recently, the World Heritage Centre had been notified by the State Party of two important measures undertaken at the property: the closing of two of the mines located at the risk zone above 4400 mts of Cerro Rico Mountain (Mercedes and Maniquiri) and the relocation of workers in other exploitation areas.

**ICOMOS** explained more in detail the nature of the factors threatening the heritage value of the property, as identified by the various missions undertaken, which were mainly related to mining infrastructure. It noted that these constituted serious and specific threats that would justify danger listing according to the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked whether the Secretariat could circulate the information received recently from the State Party.

The **Secretariat** clarified that the only information that had been received was that which it had just presented to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recalled the recent tragic mining accident that had affected its country, where more than 300 persons had lost their lives. It explained that strict measures would be taken to strengthen the security and safety of the mines, and

wondered if the system in place at the mining site of Potosi was adequate. The Delegation also stressed that it was time for the international community to support the efforts of the State Party. Danger listing could have been considered, but only if this was accompanied by concrete measures to help the State Party address the challenges faced by the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that danger listing in this case appeared to be justified according to the mission report. However the Delegation criticised that the same report didn't clarified the necessary paths and methods to develop the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) in this sense the Delegation asked the State Party of Bolivia to explain what are the specific corrective measures to be envisaged to reverse the situation of the property.

**ICOMOS** clarified that the proposed mission was precisely intended to better assessing the threats affecting the property and work with the State Party to define specific corrective measures, as reflected in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted the great historic importance of this property. It expressed concerns about the risk of collapse as reported. There was clearly a need for a plan to address these security issues as well as to appropriately conserve and develop the site. The Delegation asked whether the State Party could provide details on what was being envisaged.

Since the State Party was not in the room, the **Secretariat** explained that consultations were ongoing with the national authorities of Bolivia On this issue. Once the property was going to be danger listed, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS would work closely with the State Party to identify the Desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR).

The **Rapporteur** stated that there were no amendments proposed for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM.7B.38** was adopted.

#### **Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev) – 38 COM 7B.41**

The **Secretariat** explained that, following consultations with the State Party, an amended Draft Decision was proposed for consideration by the Committee, which reflected some specific technical constrains at the site. At the same time, the **Secretariat** considered important to highlight the excellent cooperation established with the State Party for the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of this symbolic property. The Secretariat also informed the Members of the Committee that following the recent difficulties due to the fires that affected the City of Valparaíso, the World Heritage Centre, in coordination with the national authorities in Chile, had launched an emergency assistance programme to help addressing some of the most pressing issues.

**ICOMOS** referred to a development project that had been examined already in 2013 and stated that it was working closely with the State Party to identify a balanced

solution to the needs of this lively port city. The revised Draft Decision reflected this dialogue.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed solidarity to the victims of the fire that had ravaged the city of Valparaiso and stated that this property deserved the support of the international community. It also reported that the State Party had deployed huge efforts to comply with the Convention, and the Committee should have taken this into consideration and that this case is a good example to ensure a responsible approach between the requirements of the Convention and the needs for development.

The Delegation of **Portugal** took good note of the consultations that had taken place between ICOMOS and the State Party. This had done a lot to preserve its heritage and the terrible fire that struck the city had also shown the exceptional resilience of its communities. The balance which had been reached should have been acknowledged.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the State Party for the progress made and the commitments shown, including through developing a new national policy on heritage protection and a management plan for the property. The Delegation noted that, according to the information received, the development under way had been stopped following the discovery of archaeological remains. The compromise found should be welcomed.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the efforts made by the State Party. The good quality of the management plan was to be noted. It also considered the process of consultations with the State Party as a good practice to be commended.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that this was an interesting case and was glad that a consensual solution could be found.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the Draft Decision, with regard to the issue of the development projects, and expressed its satisfaction on the achievement of a compromise.

The Delegations of **Serbia, Germany and Philippines** supported the views expressed by the Delegations of Portugal, Colombia and Turkey in commending the State Party and welcoming the consensus between this and ICOMOS.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** exprime sa solidarité envers le pays concernant l'état de conservation du bien et se solidarise avec l'incendie récent. Elle évoque la bonne gestion et la conciliation des impératives du développement et la préservation du patrimoine par l'Etat Partie du Chili.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se félicite du partenariat entre l'Etat Partie et les Organisations consultatives, et note le cas de Valparaiso comme exemple d'une bonne pratique de dialogue et de coopération en vue de la conservation des biens de la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** joined others speakers in extending support to the victims of the fires that affected the city.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that the process under way in Valparaiso was a model of cooperation between a State Party and ICOMOS facilitated by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the Draft Decision.

The State Party of **Chile** took the floor to thank the members of the Committee and hoped that the following year the issues could be resolved so as to enable the continuation of the development projects.

The **Rapporteur** acknowledged the commitment shown by the State Party and read the Draft Decision which included proposed revisions under paragraphs 7 and 8.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.41** was adopted as amended.

*The session rose at 7 pm*

**THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY 18 June 2014**

**FIFTH MEETING**

**9:00 a.m. – 1 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)**

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

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

**CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

**LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

**Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia,  
Plurinational State of) (C 567rev) – 38 COM 7B.39**

The Secretariat indicated that after the submission of the SOC report, the State Party had submitted on 9 June 2014, a document regarding the progress made in the finalization of the Management and the Conservation Plan for the property. This significant progress was considered as an important step to ensure an effective management and conservation of the property. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies will be working in the next months in close collaboration with the Ministry of Cultures of Bolivia to finalize these plans. This will enable the operational launching of the conservation project for the property being financed by the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in Trust for World Heritage. The Secretariat announced that a revised Draft Decision was proposed for adoption taking into consideration this new information.

**ICOMOS** welcomed this development and acknowledged the generous contribution made by the Japanese Funds in Trust to support the implementation of Conservation actions. The management and conservation plan is an important step in addressing long-standing concerns, mainly related to the lack of an adequate management system for the site as well as conservation policies. However, given that these are very recent developments, ICOMOS stated that the decision should still reflect the concern about the extent of restoration interventions and request that these be suspended until conservation policies can be evaluated and enforced. It should also be recommended that the establishment of the buffer zone, and regulatory measures be finalized to adequately protect the OUV of the property and its conditions of authenticity and integrity.

The Delegation of **Colombia** shared the appreciation of this encouraging news.

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

**Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971) – 38 COM. 7B.40**

**City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) – 38 COM. 7B.43**

**Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico) (C 416) – 38 COM. 7B.45**

**Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) – 38 COM. 7B.46**

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

Delegation of **Jamaica** indicated that it wished to submit amendments to the Draft Decisions on Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic), National History Park - Citadel, Sans Souci Ramiers (Haiti) and Historic Inner City of Paramaribo (Suriname). It offered a general point on Caribbean sites which are extremely vulnerable.

The Delegation of **Philippines**, by Point of order, asked whether the Rules of Procedure allowed proposing amendments when the state of conservation of a property was not up for discussion.

The **Secretariat** explained that this was not a case for Rules of Procedure, but rather a procedural decision for the Committee.

The **Secretariat** explained that a deadline had been provided for submitting reports for discussion, but that Committee members could propose for discussion sites they wish to deal with.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed on the 3 Draft Decisions.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.

**Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526) – 38 COM. 7B.42**

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B .42** was adopted as amended.

**National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180) – 38 COM. 7B.44**

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.44** was adopted as amended.

**Historic Inner City of Paramaribo (C 940rev) (Suriname) – 38 COM. 7B.47**

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.47** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested to open a discussion on the State of Conservation of **Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) - 38 COM 7B.33** which was part of the State of conservation reports for the Europe and North America region that were adopted without discussion the day before.

Le **Conseiller Juridique** informe que pour revenir sur une décision déjà adoptée, il faut une décision du Comité à la majorité des 2/3.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that it had received information on Kiev late and therefore it wished to propose an amendment regarding the date of submission of the state of conservation report, which should be requested for 2015 instead of 2016.

The **Chairperson** asked if there was a consensus of the Committee to proceed with the amendment of the said decision.

No objections were made. The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B 33** was adopted as amended.

## **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

### **Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125) - - 38 COM. 7B.29**

The Delegation of **Croatia** stated that it was speaking on behalf of Kotor, it said that the State Party had made significant efforts with the state of conservation of the property and that the Committee should be more cautious about the Decision.

The **Secretariat** explained the process of dealing with the state of conservation for this property. It clarified that it had received communications from different institutions and ministries regarding the property and that comments from the State Party and the Advisory Bodies had been taken into account in the proposed revised Draft Decision 38 COM 7B 29rev. distributed to the members of the Committee.

**ICOMOS** thanked the State Party for inviting in 2013 the Advisory mission to the property which provided an important opportunity to work directly with its representatives on addressing issues raised by the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions. The recommendations of the mission were mainly on four aspects: improvement on the conservation policy, improvement on urban and territorial planning, transportation networks and technical assistance. After the mission, the State Party sent an interim report on follow up actions implemented. These positive steps were noted in the state of conservation report. ICOMOS noted that considerable efforts had been made in setting up legislative and regulatory frameworks and developing planning tools to address urban development. Zoning plans, which identify areas for new development and areas for strict protection will also need to be developed and integrated at the territorial planning level. As has been recommended by the Committee in previous sessions, clear provisions are needed to define what will be acceptable for future development in relation to the conservation of OUV of the property and the qualities and characteristics of the cultural landscape.

The Delegation of **Serbia** strongly supported the Croatian Delegation's suggestion.

The Delegation of **Poland** also supported the proposal.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recalled that Montenegro was a small state dependent on tourism. It therefore also supported this proposal in order to be more flexible on the tourism aspect.



The Delegation of **Croatia** clarified that the amendment that had been proposed by Qatar.

The Delegation of **Qatar** explained that it had recommended this amendment given that previously all projects were to be suspended which would negatively affect regional development.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie la proposition du Qatar étant attachée au défi de concilier l'impératif du développement à la protection du patrimoine.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose la reformulation suivante: « encourager la mise en œuvre contrôlée des projets d'aménagement ».

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the amendment and said that it could accept either of the terms.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the wording proposed by Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Croatia** underlined that the buffer zones and the region of Kotor should be considered as a whole, noting that the region was far larger than the buffer zone. The State Party wished to carry out activities in the region which would be without any impact on the town of Kotor. Stating that a mission should be undertaken, the Delegation strongly suggested that the Committee assess the situation in 2015 and 2016, with the objective to help Montenegro to preserve OUV of the town of Kotor and its bay.

**ICOMOS** recalled that the mission findings indicated that there may be some issues in a number of towns in the area and that it should be ensured that no impact on OUV occurred, thus a Heritage Impact Assessment should be done.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Resolution.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.29** was adopted as amended.

## **AFRICA**

### **Lower Omo Valley (Ethiopia) (C 17) – 38 COM. 7B.48**

The Secretariat presented the state of conservation of the property, notably with regard to the Kuraz sugar development project which would have significant adverse impacts on three fossil bearing geological formations and lead to potentially highly damaging changes that could be sustained by the landscape over a large area of some 100 km<sup>2</sup>, which depending on the exact location could cover some two thirds of the area of the property. These impacts include irreversible damage to fossil remains from excavations, the impact of machinery, agriculture and irrigation, and from looting and trampling associated with new settlements. The State Party had not provided the EIA for the sugar development project, which apparently was carried out in 2011. There were conflicting statements about the location of the plantations, roads and settlements in terms of their positioning with regard to the property, and the boundaries of neither the property nor the buffer zone had been delineated. However, according to recent information, the State Party had provided funding to

the UNESCO office in Addis Abeba to work on the delimitation of the property as well as on the management plan. The Secretariat pointed out that the same Kuraz sugar development, which will substract large volumes of water from the Omo river for irrigation purposes, was also a concern for the property of Lake Turkana in Kenya. Finally, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to invite a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property to consider the potential impact of the Kuraz project on the OUV of the property.

**ICOMOS** added that an additional difficulty stemmed from the lack of precise information on the location of the proposed development. The HIA undertaken provided ample evidence of the potentially highly damaging change to the landscape that the Sugar Cane project would bring – which, depending on precisely how the development relates to the boundaries, could cover as much as 100sq. km of the 165sq. km property. The mitigation measures suggested, such as confining roads to fossil poor areas were not in any way adequate, and a much more detailed HIA is needed. ICOMOS further provided information on the OUV of the property, and recalled its vulnerability. It compared the situation in 2012 when the SOUV had been prepared and today when there was a fully formed development project which could impact on two-thirds of the property; progress is only just about to start of defining the boundaries of the property in relation to attributes of OUV, and on the definition of its buffer zone or landscape setting has not yet been started. It also recalled that at the time of inscription the landscape of the lower Omo valley was lightly grazed by pastoralists – and probably had been for thousands of years. This practice was beneficial for the archaeological deposits. It is now understood that these pastoralists have been or are to be re-settled as part of the plantation project. ICOMOS strongly supported the need for a Reactive Monitoring Mission to consider these issues. More detailed information should be provided by the State Party on the scope and extent of the proposed sugar plantation project, and its present status.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested the State Party to comment on the sugar cane project.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended the State Party for preparing the HIE of the Kuraz project and fully supported the request for international assistance for preparing the management plan. It recalled the tremendous importance of the site for human evolution. It offered sharing the experience of Turkey with similar sites (Catalhoyuk).

The Delegation of **Philippines** stated that the site was of high archaeological significance. It is one overall property, not a serial site. The location of the Kuraz project should be very clearly established in the HIA. It supported the extension of assistance through a reactive monitoring mission and boundary delineation.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with ICOMOS on the need for delineation of boundaries and for a reactive monitoring mission. It wished to hear the State Party's view.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime que la basse vallée de l'Omo est très importante pour humanité, sa gestion nous interpelle tous, des actes positifs ont été posés. Elle pense que la demande d'assistance de l'Ethiopie doit être encouragée et soutenue et qu'il faut donner du temps à l'Etat partie pour fournir des informations objectives.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** explained that there were efforts concerning the delineation of the property and the management plan, that 400,000 Euros had been provided from the European Union, with UNESCO managing the project. Regarding the project, the authorities had carefully reviewed it and when mission comes it will be able to see that nothing will be affected.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed full support to the preservation of this site for the benefit of future generations.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.48** was adopted, without amendments.

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

**Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055) – 38 COM. 7B.49**

**Historic Centre of Agadez (Niger) (C 1268) – 38 COM. 7B.52**

**Osun-Osogbo Sacred Groove (Nigeria) (C 1118) – 38 COM. 7B.53**

**Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis) – 38 COM. 7B.54**

**Stone Town of Zanzibar (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C 173rev) – 38 COM. 7B.55**

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

#### **ARAB STATES**

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

**Wadi Rum Protected Area (Jordan) (C/N 1377) – 38 COM. 7B.56**

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

#### **MIXED PROPERTIES**

#### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

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

**Pyrénées Mont Perdu (France, Spain) (C/N 773bis) – 38 COM. 7B.57**

**Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region (the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) (C/N 99ter) – 38 COM. 7B.58**

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

## **AFRICA**

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

**Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147rev) – 38 COM. 7B.59**

**Bandiagara Cliffs (land of the Dogons) (Mali) (C/N 516) – 38 COM. 7B.60**

**Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C/N 39bis) – 38 COM. 7B.61**

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

## **NATURAL PROPERTIES**

### **ARAB STATES**

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

**Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506) – 38 COM. 7B.62**

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

## **ASIA-PACIFIC**

**Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154) – 38 COM. 7B.63**

The Delegation of **Malaysia** wished to open this State of Conservation report for discussion, in light of the State Party' good progress since 2011 with respect to this important site. It suggested small but important amendments to the Draft Decision because the State Party had committed both financially and politically to resolve all issues of concern of the Committee and other stakeholders. It was an iconic property for marine life but also for fishermen. The Delegation stated that the State Party should be given more time to solve concerns and invited it to provide comments.

The Delegation of **Japan** recalled that the most important issue was water quality for coral reefs. Stating that some concerns were present about how the government was dealing with the offset system for water quality, it asked the Delegation of Australia to provide more details. If the explanations were satisfactory, the Committee should agree to the amendments proposed.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that after the finalization of the current working document, the State Party had submitted additional information to the World Heritage Centre which was also shared with IUCN. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended that the Committee welcome the progress achieved by the State Party towards improved water quality and encourage it to sustain the efforts to

achieve the ultimate goal of no detrimental impact on the health and resilience of the reef. It is also recommended that the Committee welcome the progress made with the Strategic Assessment (SA) and the preparations for the LTPSD. Considering that completion of these documents is anticipated for review by the Committee in 2015, substantive analysis on their results will be undertaken next year when the GBR Outlook Report will also be completed. Regarding coastal development, it noted with concern that major decisions have been taken before the relevant SAs and LTPSD have been completed. It is clear that this strategy requires strengthening in order to put into legislation the State Party's commitment to protect the property from the impacts of port development, as well as rigorous commitment to ensure that no port developments or associated port infrastructure are permitted outside the existing long-established port areas within or adjacent to the property. With regard to the proposed dumping of dredged material from the proposed Abbot Point development, the State Party has shared further information as mentioned above.

The **Secretariat** further brought to the attention of the Committee on UNESCO Director-General's initiative to reinforce dialogue, communication and transparency between the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Center and the States Parties. A meeting was organized on 22 January 2014 for that purpose which provided an opportunity to express views and concerns regarding the specific challenges confronting the State of Conservation of the Great Barrier Reef. The Secretariat also acknowledged that it had received a large volume of reports and statements from various sources. In this respect, how to establish a mechanism for accessing the stream of information of such an enormous site is a question for the Committee. It finally summarized additional information provided by the State Party after the finalization of the current working document.

The **Secretariat** and IUCN recommended that the Committee consider, in the absence of substantial progress on the key issues identified by the Committee, the inscription of the Great Barrier Reef on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2015.

**IUCN** recalled that the state of conservation of the Great Barrier Reef had been discussed by the Committee since its 35<sup>th</sup> session in 2011, the key issues being 1. Coastal development, particularly development of ports and Liquefied Natural Gas facilities within the property; 2. Water quality; 3. The need for a Strategic Assessment of the entire property and its coastal area; and 4. Overall governance and management of the property. IUCN noted that the State Party has made progress on some of these points, notably with Strategic Assessments of the property and the adjacent coastal zone, and with improvements in water quality. However, a number of issues remained. Major decisions had been taken in December 2013 to approve developments prior to the completion of the Strategic Assessments and the Long Term Plan for Sustainable Development, including a port expansion at Abbott Point, which requires significant dredging. Associated with this development, a proposal to dump 3 million cubic meters within the property was approved prior to an assessment of less damaging alternatives. On 5 June 2014, the State Party published the Queensland Ports Strategy, which replaces the Great Barrier Reef Ports Strategy of 2012. The Queensland Ports Strategy proposes the establishment of five Priority Port Development Areas (PPDAs), four of which overlap with the property. In contrast with the intentions stated by the State Party in its supplementary information of 17 February 2014, the Queensland Ports Strategy does not reflect the Australian Government's commitment to protect greenfield areas from the impacts of development. It also does not confirm that the Fitzroy Delta, Keppel Bay, and North

Curtis Island will not be included in Priority Port Development Areas. Furthermore, the restriction on dredging included in the Strategy provides no assurances regarding restrictions on new port development or associated infrastructure outside existing and long-established major port areas, including those that are not included in PPDAs. Therefore IUCN stated that the Committee's request, made at its 36<sup>th</sup> session, had only been partly addressed for the State Party *"to not permit any new port development or associated infrastructure outside of the existing and long-established major port areas within or adjoining the property"*.

IUCN further noted that the Strategy foresees *"legislative changes to provide streamlining benefits for port development"*. IUCN highlighted the importance of the 2012 mission's recommendation regarding legal protection, institutional and management arrangements for the property, and that it will be crucial for the State Party to ensure its full implementation prior to implementing legislative changes that would facilitate port development.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recognized the importance of the Reef as an ecosystem for the world and the mayor threats it faced. It acknowledged the significant advances in the regulations taken for the improvement of the quality of the water. Nevertheless, it expressed these actions were not enough and suggested that the decision should demand the State Party to strengthen their conservation measures. It encouraged the State Party to overcome the incoherence's between local and federal politics and manifested its support to the Draft Decision so that the State Party can present during the next session of the Committee the advances done to overcome the threats over the site.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed that the conditions of the Reef had seriously declined. They recognized the efforts of the State Party to enhance the Reefs protection and reduce fishing and pollution. It expressed its concern on the effects that climate change and development projects have upon the Reef. It called out to other States Parties to support the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recognized the effort of the State Party. However, they expressed concern for the threats affecting the Reef based on the information of experts. It urged the state party to adopt measures to overcome the threats affecting the Reef.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed that the Great Barrier Reef was an international model for marine conservation. Nevertheless it pointed out that the Draft Decision foresees the negative trends. It expressed its concern on the fragility and integrity of the property as a result of development projects and acknowledged the efforts of the State Party and its commitment to continue conservation measures.

The Delegation of **Portugal** manifested their agreement with the Draft Decision and information provided by the State Party. However it pointed out that the efforts were not enough. It expressed not to fully understand how the Reef Plan or other plans could mitigate the threats affecting the integrity of the site. It considered the evaluation of the Advisory Bodies to be correct.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed that the conservation of the site supposed challenges regarding its extension. It acknowledged the progress done by the State

Party; however pointed out that recent developments as dumping ditch material were a reason of concern. It supported the Draft Decision as it was presented.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** fait remarquer que La Grande Barrière de Corail est une préoccupation depuis 2011 pour l'écosystème mondial. La déléguée de l'Algérie énumère les projets, réunions et concertations qui ont eu lieu entre l'Etat partie et les différents acteurs du bien et remercie l'Etat partie pour tous ces efforts. Cependant la déléguée de l'Algérie trouve que le projet qui prévoit le déversement de 3 millions de m<sup>3</sup> dragué sur le territoire du bien pourrait éventuellement menacer la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Elle souhaiterait savoir si une solution alternative à ce projet existe. De plus, il a été soulevé des préoccupations concernant la gouvernance du bien, notamment à l'affaiblissement du cadre réglementaire du Queens Land en matière de protection du bien. Elle souhaite que l'Etat partie apporte des précisions qui puissent lever toute inquiétude (aussi bien par les gestionnaires du site que par la société civile) concernant le transfert du pouvoir de décision du niveau Fédéral au niveau de l'Etat.

The Delegation of **Peru** acknowledged the measures to preserve the site taken by the State Party. However, it manifested concern for the loss of values of the site. It supported the intervention made by the Delegation of Colombia.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** requested the State Party to clarify the decision to transfer decision making from federal to national power, and demanded information regarding other assessments or alternate measures that have taken place which mitigate the impact of development projects and pollution on the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** manifested the site comprises valuable ecosystems with various national parks. It expressed however, there is risk of chemical pollution at the site. It acknowledged the efforts of the State Party to improve the conditions of the water despite the size of the property. It expressed concern regarding challenges and management of the site and supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Philippines** congratulated the State Party for the efforts done to mitigate the threats of the site and encouraged the State Party to continue its work regarding assessment on projects that impacts the site.

La Délégation du **Liban**, par un point d'ordre rappelle les règles du Comité, observateurs peuvent prendre la parole uniquement après que les membres du Comité se soient exprimés. Elle rappelle également que la barrière de corail est un sujet extrêmement important à l'échelle mondiale. Le Projet de décision est tout à fait équilibré car non seulement il rappelle les efforts de l'Etat partie mais aussi il met l'accent sur les problèmes. Toutefois, il mentionne que le fait de demander la soumission d'un résumé d'une page sur l'état de conservation du bien est disproportionné par rapport à la taille du bien.

The Delegation of **Poland** considered the Draft Decision to be appropriate. It requested the WWF to be given the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed concern regarding the quality of the site. It manifested its support to the State Party to preserve the site.

The representative of the **WWF** (Observer) took the floor and explained that since the site was inscribed in the World Heritage List 50 percent of its richness had been lost. It appealed to reduce the dumping near the site and asked the Committee if it considered the threats to be protecting the OUV's of the property. It appealed to the Committee to adopt the Draft Decision as it was presented originally.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** took the floor to answer questions raised by the Committee. They assured that no projects had been approved outside the existing porting zones and that in each case a rigorous environmental impact assessment had taken place. It explained that net benefit conditions which consist in a legal instrument approved by the federal government are applied to the projects. It explained that the instrument enforces placing the sand and silt in an area with similar conditions, situated 25 kilometers from the nearest coral as a way to protect the site and improve the quality of the water. Since it is a legal instrument it expressed its disagreement with paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision, which stated that no environmental impact assessment has taken place. It affirmed it will report back for the long-term sustainability plan and affirmed it is engaged to continue working with state parties, the Center and IUCN. The Minister of Environment of Queensland took the floor to respond to the Committees concerns. He expressed that regarding the prohibition of porting; Queensland Port Strategy would address the issue during the next decade and explained that reports have shown pollution loads are decreasing. He further pointed out that despite remarks by Committee members Queensland have strengthened its legislation to assure protection of the OUVs of the Great Barrier Reef alongside the Australian government. He added that jointly they are investing approximately 180 million dollars each year. He ended by reiterating the commitment of Queensland with the World Heritage Committee to preserve the site for future generations.

The **Secretariat** answered the question from the Delegation of Lebanon regarding the last paragraph on the executive summary of the Draft Decision by stating this was a standardized paragraph for all Draft Decisions.

**IUCN** commented on the transfer on decision taking powers mentioned by some Committee members. It explained that the intention in the Draft Decision was to ensure the long term plan was completed. It expressed it was evident after the reactive monitoring that all parties agreed on the need to improve the governance of the Great Corral Reef. It also noted that the federal and state level which is Canberra and Queensland have an essential role to play to assure conservation of the site. It highlighted that the presence of the Minister of Queensland in the Committee showed its commitment towards the protection of the site. It considered that the wording on paragraph 7 of the decision was comprehensive.

The **Rapporteur** indicated having received amendments from the Delegations of Malaysia and Japan and read them out.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported by **Finland, Colombia and Germany**, pointed out the importance of maintaining the integrity of the site as stated in the OUVs and reiterated that dumping, dredging, and sediment discharges affecting the property did not assure the protection of the site. It agreed with the original Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the Delegation of Portugal.



The Delegation of **Colombia**, supported the Delegation of Portugal, pointed out that the purpose of the Committee should be towards the protection of the OUVs as stated in the original Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutien les propositions des Délégations de la Croatie, **Allemagne, Pologne et Portugal**.

La Délégation du **Japon** exprime son accord sont en contradiction avec les éléments fournis par le Centre du Patrimoine Mondial et l'IUCN. La Délégation est tout à fait d'accord avec le texte original tant qu'il n'y a pas d'informations supplémentaires.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** expressed they had introduced only minor amendments to the Draft Decision in order to take into consideration the progress made by the State Party since the past World Heritage Committee Session in Cambodia. It expressed it trusted the sincerity of the State Party with the measures proposed to protect the Reef.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** pense que le Comité doit trouver un consensus. L'objectif est celui de faire en sorte que la VUE de ce site soit préservée et se demande si la proposition du Japon et de la Malaisie ne peut-elle pas répondre à cela. Elle déplore le fait que le Comité n'ait pas suffisamment d'information de la part de l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that the Committee was demanding too many tasks to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its support to the original Draft Decision.

La Délégation de **Portugal** apprécie l'effort de la Délégation algérienne, et assure que sa Délégation est disposée à un compromis. Elle note qu'il y a une nette majorité en faveur du maintien du Projet de décision tel que proposé.

The Delegations of **Kazakhstan and Senegal** expressed their support to the amendments proposed by Malaysia.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the amendments proposed by the different Delegations.

La Délégation du **Liban**, par un point d'ordre, demande à ce que l'adoption se fasse paragraphe par paragraphe.

After an extensive debate on the amendments proposed, it was decided to retain the original Draft decision.

The Draft decision **38 COM 7B.63** was adopted.

### **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338) – 38 COM. 7B.65**

The **Chairperson** informed that this report was opened at the requested of the Delegation of India and therefore gave the floor to the Delegation.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated its commitment to preserve the OUV of the property and recognized the threats to the property notably by the poaching of rhinos.

It expressed it has taken adequate steps to provide legal protection for armed guards and community volunteers. In this sense, it explained that measures had led to positive outcomes and highlighted the fact that during the first semester of 2014 no poaching of rhinos was reported. It also clarified that new encroachments did not have any serious consequences against the OUV's. Regarding the issue of security deterioration in the site, it manifested it was a reflection of the changes experienced by the instability of governance during election periods in the country. It requested that IUCN and Committee members to reconsider the reactive monitoring mission to the site.

The **Secretariat** explained that the State Party has not provided further information after the completion of the working document. It stated that the main conservation issues affecting the property included reported increase of poaching, encroachment and armed insurgence. Nevertheless, it explained that after the inclusion of the site in the World Heritage in Danger List in 1992, the Committee considered in its 35<sup>th</sup> session that the OUV's of the property had progressed significantly and proceeded to remove it from the World Heritage List in Danger. It further explained that after a mission undertaken to the property in 2012 the IUCN and World Heritage Centre still considered that the OUV's of the property were still fragile due to the reported increase of poaching. Given the conservation issues they recommend the Committee in its 36<sup>th</sup> session to request a reactive monitor mission to assess the conservation of the site.

**IUCN** welcomed the significant efforts done by the State Party to implement the recommendations of the 35<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> sessions of the World Heritage Committee and the implementation of a tourism strategy. However, they expressed its concern regarding new reports of poaching of rhinos and encroachment, which could be linked to renewed activities by insurgent groups. It expressed it agreed with the World Heritage Centre for a reactive joint monitoring mission to take place to evaluate the state of conservation of property.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** stated it agreed that the State Party should be given more time to address conservation issues and report back to the Committee in February 2015 and then consider if a reactive mission should take place.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported the Delegation of Malaysia by stating that the State Party needed more time to prepare a report.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the Delegations of Malaysia and Viet Nam.

The Delegation of **Philippines**, followed by the Delegation of Croatia and Turkey supported India's request.

The Delegations of **Croatia** and **Turkey** supported the postponement of the mission.

The Delegation of **India** recalled to the Rapporteur that if the Draft Decisions were to be presented as it was, a reactive monitor mission would have to take place.

The Rapporteur proposed a change of date from 1<sup>st</sup> of February to 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015. The Delegation reiterated that they would not commit for a reactive mission to take place.

The **Chairperson** recalled to the Committee that a State Party cannot make an amendment to a property situated in its country and asked the Committee to propose an amendment to the decision.

The **IUCN** proposed to delete paragraph 9 and to retain paragraph 10 and report back with a SOC report in 2015. It expressed this would determine the need for a reactive mission.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the motion and thanked the IUCN.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.65** was adopted as amended.

### **Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev) – 38 COM. 7B.71**

**The Secretariat** indicated that the Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex was a collection of five protected areas on eastern Thailand. It recalled that the Committee deliberated in its 37th session noting concern over the expansion of an existing road going through the property, the construction of a dam in the property's boundary, encroachment from neighboring communities and illegal logging. It further explained that the committee requested the State Party to invite a reactive mission to assess the implementation of the previous decisions made by the Committee and added that the mission took place from the 13<sup>th</sup> to 17<sup>th</sup> of January 2014.

It underlined nevertheless its concern since no further information has been received by the World Heritage Centre and given that the reactive monitoring mission noticed concern to the OUV's of the property the World Heritage Centre recommend that the Committee may consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**IUCN** explained that the State Party has made advances on the Committee's recommendations in relation to the expansion of the highway, removal of illegal cattle raising in the property and mitigation effects of the construction of the dam. It added that reports have been received concerning plans for the construction of a dam within the property and confirmed by the State Party. It also stressed out that an environmental impact assessment has not been carried out and proceeded to recommend the Committee to request the commitment of the State Party not to allow any further dam constructions that may impact the property. It added that despite the progress done by the State Party after the reactive monitoring mission, efforts to monitor the land use the property continues to be under pressure from encroachment; neighboring land use, resort developments and tense relations between authorities and local communities. It further added that the property was facing logging and that clashes between poaches and park staff were becoming increasingly violent. In this respect it extended their condolences to families of workers in the park staff who were killed or injured in name of conservation. It finally suggested that strong cooperation at international level was required and more efforts needed between other state parties including transit and market countries to control this illegal trade.

**IUCN** and the **World Heritage Centre** therefore recommended to the Committee to inscribe the site in the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Thailand** affirmed that the recommendations to inscribe the property in the World Heritage List in danger are unjustified and untimely. It expressed to share the concern with illegal logging and trade of wood by armed groups and explained that the State Party has adapted sustainable solutions to address this problem as well as safety of the park rangers. It informed the Committee that Thailand and Cambodia decided to create a joint committee to combat threats affecting the property and stressed out the need for transboundary solutions. It affirmed the State Party has the willingness to apply UNESCO's and IUCN's recommendations and considered that given an appropriate time frame it would be able to successfully implement measures to preserve the OUV's of the property. It highlighted that any abrupt decision may disrupt the engagement of stakeholders. It concluded by requesting the Committee not to inscribe the property in the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** congratulated the State Party for the measures done to reduce the impact of the high way and other threats to the property. It expressed there should be an appropriate time frame to allow the measures to take place. It concluded by saying the site should not be included in the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed concern regarding the threats in the property and encourages the State Party to ensure measures to preserve its OUV's. It congratulated the efforts done by the State Party and stated that would revise the information it has provided.

The Delegation of **Philippines** expressed that given the scale of the site it was evident the challenge in terms of preservation. It acknowledges the efforts done by the State Party and parks personnel and agreed to give the State Party more time to adopt the recommendations of IUCN. It manifested its agreement with other Delegations that the site should not be placed in the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed that noticeable efforts has been done by the State Party to control the road expansion and environmental monitoring to reduce the impact of the dam. It considered that impact assessment, implementation of programs with local community involvement among others reflect good achievements and progress by the State Party and added it was willing to give more time to Thailand to work with neighbors and stakeholders. It manifested its agreement with other Delegations that the site should not be placed in the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** indicated that the increasing rate of the illegal logging was alarming and highlighted this was not only responsibility of Thailand but also of other States Parties. It manifested they can agree with the amendments as long as it reiterated the importance to join efforts in the property's protection. It supported the Delegation of Finland regarding that other state parties who export rosewood should be involved in the mitigation process of the threats over the property. It recalled the issue of the rain forest of Madagascar as an example of the situation. Finally it indicated thee need to mobilize international support.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged the sincerity of the State Party and the measures taking place including laws to combat illegal logging. It agreed with other

Delegation that not only suppliers but also demanders should be part of a strategy to prevent illegal logging. It manifested that Thailand needed time to implement recommendations and considered the inclusion of the property in the World Heritage List in Danger to be too premature.

The Delegation of **Japan** shared its concern for the site and appreciated if the Committee could demand more time for Thailand to implement recommendations to protect the OUV's of the property. It recalled that the State Party of Thailand has a long history in the successful promotion of the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recognized the efforts of Thailand and acknowledged situations as this occurs in many countries. It expressed to be in favor of an international call that may put a stop to the demand of the illegal wood logging. It agreed with other Delegations that the State Party required time to implement conservation measures.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** agreed that additional time should be given to the State Party and acknowledged efforts undertaken by Thailand.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the extension of a time frame to put in practice conservation measures and acknowledged the efforts of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Portugal** joined the recognition by other Delegations on the efforts done by Thailand. It highlighted nevertheless, that in some opportunities when a property is placed in the World Heritage List in Danger it may improve conservation measures. It added that after listening to the representative of Thailand it agreed it is convenient to give more time to the State Party to implement measures.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed to share its empathy with Thailand taking in mind the State Party of Indonesia is also challenged with similar threats to sites. It suggested to the Committee to enhance programs on how to improve the economy of people around sites without affecting the conservation of a World Heritage Site by balancing the values of the property and the living conditions of the people besides the property.

The **IUCN** recognized the challenges of the State Party regarding encroachment and illegal logging and are satisfied with the dialogues with the State Party and added that the additional information provided by the State Party is encouraging. It expressed that the Ministry in charge of natural resources at the national level should also compromise to join efforts to preserve the site. It stressed out that the World Heritage List in Danger could be a catalyzer to mobilize international cooperation and that this could be considered in the future for the site.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm*

**THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY 18 June 2014**

**SIXTH MEETING**

**3 p.m. – 7 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani (Qatar) and H. E. Mrs Fatim Gueye (Senegal)**

**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)**

**ASIA-PACIFIC**

**Dong Phayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev) (continuation) - 38 COM 7B.71**

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.71** was adopted as amended.

The **Secretariat** made an announcement about an encouraging news from the Pacific: the Phoenix Island Protected Area (Kiribati), inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2010, has been closed for commercial fishing. This good news announced by the President of Kiribati at the “Our Ocean Conference” organized by the U.S. State Department in Washington D.C. is important to note in light of the 2014 International Year of Small Island Developing States proclaimed by the United Nations.

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

**The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798) – 38 COM. 7B.64**  
**Keoladeo National Park (N 340) (India) – 38 COM. 7B.66**  
**Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) – 38 COM. 7B.67**  
**Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120) – 38 COM. 7B.68**  
**Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284) – 38 COM. 7B.69**  
**Puerto-Princesa Subterranean River National Park (Philippines) (N 652rev) – 38 COM. 7B.70**  
**Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672bis) – 38 COM. 7B.72**

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

## **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

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

**Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225) – 38 COM. 7B.73**  
**Gros-Morne National Park (Canada) (N 419) – 38 COM. 7B.74**  
**Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Ukraine, Germany, Slovakia) (N 1133bis) – 38 COM. 7B.75**  
**Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) – 38 COM. 7B.76**  
**Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900) – 38 COM. 7B.77**  
**Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) – 38 COM. 7B.78**  
**Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis) – 38 COM. 7B.79**  
**Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United-Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 369) – 38 COM. 7B.80**

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

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Mongolia.

The Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** expressed its wish to share information about Lake Baikal, in particular concerning the project planned on the upper part of the Selenga River. It highlighted the commitment of its Government to use renewable energy resources, as well as to conduct the necessary feasibility studies and environmental impact assessments, including those on cumulative impacts, in line with both national laws and international standards. It further mentioned that Mongolia is successfully implementing, together with the Russian Federation, the agreement signed by both countries concerning transboundary waters utilization.

## **LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

**Iguazú National Park (Brazil) (N 303) – 38 COM. 7B.82**

The Delegation of **Colombia** welcomed the agreement reached between the World Heritage Centre, the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. It requested for the floor to be given to the State Party of Brazil.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the open and constructive dialogue held. It explained that the construction of the hydroelectric project was halted because of unprecedented rain. It further stated that the Government would evaluate the impact of the rain on the property and revise the project in order to decide on its future. Regarding the settler's road, the government firmly opposed the pending bill which is proposing its reopening. The Brazilian constitution forbids any legislative measure which would threaten the integrity of the attributes of the national parks and conservation units. The government welcomed the IUCN mission to further enhance the cooperation with the relevant national institutions.

The **Secretariat** reported that it received, on 16 June 2014, a response from Brazil concerning state of conservation issues of the property. A flood affected the site, and the State Party immediately evaluated its impacts. Furthermore, on 16 June 2014, the State Party reported that the Federal regional court suspended the license previously given to the **Iguaçu** project. Cooperation with Argentina is taking place in the domains of public use, law, reinforcement and research projects. The Secretariat further announced that as a result of the dialogue with the State Party, a revised Draft Decision is proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for consideration by the World Heritage Committee.

**IUCN** thanked Brazil for its appreciation of the dialogue held. It acknowledged the information provided by the State Party via the World Heritage Centre, namely a letter with photographs showing the situation before and after the disaster. It recalled that the opening of the road “Camino do Colono” had been the reason for which the property had been previously inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. If the project to re-open the road was maintained, it would provide a basis to reinscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, the opposition to the project was expressed at the highest level. IUCN took note of the changing circumstances at the property, and expressed its willingness to undertake the field mission as proposed. It thanked again the State Party for the dialogue held, and highlighted the productive attitude of the State Party in providing additional information, which facilitates the implementation of the Decision.

The Delegations of **Portugal, Germany, India, Turkey, Algeria, Philippines, Jamaica, Malaysia, Serbia, Vietnam, Lebanon, Qatar** and **Colombia** congratulated the State Party for the efforts undertaken and for the constructive dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and expressed agreement with the Draft Decision as amended.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.82** was adopted as amended.

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

**Iguazú National Park (Argentina) (N 303) – 38 COM. 7B.81**

**Galápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1bis) – 38 COM. 7B.83**

**Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138 rev) – 38 COM. 7B.84**

**Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161) – 38 COM. 7B.85**

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



## AFRICA

### **Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199bis) – 38 COM. 7B.95**

The **Secretariat** reported that a reactive monitoring mission was undertaken to the property in December 2013. It further indicated that the result of a recent elephant survey showed a drop of close to 90% of the population compared with the time of inscription, which clearly indicates the magnitude of the poaching problem. The dramatic reduction in populations of key species explicitly referred to in the Statement of OUV, in particular rhino and elephants, is unprecedented and provides a clear foundation to recommend inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in conformity with Paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The State Party addressed, on 17 June 2014, a letter to the World Heritage Centre, expressing its agreement with the proposed inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The State Party also reported different actions they have taken in response to the situation in the site and following the reactive monitoring mission of December. These include the development of a comprehensive national anti-poaching strategy, as well as a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) signed between the State Party and the German Development bank, including financial support for anti-poaching activities.

In conclusion, WHC, IUCN and the State Party, recommended that the Committee inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger to fully acknowledge the scale of the challenge, draw political attention and call for the international cooperation as foreseen in the Convention to save the OUV of this very important site.

**IUCN** highlighted that elephant poaching remained at an alarmingly high level.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** confirme que le bien est menacé d'une manière importante. Elle souligne que le pays concerné ne peut pas traiter le problème tout seul, étant donné que le trafic existe parce qu'il y a un marché. La Délégation exprime l'avis que les trafiquants doivent être poursuivis comme le sont les trafiquants de drogue. La Délégation souligne que le problème devrait être traité de manière internationale, et que le pays mérite le soutien de la communauté internationale, et le soutien de l'IUCN, pour inverser la situation.

The Delegation of **Germany** mentioned the alarming decrease in elephant population. It further mentioned the continued efforts of the State Party to remedy to the situation, as well as the support from Germany contributing to these efforts. It welcomed the efforts of the State Party in allocating more funds to the property and creating the management authority. It acknowledge that thanks to the information submitted by the State Party, the situation were more comprehensive. It finally stated that Germany's financial support to anti-poaching efforts amounted to one million euros in 2014, and hopefully more in the following years. In ending, it encouraged other countries to join the effort.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated Tanzania for its efforts and stated that inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be a powerful instrument to overcome the difficulties. It concurred with Germany in requesting international support.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite la Tanzanie pour les efforts fournis, tout en soulignant que les défis dépassent la capacité du pays à y faire face. Elle note qu'il s'agit d'un cri d'alarme de la part de la Tanzanie, d'une main tendue à la coopération régionale et internationale.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated being shocked by the illegal poaching and mineral exploitation at the property, and being worried by the role that some countries had in the situation. It welcomed the efforts of Tanzania, and called for international cooperation and for reinforcing the international coordinated effort.

The Delegation of **Croatia** highlighted that the State Party did not have the capacity to solve the problem on its own.

La Délégation du **Liban** note que l'inscription d'un site sur la Liste en péril n'est pas un but en soi. Elle suggère d'inclure dans la décision la demande d'élaborer un plan de travail, des « benchmarks » ainsi qu'un calendrier réaliste en vue du retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle propose que ce travail doit être fait d'ici l'année prochaine.

The **Secretariat** concurred with the observation that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not an objective on its own but a call for action to help solving the issues. It expressed the will of WHC and IUCN to continue working with Tanzania on safeguarding this property.

The Delegation of **Senegal** suggested to give the floor to the Observer Delegation of Tanzania.

The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** thanked the international community for the efforts in safeguarding the property, for the benefit of the whole humankind. It stated that the elephant population decreased from more than 100,000 at inscription to 13,000 in 2014. It further reiterated its commitment to combat poaching and expressed its confidence that the effort would bring results. It also expressed its agreement with the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, considering that this would cast an alarm about the problem, and help mobilize international support.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendments have been received from the Secretariat, as well as from the Delegations of Lebanon and Algeria.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision.

**IUCN** recalled that the proposed revised Draft Decision was prepared in consensus with Tanzania.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.95** was adopted as amended.

### **Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) – 38 COM. 7B.86**

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique souhaiter ouvrir le débat sur la Réserve de faune du Dja (Cameroun) et le Parc national de Mana Pools, aires de safari Sapi et

Chewore (Zimbabwe). Les propositions d'amendements ont été transmises. La Délégation a discuté avec les États parties, il s'agit d'une question de formulation, et certains thèmes n'ont pas été pris en compte, c'est la raison pour laquelle elle soumet des amendements.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed the reception of the amendments to the Draft Decision.

L'**IUCN** présente le paragraphe 7 du Projet de Décision, lequel reprend en substance le texte initial. En effet, avant la mise en service du barrage il y a des mesures urgentes à évaluer quant aux impacts sur la VU du bien. En ce qui concerne le paragraphe 8, des éléments factuels importants sont mis en place sur ce site depuis trois ans, en relation avec la VUE, sur laquelle il faut agir aujourd'hui et vite. Les actions doivent être prises immédiatement face aux Projets de développement autour du site. L'**IUCN** estime donc qu'il est important de maintenir le rapport en 2015.

The Delegation of **Germany** said it concurred with IUCN: urgent measures should be taken and it is necessary to keep to the original date.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite amender le Projet de décision pour empêcher clairement le remplissage du réservoir du barrage de Mékin. La Délégation veut en effet soumettre des propositions à l'IUCN avant le remplissage du réservoir du barrage.

La Délégation du **Portugal** soutient également la proposition de l'IUCN.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se réjouit de l'accord avec l'IUCN et ne souhaite pas tomber dans la précipitation. La Délégation aimerait donner la parole à l'Etat partie en question.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the Delegation of **Germany** regarding maintaining the original year as 2015.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique que si des progrès ne sont pas faits d'ici fin 2014, il faudra agir en conséquence. La Délégation souligne que l'Etat partie a réalisé des progrès significatifs concernant les nouvelles demandes.

La Délégation du **Cameroun (Observateur)** remercie le Qatar pour son accueil et souligne la démarche progressive visant à réduire les impacts sur ce bien via la création d'un projet structurant, encadré par des mesures appropriées pour concilier développement économique et conservation de la VUE.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** relève un problème important soulevé par les Organisations consultatives. La Délégation souhaite donner à l'Etat partie le temps d'agir en conséquence.

The Delegation of **Germany** reminded the Committee had been discussing the SOC of this property since 2011. It reminded that this property has been considered for Danger Listing in the past and that the States Party was given more time. The Delegation indicated to be reluctant to postponing the decision for another two years and not getting a solution. It underlined that if urgent measures are being looked at,

the property must be put on the Danger List next year and the dates as in paragraph 8 must be retained.

The **Secretariat** said that since it didn't expect this property to come up for discussion, some clarification should be given. It said the property came up for consideration in Saint Petersburg and there were four key issues linked to the property: firstly, overlapping mining concessions; secondly, a cobalt mine was planned in the vicinity of the property and there was no proper environmental impact assessment made; thirdly, the issue of a plantation next to the property for which virgin forests will be lost; and finally the Mekin dam under construction which will flood part of the property. It reminded that last year, a commitment was made by the Delegation of Cameroon which took measures to remove mining concessions but other three issues remain. It said that as the Delegation of Cameroon mentioned, there was some progress made but there is still the need to conduct an assessment. The concern is that in the meantime, the dam is progressing and the plantation is going forward and no progress has been made in identifying mitigating measures. It concluded that there was a need to relook at this issue next year.

**IUCN** echoed the Delegation of Germany regarding previous consideration of the property for the Danger List. It said it endorsed the concern to postpone the issue for another two years as the issue has been discussed by the Committee for five years.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** prend note de l'intervention de l'IUCN et du Secretariat. La Délégation précise qu'il faut traiter tous les Etats partie de la même façon. Dans ce sens, les délais envisagés ne sont pas raisonnablement, techniquement, ou financièrement envisageables.

La Délégation du **Portugal** avance trois arguments : l'urgence des mesures face à la logique du calendrier ; la question de crédibilité du Comité, car les décisions sont trop souvent reportées ; et enfin que cela fait cinq ans que cette affaire est en cours. Les mécanismes doivent être mis en œuvre.

En dépit du retard accumulé, la Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne que c'est une illustration parfaite de la nécessité de concilier urgence et demandes de suivi de conservation. La Délégation encourage à veiller à la crédibilité du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et inciter le Cameroun à aller de l'avant.

La Délégation du **Cameroun** annonce la mise en œuvre d'une étude d'impact stratégique. Un rapport d'étape pourra être soumis, mais la date limite de fin 2014 semble trop proche.

La Délégation du **Liban** ajoute que le lancement d'un grand prêt autour d'un site du patrimoine mondial va de pair avec le coût de l'étude d'impact, et que ce processus devrait être obligatoire pour tous les sites.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la déclaration de la Délégation du Cameroun, et ne prône pas l'indulgence, mais plutôt l'impossibilité de réaliser toutes ces démarches en six mois.

The **Rapporteur** summarized the amendments to the Draft Decision. He concluded that so far there were no more amendments different from those submitted initially. He said that several countries expressed concern on the issue but other countries

recalled that this item has been the object of discussion for two or three sessions of the Committee.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7B.86** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

**Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (N 302) (Zimbabwe) – 38 COM. 7B.97**

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime que la méthodologie présente un certain nombre de divergence, et demande que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie.

**IUCN** mentioned seeing said it saw no difficulty in the amendment proposed.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked Qatar for its warm hospitality. It thanked the **Chairperson**, the **Secretariat** and **IUCN** for the evaluation of the property. It proceeded to give an update on local efforts to protect the OUV of the property. It said since 1995, it had been continuously monitoring the site such as conducting ground surveys and a pan-African elephant survey with neighboring countries to determine the elephant population, as this is a key habitat for African elephants. This has resulted in commendable efforts in anti-poaching. It said it was part in African elephant summit in Gabon in 2013 to stop illegal killing and trafficking of African elephant ivory. It said while efforts are being made to secure local Resources and a trust fund has been set up, more resources are still required.

L'**IUCN** traite la question des deux versions du Projet de décision : le français parle de « principales espèces fauniques », et ne présente pas d'uniformité avec la version anglaise.

**Le Rapporteur** lit les amendements proposés au Projet de décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7B.97** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

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

**Sangha Trinational (Cameroun/Central African Republic/Congo) (N 1380rev) – 38 COM. 7B.87**

**Lakes of Ounianga (Chad) (N 1400) – 38 COM. 7B.88**

**Taï National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195) – 38 COM. 7B.89**

**Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley (Kenya) (N 1060rev) – 38 COM. 7B.91**

**Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (N 289) – 38 COM. 7B.92**

**Rwenzori Mountains National Park (N 684) (Uganda) – 38 COM. 7B.93**

**Serengeti National Park (N 156) (Tanzania, United Republic of ) – 38 COM. 7B.94**

**Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia, Zimbabwe) (N 509) – 38 COM. 7B.96**

**Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (N 302) (Zimbabwe) – 38 COM. 7B.97**

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

## **OMNIBUS DECISION- 38 COM 7B.98**

The **Secretariat** introduced nine properties of the Omnibus Decision where the States Parties addressed challenges successfully and there were no major problems to be resolved.

**Town of Luang Prabang (Lao People's Democratic Republic)**  
**Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation)**  
**Historic Bridgetown and its Garrison (Barbados)**  
**Port, Fortresses and Group of Monuments, Cartagena (Colombia)**  
**Pre-Hispanic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico)**  
**Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay)**  
**Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin)**  
**Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia)**  
**Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius)**

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 7B.98** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

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

### **Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev) – 38 COM. 7A.24**

The **Secretariat** indicated that the report provides an overview of the progress that has been achieved on the property. It however added that recent conflicts in Kidal region risked the fragile stability in the region which could delay current rehabilitation efforts. It said US\$3 million was raised from several donors but still US\$11 million was needed. It reiterated that contributions are still needed from State Parties. It said it invited Advisory Bodies and States Parties to combine their efforts with the World Heritage Centre contribute to the reconstruction of the rest of the mausoleums, evaluate progress achieved and prepare corrective measures to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger but for the moment it should remain on the List in Danger. It added that **ICOMOS** would provide further explanations.

**ICOMOS** highlighted the efforts carried out by the State Party and the international support for the reconstruction of the mausoleums. In addition to the technical surveys and studies carried out, it added that documentation and assessment is necessary so that specific strategies are arrived at for the reconstruction work in order that the OUV of the property is protected. It underscored that each mausoleum is distinct and requires individual reconstruction measures that ought to be based on historical and architectural documentary evidence. It said with documentary evidence it can be jointly analyzed as to how each of mausoleums can be reconstructed. It highlighted the importance of sound and robust decisions so that the OUV of the property remains intact. Additionally, the issues of overall conservation and management need to be focused on, it said.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) remercie le Qatar pour l'organisation de la 38e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, et remercie les pays qui ont aidé à la

reconstruction du Mali et de son patrimoine. La réunion de Saint-Pétersbourg a provoqué une onde de choc. La Délégation se réjouit que le Secteur de la Culture de l'UNESCO ait donné la priorité à la reconstruction des biens du patrimoine mondial du Mali. La Délégation rejoint l'avis de placer Tombouctou sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Turkey** said it found the international fund for conservation of structures in Mali commendable. It said it commended conservation efforts of the State Party. It drew attention to Turkish International Conservation Agency which has been conducting projects in that direction, particularly in the field of conservation of Timbuktu manuscripts and some historic structures. It said it would be useful for the World Heritage Centre to explore possibilities with TICA as UNESCO has recently signed a cooperation with TICA.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se réjouit de la reconstruction du Mali et ajoute que la Corporation de maçon doit être encouragée car c'est un savoir-faire centenaire.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** said it was deeply heartened by the response from the Delegation of Mali. It said it saw this property as a reminder that we must sometimes look at as an example for a site on the Danger List. It recall we often look at negative aspect of the list when the intention is to assist State Parties. It reiterated that is was pleased that the Delegation from Mali felt it was important to end his statement by making reference to that fact and that he emphasized the grass-root population in the drive for reconstruction in Mali.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne que l'aide au Mali permet d'enclencher le processus de restauration des pays du Sahel. La Délégation soutient la poursuite des efforts pour la préservation du patrimoine unique de cette région, et supporte la proposition.

The Delegation of **Croatia** endorsed the Delegation of Jamaica. It thanked Mali for its efforts and commended UNESCO and Ms Bokova for raising funds for Mali. It said this was a positive example of international cultural co-operation. It extended its help to Mali while recognizing its needs.

The Delegation of **Finland** joined other Committee members in congratulating Mali.

The Delegation of **Philippines** said it was concerned when Timbuktu was damaged. It said since then conservation efforts have been implemented but now the challenge is managing the site particularly in the area of risk-preparedness. It appealed to all members to support Mali in its efforts.

La **Présidente** témoigne sa solidarité envers le Mali, et rend hommage aux populations du pays pour sauver ce patrimoine.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its deep appreciation of the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre. It lauded the leadership of the World Heritage Committee, the Centre, the Director-General and the Member States to make this happen.

La Délégation du **Mali** signale que l'UNESCO a permis d'évaluer les besoins du Mali par des contrats et des projections pour une intervention. La Délégation souhaite mettre en place une réunion d'organisation et l'encadrement des maçons.

The **Secretariat** welcomed statements by the Delegation of Turkey and the Delegation of Croatia for their support and said it would be in contact with them. It said more support is needed for the re-construction work in Mali. Responding to the Delegation of Barbados, it said this case showed that UNESCO can have a successful role in intervening in situations of conflict.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

Le Projet de décision **38 7A.24** est adopté.

### **Tomb of the Askia (Mali) – 38 COM. 7A.25**

The Secretariat indicated that the Goa town, where the site is situated, continues to remain under threat of terrorist attack and this has hindered the resumption of activities of the Gao Cultural Mission, the body responsible for the management of the Tomb of Askia. Following a slight improvement in the security situation, a UNESCO mission was undertaken in May 2014 in cooperation with the MINUSMA UN peace keeping mission to undertake a first diagnosis of the Tomb structure. Following the conclusions of the mission, replastering work will be undertaken later this month. However, it is urgent to carry out further in dept architectural diagnosis to identify all structural weak points of the 2 mosques and carry out an assessment carry out an assessment of the other components of the property, notably the Necropolis around the Prayer Hall, and the area for the great prayer at the Tabaski Feast (Feast of Sacrifice).As mentioned earlier, although US\$3 million has been raised to date, more funding is needed to ensure the full and sustainable rehabilitation of Mali's endangered cultural heritage, including the Tomb of Askia.

The **Secretariat** and the Advisory Bodies recommend that a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission be fielded to the Tomb of Askia to assess the rehabilitation work of all the components of the property, and the global state of conservation of the property. They further consider that the property should remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS** said that security conditions have hindered conservation efforts of the State Party. It added that this has also hindered annual maintenance of the property. Furthermore, it said, the limited capacity at the institutional level and the lack of systematic maintenance have exacerbated the fragile conditions. It reiterated that systematic surveys are needed to ensure comprehensive conservation and ensure structural stability of elements. It ensured its support for technical evaluation and identification of priority measures for the properties. It recommended that proven traditional main practices are defined and continued so that architectural elements are not affected further.

La Délégation du **Mali** souligne que le principal danger qui guette le patrimoine du Nord Mali sont des attentats terroristes. La Délégation précise que la Corporation de maçon structurée de Tombouctou n'est pas présente à Gao.



La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie l'intervention de la Délégation du Mali qui traite de la crainte de la paix dans le secteur de Gao. La Délégation met en évidence l'absence de structure administrative de l'Etat. Elle salue la position de l'ICOMOS, et la nécessité d'actualiser le plan, d'envoyer une mission sur place, et que la Corporation de maçons soit transposée sur place. La Délégation appelle à travailler avec les Organisations consultatives en vue d'une meilleure organisation.

**The Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the DD and clarify some editorial mistakes in the text of the Draft Decision.

Le Projet de décision **38 7A.25** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

*The meeting rose at 7 pm.*

**FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY 19 June 2014**

**SEVENTH MEETING**

**9 a.m. – 1 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)**

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

**9A. Progress report on the Upstream Processes**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/9A

*Decision:* **38 COM 9A**

The **Secretariat** explained that document 9A presented issues related to the Upstream Process in general and the progress made on each of the selected 10 pilot projects since the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee, further to Decision 37 COM 9.

It expressed its satisfaction by stating the signature which was announced on page 3 of this regarding the pilot project happened a few days ago, so this is an important improvement concerning this pilot project between Albania and the former Yugoslavic Republic of Macedonia.

It further explained that last year the Namib Sand Sea of Namibia was inscribed on the World Heritage List becoming the first Pilot Project to test the Upstream Process which was successfully terminated. It stated that the success of this project provided an example of how the active support of IUCN, the African World Heritage Fund, the World Heritage Centre as well as the strong commitment of the State Party throughout the process were instrumental in the achievement of the process.

It highlighted that the 10 pilot projects were positive examples of Advisory support and intervention, in this sense it mentioned that in order to be effective, the upstream support should ideally intervene at an earlier stage in the process, like during the revision of the States Parties Tentative Lists.

The secretariat stressed out that the utility of the upstream support in the preparation of nominations, prior to their official submission is increasingly applied throughout the World Heritage System under different forms. It stated however that the access of all States Parties to the services of the Advisory Bodies should still be improved. It further clarified that the issue of funding of Advisory missions is addressed in another document which is submitted to the attention of the Committee, Document 12.

It stressed out that an important issue which has already been highlighted in several interventions during the session and which was impacting the effectiveness of the Advisory support on nominations was related to the very short timeline that bounds the nomination process. In this regard it suggested that an evaluation period extended by another twelve months, would ensure a more reasonable time for dialogue between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies and it would also

certainly reduce the number of problematic cases concerning nominations to be examined at the World Heritage Committee sessions.

In this regard, the Secretariat informed that point 8 of Draft Decision **38 COM 9A** put forward the request to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to work on a proposal along these lines. In that sense, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies would elaborate a proposal to be presented and examined by the working group on the revision of the Operational Guidelines that would meet during the next session of the Committee in 2015.

It added that it was quite clear that the current schedule for evaluation of nominations as described in paragraph 168 of the Operational Guidelines does not allow for enough time for dialogue and meaningful exchange between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Secretariat for its comprehensive report on the upstream processes, and manifested their support to the Draft Decision with some minor modifications in paragraph 8. It expressed that in its understanding the decision to defer a nomination of a site was to allow a constructive dialogue between Advisory Bodies and stake holders concerned within the nomination process. It further expressed that such major changes needed an in-depth discussion with the state parties and that such a proposal should be one proposal of the set up measures. It reaffirmed not being in favor of having a single proposal highlighted in the wording of the decision and asked for the reference to this single proposal be eliminated.

The Delegation of **Poland** praised the work of the upstream process and appreciated the outcome of the project. It agreed with the concern expressed by Germany concerning a proposed extension of the period for examining the nominations by 12 months. It found not convincing the justification for change and that the presumption that additional time would allow to constructive dialogue between stake holders and Advisory Bodies seemed misguided. It added that the right time to hold this dialogue is during the process of nomination preparation process and complemented by stating that the new proposal was targeting at the late step of the process. It stressed out that, preparation of the nomination and examination of the nomination dossier must be clearly differentiated. Finally it expressed it considered that the current timetable for examination of nominations was optimal, when additional details were needed or the State Party was requested to perform certain activities according to the Operational Guidelines then at that stage the referral procedure could be applied.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the Center for its work in facilitating State Parties to be part of the pilot phase of the upstream process. It noted that the success and range of results coming out from specific cases provided useful lessons for State Parties involved in the nomination process even as in the case of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. It indicated it was clear from the Draft Decisions of to be discussed during the Committee the number of referrals and deferrals associated with nominations that the upstream process could have possibly assisted. It added that it had suggested amendments to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives des résultats exceptionnels de ce processus. Cependant elle rappelle que les Etats sont souverains dans le domaine de la préparation des

dossiers de nomination et de leur soumission. Le Sénégal souligne que Les Organisations consultatives ne doivent pas encadrer la préparation des dossiers. Le Sénégal soutient la proposition de l'Allemagne concernant le conflit d'intérêt et qu'il faut éviter de donner trop de pouvoir aux Organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the Secretariat for its achievements and affirmed it was convinced on the relevance of continuing to implement the application of the process at the earlier stages of the nomination. It supported the proposal of the Delegation of Germany. It further added it appreciated that a new budget line under the World Heritage Fund had been identified for the Advisory missions, which could enable strengthening upstream process. It expressed its support to the drafting of a proposal, which reflected the upstream process in the Operational Guidelines. It expressed to be aware of the fact that the introduction of the upstream process would facilitate the operation of the Advisory Bodies. It added that nevertheless that process required additional staffing and efforts to the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Philippines** thanked the Secretariat for the progress report of the upstream process. It expressed being proud on having a protected landscape and seascape in their country as one of the pilot projects. It expressed its gratitude to the Republic of Korea for their support and expressed it was looking forward to the Advisory mission. It stressed out that in order to allow more time for dialogue between State Parties and Advisory Bodies to prepare comprehensive nominations it was worth examining possible extensions of the nomination cycle and having them reflected in the Operational Guidelines. It recognized its positive experience by working closely with the IUCN during the nomination of their site at the 37th session of the Committee. It expressed that during the process IUCN kept the lines of communication open with the Philippines in a permanent basis. It concluded by stating that a constructive dialogue between expert Bodies could address clarifications on complex nominations before submission examination by the Committee.

La Délégation de **Vietnam** indique apprécier ce processus qui a permis au Viet Nam de finaliser le cas du dossier de Chan ana qui facilitera l'appréciation du comité sur le dossier

La Délégation de **Algérie** soutient la décision d'inscrire le processus dans les orientations ; ce processus d'aide qui consiste à proposer une inscription ou non est très importante. Elle s'inscrit dans le processus de transparence mis en place par le Comité et doit être inscrit dans les orientations afin d'avoir un caractère exécutoire. Elle se déclare consciente des conséquences financières, c'est une forme de partenariat entre les Organisations consultatives et les Etats partie qui pourrait régler certains problèmes.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Secretariat for putting forward the upstream process and expressed it would benefit the nomination process. It added it considered the need for having a constructive dialogue and therefore a 12 month period was adequate.

La Délégation de **Liban** pense qu'il faut prendre en compte qu'il existe une tension extrême entre les Organisations consultatives et les Etats parties. Le processus en amont est très important. Il faudrait que l'ICOMOS regarde toutes les Listes indicatives et étudier site après site afin de voir les potentiels existants sur ce site. Il

est évident qu'il faut adopter quelque chose comme cela pour créer un dialogue entre les Etats parties et l'ICOMOS pour dénouer les nœuds qui existe aujourd'hui.

**IUCN** expressed its compromise with the upstream processes as a way to have a better coordination between State Parties and Advisory Bodies and a more transparent nomination process. It welcomed the landmark achievement of the Namib sand Sea of Namibia during the 37<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee in 2013, and recalled this was the first inscription resulting from an upstream process which demonstrated the strong engagement of the State Party, the Center, the Advisory Bodies, and the key role of the African Heritage Fund.

It recognized the complexity of the upstream processes, as it is a new approach to achieving a well-balanced World Heritage List. It stressed out on the importance of having additional resources for facilitating the development of upstream pilot projects and stated as an example of successful cooperation the financial support provided by the European Commission.

**IUCN** further announced it was pleased to announce the publication of a methodology for comparative of biodiversity properties to assist State Parties in a transparent manner that wished to put forward nominations under criteria 9 and 10. It stressed out that to put forward a nomination through the upstream process defined roles should be set. It regretted that some nominations put forward in this Committee for examination did not benefit from the opportunities of the upstream processes despite of being aware of its benefits.

It also expressed that changes to the nomination format in relation to a right-based approach provided communities to have access to the information during the nomination process and therefore provide greater transparency. It added in response to some interventions by the Committee that an extension period to open a discussion during the nomination process would increase the effectiveness of the Convention.

**ICOMOS** joined IUCN in welcoming the growth of the upstream processes and the opportunity for better dialogue between the state parties and the Advisory Bodies. It proceeded to set as example the success of the upstream process by the number of requests for Advisory missions regarding issues on nominations and state of conservation of sites. It explained that some of the missions had been the result of committee decisions but many others by direct contact and dialogue with State Parties and in terms of nominations alone, there was an increase of interaction with state parties during the evaluation process of sites despite the difficult time constraints.

It highlighted that a prominent and long standing upstream dialogue between ICOMOS and State Parties could be seen reflected in the Silk Road nomination submitted for consideration of the Committee in 2014. It expressed that in this particular case dialogues began even before the term "upstream process" was widely used by the Committee.

It stressed out that ICOMOS had been involved in working with State Parties for the past 7 years and therefore new developments in terms of advice had emerged and widen the scope of requests, for example accompanying state parties with the harmonization of tentative lists and specific approaches towards protection and

planning being seen as productive ways of carrying out sustainable development. It added that another crucial element of the upstream process involved the development of thematic studies, as publications on the Silk Road, agro-pastoral landscapes and landscapes associated with Tea cultivation.

It called the Committee's attention by manifesting its commitment to this upstream process as far as resources would allow and the question of defining the appropriate timing for the state parties to involve in the process. The option of times to be considered were stated to be, before a nomination is submitted, were opportunities are as wide as possible, the second timing would be during the nomination process when inevitably the scope is less limited and there are less opportunities for dialogue once the evaluations have been provided. It finally explained that chances for a solid dialogue occurred in the cases of a referral and particular on a nomination deferral.

La Délégation de **Liban** souhaite faire un commentaire adressé particulièrement à l'ICOMOS en prenant l'exemple de la Route de la soie qui a été cité comme un « success story » mais pour laquelle l'ICOMOS recommande que l'inscription soit différée. Il faut donc noter que le processus en amont n'est pas une solution magique pour le processus d'inscription.

**The Director of the World Heritage Centre** expressed he was pleased to see the growing support of the upstream process and the joint work between the Advisory Bodies, the state parties and the Centre. He further explained that over the years he encountered considerable resistance and suspicion on how the upstream process might work; nevertheless he affirmed it proved it is a useful tool to overcome the growing divergence between the Advisory Bodies and the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, especially if used since the instance of the preparation of tentative lists. He stressed out that this instrument was also helpful for the Advisory Bodies to identify whether or not the sites had potential OUVs.

He highlighted the importance of the thematic studies that were being undertaken by ICOMOS in a wide range of themes and typologies as well as information for preparing tentative lists. In this point he stressed out that this kind of international partnership was at the very heart of the World Heritage Convention because everybody may have a say during the process. He encouraged the state parties to work together in a system of international partnership and work towards the inscription of sites in the World Heritage List.

To clarify the observation of the Delegation of Senegal regarding the excessive power and conflict on interests the Advisory Bodies might have under the upstream process he recalled that undertaking the process was purely voluntary. He agreed with the intervention of the Delegation of Lebanon regarding that the best stage to start this process was during the preparation of tentative lists.

He highlighted that sites such as the Qhapaq Ñan, involving six States Parties (to be discussed during the Committee session) were good examples of close cooperation between the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the concerned States Parties, as well as two dedicated processes launched in Africa and the Caribbean Region. The one in Africa in 2009 supported by the African World Heritage Fund and contributing State Parties and the second in the Caribbean with the support of the Japanese Funds in Trust which enabled the launching of mentoring processes for selected nominations by state parties. He further explained that this mentoring provided

guidance on how to develop a comparative analysis, statements of OUVs and preparation of nomination dossiers during a period where people could work on these nominations and come back on a workshop format to discuss with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** mentionne que le débat n'est pas de refuser ou d'accepter la coopération entre les Organisations consultatives et les Etats parties ; mais qu'il ne faut pas imposer le tutorat des Organisations consultatives. Le danger est d'empiéter sur la souveraineté des Etat. On ne peut pas être juge et partie.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its support to the upstream process stating it would guarantee objectivity. It stressed out it would like to see the upstream process as learning and maturing process in all of the subjects addressed in the World Heritage Committee.

**ICOMOS** expressed that upstream processes as they currently existed engaged with offering advice on the robustness of sites that may be put in the tentative list in terms of their ability to manifest OUVs. It also stressed out that ICOMOS did not get involved in writing the nominations and that it was up to the State Parties to accept or not their advice. In this sense, it highlighted that the upstream process did not guarantee success. It explained it tried to optimize the opportunities that any particular property might have in terms of its potential to be put forward as a nomination, nevertheless there were limits when that advice stopped, this being in the time frame before the writing of the nomination started by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the upstream process and expressed they were satisfied in moving forward. It added this process would be more optimal if it would be undertaken in an early stage like during the preparation of the Tentative Lists.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed that the objective of the Committees work is to have balance in the List of properties specifically fomenting the inscription of natural sites. It manifested interest to know what mechanism will be taken particularly by Latin America.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its appreciation to what had been said by the Advisory Bodies. And in regard to its first intervention it clarified it supported the inclusion of the upstream process in the Operational Guidelines but disagreed with the fact that a single proposal be mentioned, as it is the case in the Draft Decision. It added it supported what was said by the Delegation of Senegal regarding the conflict of interests avoided. It concluded by remarking that Advisory Bodies cannot work at all levels.

The Delegation of **India** expressed it had similar views to the Delegation of Senegal and Germany regarding the conflict of interests in the upstream process and manifested the need to clearly be defined to what level they are involved in the revision or decisions of tentative lists. It emphasized in the need to review the phases of the upstream process and its success.

The Delegation of **Portugal** joined the remarks of the Delegations of Senegal, Germany and India regarding the issue of conflict of interests.

**IUCN** agreed with the intervention of the State Party of Indonesia by saying the whole process is a learning process and manifested to be pleased to see a State Party submitting their nomination during the Committee session with the uncertainty that it would or not succeed.

It stressed out that a nomination is a way of thinking on ways to protect a site, nevertheless he expressed that people were sometimes to focused on the end of the process, even by defining it as successful or not. In this sense, it manifested that the IUCN viewed the nomination process as a whole and a learning process

It stressed out on the importance of working on nominations before they are submitted in order to have more certainty that they do have OUVs before putting together a nomination dossier which would imply defying a management system, selection of boundaries, among others.

It explained that important contributions were being done to increase the transparency of the advice provided, by clarifying priorities of World Heritage Listing in several regions and identifying need of thematic advice as the case of the related sites in Barbados were a publication of a comparative analyses for biodiversity assessment was elaborated.

It also added that advances had been made on the translation of resource manuals aimed to a wide range of public in many angles. In terms on the question on conflict of interest it agreed with the intervention of the Director of the World Heritage Centre and reiterated on the limits the Advisory Bodies had when advising or accompanying a State Party in a nomination process.

It also stressed out that the Advisory Bodies needed to be clear of what the Committee's expectations of the upstream processes were so as to govern internally. It highlighted that in some cases advice has been provided to state parties with the false idea of representing the IUCN. In this sense, it requested the States Parties to be aware of whom they were receiving advice from.

It further responded the point raised by the Delegation of Senegal regarding conflict of interests by stating that one of the most important lessons learnt with the process of inscription of the Namib Sand Sea success was the role that the African Fund played, convening capacity building when neither the Advisory Bodies nor the State Party could provide it. In this sense, it invited state parties to search for partnerships through Category 2 Centres, universities, UNESCO chairs or other actors which may facilitate the role of the Advisory Bodies. It reiterated that the Advisory Bodies are not being asked to write nominations.

Lastly, it addressed the comment raised by the Delegation of Turkey about the potentiality for the upstream process to reduce costs for the Advisory Bodies. In this sense, it manifested its hope that the process would reduce costs for all parts involved in the production of the nomination dossier. It reminded the State Parties on the importance of determining at an early stage if the site has the significant values to enable finance, political will and community engagement to put forward a nomination dossier.

La Délégation de **Algérie** note que la question du conflit d'intérêt est récurrente ; les modalités d'éviter les conflits devraient être définies dans les Orientations.



The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the proposed amendment by Germany and joined the Delegation of Senegal, Germany and India in regard to conflict of interests.

The Observer Delegation of **Namibia** took the floor and explained that the State Party has been one of the pilot countries nominated by the African group for testing the upstream process. It explained that support lead to a successful nomination for the Namib Sand Sea. It attested that the advice and assistance to put forward the nomination by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre was just and did not exceed their functions.

It finally expressed that the upstream process was particularly helpful as it implied an open door policy with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for questions as well as fast tracking responses before the nomination. It added that guidance was provided during the process but no instructions were given to the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments by the Delegations of Jamaica and Germany and Algeria.

The Delegations of **Turkey, Poland, Sénégal, Turkey** endorsed the proposal by the Delegations of Algeria and Germany.

The Delegation of **Philippines** indicated that it will support the amendment proposed by Portugal as long as it an extension for the evaluation process be included in the Operational Guidelines as drafted by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

This proposal was supported by **Finland** and **Jamaica**.

The **Rapporteur** indicated having taken note of this request and mention that it would be reflected in the Summary Records of the session.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 9A** was adopted as amended.

## **9B. REFLECTIONS ON PROCESSES FOR MIXED NOMINATIONS**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/9B

*Decision:* **38 COM 9B**

The Secretariat recalled that this item was requested by the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee (Phnom Penh, Cambodia) following discussions concerning a mixed natural-cultural heritage nomination from Canada. It explained that the Decision **37 COM 8B.19** recognized that mixed nominations are under both natural and cultural criteria, but that the related IUCN and ICOMOS evaluations had raised fundamental questions in terms of how the links that existed in some places between culture and nature could be recognized on the World Heritage List.

It further explained that the Centre and the Advisory Bodies had worked together to provide a brief overview of the historical background and some background with statistics.

It drew the Committee's attention to the fact that 127 times between 1978 and 2013 the Committee discussed mixed nominations and a total of 78 nominations were

submitted as mixed during this period of which only 29 were inscribed as mixed (11 were inscribed only under natural criteria, 18 under cultural and the remainder were withdrawn, referred, deferred or not inscribed).

It stressed that the discussion was not at all new with the Committee and came up periodically in Committee deliberations.

It explained that very early from 1979 onwards, States Parties put forward nomination files for World Heritage Listing that included both cultural and natural values in the section "Justification for inclusion in the World Heritage List" and therefore interpreting both article 1 and 2 of the Convention, which separate cultural and natural heritage; but also the notion of "works of man or the combined works of nature and man" as referred to under Article 1 of the Convention.

It stressed that 3 phases can be identified: (a) early years 1978 to 1992 with discussions on mixed sites vs rural landscapes; (b) from 1992 to 2000 general discussions on mixed sites related to the balance of the World Heritage List and (c) finally after 2000 reference was made to clearly defining mixed (also to distinguish from Cultural Landscapes) and to contradictory evaluations; during this time a new paragraph was inserted into the guidelines in 2005 defining 'mixed' (para 46) as well as the evaluations by Advisory Bodies (paragraph 146 in addition to the Annexes 3, 5, 6,11).

The Secretariat also highlighted the difficulties in processing such nominations from the secretariat's point of view. It explained that furthermore, the Advisory Bodies ICOMOS and IUCN also looked at their evaluation procedures of mixed sites nominations. It added they had proposed a project on this matter, which was also referred to in the document.

**ICOMOS** explained that although mixed properties are both properties where nature and culture manifest outstanding universal values in quite a high proportion there is no interlink between both. It further explained that these sites represented a very small proportion of the World Heritage List and that many more properties manifested both culture and nature attributes in different degrees and that in a way culture supported nature or nature supported culture. It described that it was the case of cultural landscapes which celebrated an interaction with their environment or with natural properties where local communities were engaged in its management. It stressed out that currently the present criteria do not explicitly recognize this supportive role although in earlier versions of the criteria the wording was more helpful.

It continued to explain that mixed properties were only one way between many where natural and cultural values could be recognized through world heritage listing. It further stressed out that many improvements of the work of IUCN and ICOMOS regarding collaboration in the evaluations have taken place and they were continuing to do so. It also added that upstream processes might improve to strengthen cases presented for both cultural and natural values as well as developing fully integrated management approaches, even in situations when natural and cultural site management agencies were separated.

ICOMOS finally added that the work being undertaken by all three advisory bodies and lead by ICCROM with the support of Switzerland was building a new component

in the capacity building program of ICCROM on the concepts and practices in linkages between nature and culture.

**IUCN** expressed that the statistics that the Centre highlighted showed the significant gap between mixed site nominations and mixed inscriptions. It explained that “mixed sites” was a complex concept with difficulties concerning natural and cultural components. It suggested that this connection should be looked at also in the light of the debate of the upstream processes.

It explained that, as ICOMOS had outlined, the Advisory Bodies reflection in both the way they operated but also on the concepts they adopted and recalled that in the global definition, a protected area safeguards cultural values as well as its function in protecting nature and ecosystem services.

It noted concern about certain nominations considered by the 37<sup>th</sup> Committee Session which concerned involvement by communities, expressing the difficulty of moving discussions forward in a way that could result helpful for them, considering they were central to such nominations. It further expressed that it was an opportunity to reflect on the way it worked with indigenous communities inhabiting nominated sites.

It added that the document outlined a work in progress that would hopefully result in a mature reflection for the 39<sup>th</sup> World Heritage Committee. It concluded by thanking its working partners.

The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the project since it followed up to 20 years of efforts to include landscapes in 1992 and the combination of the two sets of criteria in 2005. It expressed that when looking back at Committee’s decisions from past years, options to the change of criteria were considered as well for the Advisory Bodies evaluation process. In this sense, it requested to know if this was still the scope of the work to be presented at the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee. It added that if this was the case, it would need some time as the advisory bodies had explained it was still at a project stage.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked ICOMOS and IUCN for their detailed report. It expressed that it was urgent indeed to start an in-depth reflection on these processes. It also requested information along the same lines as the Delegation of Japan and recalled last year’s decision which requested to report on an analysis for options to criteria changes as well as in the processes of evaluation. It further asked if there were any specific findings in the issue of coordinating management of mixed sites.

It explained that the report noted that the nomination process for the Canadian site, which was deferred at the 37<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee, had not stopped and that the State Party and the first nations were engaged in a process. It expressed that cases like this are what it expected to see as a positive outcome of a deferral decision.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** félicite les Organisations consultatives pour leur travail. C’est ce qui fait l’attrait de cette Convention: essayer de régler les problèmes existants. Dans le cas des sites mixtes, les évaluations se font d’abord par l’ICOMOS qui se rend sur le site, et ensuite l’IUCN. Il faudrait arriver à une coopération afin que

les valeurs culturelles et naturelles soient étudiées en convergence. Elle souhaite que d'ici 2015 il sera possible d'arriver à réviser au mieux des critères.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** extended its gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their commitment to seek a well-represented balanced and credible World Heritage List. It expressed that the document was an example of the continuous work in this regard. It expressed that once the evolving nature of heritage was accepted as well as the dynamics of emerging heritage it believed that it would become clearer that attempts to provide set definitions or concepts may be redundant.

It expressed that the global strategy had a great importance for the Caribbean as it was subsequently expanded to include nature and combinations of cultural and natural heritage. It explained that nearly two decades ago inscriptions of combined cultural and natural heritage had increased even though mixed nomination appeared to be more complex than those nominated on cultural or natural values only. It stressed that these nominations required more time to prepare. It highlighted that mixed nominations required expert review that would be open to the reality that each culture is unique and deserves to be addressed within that context while not losing sight of the importance of proving it has outstanding universal values.

The Delegation of **Colombia** noted that after reviewing the document, it could see critical issues in respect to this important category of mixed sites. It further expressed that these mixed sites are evidently underrepresented in the World Heritage Lists and therefore all who are involved with the World Heritage Convention must do efforts to search more inclusions of these sites in this List. It explained the need to work towards that integral comprehension of one heritage and not only as a sum of cultural and natural aspects. It stressed that from the various disciplines that involve cultural heritage systematic differences existed regarding concepts, criteria's and indicators, in this sense it was a challenge to fully understand a mixed site. It added that ICOMOS expressed on how it was almost impossible to find a medium point to dividing culture and nature and how nature supported culture and how culture supplemented nature. It concluded by encouraging State Parties to strengthen efforts to achieve consistent nominations of mixed sites.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed it was satisfied with the debate which addressed an important issue and congratulated ICOMOS and IUCN as well as the Centre for the work achieved. It had realized it was a work in process and therefore it looked forward for suggestions and proposals on this subject taking in mind the State Parties had difficulties in preparing dossiers where both natural and cultural values are identified. It further expressed that in the case of assistance by the advisory bodies it was important to articulate advice given. It recalled a case from Portugal where a proposed mixed nomination to be analyzed at a Committee session was withdrawn by the State Party. It added this had been done because of the unfavorable recommendations by ICOMOS and IUCN but nevertheless it expressed to consider that OUV did exist and that with proper guidance the outcome of the nomination may have been different. It finally suggested that a manual on preparing mixed nominations would be useful to better guide State Parties in the preparation of such nominations.

The Delegation of **Philippines** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its work and the Advisory Bodies for their report on the evaluation of mixed sites. It appreciated

the initiative in tracing the history of the Revision of the Operational Guidelines to address gaps in the criteria in relation to capturing the essence of mixed sites heritage values, including interaction of people and their environment.

It recognized there were still procedural gaps in the nomination and evaluation process and suggested that a holistic approach is still needed that could provide a better way forward to State Parties, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It stressed that this was true in the case of the Rice Terraces in Philippines Cordilleras which was inscribed as a cultural landscape in 1995. It further expressed that after two decades of managing the site it understood that the challenges and issues concerning sustainable development at cultural landscape sites were more complex. It manifested it has made them appreciate the depth and complexity of the site and its communities including the vulnerability caused by climate change and typhoon patterns. It expressed hope that the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies continue their work towards clarifying positions on procedural issues an in re nomination of inscribed sites under new criteria.

The Delegation of **Vietnam** welcomed the document by the Centre and the intention of ICOMOS and IUCN to continue collaboration towards a balanced evaluation process so as to minimize contradictory conflicts in the reports.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the Delegation of Portugal's proposal to have a manual with the appropriate wording in accordance to the Draft Decision.

The observer Delegation of **Canada** raised the question whether the current term "mixed" needed to be reconsidered or refined to reflect different models of the link between nature and culture particularly respecting aboriginal world views. It explained there were also diverse world views that have a range of integration of nature and culture models with respect to the criteria. It manifested that in the current context a nomination must meet only one of ten criteria's meaning that all criteria are given equal weight in the justification for inscription on the World Heritage List. It also raised the question if in the context of a mixed nomination model in the future would be possible to imagine a scenario where some criteria can be used in a way that is considered complementary to or interdependent with others? It also expressed if new criteria would be needed in order to recognize the bonds that exist in some places between culture and nature? It added that consideration could be given to adjust the wording of existing criteria in order to facilitate better integration.

It further posed the question that when a State Party presented a mixed nomination and the Committee considered that it met only cultural or natural criteria, how could it be insured that the Committee would still inscribe the site based on natural or cultural criteria, without requiring the nomination to be resubmitted? It finally asked how could States Parties be involved in Advisory Bodies projects if they did not attend the ICOMOS or IUCN international events? It thanked the Centre for the reflection and the Advisory Bodies for their work on the project and looked forward to a continuous collaboration.

**ICCROM** expressed that often during the debates in the Committee sessions there is a tendency to focus primarily on inscription processes; nevertheless it welcomed the Delegation of Germany for highlighting that work does not stop with the inscription of a site. It expressed the importance of ensuring that once sites are inscribed on the basis of natural or cultural criteria, that they be conserved in an integrated and

complementary way which respects both the cultural and natural values and attributes.

It recalled that **ICCROM** was developing a course in partnership with IUCN on managing the linkage between natural and cultural values of World Heritage properties and that it will provide site managers who deal regularly with management of cultural and natural values tools to ensure an integrated approach. It added that while the Government of Switzerland has generously sponsored the development of the course it was still looking for funding. It finally expressed its availability to work with state parties interested in moving forward with the implementation of the pilot course.

The **Secretariat** welcomed the numerous comments by the Delegates and noted that the Revision of the Operational Guidelines would be in the agenda of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee, so there was a possibility for revision of processes or criteria that would be considered with the Advisory Bodies. It also recognized the challenges noted by a number of Committee members such as Jamaica, Colombia, Philippines, Senegal and others. Regarding the comment of the Delegation of Germany on management of mixed sites, it replied that discussions have already started to take place with IUCN and ICOMOS and recognized that it was definitely an issue that could be worked on in the future. It finally welcomed some of the proposals made by the Delegations of Portugal and Turkey concerning a proposed Manual for mixed nominations but noted that funding would be required.

**IUCN** responded to the interventions. On Jamaica's request for support in the upstream process, IUCN emphasized the complexity of mixed site and consequently mentioned that it planned to focus the upstream process on this under-represented category of sites. It underlined the contradiction between the wish to inscribe more mixed site on the List and the move towards a more holistic understanding of "mixed". Therefore IUCN devoted special attention to their assessment. In regards to the revision of criteria, IUCN recalled that it would be at the discretion of the Committee members. It suggested to look at the current use of existing criteria and encouraged a more creative way of using them before deciding to revise them.

On the question of management, IUCN suggested to look at mixed site management best practices since its complexity can be considered as a good model for other sites to follow. IUCN reminded the members of the Committee of its plan to develop a manual for the management of mixed sites as current manuals for natural and cultural sites have not focused on this type of site. Publishing of a manual on how to nominate a mixed site could also be needed.

Regarding the issue of communication between States Parties and Advisory Bodies, IUCN expressed its commitment to improve communication regarding their ongoing projects.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie les organes consultatifs de la réflexion en cours sur les biens mixtes en raison du caractère souvent indissociable qui existe entre nature et culture ainsi que le parc du Tassili en témoigne. Le caractère mixte des biens doit être mieux pris en compte dans le travail des organes consultatifs.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** welcomed the report on the decision making process on mixed sites. This required coordination at national and international

levels. Mexico offered IUCN to host a workshop devoted to in-depth assessment of mixed sites. It would contribute to have mixed sites better represented and adequately assessed.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** welcomed the quality of mixed site nomination process considering many Indonesian sites fall under this category. However, Indonesia asked for some clarification on the criteria of evaluation, management and also communication processes between the parties.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked Mexico for the proposal. It also supported the proposal to publish a manual on this subject.

The Observer Delegation of **Chile** underlined the heterogeneity of the legal cultural environment especially in the LAC region. It acknowledged the importance of integration of mixed sites in the action plan for the region.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur for any new amendments before adoption.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision

The **Secretariat** clarified that the development of manual would require time and financial provision. Moreover, it questioned whether a discussion document could be released before the working document to the Committee meeting as the completion of the project was foreseen for May 2015.

The Delegation of **Germany** acknowledged the time constraints between the completion of project by the end of April and the presentation of working documents in May, therefore proposed to have the document published at the outcome of the meeting.

The Delegation of **Portugal** fully agreed with Germany and acknowledged the limited budget especially for the translation.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 9B** was adopted as amended.

The Chairperson indicated that the Committee will resume debates on the last site of item 7B of the Agenda, to benefit from the presence of the ministers of Kenya and Ethiopia.

**ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES** *(continuation)*

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

**AFRICA**

**Lake Turkana National Park (Kenya) – 38 COM 7B.90**

The **Secretariat** indicated that during its 37<sup>th</sup> session the Committee, has expressed its regret on the ongoing Gibe III dam project and the irrigation system linked to the dam that is taking place despite the Secretariat's requests to conduct a SEA (Strategic environmental assessment) prior to the construction and that the two States Parties conduct bilateral discussion on the implementation of the SEA. The Secretariat noted Kenya's effort on the submission of progress report within the time-frame, as well as the ongoing discussion with Ethiopia and the planned submission of EIA during the next session. However, the Secretariat has received notification that the project is continuing which can reduce significantly the flow of water to Lake Turkana, and subsequently affect the OUV of the property. In consultation with the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat, proposed to include this property in the World Heritage List in Danger. The Secretariat also noted that no reactive monitoring has taken place yet although an invitation letter has just been received by the Centre.

The Secretariat informed about a consultation meeting that had just taken place with relevant parties. During the meeting, the Delegation of Kenya and Ethiopia reiterated their plan to conduct a SEA and assured the Committee on their full commitment to take necessary measures to safeguard values of the property.

The Secretariat and IUCN's praised the good spirit of cooperation from both States Parties. However the Secretariat still expressed concern about the finalization of the construction project before the implementation of any requested assessments, and thus, hampered the OUV of the site.

**IUCN** expressed its concern on the current threats on Lake Turkana and its possible inclusion in the List of World Heritage in danger. However UICN noted the complex situation of the property, which location is shared between two State Parties. IUCN added that it had limited opportunity to conduct a dialogue with Ethiopia and to provide assistance until monitoring mission can take place. IUCN further welcomed the newly received invitation extended by the Ethiopian government for such mission. Last night dialogue was also noted as a positive effort to improve the situation. Lastly, IUCN noted that inclusion of a site into the List of World Heritage in danger is not a punishment but an opportunity to gather international assistance.

The Session continued with a Joint Statement presented by the States Parties of Ethiopia and Kenya on behalf of each government.



The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** assured the Committee members of their commitment and ongoing collaboration to address the issues on Lake Turkana, including the organization of consultation meeting the day before. The Delegation agreed to expedite the consultative process with the Secretariat and IUCN, including the development of joint plan and the submission of a request for international funding. **Ethiopia** confirmed that the SEA is being organized and reaffirmed its invitation for a joint monitoring mission. It asked the Committee to take note of its positive intentions and consequently requested the Committee not to include the property into the List of World Heritage in danger.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** also informed the Committee of the ongoing bilateral discussion with Ethiopia and assured the Committee of its commitment to consider all related assessments, including the EIA, and to use them as the basis of further discussion with Ethiopia. Kenya requested more time to follow up on the results of the upcoming SEA assessment. Echoing the Delegation of Ethiopia, Kenya also extended its invitation to the Secretariat and IUCN for a joint reactive monitoring mission. The Delegation committed itself to submit the progress report by 1 February 2015 as agreed previously.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked Kenya and Ethiopia for their valuable statements and commended on the positive development that has taken place to address the issue. However, the Delegation was in the view that the reactive monitoring mission should be conducted first before proposing the inclusion of the site into the List of World Heritage in danger.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** appreciated statements by Kenya and Ethiopia and welcomed the comment made by Portugal. However, it questioned whether the timeframe given to submit a progress report by January 2015 and a final report by January 2016 is adequate.

The Delegation of **Philippine** thanked Kenya and Ethiopia on the updates of the critical issues, and commended on their planned collaborative efforts including the implementation of the SEA. Given the limited timeframe, the Delegation proposed to give more time to both States Parties to take actions based on recommendations.

The Delegation of **Colombia** underlined the efforts of **Kenya** and **Ethiopia** to keep the outstanding universal value of the park through dialogue. It also underlined the relevance of including the site on the List of World Heritage in danger as a mean of protection and not as a sanction.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** félicite les deux ministres de l'Éthiopie et du Kenya de leur volonté de conserver, par un travail conjoint, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site et appuie la demande de délai pour la remise du rapport de la mission de suivi réactif et la considération de placer le site sur la Liste du patrimoine en Danger.

The Delegation of **Croatia** welcomed the ongoing bilateral consultation of the two States Parties, also the ongoing progress made. It looked forward to the reactive monitoring mission as invited by Ethiopia, and supported the draft amendment to not include the site into the List of World Heritage in danger.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed on the cumulative effect the development project has on Lake Turkana, which could post major threat on the OUV and the local

community. **Finland** was in the view that a joint monitoring mission should take place first before the inclusion of the property into the List of World Heritage in danger. Finally, it requested more information from the State Party of Ethiopia on the time frame of the Gibe III project to base the SEA.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its support to the 2 States Parties. It reminded that the inclusion of a property into the List of World Heritage in danger is not a negative but a positive thing. However, it underlined that the inclusion of Lake Turkana into the List of World Heritage in danger should be postponed until after the mission.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** took good note on the recent discussion among all stakeholders and the bilateral discussion between the 2 States Parties. **Jamaica** stressed the importance of EIA. Moreover, it stated that the implementation of a reactive monitoring mission should be treated as a matter of urgency in order to protect the OUV of the property.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted the importance of the National Park for wildlife as well for the community. It supported the postponement of the inclusion of the property into the List of World Heritage in Danger and the need for more time, as repeatedly requested during the previous sessions. The German Ambassador in Ethiopia has been informed by the Government of Kenya of the start of the project in February 2015. However, Germany was in the view that no filling of the dam should start before the SEA is completed and mitigation measures have been defined. Therefore, Germany joined previous speakers to look forward to the invitation of joint reactive monitoring mission.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked the two Ministers for their joint effort and welcomed the initiative to conduct the SEA. Serbia further underlined that inclusion of a site into the List of World Heritage in danger can help the State Party to reduce threat and gather international support. Serbia was in the view that the inclusion of the property into the List of World Heritage in Danger is premature, and therefore supported the amendment proposed by Portugal.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** underlined that the joint mission should be conducted to assess impact of the dam construction on the OUV, and to postpone the decision to include the site into the List of World Heritage in Danger

The Delegation of **Qatar** acknowledged the spirit of dialogue prevailing to remove all obstacles to the protection of the site. Qatar also welcomed UICN's suggestion mission to solve the problem and supported the inscription of the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India** was also in the view that at present it would be premature to include the site into the List of World Heritage in danger

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se félicite de la présence des ministres qui transmettent ainsi la position officielle des Etats et d'une concertation réelle entre les deux pays. Elle encourage l'envoi d'une mission de suivi réactif conjointe et la soumission de son rapport avant le 1er février 2015 ; ceci afin d'aller jusque bout du processus de concertation.

The Delegation of **Turkey** was pleased to see the level of cooperation and status of dialogue between the 2 States Parties to maintain sustainability of the property. Following the assessment made by the Centre, Advisory Bodies and the 2 States Parties, the Delegation noted on the constructive dialogue that can lead to the resolve of problem. Echoing on previous comments, it also considered premature to include this property into the Danger List.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** se félicite de l'engagement de haut niveau pour la conservation de ce bien et des efforts de dialogue. Elle préconise également l'attente de la réception du rapport de mission de suivi réactif avant de décider si le site doit être inscrit sur la liste en péril.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** highlighted the technical efforts that are planned. The filling of the dam is now monitored by a high-level Delegation by the 2 countries, that elaborated three construction scenarios, all of which pay high attention to the environment and won't affect the OUV of Lake Turkana negatively.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland, Jamaica, Croatia, Turkey, Germany** supported the amendments proposed by Portugal and Algeria.

The **Secretariat** clarified that a reactive monitoring mission to Kenya has been conducted in 2011 but not yet to Ethiopia. It recommended that the wording should keep both States Parties mentioning a joint delegation, however left the matter to the Committee members to decide.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite savoir si, en raison du temps écoulé depuis la mission d'ores et déjà accueillie, le Kenya souhaite renouveler l'invitation faite d'une mission, cette fois-ci conjointe avec l'**Ethiopie**.

**IUCN** indicated that adding that monitoring missions should be conducted jointly between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies, and not just by IUCN.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7B.90** was adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST** *(continuation)*

### **9C. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THE PACT INITIATIVE: FOLLOW-UP TO RESOLUTION 19 GA 9.**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/9C

*Decision:* **38 COM 9C**

The **Secretariat** recalled the background of this agenda item; as requested by Resolution **18 GA 8**, a final report on the implementation of the recommendations of the External Auditor on the Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative established further to the recommendations of the Open-ended working group (OEWG) was presented to the 19th session of the General Assembly. By Resolution

**19 GA 9**, the General Assembly appreciated the work of the OEWG and endorsed its recommendations. However, the General Assembly also noted that the World Heritage Committee, at its 37th session, had decided not to implement recommendations 12 and 20, related to conflicts of interest. Therefore, the General Assembly, requested the Committee to reexamine these recommendations with a view to their implementation. The Secretariat mentioned that it is left to the Committee to adopt an appropriate Decision after having examined the document. The Director hoped to receive feedback from the Committee member on their view.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que c'est une question centrale. Elle rappelle que le principe au cœur de la gouvernance et du fonctionnement des organisations internationales est d'éviter toute situation pouvant générer des conflits d'intérêt. Puisqu'il n'y a pas de mesure prévue dans les textes de la Convention sur cette question, la Délégation propose qu'il soit admis que les membres du comité s'abstiennent de proposer des sites à l'inscription pendant leur mandat.

La Délégation du **Portugal** souligne que sa position est à l'opposé de celle du **Liban**. En effet, le Portugal a volontairement décidé de ne pas proposer de candidature pendant leur mandat afin d'éviter tout risque de conflit d'intérêt. Elle suggère de demander l'avis du service juridique, mais affirme que l'on ne peut poser de restrictions aux états sauf à amender, réviser la Convention. Une telle décision doit être prise librement par chaque Etat membre en toute souveraineté.

The Delegation of **Japan** emphasized that submission of nominations is the right of each States Party. It noted that it would not be possible to prevent nominations during the Committee members' mandate without revising the Convention. While encouraging each States Party to implement this recommendation, Japan acknowledged domestic circumstances that each States Party might have. Japan further questioned whether the issue of conflict of interest was really proven as it doubted whether any of the Committee members had ever had special privileges in terms of their new nominations when serving as Committee member. A good nomination dossier as well as recommendations provided by the Advisory Bodies were crucial tools to assess sites. Japan expressed its concern that the implementation of this recommendation would discourage States Parties to become Committee Members and requested the Committee members to take this into consideration.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rappelle que la possibilité des Etats de soumettre des propositions d'inscriptions est un fondement de la Convention et un droit pour les Etats Parties, que l'on ne peut le contredire sans modification de la Convention. La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne qu'elle s'est engagée elle aussi à ne pas soumettre de sites durant son mandat.

Le **Conseiller juridique** rappelle avoir donné un avis sur la recommandation de l'Auditeur externe d'une éventuelle interdiction faite aux membres du Comité de présenter des sites à l'inscription durant la durée de leur mandat. Si tel était le cas, les membres seraient alors dans l'incapacité d'exercer pleinement leur droit et cette situation enfreindrait alors leurs prérogatives de membres.

The Delegation of **Philippines** proposed instead that each States Parties can decide this on a voluntary basis.

The Delegation of **Turkey** echoed previous comments, stating that the implementation of this recommendation should not restrict the right of States Parties. Instead, it should be on a voluntary basis. Agreeing on the spirit of voluntary restraints, Turkey supported the proposal by Germany and Portugal.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commented on the ongoing discussion to reach a consensus on the matter. It pointed out that according to the Rules of Procedure, one seat is reserved to a State Party who does not have a site inscribed on the List, and Jamaica's membership in the Committee follows this situation. **Jamaica** further pointed out that the mandate of the Committee members is to uphold and promote the implementation of the Convention. Therefore, it did not observe any conflict of interest and was of the view that voluntary implementation of this recommendation should be encouraged.

The Delegation of **Germany** stressed that the 2 recommendations from the external auditors could be implemented on a voluntary basis. Germany expressed its agreement on such position and supported the integration of the 2 recommendations in regards with voluntary inclusion into the Rules of Procedure, if feasible.

The Delegation of **Finland** acknowledged the importance of avoiding conflict of interest. Moreover, it acknowledged that the implementation of the recommendations made by the external auditor would add to the credibility of the Committee's work. Finland proposed several alternatives for States Parties serving as Committee members while at the same time nominating a site, among others, allowing the concerned Committee member to catch up with the nominations after its membership finished, or to organize a transitional period. Finland strongly supported including this agenda item on every Committee session.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle cependant qu'il n'est pas question d'interdire aux Etats Parties de présenter des sites mais que Comité peut prendre la décision de sursoir à l'examen des propositions soumises par les membres du Comité durant leur mandat. La pratique confirme que les Etats se présentent comme membres du Comité pour proposer des demandes d'inscription. Enfin la Délégation rappelle que le Comité doit examiner la révision de son Règlement intérieur.

After an extensive debate, it was proposed by the Delegation of **Lebanon** to constitute a drafting group on this matter which will work on a consensual text that will be submitted to the Committee on Monday 23 June.

This proposal was agreed upon.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm*

**FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 20 June 2014**

**EIGHTH MEETING**

**3 p.m. – 7 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani (Qatar) and H. E. Mrs Fatima Gueye (Senegal)**

**Address by the Director General of UNESCO**

The **Chairperson** invited Director-General of UNESCO to deliver her address.

**Mrs Irina Bokova Director-General of UNESCO** delivered her address by which she expressed her appreciation to the Qatari authorities for hosting the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Director-General** commended and paid tribute to the decision of Qatar to allocate 10 million dollars to support risk management on World Heritage Sites. The Director recalled how timely this decision of Qatar is, when threats to heritage are raising across the world, as she witnessed in Iraq, Syria, Congo and elsewhere. She noted the crucial importance of safeguarding of heritage and human lives, stressing that in emergency situations, there is no choice to be made, since affirming the protection of heritage is inseparable from the protection of human lives, because it is essential for resilience, for recovery and for dialogue.

The Director-General noted that since the previous session of the Committee, in Phnom Penh, several properties have been affected by devastating natural disasters as well as by conflicts. In this regard, she called upon all States Parties involved in the conflict to safeguard cultural heritage and take all possible measures to avoid further destruction. She stressed that the actions, led in close liaison with the international community, demonstrated once again that cooperation and unity are essential in identifying immediate needs and safeguarding measures for rehabilitation and recovery of World Heritage.

La Directrice générale rappelle l'action et rôle de l'UNESCO en faveur de deux sites du patrimoine mondial : reconstruction après un grand incendie en Mars 2010 des tombes de Kasubi, en Ouganda, avec le soutien du Japon, et aussi la reconstruction des mausolées de Tombouctou, au Mali, avec le soutien de l'Union Européenne et le peuple du Mali.

La Directrice générale souligne que rôle de l'UNESCO, et le rôle du Comité est de puiser dans l'histoire commune la force de penser l'avenir. Elle précise qu'il faut protéger les idées que les peuples ont voulu transmettre à travers le patrimoine et dont nous devons être dignes.

La Directrice générale réaffirme que l'idée d'une civilisation guidée par la conviction que chaque culture a en elle une part exceptionnelle universelle est l'idée du patrimoine mondial, et c'est aussi l'idée de l'UNESCO.

Elle réaffirme l'importance des principes d'objectivité et d'impartialité dont dépend notre crédibilité, et le fait que cette exigence s'applique à tout le monde : Secrétariat, Etats Membres, organes consultatifs. Elle rappelle qu'elle a eu l'occasion d'exprimer son inquiétude sur l'érosion progressive de ces principes au cours des années, mais également de voir que le travail pour un dialogue renforcé et régulier entre les Etats, les organes consultatifs et le Secrétariat, porte ses fruits.

La Directrice générale souligne l'attractivité exceptionnelle du Patrimoine mondial, qui donne aux Etats l'envie de se dépasser, de penser la culture à l'échelle des continents et de l'humanité entière, de dire qu'il y a un seul patrimoine commun à protéger ensemble.

Elle mentionne le rôle du Patrimoine mondial comme allié contre la pauvreté, pour le développement des compétences et des emplois locaux, dans l'économie de l'artisanat et du tourisme notamment. Le patrimoine mondial est également un notre allié pour lutter contre le dérèglement climatique et protéger la biodiversité.

La Directrice générale mentionne enfin que la culture représente, au-delà du patrimoine, une plateforme unique pour la paix et pour le développement durable.

## **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 2014, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/8A

*Decision:* **38 COM 8A**

The **Secretariat** introduced briefly the Document 8A which presents the Tentative Lists of all States Parties submitted in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* as of 15 April 2014.

It highlighted that 177 States Parties have Tentative List while 13 States Parties have no Tentative List. 23 States Parties submitted new properties on the Tentative List since previous session of the Committee. The number of new sites added to the Tentative List since the 37<sup>th</sup> session is 84, which brings the total of sites included on the Tentative List of all States Parties up to 1627.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to make comments.

The Delegation of **Germany** regretted that the gap analysis by ICOMOS has not been revised for long time.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to make comments.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged the needs to revise the gap analysis which was made 10 years ago and expressed eagerness to revise it whenever resource would be available.

In order to be better prepared, the Delegation of **Poland** requested the Secretariat to provide to States Parties the announced proposals concerning Tentative Lists in the context of the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* in advance of the statutory 6 weeks prior to the next Committee session, in order to give the States Parties more time in the exam of such proposals.

La Délégation du **Liban** suggère que le Comité envisage une stratégie pour apporter un soutien aux treize pays qui n'ont pas encore soumis leur Liste Indicative afin qu'ils puissent le faire.

The **Secretariat** responded to the Delegation of Poland that it would try its best to provide updated proposals concerning Tentative Lists in the context of the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* as early as possible. It responded to the Delegation of Lebanon that some of the States Parties which do not have any site on the Tentative List are small states, from which it may be difficult to expect the submission of a Tentative List.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was received on the Draft Decision but that it seems The Delegation of Lebanon would like to propose one.

The **Chairperson** clarified that submitting Tentative List is not an obligation requested to the States Parties by the Convention.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8A** was adopted as amended.

## **8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

*Documents:* WHC-14/38.COM/8B  
WHC-14/38.COM/8B.Add  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B1 and Corr  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B1.Add  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B2  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B2.Add  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B3  
WHC-14/38.COM/INF.8B4

*Decisions:* **38 COM 8B.1 to 8B.3**

The **Chairperson** opened item 8B regarding nominations to the World Heritage List, and provided guidance on the various documents pertaining to this item, indicating that all factual errors letters had been reviewed, and noting that only those that were considered as dealing with ascertained factual errors had been retained.

### **FACTUAL ERROR LETTERS**

The **Chairperson** indicated that Document **INF.8B4** presents Factual Errors identified by States Parties in the Advisory Body evaluations. In accordance with paragraph 150 and Annex 12 of the *Operational Guideline*, Factual Errors were distributed to Members of the Committee in the form of this information document in the two working languages. She reminded the States Parties that at its last session



the Committee decided to make it mandatory to submit Annex 12 of the Operational Guidelines when the States Parties intend to notify factual errors and to proscribe the submission of all other kind of material and documentation which could not be verified and properly evaluated by the relevant Advisory Body. She stated that to this extent the debates should only deal with what has been notified through the official format.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to read out the list of Factual Errors.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the full versions of all these letters had been uploaded on the same web page related to the nominations and read out the list of factual errors received.

Factual Errors Letters received:

- Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru, Qhapaq - Ñan, Andean Road System
- Botswana - Okavango Delta
- China / Kazakhstan / Kyrgyzstan - Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor
- China / Kazakhstan / Kyrgyzstan - Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor
- Denmark - Stevns Klint
- France - Tectono-volcanic Ensemble of the Chaîne des Puys and Limagne Fault
- Germany - Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey
- Ghana - Tongo-Tengzuk Tallensi Cultural Landscape
- India - Rani-ki-Vav (The Queen's Stepwell) at Patan, Gujarat
- Iran (Islamic Republic of) - Shahr-I Sokhta
- Iraq - Erbil Citade
- Italy - The Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato
- Japan - Tomioka Silk Mill and Related Sites
- Mexico - Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche [Extension and renomination of the "Ancient Maya City of Calakmul, Campeche"]
- Myanmar - Pyu Ancient Cities
- Netherlands - Van Nellefabriek
- Palestine - Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir
- Republic of Korea - Namhansanseong
- Russian Federation - Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex
- Turkey - Bursa and Cumalıkızık: the Birth of the Ottoman Empire
- Turkey - Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape
- United Arab Emirates - Khor Dubai (Dubai Creek)
- United States of America - Monumental Earthworks of Poverty Point
- Viet Nam - Trang An Landscape Complex
- Zambia - Barotse Cultural Landscape
- Belgium - Plantin-Moretus House-Workshops-Museum Complex

## CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the item on proposed name changes to World Heritage properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Secretariat** presented the following 3 proposals:

- Malta - Hal Saflieni Hypogeum
- Sweden - Church Village of Gammelstad, Luleå
- Sweden - Varberg Radio Station

The Draft Decisions **38 COM 8B.1 to 8B.3** were adopted.

## NOMINATIONS WITHDRAWN AT THE REQUEST OF THE STATE PARTY

The **Chairperson** came to the matter regarding withdrawals of nominations at the request of the State Party and invited the Secretariat to read the list of such withdrawals.

The **Secretariat** stated that a total of **5 nominations** were withdrawn before the commencement of the session and that 36 nominations (8 natural properties, 2 mixed properties and 26 cultural properties) would be examined at this session. The withdrawn nominations are;

- Czech Republic, Slovakia - Sites of Great Moravia: The Slavonic Fortified Settlement at Mikulčice and the Church of St Margaret of Antioch at Kopčany
- Portugal - Arrábida
- Spain - Cultural Landscape of Valle Salado de Añana
- Spain - Jaén Cathedral
- Viet Nam - Cat Ba Archipelago

## EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **Chairperson** recalled two essential procedures concerning nominations to be examined.

She indicated that firstly, the Committee is requested to examine the recommendations and Draft Decisions presented in the relevant Documents, and, in accordance with paragraph 153 of the Operational Guidelines, take its Decisions following four categories:

- The Committee may decide to **inscribe** a property on the World Heritage List (paragraph 154 of the *Operational Guidelines*);
- The Committee may decide that a property should **not be inscribed** on the World Heritage List (paragraph 158 of the *Operational Guidelines*);

- The Committee may decide to **refer** back a nomination to the State Party for additional information (paragraph 159 of the *Operational Guidelines*);
- The Committee may decide to **defer** a nomination for more-in-depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision by the State Party (paragraph 160 of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The Chairperson underlined in particular that, nominations which the Committee decides to **refer back** to the State Party for additional information may be resubmitted to the following Committee session for examination. She indicated that, for a referred nomination there is no new nomination file to be prepared and there is no evaluation mission of the relevant Advisory Body foreseen to the property.

The Chairperson mentioned that if the Committee decide to **defer** a nomination: an in depth assessment or study, or a substantial revision of the nomination file by the State Party is needed. Therefore a new nomination should be submitted by 1 February, which will be re-evaluated by the relevant Advisory Body during the full year and a half evaluation, cycle according to the procedures and timetable outlined in paragraph 168 of the Operational Guidelines.

Secondly, on the specific issue of **submission of additional information** on nominations, the Chairperson recalled point **H** of paragraph **148** as well as the nomination timetable of paragraph **168** of the Operational Guidelines, which establishes the deadline for the submission of additional information on nominations and says:

*“The evaluations and presentations of the Advisory Bodies should not take into account or include any information submitted by the State Party after **28 February** in the year in which the nomination is considered.”*

The Chairperson then proceeded with the examination of Nominations indicating that she will begin with the cultural nominations, followed by mixed and then natural nominations. She added that the Advisory bodies will proceed with a brief presentation of their Evaluation Process before the examination of nominations.

#### **A. NOMINATIONS TO BE PROCESSED ON AN EMERGENCY BASIS**

Property	<b>Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir</b>
Id. N°	<b>1492</b>
State Party	<b>Palestine</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination. ICOMOS did not consider that the present nomination was unquestionably of Outstanding Universal Value and that while several threats have been identified for the property, ICOMOS had not found that it was facing an emergency for which an immediate decision by the World Heritage Committee could ensure its safeguarding.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to make comments.

The Delegation of **Germany** referred to the decision of ICOMOS not to recommend to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger on an emergency basis and requested clarification by ICOMOS if this decision only affected Palestine's ability to nominate the property on an emergency basis, or if it would permanently preclude Palestine from attempting to nominate this property.

**ICOMOS** indicated that the *Operational Guidelines* clearly did not preclude the nomination from being reconsidered on a normal process with the 18-months evaluation process and that the ICOMOS recommendation for non-inscription only related to its emergency status.

The **Chairperson** responded by questioning if ICOMOS believed that the state of Palestine was not an emergency

*[The Delegation of Lebanon delivered the following statement in English]*

The Delegation of **Lebanon** acknowledged that ICOMOS had to present the Committee with a full evaluation in such a limited time. It noted two issues which needed to be addressed, whether or not the emergency character of the nomination is justified, and whether or not the property has a justified Outstanding Universal Value. It quoted the evaluation by ICOMOS and noted three arguments which the Delegation found unconvincing: 1) plans of security fence are not moving forward; 2) the visual impact is negative but may be reversible in the future, and 3) the decision of the Committee would not influence the protection of the property as it would not oblige the State Party not associated with the property to abide by it. It suggested that these three arguments used by ICOMOS were not valid and notably that Article 6 of the World Heritage Convention obliged States Parties to the Convention not to affect the cultural heritage of other States Parties, stating that these interpretations were not valid. The Delegation also addressed ICOMOS' interpretation that the property did not have Outstanding Universal Value and suggested that Mediterranean cultural landscapes were not yet completely understood. It then noted two past cases where ICOMOS did not recognize Mediterranean cultural landscapes to have OUV, yet the Committee inscribed the properties nonetheless. He referenced ICOMOS' recent decision to undertake a Thematic Study on the subject as a sign of the need for further exploration, but recommended that the Committee should be consistent with its previous decisions and inscribe the property on the World Heritage List immediately without waiting another year.

The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked ICOMOS and joined the Delegation of Lebanon in supporting inscription. It then recalled the UNESCO Constitution and suggested that the Committee should promote dialogue and peace through mutual understanding. The Delegation noted that it would have wished that the nomination had come as a transboundary nomination between Israel and Palestine to move in the direction of safeguarding, protecting and promoting each other's values.

The Delegations of **Senegal, Algeria, Kazakhstan, Peru, Qatar, Malaysia, India** and **Jamaica** supported recognition of Outstanding Universal Value and emergency situation of the property.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Rapporteur**.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the Delegation of Lebanon has proposed amendments to

the Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the Draft decision in order to change it from “not consider” the property is unquestionably of Outstanding Universal Value and is in *emergency situation for which an immediate decision* to “considers” it is. He also informed that the Delegation of Lebanon has proposed to add new paragraphs for inserting statement of Outstanding Universal Value, for inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and for encouraging the international community to facilitate the conservation of the property and requests that the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS provide support to the State Party as may be appropriate.

The **Rapporteur** suggested that should this property be inscribed, the Committee would need to insert its criteria, integrity, authenticity, protection and management as well, in order to complete its statement of OUV.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested a secret ballot vote on the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon. This proposal was seconded by the Delegations of **Finland** and **Croatia**.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee take a break while the Secretariat prepares the voting on the session and gave the floor to the Legal Advisor to explain the process of voting which would happen for the secret ballot.

Le **Conseil juridique** informe les membres du Comité de la procédure de vote au bulletin secret, selon l'Article 42 du Règlement intérieur. Avant l'ouverture du scrutin secret, le Président désigne deux scrutateurs parmi les Délégations des membres du Comité pour dépouiller les bulletins de vote. Lorsque le décompte des voix est achevé et que les scrutateurs en ont rendu compte au Président, celui-ci proclame les résultats du scrutin, en veillant à ce que ceux-ci soient enregistrés comme suit:

Du nombre des membres du Comité sont déduits:

- a) le nombre de membres du Comité absents, s'il y en a;
- b) le nombre de bulletins blancs, s'il y en a,
- c) le nombre de bulletins nuls, s'il y en a.

Le chiffre restant constitue le nombre de suffrages exprimés.

Le Conseiller juridique informe que la majorité requise pour ce vote est la majorité des 2/3, conformément à l'Article 37 du Règlement intérieur. Le Conseiller juridique informe le Comité que le bulletin de vote concernant le Projet de décision comportera la mention «Etes-vous en faveur des amendements proposés par la Délégation du Liban concernant le Projet de décision 38 COM. 8B.4 ?, OUI/ NON.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the ballot forms were being printed for Committee members and that they would be distributed. The Delegates of **Japan and Portugal** were appointed as tellers.

The **Secretariat** indicated that it will proceed with the vote by calling Members of the Committee in the English alphabetical order.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, par un point d'ordre, demande à savoir pourquoi la case « Abstention » est absente sur le bulletin de vote qui a été distribué.

Le **Conseiller juridique** indique que le vote blanc sera considéré comme abstention.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande à savoir pourquoi il n'y a pas une case spécifique pour le vote blanc.

The **Chairperson** clarified that an abstention would be expressed by not marking neither "YES" nor "NO" on the ballot paper.

**[The Voting process was initiated]  
[Counting of ballots]**

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote.

**21** Committee members presents.

**7 blank ballots.**

**No invalid ballots**

**14 members voting** [majority of 2/3, i.e 10 votes]

**11 YES**

**3 NO.**

The **Chairperson** congratulates Palestine on the inscription of its site and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Palestine.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** (Observateur) remercie les membres du Comité qui ont voté en faveur de la décision pour l'inscription, faisant ainsi acte de courage, de justice et d'équité. Selon la Délégation l'inscription est un épisode d'une belle éloquence qui démontre que l'Etat partie n'est pas contré chaque fois qu'il prend une initiative. La Délégation souligne en outre que seule la chute des murs assure la paix et décrit la décision prise comme courageuse contre l'enfermement et exclusion.

The **Chairperson** thanked Palestine for its intervention and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Israel.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** thanked and congratulated Qatar for hosting the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation expressed its concern, regarding the inclusion of this site on the List of World Heritage in Danger which is a negative landmark in the heritage of UNESCO. It also stated that the Committee neglected procedures and guidelines and disregarded and discredited ICOMOS' highly professional and distinctive work. It noted that the 2 Palestinian sites have been inscribed as emergency nominations, undermining application of the Operational Guidelines and the role of the Advisory Bodies in the Convention. Since Palestine has only submitted nominations on an emergency basis, taking advantage of this procedure, Israel considered this as an abuse of the system. The Delegation indicated the adopted decision was a "knockout" to the Convention and to the Committee. It also reiterated the findings of ICOMOS regarding the nomination. It further regretted that part of the Committee members failed to fight against the politicization and safeguard the Credibility of the Convention and the Committee.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation. She requested that, in the future, the State Party of Israel provides access to missions by the Advisory Bodies.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.4** was adopted as amended.

## **D. CULTURAL SITES**

### **D.1. AFRICA**

#### **D.1.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Tongo-Tenzuk Tallensi Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1409</b>
State Party	<b>Ghana</b>

The **Secretariat** noted that a factual error letter was received concerning this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination for the Tongo-Tenzuk Tallensi Cultural Landscape (Ghana).

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note la lettre rapportant des erreurs factuelles et constate la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La Délégation souligne qu'il faut d'abord entreprendre des évaluations environnementales sur le patrimoine mondial et/ou évaluations d'impact sur le patrimoine appliquées aux biens du patrimoine mondial au lieu de parler des interdictions et ce pourquoi la Délégation a proposé un amendement au paragraphe 5e.

The Delegation of **India** requested to hear the view of the State Party of Ghana.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the view of the Delegation of Senegal. It feels that the current tools for mapping tangible and intangible elements are not sufficient; suggests that where criterion (vi) is included, an expert on intangible heritage might be included, and that anthropological data be included in the nomination dossier to represent the significance of the relationship between tangible and intangible heritage attributes.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported ICOMOS's recommendations of the need to protect the OUV of the site and allowing them to continue to develop the nomination dossier. Germany supported the proposal of Senegal.

In the absence of the Observer Delegation of Ghana in the Room, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendment has been received so far, but that he understood that the Delegation of Senegal would like to include an amendment.

**ICOMOS** confirmed that there is no mention of mining in their recommended decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.17** was adopted as amended.

Property	<b>Mount Mulanje Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1201</b>
State Party	<b>Malawi</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination for Mount Mulanje Cultural Landscape to the Committee.

**IUCN** also provided comments.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with ICOMOS, who they feel has constructive recommendations and they support deferral but encouraged the State Party to re-nominate at a later date.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** confirme qu'elle souhaitait entendre l'avis de l'Etat partie et note les conclusions intéressantes de l'IUCN. La Délégation encourage le dialogue entre les organisations consultatives et le Centre du patrimoine mondial avec le soutien du Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its understanding of the importance of this property to the local community not only because the site is maintained through sustainable and traditional management systems but also due to the spiritual importance for the local community. They supported the recommendation provided by ICOMOS, though they stated that they hoped this property would be nominated again in the future with consideration of criteria (iii) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the State Party of Malawi for the nomination of such an interesting cultural landscape property and also agreed with the recommendations provided by ICOMOS. They felt that the nomination dossier failed to make a clear case under the criteria it was nominated. With enhanced comparative analysis and clearer proof of authenticity this property could potentially meet criteria (iv) and further time would provide the State Party with the ability to better integrate the traditional and official management systems for increased protection and maintenance of the property. The deferral could provide the State Party with time to strengthen their nomination.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the property is a testimony of the relationship between people and nature. The Delegation supported the recommendations made by ICOMOS, but also stated that the nomination needed to provide further information on the tangible and intangible heritage of the site as well as a comparative analysis.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** would like the State Party to draw further connections between the tangible and intangible heritage of the site. They also agreed with the recommendation of ICOMOS. It noted that the criterion (iv) would need to be justified including applicability of the criterion (iii). The comparative analysis would be necessary. The State Party should also identify the sources of OUV, the informational sources of authenticity, and augment the comparative analysis to highlight aspects of cultural guardianship.

The Delegation of **Columbia** appreciated ICOMOS' work and expected a collaborated efforts for future inscription.



La Délégation d'**Algérie** encourage l'Etat partie à poursuivre le travail sur cette proposition d'inscription. La Délégation encourage le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain de s'associer à la mise en œuvre des recommandations de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported the recommendation of ICOMOS. They would also like the State Party to explore nomination under criteria (iii) and (vi). Also, they felt that the State Party did not provide a sufficient review within the nomination dossier, which would have provided more information to be considered

**IUCN** underlined that this property represented one of the irreplaceable areas of the globe due to its biodiversity. The State Party should take into consideration natural criteria. There are also a number of issues with mining and logging which need to be addressed. They also encourage a field evaluation mission in the future if the property is to be re-nominated to determine if the property meets all natural criteria.

**ICOMOS** wished to address the relationship between monitoring indicators and the intangible characteristics. There is no formal cultural heritage protection in place and cultural heritage protection mechanisms lie in traditional management and spiritual expression through social taboos and rituals. ICOMOS feels that monitoring of cultural heritage practices is essential.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** s'interroge sur la possibilité d'établir des indicateurs concernant une telle culture intangible.

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

La Délégation du **Liban** demande de maintenir l'interdiction des activités minières figurant dans le Projet de décision et ajoute l'obligation d'entreprendre des études d'impact des activités minière sur l'intégrité du bien avant toute nouvelle proposition.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.18** was adopted as amended.

Property	<b>Barotse Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1429</b>
State Party	<b>Zambia</b>

The **Secretariat** noted that a factual error letter was received concerning this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Japan** was interested to know whether the new construction was within the boundaries of the property and would like to hear the State Party's view on this.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la demande du Japon. La Délégation souligne qu'il faudrait prendre en compte le caractère du paysage culturel et la nature dynamique de cette région depuis 400 ans et c'est également qu'elle soutient le renvoi.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the deferral of the nomination at this time. It stated that the cultural landscape shows promise, but more work is needed to solve issues with the development pressure and property's boundary definition.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the recommendation presented by ICOMOS, but also stated that the site has potential concerning the cultural landscape. The Delegation expressed concern with the factual error format which demonstrates a number of differences in opinions, rather than factual errors, and was interested in the response of Zambia on this concern.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** echoed the concerns of Germany and was interested to hear the concerns and issues addressed by Zambia.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its support for the referral.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** was concerned with whether the information provided by the 3 interventions mentioned in the report, which ICOMOS stated as irrelevant, was relevant at this stage to indicate its referral or deferral.

The Observer Delegation of **Zambia** clarified that the concerned road in question is within the property and it is an upgrading. Some inconsistencies were observed and discussed between the Delegation and ICOMOS. They also stated that ICOMOS did not have enough time to analyze all these issues.

The Observer of **Tanzania** understood the issues Zambia has expressed and would like the State Party to be given the best possible options to re-nominate the property, due to the importance and value of the property to humanity.

**ICOMOS** stated that many of the differences of opinion between the Delegation of Zambia and ICOMOS were now resolved; in particular the phrase land management, used by ICOMOS, caused difficulty because it seemed to be misunderstood. The new information presented in factual errors notification has strengthened certain areas of the dossier, but does not change the overall conclusions reached by ICOMOS. The raising and widening of the new road is one of the issue, since it runs a significant distance across the property. However, they did emphasize the need to create an appropriate boundary and solve the issues of mining and logging. ICOMOS was of the view that the best option would be defining the boundary and fix some procedures for protection. Also, the management issues cannot be solved with a referral.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the debate will resume on Saturday.

*The meeting rose at 7 p.m.*

**SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY 21 June 2014**

**NINTH MEETING**

**9:00 a.m. – 1 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)**

**ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE  
LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL  
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)**

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the discussion concerning the Barotse Cultural Landscape in Zambia will resume as it was not finalised yet.

She also indicates that the Secretariat will clarify the order of the presentation of the nominations, following some changes decided by the Bureau at its morning session.

**D. CULTURAL SITES (continuation)**

**D.1. AFRICA**

**D.1.1. New Nominations (continuation)**

Property	<b>Barotse Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1429</b>
State Party	<b>Zambia</b>

*(continuation)*

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

La Délégation du **Liban** note que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site est très claire et facilement justifiée. Toutefois, il existe de très gros problèmes, notamment un aéroport dans la zone proposée pour inscription, ainsi que des activités minières. Elle note que la résolution de ces problèmes nécessitera du temps, et se prononce pour différer l'examen de cette proposition d'inscription. Elle souligne que si l'Etat partie dépose le dossier rapidement, il pourra être examiné par le Comité à sa 40e session.

La Délégation du **Senegal** souligne que l'Etat partie a réalisé des études et les a soumis à l'ICOMOS, et que ces études auraient dû figurer dans le dossier. Elle appelle à faire confiance à l'Etat partie. Elle note qu'il n'y a aucun doute concernant la VUE du site, et qu'il s'agit d'aménagements techniques à faire pour finaliser le

dossier. Elle souligne que les sites du patrimoine mondial ne sont pas des sanctuaires où il ne faut absolument rien faire.

La Délégation **d'Algérie** indique comprendre les réticences exprimées par la Délégation du Liban, mais note qu'il s'agit de maintenir la dynamique dans laquelle l'Etat partie s'est engagé pour prendre les mesures nécessaires. Elle se prononce par conséquent pour le renvoi du dossier.

The Delegation of **Portugal** understood the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Lebanon, but felt it was important to keep the momentum. The OUV was apparent in this case. Having heard the State Party and the proposal from Senegal, the Delegation considered that referral would be more appropriate. However, it would be important for this to have a clear vision of how the overall landscape would be managed and protected.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the views expressed by Portugal and Senegal.

The Delegation of **Malaysia**, having examined the documents, urged the State Party to engage in a constructive dialogue with the stakeholders with an aim to safeguard the property. The issues raised could have been dealt within a short time and this is why the Delegation considered that a referral would be the best choice.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted that the State Party had made considerable efforts. It considered that the attention should be now placed on the development plan at the property, which should have been controlled.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** stressed that the phenomenon of the transhumance, of which this property was a remarkable example, was of great global significance. It considered that a referral would provide the State Party with an encouragement to undertake the necessary measures that would eventually enable the inscription of the Barostze Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List.

The Delegations of **Croatia, Turkey, Germany** and of the **Republic of Korea** supported the previous speakers.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there were any objections to referral.

La Délégation du **Liban** note qu'il s'agirait d'un premier site ayant un aéroport dans la zone protégée.

The Delegation of **Croatia** recalled that it had a World Heritage property in its territory which included a small airport.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

**ICOMOS** took the floor to underline that in this case there was an issue with the definition of the boundaries. If the Committee decided to refer the nomination, there would be no time for ICOMOS to evaluate the new proposal. ICOMOS suggested, therefore, that the Committee might include in the decision a request for an ICOMOS advisory mission to help the State Party redraft the nomination.

The Delegations of **Lebanon** and **Turkey** agreed with the ICOMOS proposal.

The **Secretariat** noted that the correct wording for the decision would have been to “refer the nomination”, rather than the examination.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.19** was adopted as amended.

## **D.2. ARAB STATES**

### **D.2.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Erbil Citadel</b>
Id. N°	<b>1437</b>
State Party	<b>Iraq</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error letter concerning this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation and recommendation, suggesting that the nomination be deferred.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted that ICOMOS, in its evaluation, pointed out that written epigraphic and iconographic sources suggest that Erbil has had a long history since earliest times and played an important role at different eras. It noted that this alone may justify a potential OUV of the property. It further noted that the problem lied in defining the attributes. It noted that ICOMOS did not find evidence for criterion (iii) because of the fact that the tell cannot be fully excavated, since excavation would destroy the urban fabric of the Citadel. It also noted that ICOMOS did not find evidence for criterion (v), because of the population having been relocated. It stated that the criterion (iv) was justified, the site being an outstanding example of urban ensemble and landscape, which illustrates significant stages in human history. It noted that Erbil Citadel is a rare example of an urban citadel which has developed over a long period of time on the top of archaeological mounds. It noted that ICOMOS had suggested that the dossier be reorganized with focus on criterion (iv). The Delegation of Lebanon considered that the boundaries of the property, as proposed, are adequate to justify for criterion (iv), while further steps would need to be done for enhancing the protection and management of the property, mainly through reconsidering the location and/or architecture of the Kurdistan National Museum, strengthening the involvement of inhabitants and Erbil civil society in the revitalization of the citadel, and elaborating a strategy to implement the conservation and revitalization program.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** concurred with the Delegation of Lebanon that it would not be possible to excavate the mound, but stressed that there was sufficient archaeological evidence to support the dating of the tell to at least the third millennium BC. This was the only surviving example of such a tell. The Delegation also acknowledged that the nomination had some unusual aspects and would have liked to hear clarifications from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Croatia** considered that Erbil was a magnificent, outstanding site. ICOMOS was right in noting a lack of clarity in the nomination, for example in the reference to the property as a living site, when in fact the entire population had been relocated in 2006. The Delegation also acknowledged that the material evidence of a

continuous occupation since the third millennium BC was scarce. However, the statement made by ICOMOS whereby it had not had sufficient time to take into account in its evaluation the new information provided by the State Party was puzzling. Could ICOMOS explain?

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that Erbil was a very rare example of a multi-layered city dating back millennia, where the process of tell formation was still ongoing to this day. The site was well conserved and the required management plans were in place. The Delegation commended the regional administration for their work in this regard, as well as UNESCO for its support to the nomination. More information from the State Party on the archaeological aspects would be welcome. However, the OUV of this property was unquestionable.

The Delegation of **India** questioned: why no additional information was requested from the State Party if ICOMOS had doubts?

The Delegation of **Jamaica** acknowledged that the comparative analysis of this nomination was not fully convincing and that there were still some aspects of the regulatory framework for the protection of the property that required attention. The extra time allowed by a deferral of the nomination could provide an opportunity to address these issues. The Delegation wanted to hear from the State Party on these two points.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted that the study and documentation of this site should have been a priority, as according to ICOMOS this had not yet been done. There were questions in particular to the linkages between the Ottoman City and underlying archaeological remains. The Delegation would have liked to know from the State Party how much had been published in this regard.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that the OUV of this property could have been demonstrated. The Orient Department of the German Archaeological Institute was working on the site and could have easily assisted the State Party in reformulating a justification for the inscription of the property. The Delegation asked the State Party to provide more explanations on the conditions of authenticity and integrity.

The Delegation of **Qatar** supported the views expressed by the Delegation of Germany.

La Délégation **d'Algérie** note que la proposition d'inscription a été élaborée en étroite collaboration avec l'UNESCO, le bureau régional de l'UNESCO, ainsi que d'autres experts. Elle souligne que le site témoigne d'une longue histoire et d'une occupation ininterrompue depuis des millénaires, et appelle à un approfondissement étayé par la documentation archéologique, qui aurait dû être demandé et discuté avec l'Etat partie. Elle note que concernant le tourisme, ainsi que les choix conceptuels en matière architecturale, l'Etat partie peut apporter des éclaircissements. Elle soutient la demande des Délégations qui ont souhaité que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie. Elle souligne que l'Etat partie a pris en main la revitalisation de l'ensemble historique, en coopération avec l'UNESCO, et a établi un « Master Plan », en cours d'exécution, qui implique les habitants dans ce processus. En conclusion, la Délégation d'Algérie note qu'elle a soumis un amendement visant

l'inscription du bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle aussi les dispositions organisationnelles mis en place par l'Etat partie depuis 2008.

The Delegation of **Poland** welcomed the efforts made by the State Party, but would have liked it to provide clarifications regarding the category of this property. Acknowledging that the Operational Guidelines required a revision in this regard, the Delegation wondered if in this case the concept of historic urban landscape would have not been more appropriate.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note que la Citadelle est un ensemble extrêmement complexe, et qu'il ne faut pas mélanger deux analyses, car il existe deux horizons, qui apportent chacun une catégorie d'information, notamment une plateforme archéologique et une citadelle construite dessus. Elle note que bien que des recherches ultérieures seraient nécessaires, la VUE du site ne peut être contestée. Elle note également que dans la cette région, les premiers paysages urbains se mettent en place depuis presque 6000 ans, auxquels se superposent ensuite les ensembles urbains comme la citadelle. Elle souligne que la préoccupation concernant l'authenticité est moins importante que celle concernant la sauvegarde du site, notamment le système de gestion, et demande que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat Partie.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** considered that this property had a very strong potential for demonstrating OUV, that further studies would be able to confirm. It wanted the State Party to elaborate on this.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted that epigraphic sources made it very clear that Erbil was a site of great antiquity, and supported the statement made by the Delegation of Algeria.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recognised that there were some issues with this nomination and would have liked to hear from the State Party, for example on the relationship between public and private sector in the management of the property being nominated.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked the State Party for its conservation efforts. It was convinced of the OUV of this property and wished to hear from the State Party on its conditions of integrity and authenticity.

The Delegation of **Turkey**, after hearing the comments from Algeria, felt that, in the current context of social and political instability in the region, the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List would send a positive message and promote reconciliation through culture, which was the primary objective of UNESCO. It therefore asked that the State Party explained what evidence was available to document the ancient layers of the site.

The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** thanked all members of the Committee for their support. The OUV of the property was not in doubt. The site was registered as an archaeological tell since 1937. In relation to the category of this property, the State party clarified that it was a site, not a group of buildings. Erbil was one among few sites in Iraq having a dedicated management authority, with a board inclusive of all stakeholders and a clear conservation plan, which addressed all the issues raised, including research. The State Party stated that the property should have been

inscribed as it was unique in the world, and reiterated its willingness to work together with ICOMOS and other partners for its safeguarding.

**ICOMOS**, in response to the question asked by the Delegation of Croatia, explained that the main concerns were related to the concept of the nomination. Not to management issues. The new information received from the State Party in this regard had been welcomed in principle but was not critical, and could not be properly assessed due to lack of time. Regarding the issue raised by the Delegation of India, ICOMOS clarified that it had indeed requested additional information from the State Party before its panel was held, and that this new information was actually provided by the State Party directly to the expert who had conducted the evaluation mission. The recommendation for deferral was aimed at having a clearer understanding of the property based on the large amount of research which was being undertaken.

The Rapporteur read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** referred again to the issue of transparency. It noted how in ICOMOS evaluation documents, it was indicated that no new information had been requested and/or received, which contradicted what ICOMOS had just stated. Clearly, there was a need for improving the system. The Delegation asked that ICOMOS address this specific question.

**ICOMOS** explained that the reason why the document did not mention any new information received from the State Party was because this had not been provided through a formal communication in writing. However, ICOMOS reiterated that ICOMOS had indeed requested clarifications to the State Party and that these had been provided directly to the expert who had conducted the evaluation mission, prior to the ICOMOS panel meeting that had formulated the recommendation to the Committee.

The Delegation by **India** stated that it was not satisfied by the response provided by ICOMOS.

**ICOMOS** clarified, once again, that the practice was to indicate that new information had been received by the State Party when this came in the form of an official submission in writing, which was not what had happened in this case. It acknowledged that this may have caused some confusion and suggested that in the future all kinds of information sharing should be reflected in its evaluation documents.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the procedure should have been clarified so as to avoid similar situations in the future, and noted that it would submit an amendment to the Draft Decision accordingly.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** concurred with the statement of the Delegation of India, and noted that ICOMOS should be requested, for all future cases, to clearly state all types of information which was received.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recalled that in the debate held on the previous day, reference had been made to factual error letters containing information that could not have been taken into consideration by the Advisory Bodies at this stage. The Delegation asked that ICOMOS would clarify the nature of this new information and explain whether it would have an impact on its recommendations and why.



La Délégation du **Sénégal** appelle l'ICOMOS à indiquer toutes les informations, sans faire de sélection. Concernant les recherches demandées, elle note que ce serait une utopie, compte tenu de la complexité du bien, et elle cite l'exemple des pyramides qui continuent à faire l'objet des recherches qui ne sont jamais finies. Elle appelle à voir les valeurs révélées du site, qui sont évidentes.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose d'inscrire le bien en se contentant du critère (iv) qui est avéré, et demander à l'Etat partie d'étudier, documenter et cartographier les vestiges de surface, et instaurer des mécanismes pour documenter et protéger les vestiges archéologiques enfouis, afin de permettre, à l'avenir, de justifier les critères (iii) et (v).

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended decision again, including the latest suggestions from Lebanon on paragraphs 2 and 4.

Les Délégations de **l'Algérie** et du **Sénégal** appuient l'amendement proposé par le Liban.

The Delegation of **Poland** recalled that the Statements of OUV were documents of critical importance, to be drafted with utmost care. With reference to paragraph 3, the Delegation suggested that a Statement of OUV should not have been adopted at this stage, but only taken note of, pending its final approval at the next session in 2015.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that in cases where the Committee had decided to inscribe a property for which the Advisory Body had recommended deferral, only a provisional Statement of OUV had been adopted, with a final Statement to be agreed at the following session by the Committee. In addition, the Secretariat noted that the decision should have indicated by when the additional reports requested from the State Party should have been submitted.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The **Secretariat** insisted that it was necessary to indicate a date by when the State Party should have submitted the required information, for example 1 February 2016.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.20** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party of Iraq for a short statement.

The State Party noted how the inscription of Erbil was an achievement not just for the State of Iraq, but for the entire international community. It thanks everyone involved in the long process for the preparation of the nomination, as well as the State of Qatar for its great hospitality and support. The listing of Erbil as a World Heritage was an invaluable gift which the Iraqi people would cherish by taking good care of this outstanding property.

### D.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

#### D.3.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Tomioka Silk Mill and Related Sites</b>
Id. N°	<b>1449</b>
State Party	<b>Japan</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error letter concerning this nomination, and that this was included within the relevant working document, 38COM/INF8B.rev.

L'**ICOMOS** a présenté son évaluation de la proposition d'inscription. En particulier, il a noté que les critères (ii) et (iv) sont justifiés, et que l'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien sont satisfaisantes. Il a noté par ailleurs que l'analyse comparative et les délimitations du bien sont également satisfaisantes, ainsi que sa protection, conservation et gestion. En conclusion, l'ICOMOS a recommandé que le bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (ii) et (iv).

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** thanked ICOMOS for its evaluation, which would enable the authorities in charge of this property to further strengthen its conservation while enhancing the role of the Convention among the local communities.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party and fully supported the inscription on the World Heritage List of this property, which was emblematic of the significant historic role of the silk industry for international trading.

The Delegation of **Finland** was in favour of inscription, as this property testified in an outstanding way to the development of the silk industry in the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

The Delegations of **Colombia** and **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party and fully supported the inscription on the World Heritage List of this property.

The Delegation of **Turkey** joined other in supporting the inscription of the site. It noted how the theme of silk production and trade had a strong potential for underpinning a serial, transnational nomination since silk had been produced and traded over more than 3000 years stretching from Japan to the Mediterranean and beyond. The Ottoman Empire had built a number of silk industrial plants. The Delegation hope that this inscription would generate a new impetus concerning other nominations related to the silk industry and trade.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated the State Party for nominating this outstanding property that testified in an exceptional manner of an important human interchange.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by the Delegation of **Viet nam**, noted that the inclusion of this property on the World Heritage List would fill a gap, and supported its inscription.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** félicite le Japon pour l'excellente présentation du dossier, et relève l'excellente collaboration de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegations of **Qatar, Malaysia, Peru, Portugal, Croatia and Serbia** congratulated the State Party and supported the inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Liban** appuie l'inscription, et se joint au souhait de la Délégation de la Turquie de voir à l'avenir un projet transnational concernant le patrimoine de la soie.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite le Japon pour ce dossier, et l'ICOMOS pour sa collaboration.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported inscription and noted how this nomination represented a model of cooperation between the State Party and ICOMOS.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.27** was adopted.

The **Chairperson**, on behalf of the members of the Committee, congratulated the State Party and gave it the floor for a short statement.

The State Party expressed its happiness for the inscription of this property, on behalf of the government and of the people of Japan. It thanked experts and the members of the Committee for the support. The site was a very significant one, and all those who had contributed to its safeguarding and to the nomination process should have been acknowledged and thanked. The State Party reassured the Committee that it would be always mindful of the honour bestowed upon Japan with this inscription and would take good care of the property in the future.

#### **D. CULTURAL SITES** *(continuation)*

##### **D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

###### **D.4.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Van Nellefabriek</b>
Id. N°	<b>1441</b>
State Party	<b>Netherlands</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the information on the nomination to the Committee.

La Délégation de **Liban** soutient la recommandation de l'ICOMOS qui considère que le critère (i) n'a pas été justifié parce que l'usine Van Nelle n'est pas une des implantations industrielles parmi les plus abouties, durant l'entre-deux-guerres, du modernisme dans le monde industriel et du fonctionnalisme en architecture. En ce qui concerne le critère (ii), la Délégation constate que les valeurs du mouvement moderne sont déjà représentées sur la liste du patrimoine mondial par des biens plus importants que l'usine Van Nelle. Le critère (iv) est pleinement justifié parce que l'usine Van Nelle représente un exemple éminent pour l'architecture industrielle. La Délégation propose l'inscription uniquement sur la base du critère (iv).

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan, Turkey, Finland, India, Philippines, Jamaica, Algeria, Croatia, Qatar, Viet Nam, Republic of Korea, Malaysia, Colombia** and

**Senegal** expressed their in favor of inscription of the property as an outstanding example of industrialization as well as an icon of Modernism, and commended the State Party's effort to ensure protection and management measure for the property.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its full support for the inscription on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), and acknowledged the difficulties of preserving material which is fragile to keep and commended the State Party's effort.

The Delegation of **Germany** highlighted that the property would fill the gap of the World Heritage List which yet had less industrial heritage and joined the Delegation of Japan in supporting inscription on the basis of criteria (ii) and (vi).

The Délégation du **Liban** demande un avis de ICOMOS et des experts de l'Etat Partie sur les réserve concernant le critère (ii), en particulier sur la pertinence du choix du site comme expression du des valeurs du mouvement moderne en urbanisme et du modèle de la « cité ouverte ».

**ICOMOS** considered that the property embodied the bringing together and use of technical and architectural ideas that were born in various parts of Europe and North America, just before World War One and in the years that followed. It also considered it was successful in terms of its location with its harmonious functional relationship with its environment, and its accomplished architectural realisation. It became one of the great international icons of Modernism in the industrial field, and constitutes an exemplary contribution by the Netherlands to this movement. It further considered that the property illustrated the long-established importance of the port of Rotterdam in the international food product trade.

The Observer Delegation of **Netherland** considered the layout and construction of property was expression of the value of Modernism which made the property universally recognized icon of modern culture and design showing social concern and development of open and free society. It would recommend to inscribe the site under criterion (ii) and (iv).

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.35** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated on behalf of the members of the Committee, the Delegation of Netherland for the inscription of Van Nellefabriek on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Netherland** thanked the Committee and the international community for their support and promised its continuous effort to protect and to manage the property.

## D.2. ARAB STATES

### D.2.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Historic Jeddah, the Gate to Makkah</b>
Id. N°	<b>1361</b>
State Party	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** expressed its disagreement with the evaluation by ICOMOS by saying it did not consider that the lack of conservation was the greatest challenge facing the property, and that the overall conservation of nominated area including living area was long-term project. It suggested inscription of the property, since the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was recognized, proposed boundary was adequate, and the protection measure was satisfactory. It also suggested the State Party to launch 3 year program in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to develop definition of property attributes and a comprehensive strategy for conservation of the property based on historic urban landscape approach.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Colombia** wondered why ICOMOS did not require additional information despite the lack of urban and architectural data that could justify the Outstanding Universal Value and the lack of a management plan that seemed to be neither approved neither implemented. The Delegation welcomed the efforts of the local government as well as the commission of tourism and antiquities to conserve and maintain buildings as well as financial measures and asked for further clarification on the management plan and on specific buildings.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that Jeddah was a living city and an inherited historic town. As such the challenges of preserving the historic values while at the same time keeping the town alive were enormous. The Delegation underlined the importance of the commitment of the authorities to preserve the old town under resources that can be allocated for this purpose. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia had undertaken efforts to conserve and maintain the urban network of building and had revised national and local regulation. Therefore the Delegation of Peru considered that the conditions of integrity were fulfilled and that the nomination merited the inscription in the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **India** considered the Outstanding Universal Value was well justified. It also pointed out that there is a transparency issue in the working of Advisory Bodies by quoting ICOMOS evaluation in particular page 89 (“No additional information was requested from the State Party”) and page 99 (“Although the nomination dossier is much augmented since the first nomination, it does not provide the necessary detail to show how what has survived is sufficient to substantiate the proposed value of the nominated area.”) The Delegation stressed that the nomination documents must have been much improved if ICOMOS requested additional

information, and that the Committee should take this issue in the *Operational Guidelines* to avoid any discrepancy in future.

The Delegations of **Portugal, Columbia, Peru, Turkey, Kazakhstan, Philippines, Algeria, Qatar, Senegal, Jamaica, Germany, Republic of Korea, Croatia, Malaysia,** and **Viet Nam** joined the motion by the Delegation of Lebanon in supporting to amend the Draft Decision from deferral to inscription.

The Delegation of **Croatia, Germany** and **Japan** requested further information on legislation status, schedule in regard to the development of comprehensive management plan and methodology for integration into historic urban landscape approach from the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Saudi Arabia** stated that the nomination file has been improved since the previous examination, in collaboration with ICOMOS and international community. It confirmed that the Delegation has completed a comprehensive inventory of the property, which they have used for rehabilitation of some of historic buildings, and expressed eagerness to continue close cooperation with international experts, ICOMOS as well as owners of the buildings to preserve historic heritage.

La Délégation de **Liban** se réfère à la demande d'information aux Etats parties. Un audit sur les prestations d'ICOMOS autant que l'organe consultatif de l'UNESCO pour l'évaluation des propositions d'inscription inclut une recommandation précise et prioritaire d'envoyer de façon systématique des demandes d'informations sur tous les biens en cours d'examen. La Délégation constate que cette recommandation est d'actualité.

**ICOMOS** responded by saying in terms of this property specifically, ICOMOS needed information for basic understanding of the cultural asset of the city of Jeddah and buildings; how they were related to each other and mission expert confirmed such kind of information did not yet exist at the time of nomination file put together. ICOMOS explained also in general term, that it considered ICOMOS aimed to be collaborative with States Parties as much as possible during evaluation process. ICOMOS further explained that it did not request information when ICOMOS knew information did not exist or ICOMOS felt information requested might lead to substantial revision of the nomination document and then ICOMOS had no capacity to review them.

**ICOMOS** also responded in regard to the conservation issue, it considered overall ensemble was in danger and structured approach would help establishing detailed measure and roadmap which would set out desirable state of conservation.

The **Rapporteur** read out amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.21** was adopted as amended

On behalf of Committee members, the **Chairperson** congratulated the Delegation of Saudi Arabia for the inscription of Historic Jeddah, the Gate to Makkah on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Saudi Arabia** thanked ICOMOS for its comments and expressed its honor on inscription. It also confirmed its continuous effort to protect this historic city as the gateway of pilgrimage to Makkah.

Property	<b>Khor Dubai (Dubai Creek)</b>
Id. N°	<b>1458</b>
State Party	<b>United Arab Emirates</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation on the nomination to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its disagreement with the evaluation by ICOMOS by saying the property is unique example of urban settlement which has distinct character from other settlements.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the unique feature of the property can be considered and that the Committee should allow the State Part to come back with revised nomination in future. It was joined by the Delegation of **Germany, Finland, Philippines** and **Malaysia**.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Member of Committee to submit amendment to Rapporteur, if any, and adjourned the morning session.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm.*

**SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY 21 June 2014**

**TENTH MEETING**

**3 p.m. – 7 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani (Qatar) and H. E. Mrs Fatima Gueye (Senegal)**

**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*)**

**D.2. ARAB STATES**

**D.2.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)**

Property	<b>Khor Dubai (Dubai Creek)</b>
Id. N°	<b>1458</b>
State Party	<b>United Arab Emirates</b>

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** recognized the cultural significance of Khor Dubai as a commercial trade center which has developed around the harbor quality of the creek although regret the insufficient assessment by ICOMOS in acknowledging its uniqueness. The historical and geographical value has been presented in a professional way. It supported the proposal put forward by the previous speakers to defer the nomination in order to allow the State Party to develop its argument and resubmit the nomination in the coming years.

The Delegation of **Colombia** acknowledged the importance of Dubai creek. It noted that threats as mentioned by ICOMOS due to urbanism has not properly been defined.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** took note of the deficiency of information as elaborated by ICOMOS for further inscription of this property. However considered the potential this property has in demonstrating interaction between human and the marine environment. The Delegation joined the deferral recommendation to give chance to the State Party to improve on the nomination dossier.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, prend acte des analyses et des suggestions de l'ICOMOS et de l'Etat partie. La préservation de ce bien est un miracle, aux vues de l'explosion du pays et de son développement économique. Il faut que ce site soit inscrit un jour mais le différer est pour l'instant une bonne solution.



The Delegation of **Japan** conceded the important significance of the property, and admit the difficulty in recognizing the value. The Delegation requested clarification from the State Party on cultural and architectural elements considered to have melted. It encouraged on the resubmission of the nomination dossier following improvement, however, at this point supported the deferral recommendation.

The Delegation of **Poland** joined previous speakers for deferring the inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** underlined the grotesque urban transformation that is shaping up in the region and therefore agreed that it has become even more important to preserve the remaining historical elements. It agreed with the deferral recommendation, to give more chance to the State Party to work better with the Advisory Bodies and improve the argument for inscription.

The Delegation of **Croatia** appreciated the cultural potential and the unique value of the property which can still be strengthened. It agreed with the deferral process.

The Delegation of **India** noted the interesting aspect of Khor Dubai related to the multicultural and multidimensional value that can contribute to the much needed diversification of the present properties on the List. However, it reiterated its support on deferring the nomination for the time being.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** relève que l'importance historique de Khor Dubai est claire. Le développement de la ville entraîne le délaissement du centre historique. La Délégation souligne la reconstruction de bâtisses anciennes (260 restaurées, 60 dédiées à la reconstruction). Les gestionnaires de cette ville ont respecté le parcellaire de cette ville. La Délégation souligne l'absence de prise en compte du caractère immatériel du site par l'ICOMOS, car les villes historiques se caractérisent aussi par leur architecture et savoir-faire. La Délégation réitère l'importance du patrimoine immatériel, et soutient le différé.

The Delegation of **Qatar** said Khor Dubai is a city of modernism. The Delegation thanks the United Arab Emirates, and agreed that more time should be given: differing is a good option.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported the recommendation for a deferral.

La Délégation du **Vietnam**, soutient la préservation de Khor Dubai, qui est un effort important. La Délégation souhaite donner du temps à l'Etat Partie, et le report de l'examen, pour qu'il soumette un dossier.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** thanked Qatar authorities for organizing the meeting and the World Heritage Centre for its continuous support in protecting the heritage of humanity. In addressing the first question, it reaffirmed the Delegation of Qatar that Dubai has a total number of 315 historic building, of which only 86 buildings (22%) were restored. It mentioned the plan to restore the rest 78% in the following years. In terms of methods of restoration, it assured the use of scientific restoration technique in the restoration of 68 historical buildings in Chandanagar, involving the use of historical videos, photos, as well as dialogue with the local elders regarding the traditional restoration technique. Therefore the Delegation confirmed that 85% of the buildings were restored as close as possible to the original state.

Addressing the question from the Delegation of the Philippines on the different reconstruction concept between the European and those done in Khor Dubai, **ICOMOS** confirmed on the minor technical differences. Due to its reconstruction scale, Khor Dubai was compared to the Historic Centre of Warsaw, however noted the two differences between the two sites. First, in regards with the nomination category under which every site was inscribed, and second, on the background of the building destruction. ICOMOS reaffirmed that its work was guided by Paragraph 86 of the Operational Guideline on the concept of authenticity in the context of reconstruction. Furthermore, ICOMOS emphasized its view that it does not consider reconstructed buildings to carry a unique and authenticity value, regardless of any region-specific reconstruction method.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments following the interventions, and the modification of Paragraph 2 from the Delegation of Serbia.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.22** was adopted as amended.

The **Secretariat** informed about the various requests on the change of order of examination of the nominations indicating it has tried to accommodate every requests.

A majority of Committee member expressed their wish to have a clear indication of the order of examination of nominations.

The **Secretariat** acknowledged the confusion created by specific requests.

At the request of the members of the Committee, the Secretariat read out the List of order of examination of nominations as discussed by the Bureau during its morning meeting.

The **Secretariat** read out the list of order of presentation based on the morning bureau meeting, namely Mexico, Germany and Qhapaq Nan.

After a debate on this question; the **Chairperson** concluded that the order of presentation will follow the one indicated during the Bureau meeting.

### **C.3. LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

#### **C.3.1. Extensions of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche [Extension and renomination of the “Ancient Maya City of Calakmul, Campeche”]</b>
Id. N°	<b>1061 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>

**ICOMOS** recalled the background of the property, which was inscribed on the World Heritage List under cultural criteria in 2002. **IUCN** presented its evaluation of natural criteria.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recalled this example is a unique mixed site, which involves the cultural elements of a very special civilisation. This is one of the great biodiversity centres in the world. Since the rich biodiversity has been demonstrated by the Delegation of Mexico, the Committee should recognize the quality of this site. The Delegation of Colombia supports this NOM and reminds other State Parties of the various levels of implication (states and regions), and the on-going dialogue with different actors. She feels this is a credible and balanced NOM.

The Delegation of **Portugal** welcomed the renomination of this cultural property to include the natural attributes, recognizing the complex integration of cultural and natural elements under a mixed site. It was in the view that the nomination could enrich the under-represented category of mixed site and add the credibility of the Convention. In conclusion, the Delegation extended its support on the renomination of the site.

The Delegation of **Peru** added that few Latin American countries present such sites. Furthermore, the National Law gives very high protection to archaeological properties, including Calakmul. Mexican authorities should meet the challenge for better protection, financial and institutional help. Efforts made by Mexico should be recognized; this extension should be approved.

The Delegation of **Turkey** acknowledged that evaluation of this property was done by two separate Advisory Bodies. The site was initially inscribed as a cultural site in 2002, now planned to be extended in order to integrate more than 300.000 hectares of subtropical forest to become a mixed site. Echoing IUCN evaluation, it noted that the natural elements do not harm the integrity of the site and the protection system was adequate. The Delegation was satisfied with the information as has been provided, therefore supported previous speakers to approve the extension.

The Delegation of **Germany** recognized the specific situation of this renomination. It suggested approval of the property if the following conditions are met. First, the extended area can enhance the Outstanding Universal Value and show the integrity. Second, the mixed property is able to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value under the natural criteria. Third, the mixed site has an integrated management system that manages both the cultural and natural values.

It noted on the fulfillment on the first criteria. For the second criteria, while noting on the importance of the biodiversity values, comparative analysis was considered weak and did not truly demonstrate the connection between man and nature. The Delegation commended on the excellent management of the biosphere reserve, however proposed to further elaborate the integration of the natural and cultural value before inscription of the site into the List.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** s'étonne de l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS. La Délégation exprime l'objectif de cimenter la VUE, comme l'**IUCN** a présenté la réserve de biosphère. Il y a toute une gouvernance qui reflète des valeurs naturelles. Cependant, les Organisations consultatives ont rencontré des difficultés pour analyser le rapport entre la valeur culturelle et la valeur naturelle. Les Organisations consultatives font chacune leur travail, et mettent ensuite leur travail en commun. La

Délégation poursuit en disant qu'il faut dépasser ces difficultés. Ce projet d'extension est un atout pour protéger la valeur culturelle déjà reconnue et inscrite. La Délégation appelle maintenant à reconnaître la valeur naturelle, qui permettra de recouvrir et protéger la valeur culturelle.

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated the good intention behind this renomination, noting that the expansion can further enhance the cultural significance of the property. However, it requested clarification on the natural significance, as well as the connection between these natural properties with the cultural elements and how this can strengthen the Convention.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** appreciated the cultural significance of the property. This discussion further justified on the particular situation of mixed site nomination. The Delegation welcomed this renomination, however required further clarification from the State Party regarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Croatia** recalled previous discussion on Agenda Item 9 and stated that the renomination of Calakmul mirrors all the difficulty of assessing mixed cultural and natural site. Considering that each cultural site and the biosphere reserve have existed for a long time and have an adequate protection management system, Croatia didn't understand basis of the debates for the planned integration. It also questioned the assessment on the inadequate assessment of the boundary and requested the State Party to comment on this evaluation. Lastly, the Delegation extended its support on the inscription of the extension of the property.

The Delegation of **India** commended Mexico for proposing this mixed nomination, acknowledging the outstanding attributes of the property. Considering each site has existed for a long time with its own protection system, it proposed the State Party to build upon the existing coordination for better management of the site.

The Delegation of **Finland** shared the confusion on the request of status change from a cultural property to become a mixed one. It welcomed the proposal of extension seeing the Outstanding Universal Value. Based on the explanation by the State Party, Finland did not see major problem in the management or integrity of the property, and therefore supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** was in the opinion that the nominated site has demonstrated adequate integrity and authenticity for the proposed extension based on the comprehensive information from the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. Each management system under the cultural and natural assets will provide an even stronger protection of the whole property. Kazakhstan supported the renomination of the property on the World Heritage List under both cultural and natural criteria.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** recognized the historical importance of the Ancient Maya civilization to humanity and commended the State Party's intention to complement the existing archeological site with the surrounding natural element. In order to assess the involvement of community in the natural part, the Delegation inquired the Centre and the Advisory Bodies whether the cultural attribute could be evaluated independently and thus minimizing conflicts for future nominations.

The Delegation of **Philippines** shared the opinions expressed by other delegations. It asked the State Party concerned on the standard used to determine the boundary.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** signale que ce site possède un véritable potentiel de VUE, d'autant plus par l'extension et l'ajout de la valeur naturelle. La Délégation requiert de la part des Organisations consultatives, que ce dossier soit présenté, car le dossier constitué par la Délégation du Mexique n'a pas été considéré à sa juste valeur. La Délégation soutient l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Vietnam** recalled the good management practices the two components already have being world heritage properties. It appreciated the natural components regarded as natural habitat. The Delegation supported the inscription of this nomination.

The Delegation of **Peru** insisted on the focus of several enquiries. The Delegation expressed their wish to hear from Mexico on that matter, and asked about the kind of coordination implemented.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** joined the support for the renomination. It proposed that the Draft Decision should be modified to better reflect the discussion on the boundary and coordinated management between the cultural and natural sites.

La Délégation du **Liban** note que cette demande d'extension est basée sur les faits suivants. Les sites inscrits sur les critères culturels (i), (ii), (iii) et (v), auxquels s'ajoutent les critères naturels (ix) et (x). Il s'agit d'une proposition d'extension et d'une re-nomination (ajout de la valeur naturelle). Elle poursuit en proposant d'accepter l'ajout des critères naturels comme l'IUCN l'a recommandé, quitte à trouver une meilleure solution de gestion par la suite. C'est toute la complexité d'un site mixte qui se présente ici.

The Delegation of **Serbia** joined previous comments by Croatia and Vietnam on the exceptionality of mixed nomination and fully supported the nomination into the List.

The Delegation of **Mexico** elaborated on the unique profile and exceptional value of the property. Considering each of the cultural and natural property already has a strong protection management system, the Delegation was in the view that this nomination can further strengthen them both, as well as to enrich the diverseness of mixed site nomination. It reiterated its continuous commitment to safeguard the site.

In addressing the first question on the national mechanism to coordinate various agencies in charge of the cultural (archeological remains) and natural issues (biosphere reserve), it has developed an archeological and environmental protection plan based on coordination of related agencies. These two agencies have also setup an advisory bodies in cooperation with academic experts as well as local community to ensure maximum protection of the two properties. This is the highest-level national protection. In regards with second question, on the boundary limit, the establishment of such was decided on best available evidence to ensure full integration of both the cultural and natural value. National and international academic experts and the indigenous group also contributed on this discussion. For the third question on the characteristic of the Outstanding Universal Value, five criteria are being proposed carrying both cultural and natural values.

**ICOMOS** addressed the question by Finland, stating that cultural elements were assessed on how the extension can enhance the cultural criteria and whether the nomination dossiers have sufficiently justified this.

**IUCN** noted that the two sites are already world heritage sites being proposed for an extension. It pointed out on the lack of understanding in the nomination dossier on the cultural parts that needed to be clarified during the evaluation process. Regarding Lebanon's question on whether natural assessments took into account the cultural criteria, IUCN responded that one underlining idea behind mixed site nomination is the demonstration of interaction between man and nature in which this property satisfies. In regards to the question from Turkey, of whether IUCN would inscribe this property if this has just been nominated under a natural site, IUCN recalled that this is an extension of a cultural site although involving a natural area, therefore a joint assessment shall be conducted in such case.

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

The **Secretariat** clarified that the site extended is the initial site, which will include the protected areas and become the Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forest of Calakmul, Campeche. The Secretariat confirmed that this is the right formula for the extension.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.16** was adopted as amended.

The observer Delegation of **Mexico** expressed the State Party's gratitude to this session of the Committee for adopting the extension of this property as a mixed site on the World Heritage List. He noted their pride and acknowledged the contribution of the National Institute of Culture and History and the National Institute for Natural Protected Areas, working closely with local communities and indigenous societies.

The Observer representative of the **National Institute for Natural Protected Areas of Mexico** noted the Institution and resources available to ensure the conservation of this property. He noted the outstanding universal qualities of the site and that it is Mexico's first mixed site, which brings new challenges that will be shouldered while upholding natural and cultural values of the site. He expressed Mexico's commitment to continuing working for peace, tolerance and respect of all cultures through sustainable development and cooperation with the UN System.

The Observer representative of the **National Institute of Culture and History of Mexico** highlighted how this mixed property of Mexico responds to the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List.

## D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

### D.4.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey</b>
Id. N°	<b>1447</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>

The **Secretariat** mentioned that a factual error letter was received concerning this nomination.

The ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Chair opened the floor for discussion, and granted the Delegation of Germany the possibility to intervene.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted the ICOMOS Evaluation, but had three points to add about the management and legal protection of the site, namely: the establishment of the management authority; the German laws protecting the site; and the traditional management system, which is maintained at the property. They also confirmed that the proposed wind farm near the property will not be approved in order to avoid any potential negative impacts, and that neighboring communities have been instructed to ensure that buildings and development projects will not have a negative impact on the property. It indicated that a letter was sent to ICOMOS on 5 March 2014 confirming this.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** considered that the property has sufficient management mechanisms and legal protection. In addition it considered that the conservation of its artistic assets is satisfactory.

The Delegation of **Portugal** considered this a very solid nomination file and they support inscription under criterion (ii),(iii) et (iv), but not under criteria vi. However, they asked Germany to submit information on monitoring indicators and relevant stakeholders before the next Committee meeting. They also requested the State of Lower Saxony to undertake not to authorize the construction of anything that could have negative impact on the property such as wind farms.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the inscription but noted concern over the development of wind farms and community ownership.

The Delegation of **Croatia** and **Finland** supported the inscription of this site.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the inscription, and thanked ICOMOS for their report and the State Party of Germany for the additional information and clarifications.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne qu'il n'y pas de problème de valeur universelle, ni d'authenticité, ni d'intégrité et que la réponse fournie par l'État partie sur le caractère traditionnel de la gestion est acceptable. De même que l'engagement écrit relatif au danger potentiel de l'implantation des éoliennes semble suffisant pour soutenir l'inscription du bien à la 38<sup>e</sup> session du comité du patrimoine mondial, et il recommande que le Centre garde une copie de cette lettre comme référence.

The Delegation of **Finland** fully supported the inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** stated that there is a need to enforce the decree from Lower Saxony that there will be no adverse effects on the property from development; however they feel that the most critical of ICOMOS' recommendations have been complied with; therefore, they fully support inscription under criteria (ii),(iii) et (iv).

La Délégation de **Colombie** souligne que bien qu'elle ait eu des doutes sur la question de la propriété du bien et son état de conservation, les éclaircissements apportés par l'Allemagne sont pleinement satisfaisants et que par conséquent, la Délégation soutient l'inscription du site.

The Delegations of **India** and **Japan** fully supported the inscription.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** constate que le dossier répond aux critères ii, iii et iv. Elle constate en outre que la question de la gestion ne se pose pas seulement aux pays en développement mais également aux pays développés, comme en témoigne ce dossier de candidature. La Délégation du Vietnam soutient par conséquent l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party of Germany for a well-preserved and managed site. Noting the recent information provided by Germany confirming that the wind farms will not be approved in order to avoid negative development impacts on the property, the Delegation of Kazakhstan fully supported inscription.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** considère que l'Etat partie a donné des éclaircissements suffisants concernant le bien et le plan de gestion, et que des engagements ont été pris pour éviter des dommages. Par conséquent, la Délégation de l'Algérie soutient l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** acknowledged the extensive research undertaken in relation to this site as well as the additional information provided by the State Party of Germany to address the concerns raised by ICOMOS. They therefore support the recommendation to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully supported the inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, prenant acte des engagements de l'État partie, notamment sur la propriété du bien, soutient l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Qatar** fully supported the inscription.

The **Chairperson** asked if ICOMOS had comments.



The representative of **ICOMOS** clarified the possible solution proposed for the wording of the “management authority”. They justified that the reference was aligned with the wording in the initial “additional information” letter. ICOMOS wanted to have one of the solutions proposed for management purposes formalized before inscription but it is up to the Committee to decide what should be done. The representative of ICOMOS further clarified that they were not discussing the constitutional organization of the country but rather they were recommending something that the State Party was recommending itself for the development of the future management system of the property.

The **Chairperson** gave floor to the **Rapporteur** who noted that ICOMOS already prepared the SOUV, which was reflected on the screen and read the Amendments in paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Poland** requested an additional paragraph be added for the State Party to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2015.

The **Rapporteur** agreed that a standard paragraph will be added to the Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.33** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Germany.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed the Federal Republic of Germany’s gratitude towards the members of the Committee, and noted that the nomination file represented 16 years of work by experts with the owners of the site to get the results achieved. The representative from Germany then gave the floor to two traditional owners to intervene: Parish Priest Ludger Eilebrecht and Viktor, Duke of Ratibor.

Parish Priest Ludger Eilebrecht thanked the host for the well-organized session, and also thanked ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and their experts. He quoted French writer Antoine de Saint Exupery noting that “You don’t tell something essential about the dome if you speak only about its stones”. He said they see Corvey as a symbol of the ideal of its founders, and noted that it is “our obligation” to protect this heritage for our time and for the next 2,200 years.

H.E. Viktor Duke of Ratibor, as one of the owner of Corvey, thanked the Committee for the inscription of Corvey on the World Heritage List. He presented the long-term management responsibilities undertaken by his family, which will guarantee a sustainable management of Corvey for next generations. This inscription will serve to ensure an adequate preservation of the monument, its visual integrity and to furthermore open it to public. The successful cooperation with public authorities especially for monument preservation will be guaranteed.

## D.5. LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

### D.5.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System</b>
Id. N°	<b>1459</b>
State Party	<b>Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Equateur, Peru</b>

The **Secretariat** noted that a factual error letter was received concerning this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne le caractère nouveau de ce type de bien en raison de son échelle. Elle souligne également la méthodologie établie entre l'ICOMOS et l'État partie qui a permis à l'ICOMOS de recommander l'inscription et non le renvoi. La Délégation recommande que cette méthodologie soit systématique pour tous les dossiers à problèmes.

The Chairperson gave the floor to **Portugal**, who then suggested first giving it to Peru since the Minister was present.

The Delegation of **Peru** underlined the commitment of financial and human resources made for the preparation of the nomination over the past 13 years by the six States Parties involved. The methodology developed with ICOMOS was also praised.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated all six States Parties for this extraordinary and unique transboundary site. The representative noted the tangible and intangible features, which encompass more than 30,000 km, are in use still today. The Director and capable staff staff of the World Heritage Centre as well as ICOMOS were also thanked for helping this exceptional nomination come through.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated ICOMOS for a difficult job done and praised the 6 States Parties involved, who have set a gold standard on how transnational nominations should proceed.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the inscription of the site with the addition of criteria vi in order to recognize the intangible heritage elements of the property, noting that the Andes Road continues to play a role of exchange, cultural reference and identity for local communities in the sites seven components.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated ICOMOS and the States Parties involved, and noted that, as neighbors in the region, this nomination will impact the Action Plan for 2014 to 2024. The representative noted that this site provides history lessons that are a benefit to all humanity, and suggested that the importance of local communities as traditional culture bearers should be more prominent in the inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed their support of the nomination and lauded the exemplary work undertaken on a transnational level and on a community level. They pointed out that this property is in an area of high seismic activity, so the management will be important. After thanking the States Parties involved for

enriching the World Heritage List with this awe-inspiring property, the representative noted that a road that connects six nations is now connected to the rest of the world.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also supported the inscription of the property with criteria (vi).

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

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted that the OUV of the property was unquestionable in the ICOMOS evaluation, and that it is a site without precedence on the World Heritage List. Supporting inscription on the basis of criterion (ii), (iii), (iv) and the additional (vi), the representative also pointed out that the nominated cultural routes are distinguished by cultural heritage conserved by oral history and traditional management systems, which is an exceptional phenomenon. Recognizing that the property is vulnerable to modern development pressures, the representative suggested that conservation is only possible by sustaining traditional ways of life, monitoring and conserving this heritage route as well as by developing strategies to address local communities, which should be adopted all by six States Parties.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the inscription with the addition of criteria (vi), and requested ICOMOS and the States Parties to comment on this additional proposal.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully supported this transboundary nomination, noting that transboundary nominations should be encouraged as they promote cooperation among neighboring States Parties, which is the gist of the spirit of UNESCO.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** apprécie le résultat du processus en amont et souligne le caractère transnational exemplaire du dossier. Elle recommande aussi l'inscription au titre du critère (vi).

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the inscription of the site with the addition of criteria (vi).

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que les inscriptions transnationales enrichissent la Liste du Patrimoine mondial en apportant la dimension d'inter-culturalité et de partage. Par conséquent, elle appuie l'inscription du site.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne l'exemple de coordination au niveau local et régional que représente le dossier et appuie l'inscription au titre des trois critères proposés par l'ICOMOS ainsi qu'au titre du critère (vi) afin d'inclure les valeurs immatérielle du monde andin.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** joined previous Committee members in supporting the inscription with the addition of criteria (vi) to recognize the important intangible heritage elements in this dossier.

The Delegations of **Japan, Qatar** and **Poland** all welcomed the inscription of this transnational nomination.

The Representative from **ICOMOS** responded to questions formulated by the States Parties of Lebanon, Algeria, India and others regarding how the file was evaluated by ICOMOS and wondering whether this could be a systematic approach for all future

nominations. The representative confirmed that ICOMOS would like to have an intense dialogue with every State Party on every nomination file submitted, but unfortunately resources are not available for this. They noted that the Committee should congratulate itself since it provided additional resources for further evaluation of this nomination file, which allowed this in-depth consultation. ICOMOS reiterated its agreement that it was an effective process that would be desirable for every single nomination.

In response to the question from the State Party of Germany regarding the addition of criteria (vi), the representative from ICOMOS noted that in its evaluation, ICOMOS considered that the associated living traditions and beliefs are very strong, but at this point it would need to be better defined how this criteria can be justified for all serial components. ICOMOS suggested that perhaps the States Parties would be in a position to provide this information.

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee of the conditions that made this nomination possible. He thanked the Spanish cooperation with UNESCO, which over the years provided over a million USD for this nomination. He noted that colleagues in the World Heritage Centre dedicated a lot of time to this dossier over the past ten years. He concluded by praising the intense and unique cooperation framework that made this nomination possible.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.43** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Minister of Culture of Colombia to speak on behalf of all of the States Parties.

La Délégation de **Colombie** exprime sa reconnaissance au Centre du patrimoine mondial, au Comité du Patrimoine mondial, à l'ICOMOS, à l'Espagne, ainsi qu'aux six pays concernés par ce dossier d'inscription. Il souligne que, pour la première fois depuis 1972, six pays se sont réunis pour proposer un site culturel d'une importance transnationale. Le ministre colombien précise que cette inscription présente une opportunité sans précédent pour la coopération entre les différentes communautés Andines et la possibilité de renforcer leurs liens historiques et culturels au-delà des frontières nationales.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Minister of Culture of Peru to make a brief statement on behalf of the Andean roads network.

The Minister of **Peru** speaking on behalf of the Delegation of Peru, noted that the Andean Road System represented the accomplishment of the Andean civilization, which took 2000 years to build and united the entire Inca empire. He paid tribute to the technical committees of six States Parties who dedicated years of their lives to this nomination, and who earmarked resources that had to be taken away from other sites to focus on this joint effort. In closing, he expressed his hope that this experience can be used as an exemplary exercise in dialogue for future generations

The Delegation of **Ecuador** noted that dialogue has existed in Andean regions for centuries, and that this road network brought people together for exchange and dialogue despite the elements. They expressed their gratitude to the World Heritage Centre for the steadfast support received.

The Delegation of **Argentina** noted that seven provinces in Argentina are included in the property where Incas built roads to bring people together. They pointed out that some of the roads are 5000 meters above sea level, and that cities and roads were built at elevations no other civilization has been able to match. They thanked the World Heritage Centre for its support.

The Delegation of **Chile** expressed its gratitude to UNESCO and to all involved in the nomination dossier. They noted that national funds have been allocated for the management system to ensure the management of this property in the future. They thanked the indigenous peoples in northern part of the country and other areas.

The observer Delegation of **Bolivia** stated that this is a historic date, and on the 21 of June, the new year of the Andean people, will begin with this World Heritage inscription. They noted that this road built by their ancestors has brought together peoples, cultures and belief systems. They stated that this is just the start of the long road ahead where we will be working together. Thanked the World Heritage Centre that supported this process, and also thanked the Director-General of UNESCO who recently visited Bolivia and this area.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** requested that the Committee stick to the original order of presentation of nominations during the next morning session, and that in case of changes, urged that the Bureau is consulted as well as the countries who had nomination files to be examined.

The **Chairperson** said that the State Party of Kazakhstan's comments will be taken into account, and gave the floor to the Delegation of Portugal.

The Delegation of **Portugal** asked to know the order of nominations for the following session.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested a revised document tomorrow indicating the order of nomination to be examined.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the Secretariat will provide the requested list. She closed the session congratulating the States Parties who had properties inscribed at this session.

*The meeting rose at 7 pm*

**SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 22 June 2014**

**ELEVENTH MEETING**

**9:00 a.m. – 1 00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)**

**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)**

**D. 3. ASIA / PACIFIC**

**D.3.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Namhansanseong</b>
Id. N°	<b>1439</b>
State Party	<b>Republic of Korea</b>

The **Secretariat** clarified that a factual error letter was received from the State Party.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the property.

The Delegation of **Germany, Croatia, Philippines and Malaysia** considered the presentation very convincing and supported the inscription recommended by **ICOMOS**.

The Delegations of **Japan, Kazakhstan, Jamaica, Vietnam, Serbia, Algeria, Turkey and Colombia** also voiced their support for inscription.

The Rapporteur informed that no amendment was received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.29** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** then adopted the Decision and conveyed its congratulations to the Republic of Korea on behalf of the Committee.

The Delegation of **the Republic of Korea** thanked the Committee in the name of the people of Korea and assured it would make every effort to implement the recommendations of **ICOMOS** and preserve the OUV of the property.

Property	<b>The Grand Canal</b>
Id. N°	<b>1443</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>

The **Secretariat** clarified that a factual error letter was received from the State Party.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the property.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** considered that no sites were devoid of challenges. In this case, the State Party had already made important efforts to address the recommendations and expressed commitment to continue to do so.

The Delegation of **India**, supported by **Portugal**, noted that this was the most extensive human made waterway in the world and considered the site should be inscribed under criteria (i), (iii) and (iv). Substantive recommendations had already been addressed and the remaining issues could be addressed after inscription. It requested to hear the State Party on this

The Delegation of the **Kazakhstan** noted that the State Party had already extended the buffer zone and that plans were being put in place to counter the existing threats. It therefore supported inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime que ce site inaugure un nouveau type de bien. Elle ne partage pas l'avis d'ICOMOS sur le critère (vi) et considère cette interprétation d'ICOMOS réductrice du fait qu'elle ne prend pas en compte la dimension immatérielle. Elle demande la prise en compte du critère (vi).

The Delegation of **Poland** requested ICOMOS to clarify the situation of the integrity of the property.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** indique comprendre la position d'ICOMOS sur le renvoi mais considère que l'Etat Partie a fourni beaucoup d'efforts. Elle soutient l'inscription sur la base des recommandations d'ICOMOS.

Les Délégations du **Sénégal, Turquie, et Serbie**, estime que la VUE du bien est très largement démontrée et que l'Etat Partie a fait des efforts importants. Elle recommande l'inscription dès cette session.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested to reflect the recommendations of ICOMOS in the decision and asked the State Party to report back to the Committee on these.

The Observer Delegation of **China** explained it had already implemented two important recommendations of ICOMOS: it had expanded the buffer zone to 1500 ha and had promulgated regulations for a better management of the buffer zone. It also confirmed that an archive centre is in place, covering the entire property. It ensured the Committee it would protect the OUV of this property.

**L'ICOMOS** indique que ce site immense qui concerne 170 millions d'habitants riverains est impressionnant. Les territoires concernés étant très peuplés, ICOMOS estime qu'il est important de demander du temps à l'Etat partie pour consolider le dossier. L'ICOMOS reconnaît les efforts de la Chine mais pense que les défis sont gigantesques en termes d'inscription et de gestion. Il indique que le critère (i) reconnaît les valeurs immatérielles ainsi que l'ensemble des autres valeurs. Il évoque trois niveaux d'intégrité qui ont été étudiés: 1) la composition en série : exprime l'intégrité dans la complétude des attributs (éléments humains, techniques,...). Du fait de la présence de différents types d'attributs, il faut donner du temps au temps, les enjeux sont immenses. 2) le bien proposé est une machine hydraulique : son intégrité fonctionnelle n'est pas totalement présentée car ce n'est pas tout le canal qui est proposé. Il faut réviser la zone tampon pour assurer une continuité cohérente. 3) l'intégrité des éléments individuels qui représentent plus de 400 pose d'énormes défis.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.23** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated China on behalf of the Committee on the inscription of its property.

The Observer Delegation of **China** thanked the Committee, the Advisory Bodies for the recognition of the OUV of the property and all stakeholders for the work on the nomination as well as the conservation and management of the site. It ensured the Committee it will continue the efforts for the conservation of the site.

Property	<b>Silk Roads: Initial Section of the Silk Roads, the Routes Network of Tian-shan Corridor</b>
Id. N°	<b>1442</b>
State Party	<b>China / Kazakhstan / Kyrgyzstan</b>

The **Secretariat** indicated that two factual errors letters were received from the States Parties, from China and Kyrgystan.

**ICOMOS** proceeded with its presentation of the evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Japan** stressed that this case was an excellent example of a successful implementation of the upstream process exercise and noted that it was able to support the process through its Japan Funds in Trust.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the silk road is one of the most important cultural routes in the world. It hoped that other components would follow in the future.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the States Parties and supported the inscription. It noted that this 38e session is a session in which Grand roads of communication that allowed people integration and contributed to peace are recognized.



The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the inscription of the site and noted that the silk road was not only an important trade route but a link between cultures. It noted that this was a transnational nomination and therefore reflected the true spirit of cooperation of the Convention.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** also expressed support for inscription and hope that other parts would follow in the future.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the States Parties for this work and stressed that this was a model for their own work on the spice route project.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recalled the significant role of this route in the cultural exchange between Europe and Asia and expressed interest in participating in any future project.

The Delegations of **Croatia, Jamaica, Vietnam, Algeria, Malaysia, Germany and Portugal** all expressed their support for the inscription of the site.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the Rapporteur confirmed that he had received no amendments to the Draft Decision but noted that there was a name change proposed, which should be corrected in the decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.24** was adopted as amended.

**The Chairperson** congratulated Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan and China on behalf of the Committee on the inscription of their property and noted she was happy this property was inscribed in Qatar, which considers itself as a bridge between East and West.

The Observer Delegation of **Kyrgyzstan** said it was proud to be part of this transnational nomination. The Silk Road enriched cultures and facilitated cultural exchange. It committed to implement all recommendations of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted this inscription was a key achievement and recalled it took almost 10 years of work with the other countries. It thanked the Committee, the Advisory Bodies the World Heritage Centre and all partners who supported the nomination, in particular Belgium and Japan.

The Observer Delegation of **China** noted the Silk Road was one of the largest networks of dialogue, cooperation and peace. It was proud of the inscription and acknowledged this was a great responsibility.

Property	<b>Rani-ki-Vav (The Queen's Stepwell) at Patan, Gujarat</b>
Id. N°	<b>922</b>
State Party	<b>India</b>

**The Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification concerning this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated India and supported the nomination of the property. It said the property represented the founding of the Solanki dynasty. It added that the site's architecture and technical achievements speak on behalf of its Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by the Delegations of **Turkey, Senegal, Japan, Croatia, Philippines, Korea Malaysia, Jamaica, Colombia** and **Algeria** congratulated India for this nomination.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** évoque le haut niveau technologique du bien, et remarque l'importance et influence du bien sur le Sud-ouest de l'Asie, le Vietnam y compris. En outre le Vietnam appui entièrement l'inscription du bien et félicite le Etat Partie.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was received regarding the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.25** was adopted.

Welcoming the inscription, the Delegation of **India** said the Rani ki Vav is a singular testimony to traditional water systems in India and the world. It thanked its team, the Archaeological Survey of India, the state government of Gujarat and the local community in achieving this recognition.

Property	<b>Shahr-I Sokhta</b>
Id. N°	<b>1456</b>
State Party	<b>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</b>

**The Secretariat** informed the Committee that it a factual error notification concerning this nomination was received.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Liban** évoque l'importance du bien en faisant plusieurs références à l'évaluation faite par l'ICOMOS, selon laquelle la propriété était une ville importante dans le sud-est de l'Iran au cours des millénaires 2ème et 3ème et que les fouilles archéologiques réalisées ont souligné des preuves claires de structures et nécropoles. La Délégation indique que l'ICOMOS a estimé que, cependant, il n'y avait pas suffisamment de matière en ce qui concerne des spécificités par rapport à d'autres propriétés dans le sud-est de l'Iran et les liens du site avec la Mésopotamie n'ont pas été pleinement prouvés. La Délégation réitère que l'ICOMOS a reconnu qu'il y a suffisamment d'information sur le bien pour témoigner qu'il a été étendu dans le Sud-est de l'Iran dans la 2e et 3e millénaire. La Délégation exprime son incompréhension quant à la la recommandation de l'ICOMOS et propose d'inscrire le bien sur la base du critère (iii). Elle suggère également de demander à l'Etat Partie de poursuivre les recherches afin d'améliorer les technologiques de conservation et permettre une meilleure compréhension du lien du bien avec d'autres civilisations, mais aussi pour donner la possibilité d'inclusion postérieur d'autres critère, tel que les critères (ii) et (iv).

The Delegation of **Finland** considered this nomination fell under different interpretations and that discussions with the States Party revealed that archeological material is far more convincing than stated in the evaluation, concerning whether Shahr-e-Sokteh had developed a far distant trade or not. The Delegation also noted that only a small part of this huge city so far has been excavated, it led them to believe that what had been seen so far is only a small part of what will come. It reiterated that this is typical of archaeology that excavations are tested and theories built on that. To solve the dilemma, it said ICOMOS must further elaborate on the archaeological materia, such as alabasters and ceramic vessels. It asked for the State Party to be given opportunity to elaborate on the far distant trade

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** said Shair-e-Sokta was one of the world's largest cities at the dawn of the urban era and important in South Eastern Iran in the 3<sup>rd</sup>-2<sup>nd</sup> millenium BC. Questioning ICOMOS, it said there is a lot of archaeological evidence that the city had intensive relations with Oman, India, Mesopotamia and Central Asia and was a hub for lapis lazuli and alabaster. It said archeological evidence proved the multi-cultural essence of property. The Delegation commended the Iranian School for preserving the most fragile material such as mud brick structures. It concluded that its point of view did not affect the property negatively as it considered all the parameters were adequate. Requesting the States Party to continue investigations on the highest level, it recommended Shahr-e-Sokteh for inscription under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Jamaica** said the property was an exceptional cultural site and disagreed with ICOMOS's evaluation. It suggested ICOMOS and the State Party to further clarify concerns regarding integrity and authenticity.

The Delegation of **Japan** said the site was located in a remote region, although the current conservation of it could be argued. Arguing that archaeological excavation research takes a long time and is often endless, it asked ICOMOS how much more archaeological evidence is needed as the work has been going on since the 1960s. Upon reading the evaluation paper, its conclusion was that the issue was most probably about comparative studies. It asked for more clarification from ICOMOS and the States Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** indicated that the reason it gave priority to the site was because the city was a prototype of the early urbanization period located on the Indo-Iranian border land. The *raison d'être* for the site's inscription was that it stood testimony to multi-ethnicity, peace and co-existence in the area as no weapons have been found in the area. Instead, plenty of evidences showing the city's deep involvement in cultural and scientific activity such as skull surgery, eye prosthesis, etc.. were discovered.

Supporting other States Parties, the Delegation of **Malaysia** believed that the property's archaeological evidence proves its integrity and authenticity. It said protection and management were in place and boundaries were accepted. It expressed its wish to highlight a few issues such as ICOMOS asking the States Party to provide evidence of the site being a link to other civilizations. It said the nomination dossier covers comprehensively the archaeological evidence for communication based on a variety of materials and supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

*[The following statement by the Delegation of Portugal was delivered in French]*

La Délégation du **Portugal** affirme avoir achevé l'analyse et étude de l'information fournie. Elle soutient la remarque d'ICOMOS que la justificative pour les critères (ii) et (iii) pourrait être mieux développée par l'Etat Partie. Le Portugal évoque que la nouvelle cartographie fournie par l'Etat partie avère l'importance du bien comme point de carrefour du 4e au 2e millénaire et son caractère de point nodale pour la région, malgré le processus de désertifications. Se référant à l'engagement de l'Etat partie pour améliorer le site, il a dit qu'il soutient l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Croatia** said the importance of the property was beyond doubt. Despite archaeological experts working on the site and the rich collection of publications on the subject, it said it was astonished that the site had not been fully recognised by ICOMOS as this seemed to be contrary to archaeological evidence. Considering that such evidence does not represent exceptional testimony is subjective and therefore questionable. It maintained that, for ICOMOS to say that to date only a very small area of site had been excavated and to use that as an argument to refute the comparative analysis was not persuasive enough, it maintained. It reminded everyone that there are 680 excavated tombs and that it was persuaded by arguments provided by the States Party. It said the property meets all criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **India** emphasized the unique and remarkable features of the property including its location. It emphasized the fact that since the city was a zone of peace, its residents could focus on artistic and scientific endeavours. It said it recognized the outstanding values of the site including its links to Central Asia, Mesopotamia and Harappa.

The Delegation of **Poland** sought clarifications from the advisory body regarding its recommendations for the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Turkey** endorsed the inscription of the site which constitutes a 1 millennium long civilizational presence. It said it was convinced of the State Party's commitment to developing the area through a buffer zone.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remarque que le site était un centre de commerce et d'échange extraordinaire et un important centre de partage. Le Sénégal recommande l'inscription du site sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondiale.

The Delegations of **Serbia, Peru, Algeria** and **Vietnam** echoed others' concerns regarding ICOMOS's report and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** underlined that a power line in the buffer zone doesn't threaten an archeological site. It added that archeological sites are needed to fill the gap on World Heritage List and therefore said it looked forward to seeing a justification of the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

**ICOMOS** raised the point made by Finland regarding alabaster and ceramic production. It said most of the discussion so far was based on comments made by experts who have been discussing how to place the site based on existing literature. It said they suggested analytical methods which would be helpful to have a scientific

comparison of the ceramic. It said the experts have not been able to establish the site's link to Mesopotamia based on the excavated objects. While it did not seek further archeological excavations, it said it sought further analysis. It said the same could be said in relation to local stone production done at a local level for a local market. It said in concern with plaster, it was useful to clarify that this plastering is a traditional form of protection. Concerning the comparative analysis, ICOMOS indicated it was convinced with the comparative analysis on the sub-regional level and opposed to the large scale long distance level. As regards infrastructure in the buffer zone, it was more to do with visual angle and not to do with threats.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.26** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Iran on this inscription.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran** thanked and showed its gratitude to the Committee for inscribing the property.

Property	<b>Pyu Ancient Cities</b>
Id. N°	<b>1444</b>
State Party	<b>Myanmar</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification concerning this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** said a lot is known about Angkor Wat and Borobudur but not enough about their antecedents. It indicated Pyu Ancient Cities filled that gap being the earliest example of Buddhist monuments and the Pali text, language and art in South East Asia. It said it had carefully looked at nomination and was shocked that in the Draft decision criteria (iii) is not apply to the site and that this was more than just a factual error, it said. It added that the site had visual integrity, legal protection and the support of the highest levels of government as well as the local community. It called for the site to be inscribed and not deferred and said it did not merit the report given by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported the nomination of Pyu Ancient Cities.

While supporting the Philippines and Malaysia, the Delegation of **Poland** requested from Myanmar more information concerning with criteria (iii) and (iv). It said Myanmar has results based on scientifically conducted research.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the site's inscription, acknowledging the symbolic importance of the site as it would be Myanmar's first World Heritage Site;

The Delegation of **India** made two points; the first echoing Philippines and Malaysia which pointed to ICOMOS factual error saying criteria (iii) was not suggested in the nomination dossier. Secondly, the Delegation reiterated that for the 1<sup>st</sup> five centuries, these were the only cities in South East Asia giving us an idea of urbanism in the region. Therefore, it fully supported the nomination.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** se joint aux orateurs précédents pour soutenir l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation affirme que le site en question est un exemple remarquable illustrant l'arrivée du bouddhisme dans la région, ce qui justifie sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La Délégation demande si la pression de l'urbanisme et celle du tourisme seraient des menaces principales sur le bien.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its appreciation for Myanmar's efforts, while adding that it wanted to hear ICOMOS's opinion on the new material presented.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated Myanmar for its nomination which could become their first inscription. It said the site has great potential to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value. It asked Myanmar to comment on the observations of ICOMOS.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** reconnaît l'importance de ses trois cités anciennes et les découvertes archéologiques. Elle questionne les arguments de l'ICOMOS et indique que le mode d'organisation et de gestion pourrait être une bonne pratique. L'Algérie soutient l'inscription du site sur la base des critères (ii), (iii) et (iv).

Acknowledging the importance of the sites, the Delegations of **Colombia** and **Turkey** supported other Delegations and asked the State Party for further information regarding major risks weighing on the sites.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** signale la question de l'erreur factuelle sur le critère (iii), laquelle avait aussi été évoquée par d'autres Etats Partie préalablement. La Délégation évoque également l'importance de l'inscription de ce site pour le peuple de Myanmar, qui serait le premier site du pays inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, mais aussi une contribution à la stratégie globale vers une Liste plus équilibré illustrant la diversité du patrimoine mondial.

Supporting Myanmar's efforts, the Delegations of **Korea, Jamaica Qatar** and **Serbia** acknowledged that the site justified its Outstanding Universal Value qualifications.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** commended various features of the site including the fact that the local community was actively involved in its protection and management.

The Observer Delegation of **Myanmar** said she would answer the questions raised and provide additional information as requested by Committee members. She said they had a complete sequence of dates both radio-carbon and stylistic relating to the cities extending back to 1000 years. Noting that Committee members were in agreement with regard to the cities' Outstanding Universal Value, she said she would explain why it was a serial nomination of three cities. She said the answer is that they form a series from the north to the south and in addition, they also form an environmental series with the northern most city being most arid while presenting the best example of how late iron age villages coalesced into an extended urban site. She listed various features of the site such as that it is surrounded by massive fortification with irrigation works integrated into it. The 2<sup>nd</sup> city, in the middle of the dry zone had also produced radio-carbon dates from the early 2<sup>nd</sup> century BC showing contacts with India in particular Pataliputra the capital of King Ashoka the great patron of Buddhism. The first bricks in the whole of South East Asia occur in that site. It also has the earliest cluster of Indian Buddhist monuments—a stupa, a shrine and

a monastery datable to 4<sup>th</sup> century AD. She added that the site had terracotta burial mounds. Srikshetra, the southern-most city, she said, in the threshold of the wet zone of lower Myanmar was the greatest, largest and most splendid city of them all. She regretted that beautiful images of it were shown that morning. The city, she said, had the largest spatial area and the largest number of hydraulic works integrated into it. She added that it also had an immense cylindrical stupa with Pali and Pyu language inscriptions. She reiterated that it was not only what the sites received but also what it passed on to other areas of South East Asia that was significant. She said the under criteria (ii), it was well documented that the Pyu adopted the Pali based Buddhism of southern India and Sri Lanka and preserved it, passed it on the Pyu empire of Myanmar and also Thailand. She said by the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the entire mainland of South East Asia had adopted that type of Buddhism. She said the regional importance of this tradition was justified as it has technological innovation through the hydraulic works. As regarding threats to site development and tourism, she said the Delegation of Jamaica had answered that. On the issue of local support which also protects the site, she pointed that the stakeholders from the three cities were there; she said, this was a tangible human demonstration of support.

The Delegation of **Poland** indicating that a decision has to be based on a scientific analysis, fully supported the inscription of the site under criteria (ii), (iii), (iv).

**ICOMOS** replied that criterion (iii) had been fully considered by them and they acknowledged their error in saying that it was not in the nomination dossier. It said the supplementary information provided by the State Party regarding detailed plans, regarding conservation, capacity building, and sustainable development and taking forward the management plan was commendable. Its area of concern was at a fundamental level, it said. It pointed out that, that Outstanding Universal Value was not clearly reflected on the ground level.

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

**ICOMOS** wondered whether it was relevant to suggest that a report be submitted by the State Party on how various suggestions made were followed up.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.28** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party, on behalf of the members of the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Myanmar** thanked the Committee for the support on the inscription of the site, which is its first World Heritage Site. It assured the Committee that protection and management would be carried out in line with international principles and with the involvement of all stakeholders and the local community.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm*

SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 22 June 2014

TWELFTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar) and H. E. Mrs Fatima Gueye (Senegal)

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)*

D. 3. ASIA / PACIFIC

D.3.1. New Nominations

Property	Silk Roads: Penjikent-Samarkand-Poykent Corridor
Id. N°	1460
State Party	Tajikistan / Uzbekistan

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** recalled that the work on the nomination has been carried out for 10 years. The State Party also stressed that the materials provided in the nomination justify the OUV and that the management plan is an inter-states based plan. The State Party agreed on the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS regarding the conservation and management plan, however, the Delegation asked the committee to amend the decision into referral.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the Delegation of Kazakhstan in respect to the justification of the OUV and stressed that the OUV of the corridor was identified by ICOMOS. However, the Delegation asked the State Party to provide the required information on the attributes as well as on the comparative analysis for the cultural components within the site.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Parties for the efforts paid in the nomination, but it supported the evaluation of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **India** wondered why no additional information was requested from the State Party by ICOMOS, and supported the proposed amendment of the decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Parties on the nomination and praised the evaluation of ICOMOS. The Delegation questioned the efficiency of



sending another mission to the site and supported amending the decision into referral.

The Delegations of **Croatia** and **Jamaica** agreed with the amendment proposal.

**ICOMOS** responded to the point raised by the Delegation of Germany by stressing that sending another mission was desirable due to management considerations and defining borders issue. It also replied to the question of the Delegation of India by illustrating that with the limited timeframe it was difficult to ask for further information and that ICOMOS depended on the feedback provided by its mission. Finally, ICOMOS responded to the State Party and stressed that the OUV of the corridor is recognized and that it was essential to understand that the Silk Road was an overarching element.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked ICOMOS how it could be assured that there would be enough time for another mission to be sent.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the position of both Delegations of Finland and Japan.

**ICOMOS** noted that referral could be problematic due to the timeframe and that a deferral would be a better decision.

La Délégation du **Liban** précise que dans un cas similaire il a fallu référer un des biens et demander une mission conjointe ICOMOS-WHC, et qu'il faut faire la même chose ici.

The **Rapporteur** informed of amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **8B.30** was adopted as amended.

## **D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

### **D.4.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Decorated cave of Pont d'Arc, known as Grotte Chauvet-Pont d'Arc, Ardèche</b>
Id. N°	<b>1426</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of this nomination.

La Délégation du **Liban** insiste sur le caractère exceptionnel du site, et félicite la France pour cette proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Delegation of France for bringing such an exceptional site to the list and supported inscribing it.

La Délégation de la **Croatie** félicite l'Etat partie pour cette proposition d'inscription.

The Delegations of **Finland, Japan, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Serbia, Poland, India, Jamaica, Malaysia, Turkey, Vietnam, Qatar, Philippines and Portugal** congratulated the Delegation of **France** on this successful nomination and supported inscribing it.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite la France pour ce bien préhistorique remarquable, et souligne l'excellente coopération avec l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Colombia** summarizes that the Delegations are in favour of this inscription, and they have reached a consensus.

The **Rapporteur** stated that there was no amendment proposed for this decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.32** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the Committee.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie le Comité et les Etats membres, et rend hommage au Centre du patrimoine mondial et à l'ICOMOS pour cette évaluation. Elle souligne que c'est un grand moment pour la région et pour la France. Elle rappelle que « la lumière de la connaissance efface l'obscurité du passé ». Elle souligne que la responsabilité et la protection de ce bien universel incombe à la France, et précise qu'une réplique de la Grotte a été conçue pour permettre les visites et pour la jeunesse.

Property	<b>Caves of Maresha and Bet-Guvrin in the Judean Lowlands as a Microcosm of the Land of the Caves</b>
Id. N°	<b>1370</b>
State Party	<b>Israel</b>

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation de cette proposition d'inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** présente deux remarques à l'ICOMOS : tout d'abord, le manque de référence à des grottes similaires situées dans les montagnes du Nord du Liban, ce qui semblait pourtant assez judicieux. Ensuite, la Délégation souhaite savoir quelle est l' « autorité spécifique légale » à laquelle il est fait référence.

The Delegation of **Portugal** encouraged the State Party to adopt the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS and supported inscribing the site.

The Delegations of **Germany, Croatia, Finland, Jamaica, Philippines, Japan Turkey, Serbia, Poland, Malaysia, India, Vietnam** and **Colombia** congratulated the State Party on this successful nomination and supported inscribing the property.

L'**ICOMOS** précise que le bail et la structure de parc sont encadrés par les autorités Israéliennes des Parcs et des antiquités.

The **Rapporteur** declared that no amendments had been proposed.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.34** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** thanked the Committee for inscribing this site on the List of World Heritage, which is yet a further recognition of the important contribution of Israel to the regional and the world heritage. It mentioned that a lot of hard work and efforts were invested preparing this nomination and that thanks are extended to all stake holders involved in the process.

The Delegation underlined that Israel is a living laboratory that connects history and present and that the Caves are a vivid example of it. It informed that; in the ancient periods the land of Israel was an important crossroad of empires, different civilizations and societies and that this fact is manifested in the numerous archeological sites throughout the country. It underlined that the site inscribed today is around 500 caves and constitutes one of the richest underground complexes worldwide. It is an exceptional cultural property that presents a succession of ethnic groups using the caves for various functions during thousands of years. The Delegation finally mentioned that the multicultural character of the property reflects the varieties of societies who used the Caves for their needs; the holistic nature of the site integrates the special geology of the region with special techniques of quarrying caves developed in Israel.

The Delegation reiterated that the State of Israel is committed to the safeguarding of the property for the present and future generations.

#### **D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

##### **9.4.3 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

Property	<b>Vineyard Landscape of Piedmont: Langhe-Roero and Monferrato</b>
Id. N°	<b>1390 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>

**L'ICOMOS** présente son évaluation de cette proposition d'inscription

The Delegations of **Germany** congratulated the Delegation of Italy on this successful nomination and thanked ICOMOS for their evaluation. The Delegation also supported inscribing the site.

The **Chairperson**, noting that there was a consensus on the inscription of this site, the Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.41** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** addressed its sincere gratitude to the Committee and to UNESCO for this prestigious recognition as well as to ICOMOS for its very helpful recommendations. It underlined that this was a particular important achievement for Italy. It expressed the appreciation of the Italian government, of the Italian Nation Commission for UNESCO, of the Italian Permanent Delegation to UNESCO and specially the appreciation by the local administrations and communities that have done such a huge effort for the fulfillment of this nomination according to the spirit of the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation expressed its willingness to further strengthen its cooperation with UNESCO in order to share its passion and knowledge with the community of Member States.

Property	<b>Bursa and Cumalıkızık: the Birth of the Ottoman Empire</b>
Id. N°	<b>1452</b>
State Party	<b>Turkey</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Liban** signale que ce dossier illustre l'impasse dans laquelle se trouvent les biens inscrits sur la liste indicative. Les choses sont beaucoup plus complexes que dans le passé. Les biens proposés dans la série de l'Etat partie ne sont pas intégrés par l'ICOMOS. La Délégation indique qu'il faut revoir le processus de l'évaluation des biens, et revoir les liens avec l'ICOMOS, car tout cela nuit à l'Etat partie, au Comité et à l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stressed that the OUV was apparent from the nomination and suggested amending the decision towards an immediate inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked ICOMOS to elaborate on why the focus of the nomination on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century components of Bursa was undermining the justification of the OUV of this property.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** note que Bursa est la première capitale de l'Empire Ottoman mettant en pratique un système urbain, qui est devenu par la suite un modèle d'urbanisation pour les autres villes islamiques. C'est un exemple de VUE, durant les 1ères années de l'Empire. La Délégation est favorable à l'inscription de ce bien.

The Delegation of **India** considered that the OUV of the property had been adequately justified by the State Party. The Delegation congratulated the State Party and supported Qatar's proposal. However, it advised the Delegation of Turkey to consider extending the property in due time to include other components.

La Délégation du **Portugal** prend note des erreurs factuelles, et de la VUE qui présente des caractéristiques très positives. La connexion avec la ville rurale semble appropriée. La Délégation demande des précisions à l'ICOMOS sur l'intégrité, l'authenticité et le choix des éléments formels du site. La Délégation souhaite connaître les éléments matériels, dans le cadre d'une inscription en série.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party and supported inscription. It also asked the State Party for a clarification on the various components of the property.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** considered that focusing on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century components of this property was justified. Moreover, the Delegation praised the adopted management plan and supported inscribing the property.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted that two components share their buffer zone, which would bring the number of the components to 6, rather than 8. The Delegation also considered that criteria (iii) was not justified and requested the State Party to further elaborate on the integrity and authenticity of the buildings following the 1855 earthquake. Nonetheless, the Delegation expressed its support for inscribing the property at this session.

**ICOMOS** responded to the point raised by the Delegation of Japan by stressing that focusing on the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> century had indeed an impact on the justification for the OUV of the property because the components were too fragmented and did not meet the conditions of integrity and authenticity. In respect to the comment made by the Delegation of Portugal, ICOMOS stressed that Bursa had much more to offer than its 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> century components. As to the observation made by the Delegation of Malaysia, ICOMOS assured them that the number of the components was 8 and not 6.

The Delegation of **Turkey** claimed that the presentation made by ICOMOS was not accurate. The emphasis on the 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> century components was due to the fact that the city of Bursa was at the time the capital of the Ottoman Empire, while Istanbul became the capital in later periods. The Delegation strongly suggested that the decision be amended accordingly.

The Delegation of **Croatia** considered that the State Party has provided a satisfactory answer to the question.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** aborde la question du dialogue entre l'Etat partie et Organisations consultatives. Elle souligne que ce site illustre la création de l'Empire Ottoman du XIV<sup>ème</sup> siècle, et que le lien entre les composantes qui forment ce bien en série s'établit facilement. Les liens socio-économiques dans des situations particulières appellent une assistance dans le cadre des programmes sociaux. Des efforts devraient être fait dans le cadre d'une société musulmane. La Délégation demande l'inscription de ce site.

La Délégation du **Portugal** est convaincue de la VUE de Bursa, et appuie son inscription.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked the State Party for the clarification and congratulated it on the nomination. The Delegation stated that all the conditions for the inscription appeared to be met.

The Delegation of **Germany** drew attention to the fact that, if this property were to be inscribed, it would be the eighth nomination for which the Committee had decided inscription based on a recommendation by the Advisory Body to defer. The

Delegation asked other members of the Committee to reflect on this and on the way the principles of the Convention are applied.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the immediate inscription of the property and the related amendment that had been proposed.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stressed the need to avoid any political or cultural competition and emphasized the role of the World Heritage Convention in building bridges among cultures.

**ICOMOS** responded to the issue of the modern Ottoman cities raised by the Delegation of Turkey by stressing that Bursa, among other Turkish cities, possessed a particularly significant heritage dating from the late ottoman period.

The Delegation of **Germany** illustrated that it is the 8<sup>th</sup> time a deferral is transformed into an inscription and stressed the need to think of the way the work is being done as well as the application of criteria.

The Delegation of **Philippines** agreed that it is a significant site worthy of inscribing and requested the Chairperson to give the floor to the Delegation of Turkey.

The **Chairperson** asked if any Delegation objects to the suggestion of the Delegation of the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Turkey** said that last year it celebrated 600 years anniversary of Polish-Turkish relations and the year before the 400<sup>th</sup> anniversary with the Kingdom of the Netherlands. It emphasized that the Delegation is not competing politically with any country or culture and not seeking a clash of civilizations, on the contrary. It called to uniting cultures and clarified that the more sites are inscribed the more the world will get closer. It recalled that last year the UN decade for the rapprochement of cultures was concluded and concluded by calling the Committee to make UNESCO's voice higher and to facilitate dialogue.

**ICOMOS** answered the two questions addressed to them: the character of modern Ottoman cities applies only to Bursa, and neither Edirne nor Istanbul meets the criteria of a modern Ottoman city. As to the point raised by Delegation of Algeria, ICOMOS assured them that it understood the relationship between the village and the Ottoman Waqf but emphasized that the village's integrity and authenticity related to its 19<sup>th</sup> century components and not its 14<sup>th</sup> century ones.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B. 37** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the members of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Turkey** provided a statement in which it said that the inscription is an encouragement to cooperate even more with the World Heritage Centre, the States Parties, and the Advisory Bodies, together with the government representatives, municipality academia and Turkish media present in the room. Turkey as a member of the Committee would be an even more vigorous member. It

thanked the Committee for its support and said it was high time to raise voices to achieve inter-civilizational dialogue. The Delegation announced their willingness to share knowledge through future collaboration and said their door was wide open to benefit from other experiences, and reiterated their commitment to UNESCO.

#### **D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

##### **Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

Property	<b>Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1457</b>
State Party	<b>Turkey</b>

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual error letter related to this Nomination was received.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **the Republic of Korea** thanked ICOMOS, and commended the State Party for the nomination that has a strong potential OUV. The Delegation asked for clarification from the State Party to consider its recommendation, namely regarding paragraph 2a of the Draft Decision where ICOMOS recommended the State Party to refocus the nomination on Hellenistic and Roman periods only.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted that the site was identified by the State Party as a multi-layered cultural landscape and that there was no reason to refocus on a specific period. The Delegation stressed that Pergamon is a unique Hellenistic and roman site in Minor Asia. It recalled that the State Party suspended construction in the buffer zone which answers the ICOMOS regulatory framework demands. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site under criteria 1,2,3,4, and 6.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the Pergamon Museum in Germany was named after this worldwide known site. It said that the director of the Istanbul department in the Museum is a member of the Delegation of Turkey, and wished to listen to his arguments about the ICOMOS evaluation in respect to the multi-layered approach and the refocusing on the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the State Party has justified the OUV of the proposed site but ICOMOS has asked to restrict the nomination proposal to the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It asked the Delegation Turkey to explain the reasoning behind its proposal that included all the historic layers of Pergamon.

The Delegation of **Croatia** said it was perplexed by the title of the file and was ready to accept the proposal by ICOMOS to focus on the Hellenistic and Roman periods. It considered ICOMOS' report as logical and consistent. In the same time it

congratulated the State Party on adhering to its arguments and asked it for an explanation about the aspect of their multi-layered nomination.

La Délégation du **Portugal** se demande pourquoi ce dossier de ne nous arrive qu'aujourd'hui. Selon elle, Pergame a toujours été patrimoine de l'humanité de par sa culture, sans oublier l'importance de la ville et de sa bibliothèque. Elle affirme que nous sommes reconnaissants à la Turquie pour ce site pour la présentation de la candidature de Pergame. Pour ce qui est de la recommandation de se concentrer sur la période hellénistique et romaine, lorsque l'on étudie les villes historiques, il n'est pas permis de séparer les temps car ils perdurent jusqu'au présent car les échelles d'évaluation de ces villes ne peuvent pas être de nature chronologique car ces échelles ne retransmettent pas leur dynamique et leur transmission que nous appelons « transformission ». Il sera difficile de parler de ville hellénistique, romaine, byzantine, ottomane comme s'il s'agissait de villes les unes à côté des autres même si nous pouvons distinguer des quartiers spécifiques. C'est une culture qui a influencé des modes de vie au-delà des frontières de la méditerranée. La Délégation du Portugal accueille favorablement le dossier d'inscription de Pergame et recommande sa nomination mais aimerait cependant attirer l'attention de la Turquie sur deux détails importants la prévention des incendies sur le site et la pression urbaine.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite la Turquie pour le site sur lequel se sont succédé les civilisations qui lui ont donné sa vitalité et note également que l'Etat partie a mis en œuvre les recommandations de l'ICOMOS. La Turquie a travaillé sur l'extension de la zone tampon, amélioration du système de gestion et renforcer la législation, la suspension des travaux au niveau de la zone tampon et surtout la mise en place d'un organe de coordination. La Délégation de l'Algérie soutient l'inscription de ce site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged the site as presented by the State Party and pointed that it understood the importance of the site and the need to protect it under criteria 1,2,3,4, and 6. Regarding the management plan, it asked the Delegation of Turkey to update the Committee members on the management plan, which if it is confirmed that it is in progress, it was ready to support the inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** said the State Party dossier shows the various tangible and intangible aspects of the site and its historical continuity since the Roman era. It supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party for the dossier, recalled the comments by ICOMOS on the buffer zone and requested the State Party to clarify.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** l'Etat partie a œuvré à l'amélioration de la délimitation du bien ainsi que le plan de gestion. Elle recommande l'inscription du site.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** fait remarquer que la VUE de ce site est avérée. Le renforcement de la protection légale concernant la pollution visuelle est une constante pour tous les sites du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation du Sénégal pense qu'il faut faire confiance à l'Etat partie et procéder à l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** gave the floor to their expert Dr. Felix, from the Istanbul Branch of the German Institute of Archaeology and the Head of excavations in Pergamon who stated that the inscription was fully justified over a life span since the



Bronze Age. He highlighted the active interaction between various layers and the reuse of strata and their transformation through various cultural traditions, therefore justifying the multilayers and their equally valuable values. As an archaeologist, he supported the inscription of the site and offered full support of his institution to the State Party on the future management plan of the site.

**ICOMOS** clarified that there was not denial regarding the multilayered qualities of the site but underlined that the nominated dossier did not provide this material evidence and the comparative analysis focused on the Hellenistic and roman eras. Also, It appreciated the explanation by the Delegation of Turkey but said it was not reflected in the dossier nor in the comparative analysis

The Delegation of **Turkey** said the dossier made reference to these aspects in different parts thus showing the continuity of the settlement. It said the site was a highly significant crossroad in Anatolia and a door to Asia. It underlined that the site was not only an archaeological landscape but a multilayered historical and urban landscape. The Delegation stressed the statement by the Director-General of UNESCO by which she expressed that there were no dominant cultures but several cultures influencing one another. Regarding the Management Plan, it said it was almost ready but following ICOMOS remarks the Management Plan was delayed to adjust to their recommendations.

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

**ICOMOS** recommended that the State Party to submit the new maps with the revised buffer zone unless it were already submitted.

The Delegation of **Turkey** said it already provided the revised map of the buffer zone.

The **Rapporteur** said he would discuss with Turkey and ICOMOS where to reflect this new information.

The Delegation of **Poland** added the standard paragraph at the end of the decision following the change from deferral to inscription.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.38** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its gratefulness to UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, all State Parties and Committee members and all specialized institutions and civil society present. Upon the request of the African Union and of the Delegation of Botswana, the Delegation of Turkey agreed to give its position of the 1000 inscribed site to the Okavango Delta (Botswana), and to keep the 999<sup>th</sup> rank on the World Heritage List. It highlighted the importance Turkey gave to all layers of their civilization and stated that their heritage belongs to the whole world, and that they cherish, value and commit to preserve and promote it as a common heritage; finally, it expressed their determination to follow the recommendations.

## B. NATURAL SITES

### B.1. AFRICA

#### B.1.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Okavango Delta</b>
Id. N°	<b>1432</b>
State Party	<b>Botswana</b>

The **Secretariat** reported the notification of factual errors in the document.

**IUCN** presented the nomination file

The Delegation of **Germany** wondered why this site was not inscribed on the World Heritage list years ago, in particular because the site was in the IUCN in the gap analysis. It congratulated Botswana and supported the inscription.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** se déclare fière de voir l'Afrique et l'Union africaine à travers ce projet inscription et salue le geste. Le site pour toutes les raisons évoquées, interactivité entre les communautés, la biodiversité, le renforcement des capacités.

The Delegation of **Poland** commended Botswana on the Nomination and thinks the site has an OUV under criteria (vii), (ix), (x). The Delegation supported the Inscription as it will enhance protection and mitigate threats.

The Delegate of **Colombia** fully agrees with the IUCN's evaluation including the criteria on the integrity and underscores the role plays by the communities on the conservation of the site. She believes that the legal protection has been undertaken by the State Party and the Outstanding Universal Value of the site has been maintained.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** est très heureuse de voir que ce site est le 1000<sup>eme</sup> proposé pour inscription. Elle aimerait rappeler la discipline qu'elle a adoptée vis-à-vis des recommandations des organisations consultatives. Elle reconnaît l'extrême importance de ce site de 1.8 millions hectare que l'Etat partie du Botswana met à la disposition de l'humanité car c'est à la fois une consécration et un sacrifice. De même, il se réjouit de voir enfin inscrit un site africain sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, ce qui n'a pas eu lieu depuis le début des travaux du Comité. Elle souhaite, comme l'a dit la déléguée de l'Algérie que cette inscription marque un nouveau départ et soit le reflet de ce qui a été évoqué à savoir une meilleure transparence dans la gestion des dossiers nomination, un meilleur dialogue entre les organisations consultatives et les Etats partie, une meilleure représentativité de l'Afrique sur la Liste. Ce site sera certes le 1000<sup>e</sup> sur la Liste mais elle rappelle que le pourcentage de site africains inscrits ne représente que 5% de la Liste, cet évènement est une joie certes mais un souhait également et aussi un regret.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.5** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Botswana and acknowledged that the 1000st site is like the 1<sup>st</sup> site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, a natural site.

The Delegation of **Botswana** acknowledged the Delegation of Lebanon and the Delegation of Senegal who advocated for the site to be the 1000's to be inscribed, and thanked the Delegation of Turkey and the Delegation of the United States of America who agreed for changing their position to allow this; the Delegation expressed that it was pleased to accept the World Heritage status and committed to the protection of their natural and cultural heritage. It expressed commitment to work with the local communities and with their neighbors Angola and Namibia to maintain the site's integrity. It highlighted that this inscription was possible thanks to the support of the African World Heritage Fund, the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and the ICOMOS program for training in Africa 2008 and 2009, and was the product of hard work and dedication of professionals in Botswana. It assured the communities that the government would preserve the site's integrity and ensure that the community would benefit from it. It thanked all the actors who took part in the nomination process and Angola and Namibia, assuring them that they would work with them to preserve the site's integrity. The Delegation of Botswana concluded by announcing an exhibition later in the day on the inscribed property.

#### **D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

##### **D.4.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Monumental Earthworks of Poverty Point</b>
Id. N°	<b>1435</b>
State Party	<b>United States of America</b>

The **Secretariat** mentioned that a factual error letter was received concerning this nomination.

The Delegation of **Peru** highlighted the archaeological importance of the site and noted that the authenticity and integrity of the nominated property were fulfilled and that protection and management were the issue. It stressed that each country had its management system and that some of the American protection measures have proven exemplary; it acknowledged that other forms of protection exist rather than a buffer zone. Concerning the highway, it highlighted that the issue was common to many World Heritage sites, and rather than its removal, they opted for regulating its use. It concluded that the site should be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Finland** acknowledged that the United States of America had a different approach to buffer zones but the expressed concern about the lack of a buffer zone and asked the State Party to explain how it deals with the buffer zone.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** souligne que la recommandation de l'ICOMOS demande de différer son inscription en raison de risques pouvant affecter le bien. Néanmoins,

d'après l'Etat partie, des dispositions sont déjà mises en œuvre au niveau local et fédéral pour mettre fin aux menaces. La Délégation de l'Algérie suggère que le Comité demande à l'Etat partie d'apporter les éclaircissements sur ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Japan** said this archaeological site definitely had OUV and recalled that it was already an archaeological park. It said the issue of the buffer zone could not be a ground for non-inscription as it related to boundaries and protection and said deferral was not fit; it recommended inscription expression their intention to follow the rest of the discussion.

The Delegation of **Croatia** commended the State Party for its excellent nomination and noted that all important elements had been met. It recommend inscription and expressed their request to hear from the State Party about the recommendations given by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said it studied the dossier and the evaluation by ICOMOS which it considered difficult to justify and lacking consistency. It said ICOMOS did not use the comparative analyses in its evaluation and that it considered that integrity was met on one hand but that the Highway threatened the site's integrity on the other. Moreover, ICOMOS considered that industrial development was unlikely and that the highest level of legal protection was met, without asking for additional information and commitment on detailed plans and visual threats. The Delegation said a detailed boundary plan with full visual protection still needed to be secured. It asked the State Party to provide commitment by February 2015 on the protection of the site and the issue of highway, in which case it supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the United States of America on the protection and management of the landscape. In view of the difference of opinion, it wished for ICOMOS and the State Party to address the issue of boundaries and legal aspects to the site. In respect to the placement of the road, it stated that heritage could not exist in isolation of development.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted that the site had OUV and remarkable earth works. It expressed its surprise by the ICOMOS recommendations to divert the highway and asked ICOMOS to clarify what "divert" meant and if the highway disrupted the OUV thus justifying deferral. The Delegation expressed its support for the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Colombia** recognizes the work carried out by ICOMOS and has carefully reviewed the nomination file and would like to stress the important of this site as a key for the understanding of settlements in America continent previous to any contact with Europeans. The Delegation of Colombia propose that ICOMOS recommendations to be included in the amendment and asks for the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **the Republic of Korea** stressed that this outstanding property deserved inscription but that the buffer zone issue needed to be clarified before inscription and asked the State Party to clarify.

The Delegation of **India** recognized the OUV of the site and considered it worthy of inscription and asked the State Party to clarify on the buffer zone and on the impact of the highway.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted all the positive elements acknowledged but supported the request of the other State Parties in asking the United States of America to clarify the issues of the buffer zone and the highway. The Delegation asked ICOMOS about the potential damages of the relocation of the highway.

The Delegation of **Qatar** echoed the other States Parties request to inscribe the site and the need to give the floor to the Delegation of the United States of America for clarification.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted that the site was well preserved and protected and its OUV was justified. It highlighted the need for additional information from the State Party on the buffer zone and expressed their readiness for a consensus on inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** reconnaît qu'il y a quelques problèmes de gestion et de protection, notamment la « highway 577 » mais propose que l'on demande à l'Etat Partie de donner des explications. Elle souhaite avoir la réponse de l'ICOMOS concernant l'impact que pourrait avoir cette voie de dégagement sur le bien. Il interpelle aussi le Etats-Unis afin de savoir si des études d'archéologie préventive et de fouilles de sauvetage afin de minimiser l'impact de cette voie sur le bien. Il aimerait aussi savoir si comment l'Etat partie compte régler le problème de l'acquisition foncière si l'Etat partie donne des explications concluantes La Délégation du Sénégal pense qu'elle pourrait recommander l'inscription du site.

La Délégation du **Viet nam** souligne que les critères importants ont été remplis et que si l'Etat partie donne les explications attendues, elle pourrait recommander l'inscription du site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the other's statements and expressed concern over highway 577 and the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** said all features of OUV are within the proposed boundaries and that with and outside the boundaries the site was well protected against threats, including through federal and state legislation. It stated that the road had no negative effect on the property and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked the State Party for the good nomination file and stressed that the site fulfill all criteria for OUV and supported Algeria's proposal and strongly supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the site was a testimony to Native American culture and heritage. Regarding the buffer zone, it recalled that the *Operational Guidelines* do not require a buffer zone when adequate protection is in place as it is the case for this site. It said the site is also protected by federal state law as an historical and national site with a multiple layer of federal and national laws, and that it is surrounded by 8000 hectares of pastoral landscape that the State is committed to maintain and buy land where available to avoid any incompatible development. The outside areas of the property are also protected by a combination

of national and federal and organizational laws. It said that moving the road would cause irreversible harm. It concluded by saying that the State is applying additional security measures and that experts from Louisiana were in the room, ready to answer more questions.

**ICOMOS** answered Portugal's questions; on comparative analysis it considered that the summarized approach of the State Party was convincing therefore ICOMOS did not need to get into more details; on the protection measures, ICOMOS said that the federal level legislation substantially protects the site at large scale but concern is on minor and small interventions related to rural development, and also to industrial development, thus the need for more protection for the setting.

On Jamaica's comment, **ICOMOS** said it did not want to push for a buffer zone but set up formal mechanisms and a strategy within the national context regardless of the buffer zone.

On diverting the road 577, **ICOMOS** said many sites faced such issues in relation to the use, and added that existing road networks could help sustain the traffic of the road without creating a new road.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.39** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the committee for inscribing the site and for recognizing it as legacy to the 26 Native Americans. It highlighted the importance of its protection. It also thanked the international community for their support to the State of Louisiana 9 years ago after hurricane Katerina, a support which allowed them to preserve heritage and continue producing new music and art. The Delegation also expressed their commitment to the principles of the *Convention*.

*The meeting rose at 7 pm*

EIGHTH DAY – MONDAY 23 June 2014

THIRTEENTH MEETING

9.00 a.m. – 1. pm

Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)

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)

D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

D.4.3. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World  
Heritage Committee

Property	<b>Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>981 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination. ICOMOS recalled the decision taken by the Committee the year before and presented an overview of the property.

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that a factual error letter had been received regarding the nomination.

The Delegations of **Lebanon, Portugal, Philippines, Kazakhstan, Japan, Qatar, India, Jamaica, Finland, Algeria, Croatia, Serbia, Malaysia, Vietnam** and **Turkey** took the floor to express their support for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List under the criteria (ii) and (vi) and congratulated the Russian Federation for its efforts in finalizing the dossier. The Delegation of the Philippines added that this dossier reminded of the importance of taking care of authenticity and integrity when undertaking restoration works.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested inscribing Bolgar under criterion (vi) only, because criterion (ii) was not sufficiently justified, while criterion (iii) envisaged the year before had now been abandoned. The Delegations of **Germany** and **Colombia** supported this position.

The Delegation of **Poland** insisted on the lack of authenticity and integrity of the site according to ICOMOS evaluation and wanted more information from ICOMOS about these elements.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its surprise at the fact that whereas it had been decided last year that ICOMOS would undertake a mission to Bolgar, the World

Heritage Centre was present as well, making it therefore a joint WHC/ICOMOS mission. It asked where the decision came from.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** s'étonne qu'on reprenne le débat et souhaite qu'on s'en tienne au consensus obtenu l'an dernier.

To reply to Germany's question, the **Secretariat** clarified that there was no joint mission WHC/ICOMOS to Bolgar; ADG/CLT was there by coincidence because he was lecturing in Kazan at that moment.

**ICOMOS** clarified that criterion (iii) initially related to the cultural testimony and civilization of the Volga Bolgars, but that it had been compromised by previous constructions and that there were not enough evidence left of the bolgar civilization. However, it underlined that the criterion (ii) could apply because it was multi-layered and illustrated exchange and re-integration of several subsequent cultural traditions and their effects and influences on the architecture, landscape design and city-planning of the site. It recalled that criterion (vi) was added by the Committee at its 37<sup>th</sup> session, and that it was justified because Bolgar had become a regional reference point for Tartar Muslims and other Muslims of Eurasia as it was associated with spiritual values related to the acceptance of Islam in this particular spot in 922. With regard to authenticity, ICOMOS confirmed that authenticity related to criterion (vi) was very strong as Bolgar was visited mostly for religious purposes.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that Bolgar was privileged because it was presented by the expert who visited the site, which put other States parties at a disadvantage. It added that it would support the inscription under criterion (vi) alone. This position was supported by the Delegation of **Poland**.

**ICOMOS** clarified that the technical evaluation mission (2012) had been undertaken by an expert who was not present today. The advisory mission (2013) was indeed undertaken by a group of experts who were all present today, but since the inscription was to be facilitated, ICOMOS considered that it was not a neutral role but an advisory role that was required in this context.

The **Rapporteur** said that he had received no amendments in writing so far.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle que ce site a été longuement discuté l'année dernière et propose de passer au vote si la Délégation de la Pologne n'est pas d'accord avec les critères retenus pour l'inscription. The Delegation of **Qatar** supported this position.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que la décision d'inscription a déjà été prise l'an dernier sur la base des critères (iii) et (vi). Elle souligne que le critère (ii) ne fait pas l'unanimité, contrairement au critère (vi) qui est le plus approprié, mais elle s'oppose au vote. Elle déplore cependant que l'ICOMOS et ne s'en soit pas tenu au seul critère (vi), car elle estime que cela aurait constitué un meilleur travail du point de vue technique.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** insiste sur le fait qu'il faut préserver le consensus et se déclare opposée au vote. Elle plaide pour une adoption de la décision telle que proposée.



La Délégation du **Sénégal** en appelle à la Délégation de Pologne pour qu'elle se rallie à la majorité.

The Delegation of **Poland** indicated that it would join the majority.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed to include in the Draft Decision an amendment about the authenticity of the site, although it had no specific wording in mind.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** considère que la question de l'authenticité est déjà prise en compte dans la projet de décision.

The Delegations of **Kazakhstan** and **Japan** reiterated their support to the inscription under criteria (ii) and (vi). The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** also considered that criterion (iii) could be added.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** indicated that the politicization of the debate should stop and strongly reiterated its position that criterion (iii) could not apply.

The Delegation of **India** insisted that since everybody supported the inscription, the Committee could go ahead with criteria (ii) and (vi).

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that contested proposals had been withdrawn.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.42** was adopted.

The State Party of the **Russian Federation** expressed its happiness at the inscription of the property. It stressed that thousands of people came to Bolgar for pilgrimage every year; a few days ago, more than 30,000 Muslims celebrated the 1,150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of Islam in the city. ICOMOS' strict requirements had been taken very seriously and the Republic of Tatarstan, fully aware of its responsibility and supported by the Russian Federation, had decided to fully apply all standards to preserve the site.

## **D.5. LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

### **D.5.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Precolumbian chiefdom settlements with stone spheres of the Diquís</b>
Id. N°	<b>1453</b>
State Party	<b>Costa Rica</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to make comments.

The Delegations of **Colombia, Germany, Finland, Jamaica, Philippines, Croatia, Turkey, Vietnam, Algeria** and **India**, took the floor to express their support for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List under criterion (iii) and congratulated Costa Rica for its exemplary approach.

The Delegation of **Poland** requested a standard paragraph to be added on the preparation of a report for next session of the Committee about the construction of the airport.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that it would be added.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.44** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the members of the Committee.

The State Party of **Costa Rica** expressed its happiness at the inscription of the property. It thanked Qatar for its hospitality and the excellent organization of the Committee. It also thanked the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. It stressed that it was the first cultural site of Costa Rica inscribed. It expressed its gratefulness for the help received during the preparation of the file. It considered that this inscription recognized the efforts of a small country in the preparation of a nomination as well as its efforts to conserve its cultural heritage. It ensured that Costa Rica would implement all necessary tasks for a proper maintenance of the site and added that it would be grateful for any technical advice in the post inscription phase.

## **C. MIXED SITES**

### **C.1. ASIA-PACIFIC**

#### **C.1.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Trang An Landscape Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>1438</b>
State Party	<b>Viet Nam</b>

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that a factual error letter had been received regarding the nomination.

**ICOMOS and IUCN** presented their evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party for having submitted a mixed nomination showing the interaction between culture and nature. It considered that ICOMOS missed out some factors and pointed out to some errors. It stressed that the authenticity of archaeological sites did not lie in the empty pits but in the artifacts. It considered that the findings made had been fully substantiated. Regarding the integrity which ICOMOS considered to be threatened by the road, it noted that access roads were necessary especially in the context of the wild jungles of South-East Asia. It deemed that the boundaries to be considered were the massive itself and that the protection of the property was reinforced if it had the same boundaries for the cultural and natural components. It therefore proposed the inscription under criteria (v), (vii) and (viii).

This proposal for inscription was supported by the Delegations of **Poland, the Philippines, Portugal, India, Germany, Japan, Kazakhstan, Qatar, Turkey and Serbia.**

The Delegation of **Poland** also considered that inscription of mixed sites was the most important for the future of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Portugal** deemed that the property enjoyed a maximum legal protection in the country. Reiterating that research was an ongoing process, it called for the promotion of a reliable management plan.

The Delegations of **Croatia and Qatar** said that the State Party had worked in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in the spirit of the upstream process in improving the nomination process. It asked the State Party to clarify the state of the legal protection of the property with special regard to tourism.

The Delegation of **India** said that the State Party had assured full support in terms of protection and management, since a management board and an action plan for tourism management and capacity building already existed.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** a étudié attentivement les rapports des Organisations consultatives, et affirme que les valeurs naturelles sont évidentes : la VUE est avérée. Toutefois, elle s'interroge : Quid de la question culturelle ? la conclusion ne va pas dans le sens de l'analyse. C'est une leçon intéressante et utile permettant de voir comment l'homme s'adapte à tout cela. L'irréversibilité des fouilles mise en évidence par la méthode, l'analyse, la collecte des données, la mise en cohérence des données, tout cela est utile pour documenter de manière concluante les critères culturels. L'ICOMOS et l'IUCN sont dans un parallélisme absolue, mais les Organisations consultatives doivent faire un effort sur les sites mixtes, la culture et la nature sont toujours ensemble, la Délégation propose l'inscription sur la base de critères (vii), (viii), (ii) et (v).

The Delegation of **Germany** asked the State Party why some areas had not been excluded out of the boundaries since they clearly detracted from the property's natural values.

The Delegation of **Colombia** welcomed the detail analysis done by the Advisory Bodies in which the potential for inscription ((vii) and (viii)) was highlighted.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, relève les critères (vii) et (viii) concernant plusieurs aspects de gestion. Ceux-ci établissent des objectifs clairs, pour un projet de plan pouvant atténuer les effets du tourisme en cours de préparation, pour réduire les risques : il faudrait entendre l'Etat partie. La Délégation estime que les conditions ne sont pas réunies concernant l'authenticité, et suivant l'avis de l'ICOMOS sur les valeurs culturels. Le rôle de l'archéologie est clair, il faut toutefois se baser sur des données scientifiques. Les facteurs pouvant affecter le bien ont été évalué.

The Delegation of **Peru** believes the cultural and natural content is very important for this site. Clear value of this site, is still investigated today. An archeological plan will be launched for this site. The cultural value and landscape should be protected and so inscribed.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was evident but called for more protection measures. It added that as far as cultural value was concerned, more research was needed.

The Delegation of **Finland** said that the site clearly had potential to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. It added that the one million visitors per year could generate income but also put pressure on the site. It also said that legal protection was necessary before considering the site's inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite améliorer le processus d'évaluation des biens mixtes. L'ICOMOS présente que les limites de l'Etat partie ne suivent pas la limite des grottes, et que l'intégrité du bien n'est pas conservée. Il faut accepter que les limites du bien ne suivent pas précisément la limite des grottes pour pouvoir inclure dans ces limites la justification de la VUE.

The Delegation of **Vietnam** thanked the Advisory Bodies and States Parties for their comments. It clarified matters relating to the boundaries, legal protection measures and management plan, which had been evaluated positively by the Advisory Bodies. It said that there were no threats to the Outstanding Universal Value but instead abundant resources for the property's protection. It asked the Committee to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List. The Delegation affirmed that necessary measures have been taken to ensure maximum protection to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including the definition of boundaries, the establishment of legal protection, as well as the elaboration of a supplementary Management Plan. It stated that all requirements for the inscription of the property under cultural and natural criteria have been satisfied. The Delegation reiterated its government's commitment to safeguard the property, and therefore requested to inscribe Trang An Landscape Complex as a mixed property under criteria (v), (vii) and (viii).

The Delegation of **Jamaica** highlighted the benefit of Upstream process for the nomination process, and appreciated the State Party's efforts. It also noted the factual errors which could lead to the misunderstanding of the property. The Delegation strongly supported the inscription as a mixed site following the comprehensive explanation from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Poland** strongly supported the inscription under criteria (v), (vii) and (viii). It suggested a discussion to be held at the end of the session concerning the process of evaluation of mixed nominations.

**ICOMOS** clarified that the sites presented in the comparative analysis had not been included on the State Party's Tentative List. Addressing the question of authenticity, ICOMOS highlighted the lack of adequate protection of the unexcavated caves from the impact of construction. In terms of existing Management Plan, ICOMOS considered the lack of information provided regarding the conservation plan of the archaeological values, and welcomed the supplementary document, which however had not been reviewed by ICOMOS in view of the time constraints. ICOMOS noted that a number of research papers have been published but none however demonstrated the uniqueness of the property in terms of people and environment. ICOMOS further stated that the current law in place regarding the specific use of forest reserve is not specific enough to guarantee the protection of the property, in particular its archeological elements and maintained that the State Party has more

appropriate protection laws at its disposal. ICOMOS further clarified that this nomination was not part of the ten Pilot Projects selected for the upstream process, nor received upstream support in any other form.

**IUCN** supported ICOMOS on the inadequate justification in the fulfillment of criterion (vii) and (viii). IUCN stressed the need to modify the boundary in order to fully integrate the cultural and natural attributes to inscribe this property under a mixed site. While noting good progresses made towards this end, it stated that the current boundaries do not meet the requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines*. On tourism and management planning, IUCN has not had the chance to evaluate the State Party's tourism plan in particular with regards to the planned increased visitation rate through the development of tourism infrastructure. With regards to legal protection, IUCN noted the lack of legislative protection for several protected areas within the boundary. IUCN also clarified the distinction between the formal upstream process and the advice provided by IUCN single experts somehow associated to IUCN and concurred with ICOMOS saying that this nomination did not received upstream advice.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** pointed out that the State Party of Viet Nam seemed to have understood that this nomination project was part of the upstream process and requested clarification from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** assured that it implemented the upstream process, noting the involvement of prominent international experts during the nomination process including the IUCN regional office. It mentioned that the government's decision to propose the property under criteria (v), (vii) and (viii) is based on these experts' assessment.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, rectifie qu'il se réfère au critère (iii) non au (ii) dans sa dernière intervention et note l'effort considérable de l'Etat partie pour travailler avec les organisations consultatives et le Centre du patrimoine mondial. En lumière des clarifications par Etat partie soutient l'inscription du site, notant qu'il faudra faire confiance à l'Etat partie quant à la mise en œuvre des recommandations du Comité.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled the discussion of Agenda Item 9A regarding the upstream process, which mentioned the sites chosen for the Pilot Projects of the Upstream process and that, at present, it did not include Trang An. However based on the numerous requests from the States Parties several technical assistance requests were extended to a number of sites outside these 10 Pilot Projects. He further added that Paragraph 122 of the *Operational Guidelines* has been revised at the last session of the Committee to encourage State Parties to contact Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre at the earliest opportunity.

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

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its objection on the proposed new criteria addition given the lack of information to support this, supported by the Delegations of Lebanon, Finland and Japan. In addition, the Delegation suggested reflecting the State Party's plan to submit an upgraded Management Plan in the Draft Decision. It also proposed the removal of Paragraph 7 on the upstream process, supported by the Delegation of Malaysia.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose une nouvelle formulation concernant le sous-plan de gestion pour le tourisme.

**ICOMOS** explained that several types of upstream process advisory schemes existed and indicated that the work of the State Party was in accordance with the third scheme, which involved assessments by the experts as well as organization of workshop and meetings. The assistance ICOMOS and IUCN have provided to the State Party during the nomination process was more of technical advice, rather than upstream advice. In response to Senegal on the possible inclusion of criterion (iii), ICOMOS noted the limited research and knowledge at this point which could justify the criterion (iii) regarding peoples and environment interaction on this property.

**IUCN** supported the ICOMOS points on the upstream process. It pointed out that revision proposed by Germany might be in conflict with the statement made by Malaysia regarding the preparation of the tourism plan.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souhaite confirmer avec l'Etat partie concernant la bonne formulation pour le plan de gestion pour le tourisme.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** welcomed the suggestion made by Algeria and reiterated its commitment to submit a revised Management Plan and Zoning Plan, which include a detailed Tourism Management sub-plan.

The **Rapporteur** read out the final draft amendments following the latest interventions.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.14** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** remercie le gouvernement du Qatar pour l'hospitalité et exprime sa gratitude pour l'aide des organisations consultatives, le Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi que les communautés locales de leur la coopération pendant le processus de préparation du dossier de l'inscription. La Délégation souligne que cette inscription est un grand honneur pour le peuple du Viet Nam et une responsabilité lourde pour la protection du site. La délégation s'engage à exécuter strictement les recommandations du Comité.

## **B.2. ASIA / PACIFIC**

### **B.2.2. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

Property	<b>Great Himalayan National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>1406 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>India</b>

**IUCN** presented the background of the property.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.7** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the World Heritage Committee and the IUCN for the inscription of the Great Himalayan National Park on the World Heritage List and underlined how the inscription in combination with the inscription of the Rani-ki-Vav (the Queen's Stepwall) at Patan, Gujarat, reflects the diversity in India's culture and nature, which the country takes immense pride in preserving.

## **B.2. ASIA / PACIFIC**

### **B.2.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Mt. Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary</b>
Id. N°	<b>1403 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Philippines</b>

**IUCN** presented the background of the property.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that no amendment were proposed to the Draft Decision

The Draft Decision **38COM8B.8** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Philippines** thanked the members of the World Heritage Committee for inscribing the Mount Hamiguitan Range Wildlife Sanctuary on the World Heritage List. The Delegation also thanked the Advisory Bodies, particularly IUCN, the Secretary and the various members of the Committee for invaluable support including helpful technical advice. The Delegation of the Philippines expressed their proudness of the nomination after having gone through several referrals, a learning process, which has substantially improved the country's capacity. The conservation of the property is considered the Philippines' gift to the rest of humanity and the country takes it responsibility to protect the property's flora and fauna including the property's critically endangered species very seriously.

## **B.2. ASIA / PACIFIC**

### **B.2.3. Extensions of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>South China Karst (Phase II) [Extension of the "South China Karst"]</b>
Id. N°	<b>1248 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>

**IUCN** presented the background of the property.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that no amendment were proposed to the Draft Decision

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.9** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **China** expressed its gratitude to the Committee members, to the World Heritage Centre, and to IUCN for the invaluable help for the inscription of this property. The South China Karst is a serial property with the three other properties being inscribed in 2009. Since then the State Party of China has made great efforts to prepare for the second phase nomination. Following the Committee's decision and IUCN's technical guidance, four new components were chosen for the extension of the property. The State Party will do its best to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and safeguard its integrity.

#### **D.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

##### **D.4.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Stevns Klint</b>
Id. N°	<b>1416</b>
State Party	<b>Denmark</b>

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual error letter has been received for this nomination.

**IUCN** presented the background of the property.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that no amendment were proposed to the Draft Decision

The Draft Decision **38 COM8B** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Denmark** expressed its happiness and thanked the World Heritage Committee for the inscription of Stevns Klint on the World Heritage List. The Delegation of Denmark also thanked the Qatari authorities for their hospitality and IUCN for its thorough and professional evaluation of the property. The Delegation underlined that the nomination was a result of collaboration between the State Party, municipal organizations and hardworking individuals. It was further highlighted that Stevns Klint is the key to understanding evolution and a dramatic massive extinction that set the stage of the world as we know it today. With Stevns Klint on the World Heritage List the State Party looks forward to sharing this story with a broader audience and to continue the joint effort to support the protection of the property in the spirit of the *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party with the country's first minaret. In view of the time constraints, the Chairperson proposed to change the order of the next four presentations and move the discussion of the natural property proposed by France to the afternoon session.



### B.3. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

#### B.3.2. Extensions of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Bialowieza Forest [Extension and renomination of “Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Białowieża Forest”, Belarus / Poland]</b>
Id. N°	<b>33 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>Belarus / Poland</b>

**IUCN** presented the background of the property.

The **Rapporteur** mentioned that no amendment were proposed to the Draft Decision

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.12** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked IUCN and the World Heritage Committee for the approval of the extension and acknowledged the fruitful transboundary cooperation with Belarus.

Property	<b>Wadden Sea [Extension of the “Wadden Sea” (Germany / Netherlands) ]</b>
Id. N°	<b>1314 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>Denmark / Germany</b>

**IUCN** presented the background of the property.

The Delegation of **Germany** corrected a technical error concerning the map in the evaluation report. It also made a request to the World Heritage Centre and the Committee members to postpone the submission of the joint State of Conservation report from 1 February 2016 to become 1 December 2016.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.13** was adopted, as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Denmark** stressed the long insightful journey towards the extension to the Danish part of the Wadden Sea as well as the pride of the local communities in protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Observer Delegation of the **Netherlands** thanked the Committee and congratulated the State Party of Denmark for the approval of the extension and highlighted the good transboundary cooperation in place.

*The meeting rose at 1 pm*

**EIGHTH DAY– MONDAY 23 June 2014**

**FOURTEENTH MEETING**

**3 p.m. – 7 p.m.**

**H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani (Qatar) and**

**H. E. Mrs Fatima Gueye (Senegal)**

The **Chairperson** announced that the Committee will examine a nomination of natural property by France and then will come back to Item 7A with examination of the State of conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls.

**B NATURAL SITES**

**B.3 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

**B.3.1 New Nominations**

Property	<b>Tectono-volcanic Ensemble of the Chaîne des Puys and Limagne Fault</b>
Id. N°	<b>1434</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>

The **Secretariat** informed that a factual error letter was received regarding this nomination.

**IUCN** presented its evaluation of the nomination to the Committee.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** estime que l'IUCN n'a pas retenu les critères 7 et 8 et a orienté son évaluation dans le réseau des geoparcs. Cela lui semble inapproprié dans le cas d'une évaluation dont l'objectif est l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle pense que la bibliographie présentée et les consultations d'experts attestent de l'intérêt suscité par ce site qui fait l'objet de divergences de points de vue sur la détermination de sa VUE. Or dans son rapport, l'IUCN souligne l'importance reconnue à ce site dans la compréhension de la vulcanologie et des sciences de la terre. Elle constate qu'aucune information n'a été demandée à l'Etat Partie et le recours à d'autres avis scientifiques est mentionné de façon laconique par l'IUCN ce qui n'aide pas à se faire une opinion sur la VUE. Quant aux éléments liés à la gestion du site, elle mentionne que l'IUCN exprime des préoccupations sur la capacité de l'autorité gestionnaire à appliquer le plan de gestion, tout en reconnaissant l'implication des populations locales et des autorités locales territoriales. Elle a relevé près de 77 erreurs factuelles qui renseignent sur la complexité du dossier dont certaines parties n'auraient pas été appréhendées de

façon appropriée. En conclusion l'Algérie demande à ce que l'Etat Partie soit entendu sur toutes ces questions.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated it attaches great importance to the role of IUCN and that there was a lack of information that justifies the Draft Decision. It affirmed that the site has real potential. It pointed out that more consistent work could be done in terms of Geo Park.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the Comparative Analysis provided evidence presenting continental rift and notorious geological structure of the earth dynamics is a considerable restrict area as the property represent the Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation understood geomorphology of the property and the landscape showed unique environment, not to mention the meaning for the history of science as pointed by IUCN. It also stated that the property was emblematic landscape where man and nature have been interacted for the last six thousand years. Considering the State Party has provided relevant information, namely complete collection of volcanic phenomena, magnetic field and continental rift, to the Committee which was not fully taken to consideration by IUCN, management and legal framework for protection are adequate, it concluded that the nomination should be referred back to the State Party to work on the issue.

The Delegation of **Finland** appreciated the State Party of its long-term commitment on nomination, yet the property has been suffered by heavy human use. The Delegation strongly supported the original recommandation by IUCN.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique qu'il y a un problème scientifique dans le dossier, une divergence d'opinion entre la France et l'UICN sur les aspects tectoniques et structurels qui n'apparaissent pas notamment au niveau de l'analyse comparative. Elle estime que beaucoup de choses ont été faites sur le site au niveau de la communauté scientifique et qu'il y a peut-être un problème de méthodologie et d'expertise du bien qui se pose. Elle est favorable à un renvoi, à un dialogue approfondi entre l'Etat partie et l'UICN pour une visite sur place pour compléter et analyser et donner l'information au Comité.

The Delegation of **India** stated that it recognized Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The Delegation considered the property was unique and excellent volcanic feature, so that it would be appropriate to refer this nomination back to the State Party in order to deepen research on the value of the property, in cooperation with IUCN.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated the State Party, and found the project justified and detailed. It considered that IUCN has used double standard concerning thematic studies and did not do same for other properties which seemed incoherent. It considered that the project should be referred instead of being proposed for non-inscription. It wanted to know what the State Party has done with IUCN in terms of thematic studies on geological aspects (2005) and the volcanoes aspects (2009). These studies identified gaps remained in volcanoes. It asked whether France has taken into account these documents in preparing his nomination dossier. It proposed that the State Party to invite IUCN mission to the property and to conduct thematic study in terms of Geo Park.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** affirme avoir étudié avec intérêt le dossier. L'évaluation de l'IUCN indique que la présence humaine semble incompatible avec le statut de bien naturel, tandis que selon le paragraphe 90 de la Convention, cela n'est pas incompatible, autrement cela rendrait pratiquement impossible l'inscription de biens naturels. Elle souhaite le renvoi pour que le dossier soit davantage préparé.

The Delegation of **Philippines** stated that it recognized potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property on the basis of criteria (viii) and urged the State Party to closely collaborate with IUCN in providing more information on volcanic structural element of the property. It supported deferral of the nomination.

The Délégation of **Qatar** encouraged and thanked France for having proposed such an important site. It supported Peru, Portugal and others. It considered that France tried to meet the requests of IUCN, and its opinion should be heard.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan, Jamaica and Serbia** joined **Portugal, Senegal and India** in supporting referral.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted no monogenetic volcano has been inscribed on the World Heritage List until now. The Delegation saw potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property, and preferred referral to encourage the State Party to develop nomination file by consultation with the Advisory Body.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted natural property is yet under representative, so that it would be appropriate to encourage a dialog between State Party and IUCN. It stated that the Delegation strongly would like to see revised nomination in future.

The Delegation of **Germany** recalled the friendship that links its country to France and said that between friends it is possible to speak frankly and stated that it did not see OUV at the current stage, and that Draft Decision should not be decided on political basis.

La Délégation du **Liban** relève un problème méthodologique dans le rapport de l'IUCN. Elle trouve incompréhensible l'affirmation selon laquelle la présence humaine et les valeurs naturelles seraient incompatibles. Le sujet étant évoqué depuis longtemps, elle pensait qu'il y avait eu une évolution chez l'IUCN.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its disagreement with referral. The Delegation preferred the original evaluation but could compromise with "deferral".

The Delegation of **the Republic of Korea** supported deferral and was joined in doing so by the Delegation of **Germany**.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** constate des divergences de vue entre l'IUCN et l'Etat partie qui sont mesurables au regard du nombre d'erreurs factuelles. Elle souhaite entendre la France afin de pouvoir avancer dans la discussion

The Delegation of **Colombia** considered there wasn't enough scientific clarity and it is necessary to collect complementary information on the field. It supported **Germany, Poland and Finland**.

The Delegation of **Poland** agreed with the proposal by the Delegation of Finland.

The **Chairperson** indicated that she will give the floor to the State Party and then to IUCN.

La Délégation de la **France** indique que de nombreuses questions ont été posées et souhaite commencer par répondre à l'Allemagne qui a évoqué la nature particulière des relations entre la France et l'Allemagne. Elle rappelle le dicton « quand on a des amis comme ça, on n'a pas besoin d'ennemis ». Elle indique que le dossier est complexe et illustre l'évolution du patrimoine. Elle fait trois remarques. La première porte sur les très profondes divergences scientifiques qui ont été constatées tout au long de l'instruction du dossier depuis que l'UICN a rendu sa recommandation. La France est convaincue que ce bien géologique originale et particulièrement didactique a une Valeur exceptionnelle indéniable du point de vue des sciences de la terre. La Délégation de la **France** estime qu'on ne peut pas être plus clair et regrette très profondément que les avis de ces 30 experts n'aient pas été pris en compte par l'UICN. Ceux-ci pointent tous des omissions, des erreurs scientifiques et des problèmes méthodologiques de l'évaluation faite par l'UICN. Selon la Délégation de la France La VUE existe et est scientifiquement constatée. Elle mentionne également le soutien sans faille des Présidents de l'Union Internationale des Sciences Géologiques et du Smithsonian.

La deuxième remarque de la France concerne les aspects qui ont été omis dans le rapport à savoir les aspects tectoniques et de maquette structurale qui constitue à la fois la complexité et la beauté du site et de la candidature.

La dernière remarque porte sur les carrières, le rapport de l'UICN évoque leur existence. Cela est vrai, il y en a 3 mais ces carrières représentent 0.7% de la surface de l'alignement volcanique et 0,1% du bien dans son ensemble et en aucune manière il ne s'agit d'industrie extractive.

**IUCN** noted that the majority of factual errors were only due to translation from French to English and from English to French. As the point of Geo Parks, IUCN would not evaluate Geo Park since it is different programme. It stated that the interaction between nature and human activity is normally defined in the Convention as Cultural Landscape and IUCN does not have view that natural heritage area are compatible with point of people's living and working as part of it, it rather analyses in the point of scale, characteristics and type which the landscapes represent.

IUCN commented that it was concerned to see the supporting letter of nomination by IUGS which has major partnership with IUCN and provided view on geological nomination including on this site. IUCN assessed all 30 letters, however it concluded the site only had regional significance but no Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criteria (viii) from its global point of view.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique que les explications fournies par l'Etat partie la confortent dans l'idée de considérer le renvoi sans se baser sur des aspects politiques et en restant dans le mandat du Comité. Elle estime que la divergence d'opinion porte sur les sujets scientifiques et suggère qu'il faudrait peut-être recourir à l'avenir à une instance indépendance pour aider à prendre une décision à déterminer la VUE. Cela a déjà été fait dans le passé par exemple pour le parc national de Kakadou présenté en 1998 par l'Australie où il a fallu recourir au Comité international scientifique.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite appuyer la remarque de l'Algérie et appelle au dialogue entre l'Etat Partie et l'UICN compte tenu de la nature des divergences et de l'importance du bien proposé qui est reconnu par l'UICN pour avoir une valeur du point de vue de l'histoire scientifique, pour son intérêt pédagogique.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** suggested adopting the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The **Chairperson** requested to the Rapporteur to read out whole Draft Decision with proposed amendments and the Rapporteur read whole paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Germany**, supported by **Poland, Croatia, Finland, Philippines, Japan, Columbia** and the **Republic of Korea** indicated that it proposed a change from “referral” to “deferral”, by stressing the difference of “referral” to “deferral” which was indicated in the paragraphs 159 and 160 of the Operational Guidelines.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime qu'à partir du moment où il est indiqué dans le Projet de décision que l'Etat partie et l'UICN vont approfondir le dialogue pour mettre en œuvre le processus en amont, le renvoi et le différé n'ont pas de sens dans le paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Algeria** proposed to retain referral and joined by the Delegation of **Portugal, Senegal, Viet Nam, Qatar, Kazakhstan, Jamaica, India, Turkey, Senegal, Lebanon, Peru, and Malaysia**.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that 7 Members were supporting “deferral” and 13 were supporting “referral”.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested a clarification on the majority needed to decide on this case.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Legal Advisor who indicated that this case could be decided by simple majority.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** fait appel au consensus, et pense que le renvoi se justifie. Elle indique qu'il s'agit de divergences qui peuvent être réglées par une mission de l'UICN que l'Etat partie est prêt à accueillir pour déterminer la VUE.

The **Secretariat** explained the difference between referral and deferral, paragraphs 159 and 160 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Secretariat underlined that under referral there is no additional visit by the Advisory Bodies to the referred nomination and that this decision is taken in cases where some additional information is required. However with the Referral it means that the OUV is already established while the Decision to Defer is more appropriate when the OUV is not established yet.

At the request of the Delegation of **Japan**, the Legal Advisor clarified again that to decide on this case, the simple majority was required.

The Delegation of **Finland** considered that the property's Outstanding Universal Value was not yet established.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 8B.11** was adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES** *(continuation)*

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

#### **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

##### **I. ARAB STATES**

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

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that a Draft Decision has been distributed into the Room.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, appuyée par la **Délégation du Sénégal**, demande la clôture du débat selon l'article 32 du règlement intérieur et de procéder à un vote secret conformément à l'article 41.

The **Chairperson** named India and Croatia as Tellers. She requested the Legal Advisor to clarify whether this matter could be decided by simple majority or two-third majority.

The Legal Advisor stated that this item could be decided by simple majority.

#### **The Voting process was initiated] [Counting of ballots]**

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote.

**21** Committee members presents.

**8 blank ballots.**

**No invalid ballots**

**13 members voting** [simple majority, i.e 7 votes]

**12 YES**

**1 NO.**

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.4** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its regrets that the Reactive Monitoring Mission has not been conducted due to unintended reasons, and called upon all State Parties to give freedom of access and allow missions on sites. The Delegation also requested the Director-General of UNESCO to pursue her efforts towards the undertaking of the mission.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** stressed the State Party's full commitment of safeguarding the property as official government to undertake such task. The Delegation stated that free access to the property has been maintained, and that archaeological excavation has been conducted in the highest professional standard. The Delegation also stated that it has submitted annual conservation report to the World Heritage Centre, and regretted that this decision was not in conformity with the reality. The delegation explained that the country is fully committed to the safeguard of all cultural and religious sites in Israel as a whole and in Jerusalem in particular as well as to the freedom of access to all the holy places of all religions including Judaism, Islamic and Christianity. It expressed that Israel executes archeological works based on profound respect towards all religions and makes its outmost efforts to show the respectful history of cultural heritage sites and explained that what characterizes the work of the archeologists is their commitment to give an appropriate representation and conservation of all archeological and historical periods of the Holy City. It stated that the Israeli Authority of Antiquity is the official governmental authority, which initiates and supervises all archeological works in Israel including Jerusalem. Every archeological excavation activity must be approved and overseen by this authority with the highest professional standards and with authorities ready to have professional discussions wherever needed. It expressed that all works are undertaken with full transparency. Moreover all information regarding these works is published in different languages on line and in the sites themselves, and furthermore the municipality of Jerusalem is conducting continuous monitoring of all activities within the Old City of Jerusalem and an annual report is submitted to the World Heritage Centre on a regular basis. The Delegation indicated that the authors of the decision chose to omit these facts and distort the reality and recalled that the inscription of Jerusalem is a World Heritage Site in danger only within the walls of the Old City, therefore any discussion on activities outside the walls should be strictly irrelevant and beyond the mandate of the Committee. It explained that last spring a UNESCO technical mission was scheduled to visit 18 sites in the Old City and its walls as indicated in UNESCO 2007 action plan for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem, but explained that regretfully in the last minute when UNESCO mission was ready to depart the Palestinians violated the agreement to which they were party and choose to politicize the mission. It further explained that by adopting the resolution the Committee was once again falling into a trap of politicization and regretted that some member states failed to sense the biased character of the wording with its only purpose to single out Israel in the forum. It also expressed that resolutions of this type contradict the nature of UNESCO, instead of bringing people together it is dividing them, instead of building bridges between communities and religions it is provoking tension. It stated that the nature of the Holy City is to promote tolerance, pluralism and mutual understanding. Finally it mentioned that Israel would continue with devotion to the safeguarding the heritage of the Holy Sites of Jerusalem for future generations and for the wellbeing of its diverse population.

The Delegation of **Canada** explained it deplored this one sided and unjust decision and that its adoption only further politicizes the work of the Committee. It stated it is rife with clauses which have no place in a decision of the World Heritage Committee and that several decades of experience have demonstrated that the Outstanding Universal Values of a World Heritage Site can only be preserved through a dialogue based on sound independent and scientific study. In this regard, it manifested it was clearly not science that was motivating this particular debate and that political attempt



to marginalize Israel after all that has been done to restore and protect this historic site is uncontainable. It concluded stating it was unproductive to single out and isolate Israel within the World Heritage Convention.

La Délégation **d'Algérie** saisit l'occasion pour mettre en exergue la mission remarquable et unique de l'UNESCO qui constitue un forum irremplaçable pour le dialogue des biens communs à l'humanité. Ceci s'applique évidemment aux biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. La Délégation d'Algérie souligne avoir présenté le Projet de décision au vote contre sa volonté, en raison du fait que depuis la session du Comité en 2010 à Brasilia, il avait un consensus concernant l'envoi d'une mission, mais malheureusement rien n'a été fait pour que cette mission parte. Elle lance un cri d'alarme aux membres du Comité : comment procéder à de nouvelles inscriptions, alors que rien n'a été fait, depuis 2010, pour le renforcement du suivi de l'état de conservation de ce bien en péril. Elle souligne que si ce bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, c'était justement pour permettre aux Etats membres d'être renseignés sur ce qui s'y passe. Elle souligne enfin que le Comité doit prendre une décision crédible, pour qu'un suivi réel et efficace soit accordé à ce bien en péril.

The delegation of **Jordan** stated that Israel was not respecting the decisions of UNESCO and was falsifying information. Since it was the first time that this Delegation was taking the floor, it thanked the State of Qatar for the efficient organization of the Committee session. It also thanked all those who have exhorted efforts to provide legal protection for the heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. It took this opportunity to warn Israel as the occupation authority on the ground of the importance of putting an end to the judaisation projects that are implemented at the Old City of Jerusalem in violation of the status quo. It stressed the importance of empowering the UNESCO authorities, making it more effectively capable to protect the integrity and authenticity of a highly significant and sacred World Heritage site which is subject to destruction and obliteration of its Islamic and Byzantine character in the hands of Israeli Department of Antiquities. It stated that this violation was a dangerous breach of the international law and of the 1994 Peace Treaty between Jordan and Israel. If we are to consider that UNESCO experienced a black day when it decided to add Battir village on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as Israeli representative put it, you can be certain that the City of Jerusalem has been through black years under the shadow of Israeli occupation policies that endanger its heritage and undermine all peace efforts and attempts to build bridges of trust. It further noted that Israeli occupation authority turned the Square of Al Aqsa Mosque into military barracks for the purpose of protecting its extreme minority does not attempt to conceal its plan to destroy one of the holiest sites of worship in Islam. Hence, Jordan and the majority of States in the world are more than concerned by the Israeli violation of the Mughrabi pathway site. It also noted that Israel has promptly moved from illegally interfering with the maintenance work at the site to eradicating the majority of historical pathways under the watchful eyes of the UNESCO international community, but it is incapable of saving this heritage. It noted that the Mughrabi Gate pathway is one example of a long list of Israeli violations in the Old City of Jerusalem. Sharing Jordan's statement of frustration are the Jerusalem monks, the Grand Mufti of Jerusalem, the Jerusalem Patriarchate, the people of Jerusalem, as well as the States who voted in favor of Jerusalem's resolution. The thirteenth monitoring report published this year by the World Heritage Centre includes a summary of Israeli report in which Israel described most of violations which took place at the Old City of Jerusalem as "conservation work". In the same report, it also noted an extremely

provocative title, proposed by the Israeli occupation authority, where Al Aqsa Mosque was mentioned as the Temple Mount. It noted that Israel went even further by claiming that the Antiquities Department was supervising and implementing the reconstruction project, which was in fact supervised and implemented by the Islamic Waqf Department and the Hashemite Restoration Committee. It mentioned the position of the Jerusalem Council of Churches which was issued on 23 June 2014, which refuses Israeli occupation calling as “conservation” its flagrant interference into heritage sites. It expressed its frustration that there are still States and organizations that are reluctant to use the term “occupation authority” when talking about Israel and its policies in Jerusalem, and the rest of the occupied Palestinian territories, since 1967. It stated that it is time to put diplomatic courtesy aside, and not give it priority over the just cause of protecting the heritage of the City of Jerusalem and of Palestine, as is the practice when it comes to all other World Heritage sites. Finally, it requested the incorporation of its statement into the documents of the 38th session and expressed thanks and consideration to all.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** (Observateur) remercie les membres du Comité qui ont voté en faveur de la Décision. Elle se dit certaine que c’est leur conscience, leur attachement au droit et aux principes de l’égalité internationale qui ont déterminé leur vote. Elle note que si la situation n’était pas aussi tragique, il serait comique d’entendre certaines Délégations, comme celle du Canada, présenter une occupation comme étant la victime des occupés. Elle note que contrairement à ce qui a été mentionné par la Délégation d’Israël, la Palestine a fourni les documents, dans l’espoir d’un consensus, dès le premier jour de l’ouverture des travaux. La Palestine n’avait pas reçu de réponse ni d’ouverture pour entamer le dialogue. La Palestine souhaitait une résolution consensuelle, et cela a été refusé. La Palestine détient le triste record du plus grand nombre de décisions onusiennes qui ne sont pas appliquées. Elle a appelé à faire en sorte que les résolutions et décisions ne soient pas une collection de papiers, pour arriver à une application concrète de leurs contenus. Elle soutient l’avis de la Délégation d’Algérie pour que l’envoi d’une mission technique dans la Vieille Ville de Jérusalem voit le jour. Enfin, la Délégation de la Palestine présente ses remerciements à l’Etat du Qatar pour son hospitalité, ainsi qu’à la Présidente pour sa conduite les travaux.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that she will deliver as Statement in Arabic. She indicated that this was a special decision on the Old City of Jerusalem that has just been adopted, which represents an important cultural site in World Heritage. She underlined that she sincerely hoped the adoption of this decision will be a key rapprochement of views and opinions regarding the issue of the Old City of Jerusalem and its surrounding historical sites, which is important to all of us.

She reaffirmed that there is no doubt that the Old City of Jerusalem represents the hope and dream to create dialogue, alliance, and cultural diversity, which is based on mutual respect of tradition and values of peoples.

She expressed her sincere hope that the Committee was capable to guarantee that the protection of cultural heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem symbolizes a common value to all and that its protection should be a cause that unites all.

Finally, the Chairperson underlined that the damages of cultural, historical and religious properties are affecting World Heritage and humanity. As such, she indicated she hoped that we continue to unite our efforts and our humanitarian stance in order to protect historical heritage and property of mankind.

The Chairperson closed **Item 7** of the Agenda

## **STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE OF THE THREE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED AT THE 37TH SESSION (PHNOM PENH, 2013) AND NOT ADOPTED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

The **Secretariat** presented Draft Decision **8B.45** and explained that at its last session the World Heritage Committee provisionally adopted three statements of Outstanding Universal Values for properties that were originally recommended for deferral and referral. The three statements correspond to the properties of Golestan Palace in the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Maloti-Drakensberg Park in Lesotho, South Africa and the University of Coimbra – Alta and Sofia in Portugal

Le **Rapporteur** annonce qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu, sauf une proposition de la Délégation du Sénégal d'un changement dans le texte de la brève description relative au site situé au Lesotho. Ce changement a été agréé par l'Etat partie et les Organisations consultatives.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.45** est adopté.

## **EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

### **NATURAL PROPERTIES**

#### **LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

Property	<b>Darien National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>159 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Panama</b>

**IUCN** presented its evaluation of the modification proposed.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.46** est adopté.

## MIXED PROPERTIES

### ASIA / PACIFIC

Property	<b>Tasmanian Wilderness</b>
Id. N°	<b>181 Sexies</b>
State Party	<b>Australia</b>

**ICOMOS** and **IUCN** presented their evaluation of the modification proposed.

The delegation of **Colombia** and **Germany** supported the Draft Decision as it was presented.

The delegation of **Portugal** expressed it agreed with recommendations expressed by IUCN and recalled they are dealing again with an issue submitted to the Committee last year in an opposite direction. It explained that the Committee last year was requested to approve an extension and in the actual session to reduce 43 percent of that extension. It expressed concern with a possible new modification request or another delisting proposed to the Committee next year. It manifested that the justification presented for the reduction of the site was feeble. It explained that by accepting this delisting this would set a bad precedent impossible to deny in similar circumstances for the future. It also expressed the Committee's concern for conservation according to a responsible engagement of a State Party to the Convention when a nomination is submitted. It finally expressed it could not accept the request and could not also disregard the position by the Australian senate, by nature conservation associations and all of indigenous communities which expressed to go in the sense of not accepting the presented delisting.

Le **Rapporteur** informe qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu sur ce projet de décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.47** est adopté.

## CULTURAL PROPERTIES

### AFRICA

Property	<b>Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1099 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the modification proposed.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique qu'elle avait pris contact avec l'Etat partie. Elle note qu'un certain nombre d'actions importantes avaient été prises, notamment la prohibition des activités minières, la compensation, une zone tampon exclusive importante. Elle annonce avoir soumis un amendement, et demande que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed, on behalf of the people of South Africa, its thanks to Qatar as well as to UNESCO for the great hospitality extended to all delegates attending this session. It thanked the Committee for giving the State Party an opportunity to address them on this issue. It indicated that many members of the Committee were aware of the efforts undertaken by the State Party in the past

several years to improve the protection of the property, and stressed out that as a state party they have worked very closely to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to ensure the property continued enjoying adequate protection against any possible threat. It explained that in the last years it has been clear that the existing buffer zone is too large and unmanageable. It was addressed by ICOMOS in the 37<sup>th</sup> session of the committee that in order to improve the conditions of the property the State Party had undertaken scientific studies which covered visual protection integrity and concentration of archeological sites and that studies had been used to propose the delimitation of the proposed buffer zone. It expressed that through this process it has ensured transparency to all stake holders and kept the Centre and ICOMOS informed and highlighted that at the cost of the State Party it invited both the Centre and ICOMOS for a technical advisory mission. In this sense, it was stated that the report of ICOMOS agreed with the lineation of a new buffer zone and noted that ICOMOS had raised issues in mining licenses in the property and its buffer zone.

The Delegation confirmed to the Committee through the Minister responsible for Environmental Legislation that no mining is allowed or will not be allowed in the future in the property under discussion. With regard to the buffer zones the State Party stated to have effective instruments for development projects intended to protect the environment. The State Party, in conformity, with the decision of the 37<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee manifested it would be responding to the Committee's request as part of the conservation report which is due on February 2016 and affirmed that the Committee can be sure that the buffer zone will be managed efficiently to insure that it provides the necessary protection to the property. It stress out that mining in South Africa is one of the highest regulated land use which makes it impossible that an authorization can be given were there is a chance that the protected area will be negatively impacted. In this order, it stated that the proposed buffer zone's size will be able to be monitored and managed effectively as confirmed by ICOMOS during their advisory and technical mission.

**ICOMOS** took the floor to clarify that the State Party mentioned the existing buffer zone had been approved locally but never by the Committee. In this sense, it reminded the Committee that the buffer zone presented would be the first official buffer zone for this property. ICOMOS noted that details of the offsetting will be provided as part of the next report on state of conservation from the property and suggested that since the state of conservation report is coming forward next year it could be provided as well with details of the environmental management framework and the proposed instruments for putting into force.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se réfère aux explications fournies par l'Etat partie et estime que des mesures ont été prises, notamment au niveau législatif, basées sur des études scientifiques, mais aussi sur les recommandations de la mission d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS. Elle note que les activités minières ont été arrêtées et qu'une zone tampon a été mise en place pour une gestion efficace et la protection de ce site. La Délégation d'Algérie souhaite, au sein de la décision, appuyer ce que demande l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its support minor modification.

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

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed it was in favor of an original proposal put forward by ICOMOS

**ICOMOS** responded to the Delegation of Germany that what had previously been stated in the original decision was no longer valid by the new information provided by the State Party. In this sense, they recommended the Committee to change the Draft Decision. It expressed that the amendments put forward by the delegation of Senegal were in accordance with the spirit of the new information provided, and suggested that it would be helpful if a date could be fixed by which the material be supplied, possibly in accordance with the date of submission of the state of conservation report next year. Finally it expressed that paragraph 6 duplicated what was expressed in paragraph 5 as drafted at the moment.

The delegation of **Colombia** expressed its supports to the proposal by ICOMOS.

La Délégation **d'Algérie** remercie l'ICOMOS d'avoir tenu compte des informations fournies par l'Etat partie. Elle soutient l'approbation de la modification des limites.

La Délégation **du Sénégal** s'étonne que la Délégation d'Allemagne ne tienne pas compte de l'évolution de l'avis de l'ICOMOS, et demande à en connaître les raisons objectives.

La Délégation **du Liban** demande si les Délégations de l'Allemagne et de la Colombie souhaitent s'opposer à la proposition de l'ICOMOS d'amender le projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Germany** demanded the confirmation of ICOMOS if it considered the new draft was suitable.

**ICOMOS** supported the amendment taking into account it had originally requested the State Party to confirm they would prohibit mining both in the property and in the buffer zone. It recalled that regarding the legal advice concept the State Party could not assure that mining in the buffer zone could be prohibited. However, it stated that under environmental directives the buffer zone will be allowed to be zoned and regulatory tools could be applied. It expressed confidence with the fact that mining will not be approved but highlighted the uncertainty that mining would be categorically prohibited. Finally, it concluded that under this context the best option to protect the buffer zone would be through the other regulatory tool. It stressed out that the Draft Decision was the reality of the situation with what the State Party could offer to conserve the buffer zone.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.48** est adopté.

## **ARAB STATES**

Property	<b>Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun</b>
Id. N°	<b>1192 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>Bahrain</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the modification proposed

La **Délégation du Liban** exprime le souhait que l'ICOMOS, dans ses présentations, montre les zones inscrites et les zones tampons telles qu'elles étaient à l'origine et telles qu'elles sont proposées pour modification, pour permettre aux membres du Comité de comprendre la situation.

Le **Rapporteur** indique qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu concernant ce projet de décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.49** est adopté.

## EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	Plantin-Moretus House- Workshops-Museum Complex
Id. N°	1185 Bis
State Party	Belgium

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle qu'une lettre d'erreur factuelle a été reçue pour cette proposition.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the modification proposed.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite savoir l'ancienne zone tampon est à présent protégée autrement que par la Convention, notamment par une autre réglementation ou loi, et si, d'après l'ICOMOS, de redessiner une autre zone tampon, plus grande que celle proposée actuellement, mais plus petite que tout le quartier ?

**ICOMOS** responded to the delegation of **Lebanon** by explaining that the terms of protection of the buffer zone were controlled by local legislative mechanisms. In this sense, it further explained that as it was protected by an entity this was certainly beneficial. It stressed out that the proposed buffer zone was much too small and would not assure protection to the property from certain types of constructions. It concluded by expressing that the existing buffer zone as inscribed should be maintained.

The **Rapporteur** informed about the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Lebanon** soutient la proposition de la Délégation de l'Allemagne.

La **Présidente** déclare que la Décision **38 COM 8B.50** est adoptée.

Property	Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata
Id. N°	829 Bis
State Party	Italy

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation des modifications proposées.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu au projet de décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.51** est adopté.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Florence</b>
Id. N°	<b>174 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation des modifications proposées.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu au projet de décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.52** est adopté.

Property	<b>Megalithic Temples of Malta</b>
Id. N°	<b>132 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Malta</b>

## **ICOMOS**

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was received to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38COM 8B.53** was adopted.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Warsaw</b>
Id. N°	<b>30 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Poland</b>

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation des modifications proposées.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38COM 8B.54** was adopted as amended.

Property	<b>Kizhi Pogost</b>
Id. N°	<b>544 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the modification proposed.

The **rapporteur** stated that no amendment has been received on this Draft Decision

The Draft Decision **38COM 8B.55** was adopted as amended.



Property	<b>Burgos Cathedral</b>
Id. N°	<b>316 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the modification proposed.

The **rapporteur** stated that no amendment has been received on this Draft Decision

The Draft Decision **38COM 8B.56** was adopted as amended.

## **8D. CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE INVENTORY**

*Document:* WHC-14/38.COM/8D

Decision: **38 COM 8D**

La **Présidente** introduit brièvement ce point et donne la parole au Secrétariat.

The Secretariat explained that document **8D** concerned the clarification of property boundaries submitted by State Parties in response to the Retrospective Inventory. The document contained a Draft Decision, which concerned the adoption of 37 boundary clarifications of the delimitation of properties at the time of their inscription on the World Heritage List in the period of 1978 to 1998, which were received by 17 State Parties. It further explained that the document had two annexes which contained information concerning the boundary modifications and the respective Inventory for World Heritage Sites as well as maps with precise boundaries. It highlighted that this information could be found on the web site of the World Heritage Centre and that a Link to the annex was available leading to pages of the respective properties. It further explained that annex 2 concerned boundary modifications of a more complex and specific site in particular the serial property of the Historic Center of Saint Petersburg and the related group of monuments. It highlighted as well that since the first presentation of boundary clarifications in 2007 a total of 297 boundary clarifications had been successful prepared by state parties and noted by the Committee. It also pointed out that still 224 properties for which boundary clarifications are in preparation or in need to be prepared include 31 in the Africa region, 61 from the Asia Pacific region, 24 from the Arab States region, 79 from Europe and North America and finally 29 from Latin America and the Caribbean region. The Secretariat highlighted that boundary modifications for properties for which no boundary clarification has been made cannot be submitted, it is therefore a pre-condition for submitting a request for minor boundary modifications.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu concernant le Projet de Décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8D** est adopté.

## **8E Review and Approval of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value**

*Document:* WHC-14/38.COM/8E

Decision: **38 COM 8E**

La **Présidente** introduit brièvement ce point et donne la parole au Secrétariat.

The Secretariat explained that relevant document concerned the adoption of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Values and included a Draft Decision concerning the adoption of 127 statements of outstanding universal value submitted by 50 state parties for properties which had no statement of OUVs on the time of their inscription to the World Heritage List. It pointed out that the annex contained the full text in the original language submitted.

It further informed the Committee that 8 statements from Asia and the Pacific, 16 from Latin America and the Caribbean, 95 from Europe and North America, and none from the Arab nor the African region had been received. It also stressed out that since the adoption of the Retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Values in 2009 a total of 523 statements had been prepared by state parties and advisory bodies and further on adopted by the Committee. It reminded the Committee that a substantial number of Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Values are still in preparation by state parties or in the process of discussion between the state parties and the Advisory Bodies. The Secretariat also informed that the document contained the statements in the original language, but that translation was being done and would be done after the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee and would be published in both languages on the web. It recalled that at the 37<sup>TH</sup> session the Committee adopted in the decision concerning the Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Values the authorization of statements to be updated when there was a change of name of the property and that this would be done by the World Heritage Centre. It further informed that the presented decision made reference and requested the World Heritage Centre to update the size of the properties and buffer zones if necessary following subsequent decisions taken by the Committee concerning minor boundary modifications. It explained that therefore, the Centre is in the process of harmonizing all subheadings and names where there has been a decision by the Committee and affirmed it would continue to do so regarding the updating of statements whenever a minor boundary modification was adopted. It briefly outlined that paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision dealt with requests of state parties in order to provide support to the World Heritage Centre for translations of the adopted Retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Values in English or French and upload them in both versions in the World Heritage Centre web page. In this sense, the Secretariat appealed for financial assistance in order to accomplish this task.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu sur le Projet de Décision.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 8B.E** est adopté.

### **8C. Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger**

*Document:* WHC-14/38.COM/8C

Decision: **38 COM 8C**

Après une brève introduction, la **Présidente** donne la parole au Secrétariat.

The Secretariat informed the relevant document was produced after the closure of Items 7 and 8 of the Agenda. It then proceeded to summarize the decisions taken by the Committee concerning inscriptions on the World Heritage List and World Heritage List in Danger. It proceeded to inform that the Committee at its 38<sup>th</sup> session in Doha, Qatar, inscribed 26 new properties on the World Heritage List, 4 natural sites, 21 cultural sites, 1 mixed site and approved the extension of four properties already inscribed on the List. Following the debate on item 8B three nominations were referred and three deferred and in 15 cases the Committee changed the Advisory Bodies recommendations which were presented in the Draft Decisions. It pointed out that 2 referrals became inscriptions, 2 deferrals became referrals, 8 deferrals became inscriptions, 1 deferral became an approved extension, 1 non inscription became referral, and one non inscription became a deferral. It highlighted that the new overall figures of the World Heritage List reached 1007 properties from which 779 were cultural, 197 natural and 31 mixed. It further explained that the breakdown of the inscribed properties by region at the session of the Committee in Doha was composed by 1 property for Africa, 3 properties for the Arab region, 10 properties for the Asia and Pacific region, 10 properties for Europe and North America and 2 for the Latin American and Caribbean region. It stressed out that during the 38<sup>th</sup> session the Okavango Delta in Botswana became the 1000<sup>th</sup> site to be inscribed in the World Heritage List and that the State Party of Myanmar added its first property in the World Heritage List. It also recalled that the Committee had allocated approximately 26 hours of discussion to examine 36 nominations and as a result of the report of the state of conservation 3 new properties were included in the World Heritage List in Danger which were Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines - Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir, the Plurinational State of Bolivia: City of Potosí and Tanzania: Selous Game Reserve. It highlighted that accordingly to this decision there were now 46 properties inscribed in the World Heritage List in Danger.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce qu'aucun amendement n'a été reçu sur ces projets de décision.

Les Projets de Décisions **38 COM 8C.1**, **38 COM 8C.2** et **38 COM 8C.3** sont adoptées.

La **Présidente** déclare le **Point 8** de l'Ordre du jour clos.

## **ITEM 9 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST** *(continuation)*

### **9C. Recommendations of the evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT initiative: Follow-up to Resolution 19 GA 9.** *(continuation)*

La **Présidente** rappelle au Comité que le Point 9C est toujours ouvert et qu'il a fait l'objet d'une constitution d'un groupe de rédaction.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its appreciation to some Committee members and some States Parties of the World Heritage Committee for helping to draft the decision. It explained consensus was reached.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the Draft Decision was amended by the drafting group.

The Delegation of **Turkey**, supported by the Delegation of **Kazakhstan**, appreciated the efforts done for the Draft Decision but mentioned it was of the opinion the Committee cannot “urges the State Party” to refrain from submitting new nomination during their mandates but that by “continues to encourage the State Party”.

La Délégation du **Liban** ; soutenue par les Délégations de **l’Algérie, l’Allemagne, la Colombie, Philippines et Pérou**, souhaite garder la mention « urges the States Parties », car cette expression fait partie du consensus atteint lors des travaux du groupe de rédaction.

The Delegation of **Jamaica**, supported by **Senegal**, recalled to the Committee that within the context of paragraph 6 which allowed a State Party that had no sites at the World Heritage List serve as Committee Member, the delegation of Jamaica was now part of the World Heritage Committee. It expressed it was within that context it put forward the recommendation that state parties with no sites in the World Heritage List but wish to serve on the Committee, not be in disadvantage. In this sense, they stressed out that this is a situation that tends to impact Small Island Developing states and pointed out this would be in concordance with paragraph 60 and 61 of the Global Strategy.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its concern regarding the meaning of: “special treatment” and pointed out it would appreciate if the decision made emphasis on the fact that the measure would apply on a voluntary basis. In this sense, it explained that countries could be able to submit nominations even if they are serving as Committee Members.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed it would appreciate if the text would be maintained as it was drafted; nevertheless it is flexible to accept the amendment by the delegation of Lebanon.

Le **Rapporteur** présente le paragraphe 5 en y intégrant le texte modifié.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed it was in favor of leaving in the Draft Decision the wording: “continue to encourage”.

The Delegation of **Turkey** requested a legal interpretation on the use of the term “urging” that he finds not suitable in the context of the “UNESCO wording style”.

La Délégation de **l’Algérie** appuie la position de la Jamaïque au regard de la Stratégie globale. En réponse à la remarque de la Délégation du Japon, la Délégation de l’Algérie note que les Résolutions pertinentes de l’Assemblée générale sont effectivement contraignantes, tandis que les recommandations de l’auditeur ne sont que des recommandations.

The delegation of **Turkey** explained that paragraph recalled the principal that the submission is exclusive prerogative of state parties to the World Heritage Convention; therefore it reiterated that the term “urges” did not constitute a harmonious statement.

La Délégation de **l’Algérie** mentionne qu’elle pourrait accepter l’expression “encourage fortement”.

La Délégation du **Liban** s’oppose à cette proposition et souligne que l’Assemblée générale a adopté une Résolution, et que le Comité ne peut pas se mettre au-dessus

de l'Assemblée Générale, laquelle lui a demandé urgemment d'adopter certaines procédures. Par principe, la Délégation du Liban souhaite que cette opposition soit consignée.

La **Présidente** informe la Délégation du Liban que sa position sera consignée, mais note qu'il y a un accord général et prie la Délégation de s'y rallier. Elle rappelle que le Comité est responsable de son règlement intérieur. Elle rappelle également que d'une part les Etats sont souverains, et que d'autre part il existe une sous-représentativité, rappelée par la Jamaïque.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que la question de la sous-représentativité ne figure pas dans ce projet. Au contraire, les Etats qui inscrivent 1, 2 ou 3 sites lorsqu'ils sont membres du Comité ne sont pas des Etats sous-représentés, mais des Etats surreprésentés.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que l'opposition de principe de la Délégation du Liban sera consignée dans le Résumé des interventions.

Le Projet de décision **38 COM 9C** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

La **Présidente** déclare le **Point 9** de l'Ordre du jour clos.

*The meeting rose at 7 pm*

**NINTH DAY – TUESDAY 24 June 2014**

**FIFTEENTH MEETING**

**9.00 a.m. – 1. pm**

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)**

**ITEM 10 PERIODIC REPORTS**

**10A. Final report on the results of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for North America and Progress report for the Europe region**

*Documents: WHC-14/38.COM/10A*

*Decisions: 38 COM 10A.1*

**38 COM 10A.2**

The **Secretariat** indicated that the document presented the outcomes of the Periodic Reporting in the sub-region of North America (Part I) and contains a progress report on the activities undertaken for the implementation of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Europe and North America region (Part II).

The web platform designed to assist in the implementation and follow-up of the second cycle is available at the following web address:  
<http://whc.unesco.org/en/EUR-NA>.

**I. PERIODIC REPORT FOR NORTH AMERICA**

The **Secretariat** gave the floor to the representative of the Delegation of the United States, Mr. Steven Morris, and Mrs. Rebecca Kennedy from the Delegation of Canada to present the outcomes of the Periodic Reporting exercise in North America sub region. The Periodic Report was prepared by the focal points and translation into French was provided by Canada.

Mr. Steven Morris presents the summary of the report for the second cycle of periodic report exercise for North America, which includes reporting on 37 properties, including natural, cultural and mix sites, and the site managers. According to him, since many sites in North America were inscribed a long time ago, maps that show boundaries need to be strengthened. It was a challenging exercise bearing in mind that the 37 sites were spread in a vast area. It was expressed that also advice was received by Advisory Bodies. They manifested also they shared themes and attributes with LAC sites and especially indigenous people.

Mrs. Rebecca Kennedy expressed that there is only one site in the Danger List which is the Everglades (United States). She manifests there are challenges in sites but not threats. Mr. Morris complemented the intervention by saying there is limited knowledge of the World Heritage Convention and there is pressure of development in sites. He manifested there is interest in strengthening and revising the Tentative

Lists. They believe that issues as climate change should be addressed and that more awareness is needed to promote the convention in the region.

## II. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE IN THE EUROPE REGION

The **Secretariat** indicated that there was no need to go into details taking into account there was a side event of this subject. The Secretariat highlighted that the Final meeting of the second cycle for sub region Europe will take place in Finland the first week of December this year. The meeting will be an opportunity to discuss the final outcomes and action plan. It was manifested that at the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee will examine the final report of Europe and action plan. The Secretariat manifested that they are planning to do a publication on the trends, lessons learnt and future opportunities that will be addressed to professionals and stakeholders in the field and general public. The Secretariat manifested its appreciation to state parties in the region for their support and to Italy and Azerbaijan for hosting both past periodic reporting meetings. The Secretariat manifested they have made a conscious effort to provide as much information to the state parties as possible to be able to use statistics and data provided for their own purpose of policy planning and capacity building. An online platform is offered. The Secretariat also expresses its gratitude for the State Part of Finland for hosting the next final meeting.

The **Rapporteur** indicated no amendment was proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decisions **38 COM 10A.1** and **38 COM. 10 A.2** were adopted.

### **10B. Progress report on Periodic Reporting in all other regions**

*Documents: WHC-14/38.COM/10B*

*Decisions: 38 COM 10B.1*

**38 COM 10B.2**

**38 COM 10B.3**

**38 COM 10B.4**

The **Secretariat** indicated that the document contains a summary of follow-up activities of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for: Asia and the Pacific (Section I), Africa (Section II), the Arab States (Section III) and Latin America and the Caribbean (Section IV)

## I. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

The **Secretariat** underlined that in June last year, the Committee examined the progress made on the follow-up of the second cycle Periodic Reporting for Asia and the Pacific in Phnom Penh, Cambodia. The Secretariat noted that, despite the current financial difficulties at UNESCO, some activities have been organized since July 2013, using extra-budgetary resources or partner institutions such as Category 2 Centres under the auspices of UNESCO.

In this regard, the Secretariat pointed out that in November last year, the General Conference of UNESCO approved the establishment of a Category 2 Centre for

World Natural Heritage Management and Training for the Asia and the Pacific Region, as part of the Wildlife Institute of India (WII) in Dehradun, India. This shows the State Party of India's commitment to the protection of world's natural heritage through its support to the new centre. Specific actions had already been requested by the Committee during its deliberations yesterday afternoon while reviewing the nomination of the Great Himalayan National Park. Currently, the related Agreement for this C2 Centre is expected to be signed shortly by the Government of India and the Director-General of UNESCO. Further, thanks to the financial support of the Australian Funds-In-Trust available at the World Heritage Centre, a World Heritage Workshop was organized from 27 to 30 November 2013 in Suva, Fiji. The Workshop reviewed the progress towards the implementation of the Pacific World Heritage Action Plan (2010-2015) and the establishment of the Pacific Heritage Hub (PHH). The Secretariat also presents other regional or sub-regional training activities to be organized by the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITR-AP) and ICCROM in Vietnam and China in the second half of 2014. In line with Decision 36 COM 10A and 37 COM 10C.1, WHITR-AP also took the lead in developing the regional capacity building strategy and associated programmes for Asia and the Pacific region, it said. Furthermore, it is highlighted that a side event was organised during the Committee session, on 17 June to debrief the Asia Pacific States Parties, Committee members and other partners on the progress made so far. In the framework of the Mid-Term Strategy (2014-2019) of WHITR-AP, it seeks to establish a regional online platform to follow-up on the implementation of this strategy, to continue dialogue and enhance regional institutional cooperation in response to the priority activities identified in the Action Plan. The Secretariat also reminded the States Parties in the region which have not submitted their retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for cultural and natural WH properties to do so by 1 February 2015 at the latest as well as submitting clarifications of boundaries by 1 December 2014 at the latest. Finally the Secretariat thanked all national World Heritage focal points across the region, colleagues of the Advisory Bodies, staff of the UNESCO Field Offices and other institutions who provided support to the follow-up action in the Asia and the Pacific region.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was proposed to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 10B.1** was adopted.

## II.FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR AFRICA

The **Secretariat** indicated that, following the Committee's endorsement of the results of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Africa Region and its regional Action Plan, activities have continued to be organized to implement Decision 36 COM 10A in cooperation with States Parties, the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO Field Offices, the Advisory Bodies, the AWHF UNESCO Category II Centre and other implementation partners and donors. The World Heritage Centre has recently updated the status of implementation of the Action Plan 2012 – 2017 for the Africa Region, which can be found on the WHC web site. The Secretariat also appealed to all States Parties to send updated information on national efforts in order to keep this plan up to date on progress made. It equally highlighted the activities undertaken since mid-2013 within the framework Action Plan for Africa and its Regional Capacity Building Programme include:



(a) Continuation of the three-year project entitled “Implementation Programme of Second Periodic Report in Africa” for cultural heritage financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF), which has organized 6 training workshops since the last Committee session;

(b) In the framework of the “Africa Nature Programme,” financed by the State Parties of Spain, the Netherlands, and Belgium through the Flanders FIT as well as UNDP, IUCN and AWHF, actions include:

- Guidelines for engaging local communities in the conservation of natural World Heritage developed and tested in Kenya, Cameroon and Ethiopia. Their publication is foreseen in 2014 as part of the World Heritage Paper Series. The “Enhancing our Heritage” management effectiveness assessments have been carried out at 10 African World Heritage sites;
- A World Heritage knowledge-sharing network was initiated,
- A dedicated web site for the Africa Nature programme was developed;

(c) A training workshop on climate change adaptation for African natural World Heritage sites, and the final workshop for the pilot phase (2012-2014) of the Africa Nature Programme were also held. Finally, the Secretariat thanked all of the donors and partners who have made these accomplishments possible, and appeal to all States Parties to contribute funds and resources to the continued implementation of the Action Plan for the Africa region.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remarque que la position de l’Afrique est difficile dans la Convention. Elle affirme qu’en termes de gouvernance l’Afrique est presque absente dans le Comité, mais aussi qu’en termes de viabilité et visibilité il y a des difficultés au niveau du Centre du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation remercie le Centre pour tout ce qu’il amène depuis des années aux pays africains, notamment l’appui forte et durable, à travers de Fond africain du patrimoine mondiale, envisageant des accords bi-multilatéraux. Cependant, la Délégation du Sénégal affirme que l’Unité Afrique du Centre du patrimoine mondial est faible, et elle appelle au renforcement de cette unité du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Ce qui contribuerait pour améliorer la visible de l’Afrique dans la Convention, toujours envisageant une Liste du patrimoine mondiale qui soit plus représentative, équilibrée et équitable.

La Délégation de l’**Algérie** remercie et exprime son gratitude au Secrétariat pour les efforts fourni aux pays Africain. Elle invite les pays Africains à participer d’avantages de ces supports continués qui offre le Centre.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** took the floor to response to the sentiments expressed by Senegal. He said that the Director General has announced a new structure of the regional units, which are aimed to strengthen work in the regions. He highlighted that there is staff redeployed in all regions including in African region and Expressed that African World Heritage Fund work closely to the World Heritage Centre. The Director also expresses that the World Heritage Centre fully supports the Africa region.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was proposed to the Draft Decision. The Draft Decision **38 COM 10B.2** was adopted.

### III.FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR ARAB STATES

Le **Secrétariat** signale un résumé des activités de suivi du deuxième cycle du rapport périodique pour les Etats arabes. Le deuxième cycle du rapport périodique des pays Arabes a été présenté au Comité du patrimoine mondial à Brasilia, en 2010. L'année suivante le Comité (Paris, 2011) a approuvé le programme régional pour les pays arabes qui définissait 5 priorités : (1) la mise en œuvre de la Convention au niveau nationaux par la désignation de points focaux pour le patrimoine naturel et culturel dans chaque pays de la région et la création de comités nationaux pour le patrimoine mondial ; (2) la mise à jour et l'harmonisation de la Liste indicative pour le patrimoine mondial des pays de la région ; (3) la préparation de dossiers d'inscription visant une meilleure représentativité de patrimoine naturel sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ; (4) la gestion des biens ; (5) l'amélioration de l'accès de l'information notamment en arabe. Le Secrétariat mentionne que le renforcement des compétences et la formation sont les deux éléments transversaux pour la mise en œuvre de ces actions prioritaires. Il ajoute aussi que les termes de la mise en œuvre de ce programme sont discutés lors d'une réunion régionale annuelle des points focaux pour le patrimoine culturel et naturel (dont la dernière s'est tenue à Bahreïn, en novembre 2013). Outre l'augmentation progressive du nombre de points focaux désignés par les Etats parties de la région, notamment pour les questions liées au patrimoine naturel, le Secrétariat note que plusieurs Etats parties (dont l'Irak, la Jordanie, la Mauritanie, la Tunisie, le Soudan et la Palestine) ont établi, ou sont en passe d'établir, des entités nationales pour le patrimoine mondial. Ceci permet de dynamiser la convention dans les pays et de maintenir un dialogue régulier et ouvert. En suite le Secrétariat signale les activités mises en œuvre suivantes depuis la dernière session du Comité du patrimoine mondial :

- (a) le renforcement des compétences en trois ateliers de formation: un atelier national au Koweït en février 2014 pour la révision de *la liste indicative* ; un atelier sur le processus d'inscription à Casablanca en avril 2014 ; un atelier de gestion à Abu Dhabi en novembre 2013 au sujet de la gestion des Sites culturels du patrimoine mondial d'Al Aïn (Hafit, Hili, Bidaa Bint Saud et les oasis), inscrit en 2011.
- (b) travail soutenu pour une meilleure gestion des villes du patrimoine mondial dans région des Etats arabes à travers la mise en œuvre de la Recommandation concernant le paysage urbain historique : Un atelier régional en décembre 2013 à Rabat (Maroc) sur les enjeux politiques, socio-économiques et culturels du développement des ensembles urbains historiques (durabilité - un plan d'action a été adopté à la fin de la réunion) ; et aussi un atelier régional de formation à Sfax (Tunisie) en décembre 2013 sur l'utilisation de l'approche centrée sur le paysage urbain historique en amont d'un projet de proposition d'inscription d'un ensemble urbain sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, testée pour la première fois à l'occasion

De plus, le Secrétariat indique que la mise en œuvre du Programme régional a dû s'adapter aux exigences de la situation de conflit ou post-conflit dans plusieurs pays de la région. Ainsi un effort très soutenu a été fourni pour le suivi, la préservation et la gestion des biens de la Libye, du Yémen et de l'Egypte, avec une assistance technique persistante, et de grands efforts de levée de fonds. Le centre du patrimoine mondial a également travaillé sans relâche sur le suivi des biens de la Syrie, sur la réduction des risques pendant le conflit et la préparation

méthodologique de l'après conflit, travail couronné par le lancement en mars dernier d'un projet de sauvegarde d'urgence du patrimoine culturel syrien et par une réunion internationale d'experts organisée à Paris en mai dernier. Enfin, en termes de coopération pour la mise en œuvre du Programme régional, le soutien des Organisations consultatives et du Centre régional des pays arabes pour le patrimoine mondial (ARC-WH), établi à Manama comme centre de Catégorie 2 sous l'égide de l'UNESCO, a été comme toujours indéfectible. En effet, le Secrétariat note que le Centre régional des pays arabes pour le patrimoine mondial en collaboration avec IUCN fait un travail remarquable pour une meilleure représentativité du patrimoine naturel dans les états arabes, et œuvre à la traduction et la diffusion des documents de travail en langue arabe, contribuant ainsi à la mise en œuvre du programme régional, et ce en étroite coordination avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Pour conclure, le Secrétariat informe le Comité que dans l'unité des états arabes, il y a que deux personnes à mener toutes ces activités, dans une région qui aurait besoin de beaucoup plus bien entendu. A cet égard le Secrétariat remercie le gouvernement de la Turquie pour son soutien puisque prochainement un jeune professionnel turc sera accueilli dans l'unité pour une période de deux ans.

Les Délégations de l'**Algérie**, du **Qatar** et du **Liban** remercient des efforts déployés pour la région période de post conflit dans la région et exprime son soutien et coopération pour l'avenir.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was received to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 10B.3** was adopted.

#### IV.FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The **Secretariat** reports a summary of follow-up activities of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting Latin America and the Caribbean Region. It recall that the World Heritage Committee, by Decision **37COM 10A**, approved the final report of the Second Cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Latin America and the Caribbean Region. By the same decision, the World Heritage Centre was requested to develop a Regional Action Plan, in collaboration with the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies, the Category 2 Centres, as well as other relevant partners. The World Heritage Centre established a close dialogue and an active cooperation in view of the development of the action plan. As a result, a regional meeting was held in Brasilia from 23rd to 25th April 2014 to elaborate the 2014-2024 Regional Action Plan for World Heritage in LAC. Focal points from 26 States Parties, representatives of the Advisory Bodies and the Category 2 Centres for World Heritage: The Lucio Costa Centre in Rio de Janeiro in Brazil and the Zacatecas Centre in Mexico participated in the meeting. This regional meeting was jointly organized by the World Heritage Centre, the National Institute for Historic and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN) and UNESCO Brasilia. The Secretariat expressed its gratitude to the Brazilian Government for its continuous support. It highlighted how the meeting in Brasilia was a crucial step to create a platform for discussion in order to identify priority lines of action at the regional level and to define specific activities related to conservation, management, capacity-building and regional cooperation. The Regional action plan adopted in Brasilia was conceived as a specific agenda of action and reinforced cooperation and networking were considered by States Parties as fundamental for the implementation of the Plan. The adopted Plan identified 4 priority challenges in

the Region, mainly in the fields of Education and communication, Integrated heritage management, Disaster risk management (including climate change adaptation) and Sustainable tourism. In addition, the Regional Action Plan identified some non-exhaustive heritage categories considered particularly relevant for the Region, as Urban Heritage, Natural Sites, Cultural Landscapes and Archaeological Heritage. The outcomes of the meeting also highlighted as strategy the development of pilot projects to reflect the priorities of the Region and to establish good practices in terms of management and conservation of World Heritage.

The Secretariat stressed how this process illustrated the diversity in the needs and situations affecting the Management and Conservation of World Heritage in the region, and this is why each of the three sub-regions had already started defining the main lines of action of their respective sub-regional Action Plans to take into account their own specific needs. In this regard, the Secretariat informed that the first meeting to develop the sub-regional action plan for the Caribbean was already scheduled for the second half of 2014 in la Habana (Cuba). In addition, the secretariat announced that Funds have already been secured for this purpose thanks to the contribution of the Netherlands Funds in Trust for World Heritage. Finally, the secretariat thanked all the States Parties, focal points and site managers of the Region that have participated in the elaboration of the action plan, as well as the Advisory Bodies for their active participation in this process and for their continuous support to the World Heritage Centre in the follow-up process for the Periodic Reporting.

**ICOMOS** note the importance of the periodic reporting and the development of the Action Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean in order to establish a roadmap to address the trends and challenges that were identified during the periodic report presented to the Committee in 2013. The Action Plan identifies actions to work on cross-cutting issues affecting the majority of the States Parties, it said. Among them, the increase in demand for natural resources, infrastructure development, social changes, unplanned tourism have been identified as priorities. ICOMOS also highlighted how the responsiveness remains challenging and is limited in several places due to limited resources, lack of trained personnel, pressures on policy priorities, among others. It added that given these challenges, the States Parties in the region have emphasized the importance of implementing sustained action to ensure the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the sites listed, by identifying pilot cases to develop innovative approaches and tangible examples where conservation and management of properties contribute to sustainable development and where human, economic, environmental and cultural dimensions are incorporated so. ICOMOS also stressed how capacity and education are key cross-cutting themes for heritage and covering various disciplines, and in this regard, it is worth noting the opportunities that can be generated through the Program LATAM from ICCROM. The Advisory Body also remembered the definition of regional and sub-regional training and education strategies are inserted in the context of the overall strategy for capacity building in World Heritage, adopted by the Committee at its 35th session. It also mentioned that they had the opportunity to participate in the process of preparation of the periodic report and the definition of the Action Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean, which is not an end in itself but a means to a larger end: the protection of World Heritage sites and the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in Latin America and the Caribbean. ICOMOS affirmed how essential is for the advisory bodies to continue actions to directly support the site managers and the states parties to the challenges they face, and that this support fosters the use of the Convention as a tool for heritage. In this sense,

ICOMOS evoked cases like Humberstone or Qhapac Ñan, presented in the current session, where the benefits of joining efforts for conservation can be noted and commended. Finally, it spoke on behalf of all the other advisory bodies to reiterate their interest to assist states parties, both within in the mandates that have to do with world heritage, but also in a broader sense for the implementation of the Action Plan. We hope collaboration and strategic work allows us to reach the main objective of the Convention that is the conservation of sites which are of outstanding universal value, it highlighted.

The Delegation of **Colombia** thanked the Secretariat and ICOMOS for the development of this strategy and stressed the importance of meeting held in Brazil. It also called out other States Parties from other regions to assist in the implementation and cooperation of this action plan in Lac region in the spirit of the convention.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the Secretariat for its support in heritage initiatives in LAC and also recalled that still there are some challenges to face, as the Caribbean region is not that much represented in the World Heritage. It also stated that the cooperation in LAC, especially within the Caribbean sub region has never been as robust, but States Parties and stakeholders are becoming more and more proactive. It also recognized that regional cooperation is critical. The Delegation also drew attention to the fact that 2014 is the international year of small islands developing states and that in this sense they are encouraged by the united front that is inflowing in the region in support of heritage.

The observer Delegation of **Barbados** commended the World Heritage Centre and the LAC Unit and the Government of Brazil for the preparation of the action plan for the region. It also recalled the climatic vulnerability of the region and how there is common need to develop sustainable tourism strategies. Barbados said they feel the need for category 2 centres in the region to strengthen those issues in the region.

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

The Observer Delegation of **Cuba** thanked the stakeholders that contributed for the realization of the action plan, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the Category 2 centres of the region. It stressed how this action plan had cooperated towards a favourable social and economic direction and that the recent inscription of the Andean Road System is a great example of the cooperation in the region.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 10B.4** was adopted as amended.

The Chairperson closed **Item 10** of the Agenda.

## **ITEM 11 INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

*Documents: WHC-14/38.COM/11*

*Decisions: 38 COM 11*

The **Secretariat** introduced this item and presented the structure of the document.

Le **Secrétariat** attire plus spécialement l'attention du Comité sur la partie 2 du document, qui montre l'état du budget de l'assistance internationale pour 2014-2015.

Depuis l'élaboration du document 7 autres demandes ont été approuvées, ce qui porte le nombre total de demandes approuvées en 2014 à 21. Par conséquent les fonds disponibles pour 2015 s'élèvent maintenant à 320.963 dollars E.U. Le Secrétariat met l'accent sur le fait que les fonds affectés à l'Assistance Internationale sur une base volontaire par quelques États Parties sont actuellement totalement épuisés et qu'il ne reste quasiment plus de fonds en 2015 pour les catégories de l'assistance préparatoire et de l'assistance de conservation et gestion-culture. Les fonds additionnels reçus jusqu'à présent avaient permis l'approbation d'un montant annuel de 118.400 USD en moyenne depuis 2010. Grâce à ces fonds 6 demandes ont encore pu être approuvées en 2014 ; néanmoins, une demande a déjà dû être refusée par manque de financement. Le Secrétariat souligne la situation critique dans laquelle se trouve le budget de l'assistance Internationale, qui était un des objectifs de base de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie le Secrétariat pour son excellente présentation et se déclare profondément préoccupée par l'état du budget. Elle appelle instamment les Etats Parties à se pencher sur cette question qui pourrait avoir des conséquences assez sérieuses sur la crédibilité des travaux du Comité.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** drew the attention to the fact that this matter would come up again under Item 12 on the budget. He added that the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund was in question since the size of the Fund was not going to grow, since the amount of assessed contributions was almost fixed, whereas the demands on the Fund were increasing. He recalled that the General Assembly created a sub-account for International Assistance and that the Fund could grow only through voluntary contributions from States Parties.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendment was received on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 11** was adopted.

The Chairperson closed **Item 11** of the Agenda.

## **ITEM 12. PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2012 2013, THE INTERIM FINANCIAL STATEMENT AND THE STATE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 2014-2015 BUDGET**

*Documents: WHC-14/38.COM/12*

*Decisions: 38 COM 12*

The **Chairperson** introduced this item and presented the structure of the document. She then gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group, **Mrs Anne Huhtamaki**, from the Delegation of Finland. Before doing so; she first paid tribute to the work of Huhtamaki who spared no efforts in the accomplishment of its work. The Chairperson underlined that she understood that a Draft Decision is proposed by the Working Group and has been distributed in the room. She gave the floor to the Chairperson of the Working Group to present the conclusions of the group.

The **Chairperson of the Budget Working Group** presented the final report of the group. She recalled that Item 12 of the provisional agenda of the Committee had been opened in the Plenary on 16<sup>th</sup> of June, and that the budget working group was

established as a standing consultative body to review the biennial budget of the World Heritage Fund as per a decision taken by the Committee on its 36th session. She also clarified that the Budget group was composed by 25 State Parties, among it 10 were members of the Committee and held 5 sessions. She indicated that the Draft Decision presented was a consensual one. The Chairperson of the Working Group also thanked the Chairperson of the Committee for mobilizing State Parties to assist and participate in the group. She further indicated that the Working Group was able to base its work on the last year's Committee's decision on budget, which very adequately described the challenges of the financial situation and conclusions of which were still valid today.

The Chairperson of the Group highlighted the main issues and conclusions reflected in the draft decision before its adoption. She indicated that the Working Group expressed its deep concern of the Sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, which is increasingly dependent on extrabudgetary resources and of the fact that this meant unpredictability of financing.

She underlined that the difficult financing situation has affected the ability to provide for activities related to the Convention, especially conservation and management of properties, which was a top priority. At the same time, it should be noted that as Members States continue to inscribe more and more World Heritage sites, this results in more work being requested from the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies.

The Chairperson indicated that the Working Group called strongly upon States Parties to pay timely their assessed contributions and are were strongly encouraged to voluntarily contribute to the sub-accounts of the World Heritage Centre, especially International Assistance and the sub-account for "enhancing the human capacities of the World Heritage Centre". In addition, she indicated that, as already presented in the last Year's Committee decision, States parties are encouraged to contribute by choosing the several options of additional financing.

The chairperson mentioned also that the Working group expressed its concern of the worsened staffing situation of the World Heritage Centre after the cuts in the number of personnel and as the staff was under increasing pressure to do more work with fewer staff members.

Furthermore she indicated that looking forward, in order to urgently achieve the sustainability of the WH Fund, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies are called upon to propose to the next 39<sup>th</sup> Committee for consideration a comparative analysis of options for further efficiency and cost-saving measures as well as for resource mobilization and this will should be done in consultation the States Parties. She called upon proposals and contributions of members states in this regard.

Finally, the Chairperson thanked all the delegates, Committee and non-Committee Members, experts, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their excellent cooperation and support as well as the dialogue and good atmosphere in which the Working Group was able to conduct its work. She also thanked the host country, Qatar, for the facilities and support personnel made available to the Budget Working Group and which greatly facilitated the work.

The Delegation of **Philippines** congratulated the effort made by the Budget Working Group and expressed its concern on the sustainability of World heritage Fund and its increasing demands. They supported the Draft Decision proposed by the budget working and also enquired about the implementation of a provision adopted by the last World Heritage Committee (decision 37 COM 15) concerning the identification of future decisions adopted by the Committee and its financial implications on the budget provided.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** took the floor to clarify that the Secretariat would, at the end of the session, present the costs of all decisions adopted by the Committee at its present session.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment was received on this Draft Decision revised by the Budget Working Group.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 12** was adopted as amended.

The Chairperson closed **Item 12** of the Agenda

### **Item 13. OTHER BUSINESS**

#### **Other Business**

*Decisions:* **38 COM 13**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee on a particular item which concerns the follow-up of Resolution **37C/96** of the General Conference, regarding the governance of the UNESCO's intergovernmental bodies.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that this item had been discussed in the Bureau meeting. He clarified that the General Conference required external auditors to carry out a strategic performance review of intergovernmental bodies of UNESCO, in this sense all the Conventions are part of this strategic performance review. In order to carry out this review, questionnaires have been sent from the external auditors to the Chairpersons, Presidents of all intergovernmental bodies. The Director recalled that this is a process where the Secretariat has a limited role, facilitating the communication between the intergovernmental bodies - in this specific case the World Heritage Committee - and the External Auditor. In this regard, the Secretariat has distributed the questionnaires to all Committee members.

The **Rapporteur** indicated having received a proposal of amendment on the Draft Decision by India.

The Delegation of **India** explained that the amendments were moved after consulting other members of the Committee, in view of optimizing decisions. They said their Draft Decision has as objective to further streamline the work and role played by the Advisory Bodies, aiming to open up the dialogue with them, not just with some State Parties, but with all State Parties.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la proposition de l'Inde et affirme qu'elle s'est souvent interrogé sur la méthode de travail des Organisations Consultatives ainsi



que sur la politisation croissante du Comité. Elle évoque la nécessité de transparence accrue afin d'améliorer le dialogue. La Délégation souligne aussi qu'il est important que les experts soient familiers des régions qu'ils analysent. Il indique que le Projet de décision vise à renforcer les capacités des Organisations Consultatives d'évaluer au mieux les dossiers d'inscription et qu'ainsi l'avis rendu soit suivi.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** highlighted that during the present session it noted that the Advisory Bodies in few cases had asked further info to the State Parties concerning evaluations of their nominations. Therefore they support the Draft Decision to improve the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and all the States Parties concerned.

The Delegation of **Japan** emphasised the need to improve the nomination process, in this regard it proposed the establishment of a Working Group, as a Standing Consultative Body, on the process of evaluation and decision-making, which will report to the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee.

The Delegations of **Jamaica, Algeria, Lebanon, Vietnam, Turkey and Finland** supported the draft proposal presented by India and the amendment of Japan. They also stressed that significant work must be improved between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Advisory Bodies for the essential work they have been doing, especially with regard to the State of Conservation and nomination evaluations, as well as capacity building. It called the Committee to have a critical look over itself.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande des éclaircissements quant à la composition du Groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Colombia** asked to respect compliance of the *Operational Guidelines* by the States Parties. It recalled that several times the States Parties present inconsistent dossiers that do not fulfill all the requirements foreseen in those guidelines.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** demande des éclaircissements quant aux implications financières de la création d'un tel Groupe avant de continuer sa proposition d'amendement.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** highlighted that all mechanisms, such as this Working Group, that are being proposed by the Committee members have direct financial implications and tremendous costs. He suggested a short break in order to allow the Secretariat to consolidate the text of the Draft Decision with all amendments received.

The **Legal Adviser** requested a clarification regarding the composition of the working group. It confirmed that even though this mechanism is not foreseen in the Convention, the Committee has the possibility to propose it.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed that the Working Group be composed of the Members of the Bureau.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** highlighted that the Rules of Procedure foresees that the Bureau meet only during the session of the Committee and recalled that every meeting has a cost.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated its proposal for a Working Group composed of Bureau members which will be strictly different from a Bureau meeting.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** emphasized that financial implications are a challenge to some State Parties that cannot participate in meeting intersessionally, and stressed that the Working Group should meet during the session of the World Heritage Committee.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** précise que sa proposition d'amendement n'envisageait pas un nouveau mécanisme pour régler des divergences d'ordre générales entre les Etats Parties et les Organisations Consultatives avant la tenue du Comité, mais que ce mécanisme soit mis en place pour régler des divergences d'ordre purement scientifique.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded to Algeria and drew again the Committee's attention to the costs of such a new mechanism.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** indique qu'un tel mécanisme serait mis en place seulement à la demande de l'État Partie et pas de façon permanente.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendments proposed so far would be printed and circulated to the members of the Committee.

The Delegations of **Turkey** and **India** agreed with the Delegation of India by saying that the composition of the Working Group should not be restricted, proposed a new paragraph after paragraph 2.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the Delegation of Germany on the need to express regrets of inconsistency with rules. The Delegation proposed to add a new paragraph referring to the external auditor's report.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique ne pas souhaiter d'opposition entre les Organisations consultatives et l'Etat partie, et requiert un mécanisme de consultation. Un Groupe de Travail mixte aurait pu être envisagé, pour améliorer le dialogue avec les Organisations consultatives, et ne pas les exclure.

The Delegation of **Colombia** indicated that dialogue, cooperation, trust, is the core of the mandate of this Convention. The World Heritage Centre, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies are all working along. The Nomination files require financial and human resources. The Committee needs a much strict implementation of the Convention, to avoid errors from Advisory Bodies and the State Parties. The Delegation asks for a broader process of reflexion, rather than blaming someone:

The Delegation of **Philippines** preferred informal ad-hoc meeting under adequate financial condition.

The Delegation of **Algeria** requested again clarifications on the costs to establish such a Working Group.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** highlighted that establishing another Working Group will require additional staff time, interpreters; travel cost for Advisory Bodies and would increase workload. He stated that while the Committee discussed how to reduce cost and work, the same Committee takes Decisions that have important financial implications. In addition, he suggested the Committee members to request the Legal Advisor to clarify the status of this Working Group.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that the Committee can decide on the composition and mechanism of a new Working Group.

The Delegation of **Algeria** indicated it understood the difficulty inherent to the creation of such a Working Group, but she underlined the financial implications on the Convention leave room for establishing an Open-Ended Working Group. It recalled the case, in 1998, of the World Heritage site of Kakadu (Australia) for which a similar Open-Ended Working Group with the view to add scientific information was decided.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose que la composition du groupe de travail soit limitée à un représentant de chaque région. Ainsi, le Comité ne commissionne pas d'organisme indépendant, c'est l'Etat partie qui fait venir une contre-expertise, c'est le droit de l'Etat Partie que de solliciter une étude d'impact.

The Delegation of **India** suggested establishing a Working Group which will meet inter-sessionally and which will report to the next session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed that the Working Group be composed of Bureau members, held meetings in Paris and debated in English to avoid unnecessary costs.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stressed that any meeting require resources, whether it is in Paris or otherwise. He also pointed out that the Bureau could not meet inter-sessionally.

The Delegation of **Germany** suggested that this was not a meeting of the Bureau, but just a collection of the members of the Bureau.

The Delegation of **Turkey** asked that all members of the Committee attend to ensure that there is not uneven representation.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la proposition de la Délégation de l'Allemagne, en soulignant que ce groupe de travail ne doit pas engendrer de coûts additionnels.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its concern that some States Parties are not as well positioned to come to Paris in terms of travel costs. It suggested that the working group should meet at the occasion of the 39th session of the Committee where all members can attend and contribute.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** réaffirme avoir fait cette proposition de modification non pas pour modifier les différences d'opinions générales avant la tenue du Comité, mais pour régler des questions purement scientifiques, et renouvèle sa confiance envers les Organisations consultatives. Il y a des divergences sur les questions

scientifiques, il faudrait des données indépendantes. La Délégation indique que les questions d'ordre financier peuvent être réglées par les Etats parties.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to the budget document, page 9 of the English version, where the modular cost were given. He explained that the average cost of each evaluation was about 20,000 to 25,000 USD and about 50,000 USD for a mixed nomination. Giving the same amount to a second scientific body would therefore increase these costs tremendously.

The Delegation of **Algeria** stated that the Delegation did not consider this scientific bodies' evaluation is done on automatic basis.

The **Chairperson** announced a break of the session for 15 minutes.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that there were a number of amendments on the Draft decision in different languages.

The Delegation of **Turkey** suggested highlighting the appreciation of the Committee for the Advisory Bodies and their expert opinions.

The Delegation of **Finland** recognized the increasing of financial costs for the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** declared that simple majority accepted to maintain the paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** (Observateur) a suivi les discussions et les décisions du Comité. Elle souligne le travail remarquable des Organisations consultatives, scientifiques. Mais elle fait remarquer que le Comité est l'organe décisionnaire et que la meilleure solution serait de peut-être de relire les *Orientations* et de les appliquer à la prochaine session.

The Delegation of **India** proposed that the Working Group be composed of 2 members from each Regional Group and that it meet in Paris to avoid additional costs. The Delegation asked for the adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal by India and underlined the Working Group should be small and regionally well balanced.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se déclare très inquiète et souligne que le processus de représentation des Etat parties au Comité (avec 1 expert nature et culture) est nécessaire pour établir un dialogue scientifique franc et ouvert. Elle précise que les Organisations consultatives sont composées d'experts. Il faut favoriser le dialogue entre les Organisations consultatives et le Comité.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stressed the Committee should consider the feasibility of establishing such a Working Group.

La Délégation du **Liban** pense qu'il faut modifier les Orientations l'année prochaine, le point concernant l'évaluation et l'inscription des biens est crucial. Les inscriptions de presque la totalité des propositions l'ensemble des NOM ne doit pas être

répétée : il faut mettre à plat le processus et s'assurer de la VUE. A ce titre, le processus en amont est intéressant. Le petit Groupe de Travail peut mettre en place des jalons pour préparer les propositions d'inscriptions du prochain Comité.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se dit en désaccord avec le Liban et se déclare fière du nombre des inscriptions sur la Liste à cette session. Elle indique qu'un petit Groupe de Travail serait trop réduit pour traiter les thèmes importants. Enfin, elle insiste sur le fait qu'il faut renforcer la transparence.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** suggère d'inscrire ce point à l'ordre du jour de la 39e session du Comité du Patrimoine Mondial.

The Delegation of **Philippines** joined the Delegation of Algeria in supporting no restriction of participation to the working group. It suggested a Group of 21 representatives, based on the size of the regional groups currently represented.

The Observer Delegation of the **Netherlands** shared concerns expressed by the Delegation of Switzerland. The Delegation noted this meeting showed an alarming lack of understanding between Advisory Bodies and the Committee members, and the result was striking discrepancy between expert advised and the Committee's decisions. The Delegation stated that it felt the credibility of the Convention and sustainability of conservation heritage is at stake. The Delegation called on States Parties to strengthen dialog with the Advisory Bodies, in favour of effective and long-term conservation of common heritage, to take all effort jointly within the existing framework, to work toward effective implementation of the Convention.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** soutient la Délégation de l'Inde, pour créer un Groupe de Travail composé de 2 représentants par région.

Les Délégations du **Liban, Qatar, Colombie** soutiennent la position de la Délégation de l'Allemagne, de l'Inde et du Vietnam. La Délégation estime que les coûts d'un tel Groupe de Travail réunissant tous les membres du Comité seraient trop importants.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its concern about the way in which the Committee has been functioning. It underlined that the creation of such a Working Group makes this discussion exclusive and which was not open to the Observer States Parties to contribute, which will create a larger problem at the General Assembly, when it is presented to those who have not been included.

The **Rapporteur** suggested indicating in the Draft Decision that the Working Group will meet at the invitation of Germany.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** note les mentions « différence d'opinion » et « différence de point de vue scientifique ».

La Délégation du **Sénégal** juge que cela devient redondant et qu'il faut s'en tenir à la « différence d'opinion ».

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the Delegation of Senegal on keeping the "difference of opinion" as the language comes directly from the factual errors report and is thus in line with procedure.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** suggested to simply referencing factual errors report which would have spoken to issue concerning difference of opinion, instead of getting into different areas.

The Delegation of **Japan Algeria, Senegal and Lebanon** supported the Delegation of Jamaica by saying that it was normal to have different opinion.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime ses réserves sur le fait de ne mentionner que le différé et pas le renvoi.

The Delegation of **Turkey** indicated that the Committee should not contradict themselves in suggesting that some paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines are more important than others.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 13** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Poland** underlined the need to have enough time during the next session to discuss this properly and respect everybody's opinion on a scientific basis.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** intervient sur la diversité linguistique. Attachant une grande importance au multilinguisme, elle se félicite de la multiplicité des langues de travail, et des efforts en matière d'interprétation. Elle félicite l'Etat du Qatar et le Secrétariat pour la promotion de la diversité linguistique.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of the result of consultations that took place between the Chairpersons of the Cultural Conventions, including the World Heritage Convention, to enhance synergies among those conventions.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** remercie les Secrétariats pour la Convention de Protection des biens culturels en cas de conflit armé 1954, et son Second Protocole 1999, la Convention concernant les mesures à prendre pour interdire et empêcher l'importation, l'exportation et le transfert de propriété illicites des biens culturels 1970 et la Convention concernant la protection du patrimoine mondial, culturel et naturel 1972 ainsi que les Présidents de leurs comités pour les efforts déployés pour améliorer et renforcer la synergie entre ces Conventions. La Délégation relève que les Etats observateurs sont placés régulièrement par ordre alphabétique dans la salle, et demande si une forme de diversité de placement pourrait être envisagée, grâce à un tirage au sort pour l'attribution des places, comme lors de la Conférence Générale.

The Chairperson closed **Item 13** of the Agenda

#### **ITEM 14. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 39<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2015)**

*Decisions:* **38 COM 14**

The **Chairperson** noted the wish of the Qatari Delegation to propose Her Excellency

Mrs Maria Böhmer, the Minister of State at the Federal Foreign Office from Germany as Chairperson of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee in 2015.

The Delegation of **Qatar** described the professional background of Professor Maria Böhmer, and proposed that she be elected by acclamation as Chairperson of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Japan** and **Senegal** supported this proposal.

The **Chairperson** declared Her Excellency Maria Böhmer elected as Chairperson for the 39<sup>th</sup> Session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Committee members for their support.

The **elected Chairperson of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee** thanked the Chairperson of the 38<sup>th</sup> session and the State of Qatar for their hospitality as well as for the excellent organization of the session. She referred to the cooperation between Germany and Qatar in a spirit of friendship. She thanked the members of the Committee for the trust they have put in her. She underlined that she looks forward to host the next session of the Committee in Bonn, a city that she knows well personally, having been elected member of the Parliament at the beginning of her career. She mentioned that the 39<sup>th</sup> session will be held in the former debating Parliament Chamber where a part of the history of Germany has been written. She informed that a lot of World Heritage sites are situated close to Bonn and that a lot of visits will be organized after the session. The Chairperson referred to the importance of the World Heritage Convention and to the importance of decisions and discussions that have been taken and held during the 38<sup>th</sup> session for the future of the Convention. She indicated that, as Chairperson of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee, she will notably focus on sustainable management and protection of the World Heritage in Danger. She highlighted the importance of Natural and Cultural heritage of Africa and of the place of Culture and Heritage in the Millennium Development Goals. The Chairperson finally mentioned the crucial importance of the protection of the Cultural and Natural heritage for future generations regardless of national borders and the common responsibility of the World Heritage Committee to keep and maintain this unique heritage alive.

The **Chairperson** congratulated again the elected Chairperson of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee and opened the floor for nominations for the Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** noted the Delegation of Senegal was only one Committee Member from the African region, and proposed Senegal as Vice-Chairperson.

This proposal was unanimously welcomed and the **Chairperson** declared **Senegal elected** as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Japan** proposed the Delegation of **India** as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared **India elected** as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Serbia** proposed **Croatia** as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared **Croatia** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** propose la **Jamaïque** pour un poste de Vice-président.

The **Chairperson** declared **Jamaica** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of the **Lebanon** proposed **Qatar** as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** declared **Qatar** elected as Vice-Chairperson.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reiterated that the Rapporteur must be designated "ad personae", as an individual and also stressed that the role of Rapporteur requires bilingual skill of English and French.

The Delegation of **Qatar** proposed Mrs Naya Khairallah (Lebanon) as Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared Mrs Naya Khairallah (Lebanon) elected as Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** congratulated once again Her Excellency Maria Böhmer upon her election and closed **Item 14** of the Agenda.

#### **ITEM 15. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 39TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2015)**

*Documents: WHC-14/38.COM/15*

*Decisions: 38 COM 15*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the provisional agenda of the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee and indicated that the Committee might wish to add one item concerning the Report by the Ad-Hoc Working Group which has been established under item 13.

The Draft Decision **38 COM 15** was adopted.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande des précisions quant aux dates de la prochaine session du Comité du Patrimoine Mondial.

The Delegation of **Germany** informed that it is proposed to hold the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee from **28 June to 8 July** 2015.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 15** of the Agenda

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Committee would meet again next day at 3 pm for final adoption of Decisions, and that the Closing Ceremony would be held from 6 pm onwards.

*The meeting rose at 1pm*





TENTH DAY – WEDNESDAY 25 June 2014

SIXTEENTH MEETING

4 pm. – 5 pm

**Chairperson: H. E. Mrs. Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani  
(Qatar)**

**Item 16. Adoption of Decisions**

*Documents: WHC-14/38.COM/16*

The **Chairperson** opened the session by congratulating the Rapporteur and the Secretariat to have succeeded in preparing the report on time. She reminded the Committee that the Decisions included in this report have already been adopted by the Committee and that therefore the task before the Committee is to adopt the report of Decision in its entirety. She indicated that the debate on the content of the Decisions will not be re-opened and that therefore the task before the Committee was essentially an editorial one. She then gave the floor to Rapporteur to explain the structure of the Report of Decisions.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les procédures de travail et méthodologie ainsi que le Rapport des Décisions. Il indique que le Rapport est constitué de deux parties, **Partie I** des Décisions **38 COM 2 à 38 COM 7B.98** et **Partie II** des Décisions **38 COM 8 to 38 COM 15**.

Before the adoption of the Report of Decisions, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the Committee had asked for a costing of the decisions in order to know what was not budgeted. This costing had been calculated comparing the decisions adopted so far with what was already provided for in the budget for the biennium 2014-2015. As a result, a little over 684.000 USD were not provided for. The Director stressed that the decisions to be adopted by the Committee at its 39<sup>th</sup> session in 2015 would add to this deficit. He concluded in recalling that this budget calculation excluded the staff costs of the Secretariat, which were met by the Regular budget of UNESCO, and those of the Advisory Bodies, which consequently would come in addition to the aforementioned amount.

The **Chairperson** asked if the Committee Members were able to review **Part I** of the report and whether any factual or editorial errors were noted.

**IUCN** identified an editorial error in decision **38 COM 7A.37**.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that this will be corrected.

Since there were no further comments, the **Chairperson** declared **Part I** of the report adopted.

The **Chairperson** moved to **Part II** of the Report of Decisions.

**IUCN, Germany, India, Poland, Jamaica, Japan, Korea, ICOMOS, Malaysia, Croatia** identified editorial errors in decisions **38 COM 8B.5, 38 COM 8B.9** and **38**

**COM 8B.12, 38 COM 8B.33, 38 COM 8B.7, 38 COM 8B.24, 38COM 8B.33, 38 COM 8B.23, 38 COM 8B.27, 38 COM 8B.29, 38 COM 8B.25 38 COM 8B.43 38 COM 8B.48, 38 COM 8B.13, 38 COM 7B.25.**

The **Rapporteur** clarified to the concerned Delegations that these errors will be corrected and that the text will be adjusted accordingly.

The Delegation of **Poland** inquired if Statements of Outstanding Universal Value as reproduced in the document has been verified and approved with ICOMOS.

**ICOMOS** confirme avoir fourni la déclaration de OUV qui a été adoptée telle quelle. Il reconnaît une erreur factuelle dans la synthèse, comme l'a déclaré préalablement l'Allemagne, mais pas dans les paragraphes qui concernent la gestion et protection, ce qui a été évoqué par la Pologne.

The Delegation of **Germany** pointed out what was raised by ICOMOS, stating that the paragraphs concerning management and protection should indeed be erased.

The **Rapporteur** requested a confirmation from ICOMOS.

**ICOMOS** souligne qu'il semble difficile de discuter le sujet évoqué par la Pologne dans le contexte de décisions adoptées. Par conséquent **ICOMOS** suggère que la VUE soit déclarée de façon provisoire jusqu'à que l'ICOMOS et les pays concernés discute pour arriver à une version finale de VUE.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the change about the Statement of OUV will be accommodated as requested by ICOMOS.

As there were no further remarks, the Chairperson declared **Part II** of the report adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt Report of decision in its entirety.

The Report of decisions was adopted.

In its closing remarks the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** expressed, on behalf of the Director General of UNESCO, and on his own personal behalf, its sincere gratitude to the State of Qatar, and to the Chairperson in particular, for the exceptional arrangements made and matchless facilities provided, the extraordinary hospitality and for the outstanding and exemplary manner in which the 38<sup>th</sup> session was organized. He commended the exceptional efforts of the State of Qatar to make this session a resounding success and a memorable and extremely impressive experience for all of the participants. He underlined that, the Secretariat always strived to provide the best possible information and services to enable Members of the Committee to take well informed decisions. In the past 9 days, he noted that the Committee adopted 231 decisions, based on the more than 42 working documents that the Secretariat produced. He thanked also the 3 Advisory Bodies ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM for their close collaboration in this undertaking. The Director of the Centre acknowledged the excellent contribution of the Rapporteur Mr Francisco Gutierrez Plata, referring to his close working relation with the Secretariat in a very professional and efficient manner.

The Director of the Centre underlined that, above all, the success of this session was because of the very able leadership and the way in which the Chairperson conducted its business. He stressed that her efficient and effective style enabled consensus in all the decisions and navigated difficult negotiations in a most harmonious and gracious style. He mentioned that it was a pleasure working the Chairperson and that the Secretariat was looking forward to continuing this collaboration in the future.

The Director of the Centre thanked also all members of the Committee for their cooperation and contributions. He assured the Secretariat will continue to improve working modalities, including through enhanced transparency and dialogue with all concerned, to more efficiently and effectively support their work. He also underlined the contribution of all observers from States Parties, IGOs and NGOs to the deliberations.

The Director of the Centre also noted that this session has discussed a number of critical issues, which would require reflecting further on the ways in which each of the three pillars of the World Heritage system – the States Parties and the Committee, the Secretariat, and the Advisory Bodies – can improve its functioning. Regarding nominations, he noted that the number of times that there was divergence between the decisions of the Committee and the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies was a clear pointer to the need for all to engage early on and throughout the nomination process to avoid such situations. He indicated that, at the same time, the challenges continue to mount notably with regards to the increasing number of World Heritage sites while both the financial and human resources continued to decline and are not adequate to meet the growing needs and expectations. He underlined that the same was true of the increasing occurrence of natural disasters that are affecting World Heritage sites, stressing that the generous contribution of the State of Qatar will go a long way in dealing with these emergency situations.

The Director of the Centre concluded by thanking each one of his colleagues in the World Heritage Centre for their outstanding contributions to ensuring a smooth and efficient conduct of the meeting, as well as the interpreters and the huge team of technicians. He seized this opportunity to welcome the new Chair of the World Heritage Committee Prof. Maria Bohmer, and reiterate the readiness of the Secretariat to work with her and the German authorities in preparing for the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee.

On behalf of the Secretariat, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the **Chairperson** with a Gavel in testimony of her great performance and remarkable Chairmanship during the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee.

On behalf of the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Qatar** also expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson and presented her with flowers.

The **Rapporteur** thanked the **Chairperson** for the opportunity of assisting her at the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee. He also congratulated the Secretariat and the Committee for the cooperation.

The **Chairperson** then declared the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee closed.



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

## **38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee**

Doha, Qatar- 15 June 2014

Address

by

**H.E. Dr Hao Ping**  
**President of the General Conference**  
**Vice-Minister of Education**  
**of the People's Republic of China**

Your Excellency, Mr Prime Minister,  
Ms. Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee,  
Mr Chairperson of the Executive Board,  
Members of the World Heritage Committee,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is a pleasure for me to be here with you for the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Government of Qatar, and the Chairperson and her team for hosting this session of the Committee in Doha.

Dear Colleagues,

In the last 38 years of the sessions of the Committee, with the efforts in preserving the natural and cultural heritage of the world for more than forty years, we have witnessed the inscriptions of more than 1000 sites that stand as testimonies of great civilizations. This is what we should be proud of,

because we are more than convinced that, what we are doing today is beneficial to the humanity as a whole.

The achievements that we have made today depend on the strong political will of all member states of UNESCO, on the tireless efforts of all experts and researchers present here, as well as those who had no chance to attend our conference due to various reasons who also deserve our respect and appreciation.

Dear Members of the Committee,

Today, preservation of world heritage is highly concerned by all member states. Achievements are already behind us; more challenges, such as climate change, natural disasters, regional conflicts, are waiting ahead. The Chinese philosopher Confucius once stated:

*When at thirty years old, we become truly independent;  
When at forty years old, we are no longer confused about what  
we are doing;*

To tackle these emerging challenges, we need to listen to different voices from member states, to exchange the experiences and best practices. In this regard, I would like to suggest the following approaches:

***First, education is the way to guide the young generation to heritage preservation;***

To raise the awareness of this importance and to enhance the sustainability of our work, youth need to be involved in this process, since they are the one we pass the heritage to and the one who pass it on.

Therefore, we encourage integrating the elements of our preservation work of heritage into textbooks for primary and secondary schools; we encourage establishing the concerned disciplines, or centers in universities to conduct the researches while bring up the talents in this regard.

***Second, efforts may be made through heritage work to integrate the culture into the post 2015 agenda***

As we are discussing the post-2015 global agenda today, culture has been leveraged onto an unprecedented level. Last year, UNESCO hosted an international conference on culture and adopted *Hangzhou Declaration*, which emphasizes the role of culture in preserving diversity and sustainable development.

Last month, I also attended a meeting at UN headquarters in New York, to advocate the role of culture as an enabler and driver of sustainable development with the view to integrating culture in the post-2015 development agenda.

Natural and cultural heritage constitutes an essential part of the cultural development, and thus would have impact to our future agenda.

***Third, based on the resolutions on structural reform of our organization, we need to push forward as well the reform on the heritage work.***

Much progress has been made in the past in this regard, however, in order to facilitate the universal representation in the Committee, we need to explore all possibilities as to increase the diversity of the membership of the Committee.

Hence, it was with joy that I welcomed the news of the establishment of an Open-ended Working Group, by the General Assembly of States Parties, with a mission to enable all regions to be equitably represented at any time.

***Fourth, natural and cultural heritage should be the band to link different civilizations for mutual learning and understanding;***

*“Different cultures may come in different colors, there’s no dominant culture in the world and this makes the mutual leaning and exchanges possible and valuable.”* As said by Chinese President in his speech, Mr. Xi Jinping, during his last visit to UNESCO on 27<sup>th</sup> last March, he also cited the example of the role played by Silk Road in bridging the East and West and creating opportunities for prosperity and wealth for the inhabitants of both regions.

Hence, heritage can be considered as a critical element to promote the understanding and to maintain the peaceful development.

***At last but not the least, I call on the governments to integrate the heritage work into national strategy, and focus needs to be put not only on the application but more important, on the preservation.***

The international community expectation from us is to reinforce the diversity of sites represented on our list. It is evident that such historical wealth will enrich our convention and will ensure a balanced, representative and credible World Heritage List.

Finally, on behalf of the General Conference of UNESCO, I wish you all a very fruitful Session and a lot of success in your works.

Thank you



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

ANNEX 2

## Opening Remarks 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee

**H.E. Ambassador Mohamed Amr**  
**Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO**  
**Permanent Delegate of the Arab Republic of Egypt to UNESCO**

Qatar National Convention Centre  
Doha, State of Qatar  
15 June 2014

Your Excellency, Sheikh Abdullah bin Nasser bin Khalifa Al Thani, Prime Minister of the State of Qatar,  
Your Excellency, Sheikha Al-Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al-Thani, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee,  
Your Excellency Mr Hao Ping, President of the General Conference of UNESCO and Vice-Minister of Education of China  
Madame Director-General of UNESCO,  
Esteemed Members of the World Heritage Committee,  
Excellencies,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am very pleased and honoured to address this august assembly for the opening of the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee, on behalf of all Members of the Executive Board, and in my own name.

I should like to thank the Authorities of the State of Qatar, and especially the Chairperson of this session of the World Heritage Committee, H.E Sheikha Al-Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al-Thani for providing your country's most gracious hospitality, but more importantly, to congratulate you for organizing such an international event.

The World Heritage Committee represents both the world's conscience and expertise in the area of preserving and strengthening both natural and cultural heritage.



Selection of sites for inscription onto the World Heritage List is an important task, which positively impacts the promotion of intercultural awareness, the celebration of cultural diversity and the promotion of the wonder and beauty that our planet has to offer.

The Work of the World Heritage Committee is based on the principles of neutrality, objectivity and technicality.

As you seek to protect the common heritage of humanity, it is only natural that what you do here is admired by the peoples of the world.

There are no "black-holes" on this planet when it comes to protecting heritage; every region – even in the most remote corner – count. You have proven this time and again.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

UNESCO's World Heritage List is a source of wealth, pride and even prestige for the peoples and cultures of the world. The wealth and diversity of natural and cultural heritage, the corresponding relevant expertise and a keen interest in this heritage exists in all corners of the world without exception.

It is only natural, therefore, that there is an ongoing process in Paris, for which I'm sure you are all aware, that aims at achieving equitable geographic distribution and cultural representation, not only in the membership of the Committee, but also in the broader sense of this concept, including on the World Heritage List.

This certainly enhances the universal character of the 1972 Convention and its aims, and I'm confident that this issue will receive the requisite attention and the much needed advice of all of you present here today.

Your active participation during the deliberations of the coming days is absolutely vital.

Distinguish Guests,

As we know, UNESCO's success lies in the global recognition and implementation of its normative instruments, especially the 1972 Convention. This document is perhaps the most successful of all international instruments for the protection and preservation of cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value.

We are all keenly aware of culture's role as a motor for development. It is our responsibility to make this become a reality.

We can do so in many ways – notably by upgrading and preserving World Heritage properties; or through the reinforcement of capacity-building for the good management of the sites inscribed on the List; as well as through the promotion of a responsible approach to tourism development.

To succeed in making this possible, we must ensure that local stakeholders receive the support they need; and we must redouble all efforts to promote public awareness of values for social development.

Certainly, a concerted determination exists to improve this situation through global action, regional capacity-building and financing mechanisms, which support the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Culture's role in achieving equitable, inclusive and sustainable development needs to be even more widely recognized and better demonstrated.

In fact, during the 194<sup>th</sup> session of the Executive Board, held last April, Members were informed that there is now clear evidence that cultural projects and culturally-sensitive approaches to development can indeed contribute to the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

With this in mind, I'd especially like to thank the Director-General for the excellent meeting she organised, within the framework of the President of the United Nations General Assembly's special thematic debates. In May, together with the President of the General Conference, I participated in a debate on "Culture and Sustainable Development in the Post-2015 Development Agenda".

At that time, I had the opportunity to communicate to Representatives of the General Assembly the Executive Board's specific request that the central issue of culture – as an enabler and a driver of equitable and sustainable development – finds its rightful place in the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda.

As the body responsible for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention, this 38<sup>th</sup> Session of the Committee has a clear mandate and responsibility also to ensure that such efforts progress forward, along the right path.

It is your collective responsibility to actively contribute to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Dear Members of the Committee,

It is also your responsibility to participate in the reflection on the Convention's future, on the strategies that can be developed, as well as on our capacity to take up existing and future challenges. Thus the work you – the Members of the Committee – are about to undertake over the coming days is of great importance, not only for those States Members who have submitted proposals, but – most certainly – to all the peoples of the world. I implore you, therefore, to keep in mind the wisdom of Thomas Jefferson: "Whenever you do a thing, act as if all the world is watching."

I know that we can be assured of your individual commitment in this regard.

"Culture is the widening of the mind and of the spirit", as was underscored by Jawaharlal Nehru. You are about to make the expected decisions relating to those sites which shall be considered of "outstanding universal value".

Thus, the work you are about to embark on over the coming days is of great importance, not only for those States Members who have submitted proposals, but – most certainly – to the entire world.

I am convinced that your wisdom and competence in doing so will be another valuable contribution to promote and enrich our cultural diversity in the never-ending quest of making the world a better place to live.

With this in mind, I wish you a successful meeting and fruitful deliberations.  
Thank you.

**Address by Francesco Bandarin  
UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture  
At the opening ceremony of the 38<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee  
Doha, Qatar- 15 June 2014**

Excellency, Mr Prime Minister,  
Excellency, Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee,  
Excellency, Mr President of the General Conference of UNESCO,  
Excellency, Mr Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO,  
Excellencies  
Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee,  
Ladies and Gentlemen,

- Allow me first to extend to you all the very best wishes of the Director-General of UNESCO, Mrs Bokova, who unfortunately is not in a position to be with us today. She is however looking forward to join us in the course of the week.
- I am honoured to be with you today and to have the opportunity to visit once again Qatar, a country with a fascinating heritage and a renowned actor on the international culture scene.
- Your personal involvement Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa in activities to promote cultural heritage from the local to the international level is very much appreciated.
- Indeed Qatar has successfully positioned itself as a key player in the cultural world with a commitment to safeguarding both intangible and tangible. The efforts developed by Qatar towards protection of its cultural heritage have been demonstrated through the inscription of first site of the country, Al Zubarah Archaeological Site, on the World Heritage List last year during the 37<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee.
- Protecting culture is protecting people; it is about safeguarding their ways of life and providing them with essential resources, promoting social cohesion and ultimately sustainable human development. In this regard, UNESCO is pleased to note that Qatar has reaffirmed its commitment to fulfil our shared responsibility to safeguard humankind's common cultural heritage for future generations.
- We are convinced that Qatar shares UNESCO's commitment to ensure that culture, which was absent from the MDG agenda, takes its rightful place in the post-2015 development agenda. The international community must fully

recognize the power of culture as a driver and enabler of social inclusion, of poverty alleviation and eradication, of sustainable development.

Excellencies, Dear colleagues,

- UNESCO is well known internationally for its work in the field of culture, as it is the only UN Organization with a specific mandate in this field. As such it has elaborated a normative body of conventions notably in the field of culture, all of them are driven by UNESCO's ethical mandate to promote culture in its fruitful diversity, through international cooperation and dialogue, based upon respect for shared values, human rights and the equal dignity of all cultures.
- However, as you are all aware, we are facing difficult times and critical issues that may undermine our action in the future. During this period of budgetary constraints, we must respond to increasing demands and challenges from UNESCO's cultural conventions. To do so, we must find appropriate ways and means to continue this essential work with less staff, and decreasing funding.
- Therefore I appeal to all of you to look for more efficient and effective working methods. I also and urge your Governments to make unrestricted voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund, to support one of UNESCO's most successful flagship programmes. The steady rise in the numbers of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the complex long-term conservation and management needed at World Heritage sites makes it increasingly difficult to meet our goals without additional support.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

- Ces difficultés financières profondes s'accompagnent d'une réflexion entamée il y a quelques années dans le cadre notamment de l'avenir de la Convention et qui concerne aussi bien les méthodes de travail et la transparence des processus, ce qui a un impact direct sur la crédibilité de la Convention, et bien sûr de la Liste.
- Ayant identifié ensemble les racines des problématiques représentant une menace pour la crédibilité de la Convention, nous nous attachons à identifier des remèdes et des solutions qui passent notamment par le dialogue et la coopération. Il reste toutefois de nombreux défis.
- Ainsi, dans un monde en évolution perpétuelle et soumis à des changements rapides et brutaux, les défis de conservation surgissent de plus en plus nombreux et la capacité d'adaptation est l'un des principaux atouts de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.
- Afin de renforcer la mémoire institutionnelle et améliorer la transparence de l'un des processus les plus fondamentaux de la Convention, à savoir, le suivi de l'état de conservation des biens inscrits, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a établi un système d'information sur l'état de conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial depuis 1979. Depuis son lancement, cet outil public en

ligne connaît un succès important de par le nombre toujours croissant de consultations et de recherches qui y sont effectuées par toutes les parties prenantes de la Convention et le grand public.

- De plus, pour la première fois cette année, de très nombreux Etats parties ont accepté que les rapports qu'ils ont soumis au Comité sur l'état de conservation de certains de leurs biens soient rendus disponibles, de manière publique, par l'intermédiaire de cet outil en ligne. Ceci représente une grande avancée pour l'accès à l'information par le plus grand nombre et la transparence de nos processus. Je ne peux ici que féliciter et remercier les Etats parties qui y contribuent activement.
- Outre la conservation, fondamentale et essentielle à la transmission de notre patrimoine aux générations futures, l'un des principaux défis à relever se trouve également dans la Valeur Universelle exceptionnelle. Ce qui fait l'une de nos spécificités, ce qui rend unique le concept de patrimoine mondial, c'est son application universelle, qui passe par la reconnaissance de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle des sites qui trouvent leur place sur la Liste. Il est essentiel de faire que ce principe de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle soit appliqué et respecté, tant au moment de l'inscription d'un site que dans le processus de sa conservation et protection future. Il faut être très attentifs à ce défi, qui ; lui aussi, menace comme je vous le disais, la crédibilité de la Liste et donc de la Convention.

Excellences, chers collègues,

- La session que nous nous apprêtons à ouvrir est une session importante, tant pas le nombre de points cruciaux qui sont inscrits à l'ordre du jour de votre Comité mais également par l'engagement que nous allons, une nouvelle fois, renouveler tous ensemble : faire de la protection de notre patrimoine commun une priorité qui doit s'inscrire aussi bien dans nos agenda nationaux que dans l'agenda international. Soyez assuré que l'UNESCO, dont c'est là une des principales priorités, ne faillera pas à vous accompagner dans cette tâche.
- Je vous remercie de votre attention.



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

**Address by Irina Bokova,  
Director-General of UNESCO  
on the occasion of the 38<sup>th</sup> Session of the World Heritage  
Committee**

**Doha, 20 June 2014**

Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani, Chairperson of the  
World Heritage Committee,  
Mr President of the General Conference,

Mr Chair of the Executive Board,

Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee,

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am honoured to address you today, as you engage in a new phase of your work,  
and I wish most especially to thank Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa Bint Hamad  
Bin Khalifa Al Thani for her leadership as Chair of the Committee.

From the outset, I wish to pay tribute to the Government of Qatar for organising this  
session and for its decisive support to World Heritage.

This leadership was strongly reaffirmed a few days ago with the decision to allocate  
10 million dollars to support risk management around World Heritage sites.

We are all deeply grateful for this leadership and vision.

I see this as a symbol of the cooperation and partnership that exists between  
UNESCO and Qatar – this is embodied also in the work of Her Highness Sheikha  
Moza bin Nasser as UNESCO Special Envoy for Basic and Higher Education.

The decision of Qatar is especially timely, with threats to heritage rising across the  
world – I say this with special emotion, as we witness the tragic situation in Iraq, in  
Syria and elsewhere.

Wherever extremists seek to attack people and their identities, heritage is targeted.

We see the destruction of culture used as a weapon of war, to destabilise and to  
humiliate, to impose a sectarian vision of the world.

In too many countries, we see attacks against those who strive to protect the common heritage of humanity -- like the Director of the Virunga National Park, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, attacked earlier this year.

In too many countries, individuals or organised groups seek to exploit social fragility and unrest to destroy and steal historical memories and heritage – we all recall looting of the Museum of Islamic Art in Cairo.

Heritage is falling victim also to other, more insidious attacks...

when people use it as pretext to fuel hatred and set memories against each another, instead of using it as a force for dialogue, mutual understanding and peace...

or with the false rhetoric that we must 'choose' in emergency situations between safeguarding culture and human lives.

There is no choice to be made, we must protect both, and we must respond firmly to all such threats.

We must affirm the protection of heritage is inseparable from the protection of human lives, because it is essential for resilience, for recovery and for dialogue.

We must respond in every way possible, through protection, through reconstruction, through capacity-building, through political and financial support.

We did so in Egypt, and sent out a mission immediately after the attack against the Malawi Museum earlier this year.

We do it today in Afghanistan, to protect the Bouddhas of Bamyan, with the support of Italy.

We did so in Chile, to limit the consequences of the terrible fire in the historic district of Valparaiso.

We did so in the Philippines, after Typhoon Haiyan, and we are going to support Bahrain, where part of the pearling site has been damaged by fire.

Last year, you recall the Committee inscribed Syria's World Heritage Sites on the List in Danger – and UNESCO has mobilised all its partners to limit the damage, to fight against the illicit traffic of cultural goods, to build inventories, to ensure the protection of cultural objects.

We have launched a Global Observatory of Syrian Cultural Heritage, to gather and list all relevant documents, photographs and information.

Last month, I organised at UNESCO a meeting of world specialists on Syria's cultural heritage, with NGOs, archaeologists and international auction houses, to better coordinate our action.

We have no time to lose, and I am convinced this Committee stands ready as always to act according to its responsibilities.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Nous devons poursuivre le combat car en dépit des difficultés, nous gagnons aussi des batailles.

En Ouganda, avec le soutien du Japon, l'UNESCO vient de lancer la reconstruction des tombes des rois du Buganda à Kasubi, qui avaient brûlées en Mars 2010.



Et j'y suis très sensible, car j'ai visité le site deux fois, avant et après l'incendie. J'avais promis que l'UNESCO reconstruirait les tombes, et nous sommes en train de le faire.

Au Mali également, l'UNESCO avait promis de reconstruire les mausolées détruits, et l'UNESCO tient ses promesses.

Les deux premiers mausolées viennent d'être rebâti, avec le soutien de l'Union européenne - et je remercie tous nos partenaires, la Norvège, les Pays Bas, la Suisse, et d'autres qui nous rejoignent, avec le peuple du Mali et la MINUSMA : ensemble nous reconstruirons les mausolées jusqu'au dernier, nous assurerons la transmission du patrimoine et la sauvegarde des manuscrits.

C'est la réponse de l'UNESCO à tous les extrémismes.

J'y suis plus déterminée que jamais.

J'ai été à Tombouctou avec le Président de la France, M. François Hollande - j'ai vu les manuscrits brûlés, les séquelles sur la mosquée Djingareyber, et je comprends ce qu'est l'énergie d'un peuple qui retrouve son patrimoine.

A travers la reconstruction des mausolées, c'est tout un pays qui se reconstruit et reprend confiance dans l'avenir.

Et avec eux le monde reprend à son compte l'héritage millénaire de la sagesse islamique et du dialogue des cultures de l'Afrique et du Monde Arabe, conservés dans les manuscrits de Tombouctou.

Voilà précisément le rôle de l'UNESCO, et le rôle de votre comité : puiser dans notre histoire commune la force de penser l'avenir.

Nous sommes lucides et nous savons que ces efforts sont précaires, car dans ce monde fragile, ce qui résiste au temps, ce ne sont pas les monuments, pyramides ou mausolées.

Ce qui dure et qui résiste au temps, ce sont les idées que les peuples ont voulu transmettre à travers le patrimoine. Ce sont elles que nous protégeons et dont nous devons être dignes.

Dans cette enceinte, nous sommes les gardiens d'une conscience et d'un idéal.

L'idée d'un monde où chaque culture s'enrichit et se renforce en participant à la sauvegarde des autres.

L'idée d'une civilisation guidée par la conviction que chaque culture a en elle une part exceptionnelle universelle.

C'est l'idée du patrimoine mondial, et c'est l'idée de l'UNESCO.

La vitalité d'une idée comme celle-ci ne se mesure pas seulement au nombre des sites inscrits, à l'ampleur des financements, aux discours et à l'aura médiatique - immense - de cet événement.

On ne protège une idée qu'en lui restant fidèle, par la force morale qui s'éprouve dans la durée.

Voilà notre héritage le plus précieux à transmettre et je vois trois axes d'action pour réussir, par lesquels je voudrais conclure.

Transmettre le patrimoine mondial, c'est d'abord rester constants et intransigeants sur les principes d'objectivité et d'impartialité dont dépend notre crédibilité.

Cette exigence s'applique à tout le monde : Secrétariat, Etats Membres, organes consultatifs.

Tous sont soumis aux mêmes règles de rigueur et de sens des responsabilités.

Lorsqu'un seul maillon s'affaiblit, toute la chaîne est fragilisée.

Cette exigence vaut pour l'examen des dossiers, dans l'accompagnement des Etats qui doit se faire dans un esprit de dialogue, selon les standards internationaux les plus stricts.

Cette exigence vaut pour le traitement des candidatures, dans l'impartialité des décisions des Etats Membres.

Cette exigence doit s'appliquer bien après l'inscription, dans la gestion quotidienne et durable des sites.

J'ai eu l'occasion d'exprimer mon inquiétude sur l'érosion progressive de ces principes au cours des années.

Et je suis heureuse de voir que le travail dont j'ai pris l'initiative en 2012 pour un dialogue renforcé et régulier entre les Etats, les organes consultatifs et le Secrétariat, porte ses fruits.

Il est essentiel que vos discussions continuent et portent à la fois sur les modalités d'échange d'information, et sur le respect des normes les plus élevées d'intégrité et de transparence.

C'est le moyen de perpétuer la réputation d'excellence que nous avons construite au fil des années.

Transmettre le patrimoine mondial, c'est deuxièmement sans cesse approfondir l'idée fondatrice de la Convention, pour la coopération culturelle internationale.

Comment ne pas citer les candidatures transfrontalières – comme cette année le Qhapaq Nan – et tant d'initiatives de coopération culturelle, la route de la Soie, et bien d'autres ?

Tous ces projets – sur lesquels il revient aux Comité de se prononcer – témoignent de l'attractivité exceptionnelle du Patrimoine mondial, qui donne aux Etats l'envie de se dépasser, de penser la culture non plus à l'échelle des Etats seulement, mais à l'échelle des continents et de l'humanité entière, de dire qu'il n'y a pas le patrimoine des uns et celui des autres, mais un seul patrimoine commun à protéger ensemble.

Le troisième axe, c'est enfin et surtout de voir au-delà du patrimoine tous les enjeux contemporains que nous pouvons traiter grâce à lui.

Le patrimoine mondial, c'est la biodiversité ;

C'est le développement durable - le développement urbain durable ;

C'est la protection de l'océan ;

C'est la construction de la paix ;

Le Patrimoine mondial est notre allié contre la pauvreté, pour le développement des compétences et des emplois locaux, dans l'économie de l'artisanat et du tourisme – et nous aurons en février 2015 au Cambodge, avec l'Organisation mondiale du tourisme, une conférence mondiale conjointe sur le patrimoine et le tourisme durable.

Le patrimoine mondial est notre allié pour lutter contre le dérèglement climatique et protéger la biodiversité. Les sites du patrimoine mondial – comme les réserves de

biosphères - sont des laboratoires où s'inventent les solutions d'avenir pour la gestion durable des ressources, et nous allons faire entendre ces solutions à la Conférence COP 20 à Lima au Pérou, au Sommet des Nations Unies sur le changement climatique, au mois de Septembre, et l'année prochaine à Paris, en France, pour la COP 21.

Je pense également à la protection de l'océan par les aires marines protégées, qui sont des sanctuaires pour comprendre et transmettre les ressources de l'océan, prévenir les risques, et c'est l'enjeu central de la conférence d'Appia sur les Petits Etats Insulaires en développement, en septembre.

L'inscription de tel ou tel site est un tremplin pour traiter efficacement l'ensemble de ces sujets, qui montrent l'immense contribution de l'UNESCO.

Oui, Mesdames et Messieurs, la culture représente, au-delà du patrimoine, une plateforme unique pour la paix et pour le développement durable et c'est cette vision globale que nous devons intégrer dans le programme des Nations Unies pour l'agenda post 2015.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Le patrimoine mondial est une idée d'autant plus efficace qu'elle est belle, et généreuse, et crédible, et qu'elle offre aux peuples une ambition supérieure qui les pousse à se dépasser et à donner le meilleur d'eux-mêmes, et dans cet esprit, je vous souhaite une fructueuse 38ème session du Comité du Patrimoine mondial.

**Oral Report by the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group, Mrs Anne Huhtamäki (Finland), on 23 June 2014**

Thank you Madam Chairperson,

I have the pleasure to introduce the draft decision on the budget, which was formulated by consensus by the budget working group. The document was distributed today.

The Budget working group had five meetings. There were 25 States, among which 10 Committee Members Parties, participating in the consultations.

Thanks to the valuable work of the Budget Committee working group of last year, this working group was able to base its work also on the last year's Committee's decision on budget, which very adequately describes the challenges of the financial situation and conclusions of which are still valid today.

Madame Chair,

Please allow me to briefly highlight the main issues and conclusions which are reflected in this draft decision, before the Committee takes up the draft decision for adoption.

The working group expressed its deep concern of the Sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. The Fund is increasingly dependent on extrabudgetary resources and this also means unpredictability of financing.

The difficult financing situation has affected the ability to provide for activities related to the Convention, especially conservation and management of properties, which is a top priority. At the same time, as Members States continue to inscribe more and more world heritage sites and this results in more work being requested from the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies.

The States Parties are called strongly upon to pay timely their assessed contributions.

Furthermore, the States Parties are strongly encouraged to voluntarily contribute to the sub-accounts of the World Heritage Centre, especially International Assistance and the sub-account for "enhancing the human capacities of the World Heritage Centre". In addition, as already presented in the last Year's Committee decision, States parties are encouraged to contribute by choosing the several options of additional financing.

The Working group also expressed its concern of the worsened staffing situation of the World Heritage Centre after the cuts in the number of personnel and as the staff is under increasing pressure to do more work with fewer staff members.

Looking forward, in order to urgently achieve the sustainability of the WH Fund, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies are called upon to propose to the next 39<sup>th</sup> Committee for consideration a comparative analysis of options for further efficiency and cost-saving measures as well as for resource mobilization and this will be done in consultation with the States Parties. Your proposals and contributions, dear colleagues, can be of great help to the Secretariat in preparing this.

Finally, Madame Chair, I would like to thank all the delegates, Committee and non-Committee Members, experts, the advisory bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their excellent cooperation and support as well as the dialogue and good atmosphere in which we were able to conduct our work. I would also like to thank the host country, Qatar, for the facilities and support personnel which it made available to the Budget Working Group and which greatly facilitated our work.

Thank you, Madame Chair.