



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

**World Heritage**

**39 COM**

**WHC-15/39.COM.INF.19**

**Original: English/French**

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

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

**WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

**Thirty-ninth session**

**Bonn, Germany  
28 June – 8 July 2015**

**SUMMARY RECORDS**

**RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS**

## **Table of contents**

### **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 38th session of the World Heritage Committee (Doha, 2014)
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 initiative "The World Heritage Convention: Thinking Ahead"
  - 5D. The *World Heritage Convention* and Sustainable Development
  - 5E. Recommendations of the evaluation of the Global Strategy – Follow-up to Decision 38 COM 9C
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 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger
  - 7B. State of conservation of 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 2015
  - 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. Progress report on the reflection on processes for mixed nominations

## **PERIODIC REPORTS**

10. Periodic Reports
  - 10A. Final report on the results of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Europe region and Action Plan
  - 10B. Follow-up of the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for the other regions and general reflection on Periodic Reporting

## **WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS**

11. Revision of the Operational Guidelines
12. Progress Report on the draft Policy Guidelines

13. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods

13A. Working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination: Report of the ad-hoc working group

13B. Feasibility study on an additional ordinary session of the World Heritage Committee

**FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

14. International Assistance

15. Report on the execution of the budget for the biennium 2014-2015 and preparation of the budget for the biennium 2016-2017

16. Other business

**CLOSING SESSION**

17. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee (2016)

18. Provisional Agenda of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee (2016)

19. Adoption of Decisions of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee (2015)

20. Closing of the session

**SUNDAY, 28 JUNE 2015**  
**OPENING OF THE SESSION**  
**7 p.m – 8.30 p.m**

**ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION**

*Document: WHC-15/39.COM/INF.2*

The Opening Ceremony of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee was organized at the World Conference Centre, Bonn on Sunday 28 June 2015 in Bonn, Germany. 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 104 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

Albania; Andorra; Angola; Argentina; Australia; Austria; Azerbaijan; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Barbados; Belgium; Benin; Bolivia (Plurinational State of); Bosnia and Herzegovina; Botswana; Brazil; Brunei Darussalam; Bulgaria; Cambodia; Cameroon; Canada; Chad; Chile; China; Costa Rica; Côte d'Ivoire; Cuba; Czech Republic; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Denmark; Egypt; Eritrea; Estonia; Ethiopia; France; Georgia; Ghana; Greece; Haiti; Holy See; Honduras; Hungary; Iceland; Indonesia; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Jordan; Kenya; Kiribati; Kuwait; Lao People's Democratic Republic; Latvia; Lesotho; Lithuania; Luxembourg; Madagascar; Mali; Mauritania; Mexico; Mongolia; Morocco; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Netherlands; New Zealand; Niger; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Pakistan; Palestine; Panama; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Russian Federation; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Singapore; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Spain; Sudan; Sweden; Switzerland; Thailand; The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Tunisia; Turkmenistan; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United Republic of Tanzania; United States of America; Uruguay; Uzbekistan; 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:

- Her Excellency Ms Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO
- Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer, Chairperson of the 39th 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
- Ms Sylvia Löhrmann, Vice-President of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the Länder in the Federal Republic of Germany and Minister of School and Further Education of North Rhine Westphalia
- Mr Michael Groschek, Minister of Construction, Housing, Urban Development and Transport of the Federal State of North Rhine-Westphalia
- Mr Jürgen Nimptsch, Mayor of the City of Bonn
- Dr Verena Metze-Mangold, President of the German Commission for UNESCO

A cultural performance and a reception followed.

**FIRST DAY – Monday, 29 June 2015**

**FIRST MEETING**

**9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**ITEM 2 ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS**

*Document: WHC-15/39.COM/INF.2  
WHC-15/39.COM/2.rev*

*Decision: 39 COM 2*

The Chairperson opened Item 2 of the agenda.

The Rapporteur stated that no amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 2** was adopted.

**ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE**

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

*Document: WHC-15/39.COM/3A  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.3A.Rev.3  
WHC-15/39.COM/3B.Rev.2*

*Decisions: 39 COM 3A  
39 COM 3B*

The **Chairperson** opened item 3 of the agenda.

The **Secretariat** indicated that there were two additional items in the revised agenda, document WHC-15/39.COM/5E on the Recommendations of the evaluation of the Global Strategy – Follow-up to Decision 38 COM 9C and document WHC-15/39.COM/13B on the Feasibility Study on an Additional Ordinary Session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Rapporteur** stated that no amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 3A** was adopted.

The **Secretariat** presented the timetable, including the hours for the bureau meetings. The Secretariat indicated that the Global Coalition for United for Heritage would be launched during lunch-time in the plenary room and invited all delegates to stay behind after the morning session. The Secretariat also stated that the working groups convened would conduct their meetings during lunch or at other times outside of the plenary sessions.

Draft Decision **39 COM 3B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** informed the room that due to time constraints, Rule 22.2 of the Rules of Procedure, where interventions would be limited to three minutes for Committee Members and two minutes for observers, would be applied. The Chairperson also invited NGOs to coordinate among themselves on issues and to make one single statement. The Chairperson also reminded the room that official statements and declarations should be delivered to the Secretariat as soon as possible for integration in the proceedings. With reference to the timetable that had just been adopted, the Chairperson requested for every session to start on time. The Chairperson stated that the plenary room on the ground level was reserved for delegations and that all other participants would be on the second level of the plenary room. The Chairperson informed the room that all amendments to the draft decisions would need to be submitted to the Secretariat either in writing or by email to [wh-rapporteur@unesco.org](mailto:wh-rapporteur@unesco.org) through the specified blue form. Amendments should be delivered in a timely manner to allow the Secretariat to translate them into French or English. The **Chairperson** thanked the delegates for their cooperation on the implementation of these working procedures.

#### **ITEM 4            REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 38th SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (DOHA, 2014)**

*No document*

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 4 of the agenda and invited the Rapporteur of the 38th session to present the report from the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Rapporteur** presented the report of the 38th session of the World Heritage Committee. On behalf of the Chairperson of the 38th session, the Rapporteur thanked the delegates and the Secretariat for the session. The Rapporteur indicated the number of delegates present, the decisions that were adopted, and highlighted the positive aspects of the previous years' session. These included the constructive dialogue and policy on strengthening the role of the World Heritage Convention in sustainable development in the post-2015 agenda, as well as the important work of the Category 2 Centres. The Rapporteur stressed the importance of the World Heritage capacity-building strategy and the development of best practices. The Rapporteur shared that the 38th session examined 150 State of Conservation reports as well as new sites to be placed on to the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Rapporteur emphasized that sustainable tourism in World Heritage properties was central to the future work of the World Heritage Convention, and highlighted the importance of World Heritage tourism programme. The Rapporteur indicated that it



was decided at the 38th session that State of Conservation reports should be submitted by 1 December of the year preceding the Committee session to allow more time for dialogue. The Rapporteur stated that with the new properties inscribed, the World Heritage List now extended beyond 1000 World Heritage properties. Four extensions to original inscriptions were also added. The Rapporteur underlined that the Global Strategy was one of the most important topics for the Committee and emphasized the importance of implementing the recommendations from the audit in 2011. The Rapporteur further stressed the serious financial situation of the World Heritage Fund that hampered the conservation of properties and urged that the fund become more sustainable to ensure the future conservation of World Heritage sites. The Rapporteur also stated that one of the most important decisions undertaken in the previous year was related to the nomination of properties and that Document WHC-15/39.COM/13A of the agenda on the Working Methods of the Evaluation and Decision-Making Process of Nomination: Report of the ad-hoc working group, was related to this topic. The Rapporteur expressed gratitude for all the assistance provided during the 38th session and conveyed his good wishes to the Rapporteur of the 39th session.

#### **ITEM 5E RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY – FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION 38 COM 9C**

*Document: WHC-15/39.COM/5E*

*Decision: 39 COM 5E<sup>1</sup>*

The **Chairperson** opened Item 5 of the agenda.

The **Secretariat** stated that a working group would be established on this issue. The Secretariat stated that the 2013 General Assembly had not been satisfied with Recommendations 12 and 20 and had therefore asked the Committee to reconsider the recommendations by establishing a working group to address Recommendation 20. The Secretariat suggested that the working group on Document WHC-15/39.COM/11 regarding the Revision of the Operational Guidelines also take into account the issues related to the Rules of Procedure for consideration.

#### **ITEM 11 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

*Document: WHC-15/39.COM/11*

*Decision: 39 COM 11<sup>2</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Following the report of the Consultative Bodies and the Committee's debate, Decision **39 COM 5E** was adopted on 7 July (refer to summary records for 7 July, 9.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.).

<sup>2</sup> Following the report of the Consultative Bodies and the Committee's debate, Decision **39 COM 11** was adopted on 6 July (refer to summary records for 6 July, 5.00 p.m. to 7.00 p.m.).

The **Chairperson** proposed that a working group on Document WHC-15/39.COM/11 regarding the Revision of the Operational Guidelines be established. This group would be open to all State Parties, including non-members of the Committee, for the duration of the session and report back to the Committee at the end of the 39th session. The Advisory Bodies could also attend these working group meetings.

The Delegation of **Poland** proposed the candidature of Mr. Jad Tabet from Lebanon as Chairperson of the working group for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines.

La Délégation du **Qatar** soutient la proposition de la Délégation polonaise.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported Poland and Qatar in their suggestion for Mr. Tabet to chair the working group.

The **Chairperson** declared Mr. Tabet as the chairperson of the working group for the Revision of the Operational Guidelines.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite la présidente pour l'ouverture de la session et souhaite beaucoup de succès aux travaux. M. Jad Tabet remercie toutes les personnes qui l'ont proposé comme Président du groupe de travail sur la révision des Orientations. Il espère obtenir un bon résultat dans ce cadre.

#### **ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2014-2015 AND PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2016-2017**

*Document: WHC-15/39.COM/15*

Decision: **39 COM 15**<sup>3</sup>

The **Chairperson** introduced the item on the budget working group and invited the Committee members to propose a Chairperson for the working group.

The Delegation of **Philippines** proposed Ms. Anne Huhtamäki (Finland) as the Chairperson.

The Delegations of **Jamaica and Germany** supported the proposal.

The **Chairperson** appointed Ms. Anne Huhtamäki as chairperson of the working group. Ms. Anne Huhtamäki thanked the delegates for their support.

The **Secretariat** made practical announcements on the venue and timings for the working groups. The Secretariat stated that Operational Guidelines working group would work in both English and French whereas the budget working group would

---

<sup>3</sup> Following the report of the Consultative Bodies and the Committee's debate, Decision **39 COM 15** was adopted on 7 July (refer to summary records for 7 July, 9.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.).

only work in English. The Secretariat informed the room that the meetings would commence from the next day.

## **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-15/39.COM/5A

*Decisions:* **39 COM 5A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the report of the World Heritage Centre and its activities and explained the structure of the report. The Director stated that the first part of the report summarized the staff and budget of the Secretariat. The staff included 29 established posts, 21 from extra-budgetary resources and several State Parties have also seconded staff to the Secretariat. The Director further stated that the second part of the report summarized the activities on the basis of the six performance indicators established to achieve the goal of protecting properties on the World Heritage List. The Director underlined that the core role of the World Heritage Centre was to provide support to State Parties, which had been done in a timely manner. The Director indicated that the Secretariat had also organized an extraordinary session of the General Assembly in 2014.

Regarding Performance Indicator 2 on capacity-building, the Director shared that 64 properties had received support and more than 900 people had been trained by the capacity-building initiatives. The Director emphasized that the Advisory Bodies and Category 2 Centres were important in the implementation of capacity-building activities. Regarding Performance Indicator 3, the Director shared that 174 State Parties now have a Tentative List. The Director also said that the increasing number of nomination dossiers which had complied with the Operational Guidelines was encouraging. For Performance Indicator 4, the Director elaborated that activities had been undertaken on tourism, conflict, disasters and other issues in about 39 properties and that youth activities had also increased with about 700 young people mobilized. Regarding Performance Indicator 5, the Director shared that private sector, NGOs and youth participation was growing. On Performance Indicator 6, the Director noted that an increasing number of women and young persons have participated in the work of preserving World Heritage properties, many of which were related to UNESCO's Global Priority on Africa, where many new activities have been undertaken and 55% of international assistance requests were provided to African countries.

The Director also highlighted the growing cooperation with other Conventions to strengthen the synergies among the different Cultural Conventions. The Director noted that the synergies between the Second Protocol of the 1954 Convention and the 1972 Convention would be discussed under Item 11 on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines at the present session. The Director shared that the World

Heritage Convention was also working with UNEP to find synergies and that the representative from Ramsar would also make an intervention at the present session. The Director further shared that there were currently more than 100 sites that were designated as both World Heritage sites as well as Man and Biosphere Reserves. In addition, many sites had also been designated as Geoparks and as wetlands of global importance under the Ramsar Convention.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The Delegation of **Portugal** praised the work of the Secretariat despite the budget constraints and suggested that a meeting be arranged among representatives from the other Conventions to find further synergies because threats to the common heritage of humankind were increasing. The Delegation also commended the partners that the World Heritage Centre had attracted to raise the visibility of World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** welcomed the comprehensive report and congratulated the Secretariat for its work. The Delegation noted that UNESCO's Global Priorities on Gender Equality and Africa had been strictly observed. The Delegation shared that the inscription of the 1000th World Heritage site in Botswana, the fact that 55% of International Assistance requests were granted to States Parties in the Africa region, and the work of the African World Heritage Fund, showed that the Convention was implementing its priorities. The Delegation stated its hope that more assistance would be given to other priorities such as Small Island Developing States (SIDS).

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed the activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation indicated that financial constraints in the Secretariat were serious and expressed concern that 21 posts were now financed from extra-budgetary resources. The Delegation noted that posts financed by the regular programme budget had decreased substantially, and recalled a decision that had been taken in Phnom Penh not to decrease the number staff any further because of the increase in the workload of the Secretariat. The Delegation further stressed that the situation was unsustainable and called on Member States to increase the regular budget.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended the professionalism of the Secretariat. The Delegation indicated that the Centre had been restructured in 2014 and was now a division of the Culture Sector. The Delegation noted the budgetary constraints faced and the need to streamline personnel in this regard. The Delegation indicated that there was a dilemma between World Heritage being one of UNESCO's flagship programmes, associated with prestige and good functioning, and the need to make a serious balance between the tasks at hand and the budget constraints. The Delegation underlined that for the 40th session of the Committee, there was only one nomination dossier from Africa and two from the Arab region that conformed to the Operational Guidelines and highlighted the need for this imbalance to be addressed.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Secretariat for its work. The Secretariat noted that resources were decreasing but the Secretariat was coping well and that most of the tasks have been undertaken in an excellent manner.

The **Secretariat** stated in response to Germany and Turkey that the number of extra-budgetary posts was very large and this was not sustainable unless resources were mobilized year after year. The Secretariat indicated that there was a complete mismatch between workload and resources of the Centre. The Secretariat further stated that the Committee was aware of the financial constraints and the consequent need to prioritize. The Secretariat clarified that the budget had not been reduced and was retained at the same level, but the General Conference had decided that only 80% of the budget provided by UNESCO could be dedicated to staff and 20% to activities. The Secretariat also clarified that the Centre continued to benefit from the currently centralized functions of the Conventions Common Services and Emergency Preparedness units. Regarding Turkey's point on the imbalance in nominations coming from the Africa and Arab States region, the Secretariat elaborated that upstream support would continue to be rendered to States Parties in these regions. The Secretariat also stated that in some cases, States Parties neither accepted the offer of assistance that had been provided nor submitted drafts to the World Heritage Centre to review, and therefore without prior consultation, their nomination dossiers were deemed incomplete only at the final stage. The Secretariat stressed that the only way that the programme could be sustained in the long run was to either reduce the workload or to enhance the resources provided.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its appreciation for the World Heritage Centre's work and thanked the World Heritage Marine Programme for its support to the work of the Philippines in designating Tubbataha Reefs Natural Park as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area under International Maritime Organization regulations. The Delegation stressed that there should be an increase in nominations from underrepresented regions and requested for the Secretariat to provide an indication of timelines for the study underway to apply OUV in marine areas beyond national jurisdictions.

The Delegation of **Finland** commended the Secretariat for the excellent work done despite the reduced resources and expressed concerns at the present disconnect between the work that needed to be done and the financial situation. The Delegation requested for the Secretariat to provide a more comprehensive insight of the resources required, with a view of identifying where the biggest gaps were and to identify measures to address them. The Delegation suggested that a performance indicator related to the state of conservation of properties should be considered.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the Secretariat for complying with the performance indicators and called upon the Secretariat to give more priority to the World Heritage Volunteers Programme, which could be a way to engage communities in World Heritage processes.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l'Allemagne pour l'organisation du Comité et pour son hospitalité. Elle remercie l'Espagne pour la traduction en espagnol et souligne que le Comité devrait pouvoir utiliser les 6 langues officielles de l'Organisation des Nations Unies. Le délégué remercie le Secrétariat pour son rapport complet sur ses activités et le soutien apporté à la région de l'Amérique latine.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite la Présidente et se réjouit de la nomination de son représentant Jad Tabet en tant que Président du groupe de travail sur la révision des Orientations. Elle se félicite du rapport précis et concis du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle indique qu'en raison de la menace de destruction délibérée du patrimoine mondial, le rôle de l'UNESCO et du Centre du patrimoine mondial est plus important que jamais dans cette période de crise. Elle note que, en l'absence de ressources économiques, il est temps d'impliquer le secteur privé en respectant des règles d'éthique.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked the Secretariat for the extensive report and its dedication in implementing the World Heritage agenda. The Delegation welcomed the fact that nominations have become more complete but also expressed regret that many were still incomplete. The Delegation suggested that detailed information be provided about the mistakes most frequently made in the nomination dossiers so that State Parties could prevent them. The Delegation noted that many State Parties had problems with maps which tended to be an important issue in incomplete nominations. The Delegation stressed that better guidance for maps would decrease the issues related to maps which could lead to less nominations being deemed incomplete.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie l'Allemagne de son accueil à Bonn. Elle félicite le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour son rapport et remercie particulièrement le Centre pour son soutien dans le cadre du plan d'action de Saint-Louis et le plan de gestion de Gorée. Elle apprécie le soutien reçu pour la formation des responsables africains sur le tourisme durable. Elle souligne que le groupe de travail sur la synergie des différentes Conventions sur le patrimoine culturel est une excellente initiative. Elle encourage à renforcer les ressources humaines dans le secteur Afrique. Elle souligne que le continent a le plus grand nombre de sites sur la liste en péril et que les pays africains ont besoin d'un accompagnement plus important que les autres régions. Elle soutient la proposition du Liban sur la participation du secteur privé aux activités de protection du patrimoine.

The **Secretariat** indicated that the World Heritage Marine Programme undertook the High Seas work with extra-budgetary funds raised by the programme. The Secretariat shared that it was a legal study and the results would be presented in the following year. While private sector funds were being raised, it was also challenging. Regarding developing a performance indicator for State of Conservation, the Secretariat stated that this could be considered and potentially introduced at the General Assembly scheduled for November.

The **Secretariat** shared that the World Heritage Volunteers Programme had received more attention from the Secretariat, particularly in engaging youth. The Secretariat also shared that guidance had been provided relating to the common errors and mistakes for maps. The Secretariat indicated that Member States had the opportunity to send their draft nominations by 30 September for comments, but very few took advantage of this opportunity. The Secretariat also underlined that more staff would clearly be needed to implement World Heritage activities and that the mismatch would continue to grow due to the increasing number of inscriptions, which contributed to the additional workload. The Secretariat emphasized that this reality would need to be fully addressed by States Parties. The Secretariat indicated that the

regular programme budget would not increase given the current circumstances at UNESCO and stated that the situation would need to be addressed through extra-budgetary recourses. The Secretariat also stated that in-kind services should increase, in particular through secondments, or in other forms.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** indicated that the Culture Sector was currently under very serious financial and staff constraints but still managed to perform the core tasks of the Conventions, in particular through the new Convention Common Services unit. The Assistant Director-General stressed that the sector would need to mainstream its work across all the UNESCO Conventions and that in this regard, a meeting of the various Chairpersons of the UNESCO Culture Conventions had been organized at the present Committee session (29 June 2015). The Assistant Director-General highlighted that the Culture Sector's work was consistent with the Audit recommendations and that UNESCO would require a common approach to these issues as it would not be possible to continue with the strict divisions among the Conventions unless the workload was reduced.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Allemagne pour l'organisation de la session et pour son accueil à Bonn. Elle se félicite du rapport présenté par le Centre, et ce malgré les difficultés financières qui représente un vrai problème. Elle reconnaît que la demande internationale est forte et que la ressource est limitée. Elle indique que l'Algérie est engagée pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine africain et a augmenté ses ressources dans ce cadre. Elle exprime l'espoir que le Centre redouble d'efforts en matière de renforcement des capacités en Afrique.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stressed the importance of the matter and suggested including more recommendations for nominations in future working documents.

**IUCN** thanked the Secretariat for its constrictive work. IUCN expressed concern that the World Heritage Centre had lost all of its regular posts for natural heritage. IUCN noted that excellent work had been being done by the World Heritage Marine programme, but also recognized that this was financed by extra-budgetary resources. IUCN underlined that the current situation was not sustainable. IUCN requested for the Secretariat to clarify on how the conservation of natural sites would be sustained in the current situation, if no staff with expertise in natural heritage was available.

The **Secretary-General of the Ramsar Convention** stressed the constructive work done with the World Heritage Centre and emphasized the importance of working together with all the Conventions. The Secretary-General shared that a new project with the MAVA Foundation has started to achieve synergies between these Conventions.

The **Chairperson** said that under her leadership, she had the opportunity to observe how the Secretariat worked and congratulated the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the excellent work done by the Centre. The Chairperson also stressed that the mismatch between the workload and the budget was growing wider. The Chairperson stated that it would not be easy to find a solution and emphasized that this important issue was the responsibility of all State Parties. The Chairperson further indicated that there were many undiscovered treasures all around the world

that should be protected, but there was a crucial need to provide the financial support to do this work.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the Delegation of Germany had proposed an amendment to the report.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie la Présidente pour l'accueil et l'hospitalité de l'Allemagne dans la ville historique de Bonn. Elle félicite le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'excellent rapport produit sur la base d'indicateurs de performance et pour le travail fourni en dépit des difficultés financières du Centre du patrimoine mondial, qui reste néanmoins un centre de rayonnement. Elle rejoint la Délégation de l'Allemagne sur les problèmes de coupes budgétaires, qui sont sérieux. L'expertise du Centre reste très sollicitée au niveau international alors que ses moyens sont limités. Elle rappelle que l'Algérie travaille avec le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain et a mobilisé des ressources financières pour augmenter les capacités de travail de ce Fonds. Elle réitère ses félicitations au Centre du patrimoine mondial, tout en exprimant le souhait qu'il fasse davantage en matière de renforcement des capacités en collaboration avec le Fonds du patrimoine mondial africain. Les besoins pour la région Afrique restent en effet très importants en matière d'expertise.

The Delegation of **Turkey** suggested extending the mandate of the ad hoc working group to address the issue of the regional imbalance and recommend practical measures to be taken by the forthcoming meetings.

**IUCN** commended the excellent constructive work that was being undertaken together with the World Heritage Centre. IUCN expressed serious concern that there were currently no staff posts from the regular budget for natural heritage specialists. IUCN stated that while extra budgetary resources have been mobilised by the World Heritage Marine Programme and for some other projects, it also strongly recommended the rebuilding of nature conservation staff capacity from the regular budget in the next few years.

The representative of **RAMSAR** (Observer) commended the collaboration and synergies with the World Heritage Centre for multiple designated areas, both natural and cultural World Heritage sites. The representative elaborated on a new project funded by the MAVA foundation on finding cultural champions and highlighting the relations between wetlands and culture. RAMSAR expressed its hope to replicate the Outlook Review of IUCN.

The **Chairperson** expressed great appreciation to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Secretariat for their professionalism and support in sustaining the Convention's success. The Chairperson stated that the question of the budget and the mismatch between the workload and available resources had also come up in the work of the ad hoc working group, and noted that these would be further discussed by the working groups on the budget and Operational Guidelines in the days to come. The Chairperson acknowledged that there would be new and tougher challenges to face and that coming to a solution would not be easy. The Chairperson underlined that the objective of seeking constructive solutions did not just rely on Committee members, but all States Parties to the Convention as well.



The **Rapporteur** mentioned there was an amendment from Germany on the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that many comments had been made by previous speakers on the current financial situation. The Delegation proposed an amendment to the draft decision to appeal to the Governing Bodies for more resources during the General Conference in November 2015.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** explained that the next budget for the 38 C/5 would be reviewed in October 2015 and recommended that the appeal be made for the 39 C/5 instead, because there was not much room for increased budget in the present biennium.

The Delegations of **India, Senegal, Viet Nam and Turkey** endorsed the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Germany.

The Delegation of **India** also asked the Assistant Director-General for Culture if there was absolutely no room for an increased budget in the 38 C/5.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne qu'un report au 39 C/5 ne devrait être envisagé que lorsque tout aura été tenté dans le cadre du 38 C/5.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 5A** was adopted as amended.

## **5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES**

*Documents:* *WHC-15/39.COM/5B*

*Decision:* **39 COM 5B**

**ICOMOS** reaffirmed its commitment to give the best possible advice, as reflected in the report. ICOMOS recalled that there had been considerable progress and communication with States Parties in the evaluation process and many steps had been taken in coordination with IUCN to make the procedures more transparent and efficient. ICOMOS emphasized the need for more capacity-building, assistance with Tentative List dossiers and downstream assistance to States Parties for State of Conservation dossiers.

The Delegation of **Turkey** suggested allocating more time in forthcoming Committee sessions for the Advisory Bodies to give briefing sessions on the upstream process to interested States Parties on the sidelines of the Committee sessions. As these States parties would already be present at the Committee sessions, this would mean savings for poorer countries in need of technical assistance.

The Delegation of **India** referred to the difficult relationship with ICOMOS in the past and commended ICOMOS for the improved consultation and dialogue implemented during the past year.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite le Président de l'ICOMOS pour son rapport. Elle indique que, depuis quelques années, les rapports entre l'ICOMOS et le Comité étaient devenus difficiles. Les évolutions au sein de l'ICOMOS depuis 2014 sont donc positives. Elle fait cependant remarquer que le lien web vers les termes de référence du rapport de l'ICOMOS pour le patrimoine mondial de décembre 2014 ne fonctionne pas. La Délégation ajoute que certains pays ou régions sont sous-représentés ou ont des difficultés pour inscrire des sites, comme l'Afrique et les pays arabes, et qu'ils doivent donc avoir la priorité dans le processus en amont et les missions de conseil avec l'ICOMOS. Elle remarque qu'il y a eu un travail long effectué avec les Etats ayant soumis le dossier du site en série relatif aux Vikings, alors qu'il s'agit de pays ayant suffisamment de moyens et d'expertise. La Délégation souligne que le travail et l'argent de l'ICOMOS devraient aller plutôt aux régions ayant besoin d'aide, telle que l'Afrique et les Etats arabes.

The Delegation of **Philippines** thanked ICOMOS and suggested that the new measures for transparency measures be institutionalized in the Operational Guidelines and that this could be discussed further in the working groups.

The Delegation of **Croatia** welcomed the increased transparency and dialogue from ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Finland** remarked that there appeared to be greater focus on nomination dossiers while the need for state of conservation was much higher. The Delegation proposed to target the limited resources available towards conservation efforts in order to maintain the credibility of the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Mexique** estime que le travail en amont effectué par l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour la préparation de dossiers de propositions d'inscription a été très fructueux et souhaite qu'il se poursuive. Elle remercie l'ICOMOS pour son travail en faveur de la conservation du patrimoine culturel. Elle demande enfin à ce que ses interventions soient reflétées en français dans les compte-rendus et remercie l'Espagne d'avoir rendu possible l'interprétation en espagnol.

**ICOMOS** welcomed the positive comments from Committee members and reiterated its commitment towards encouraging more transparency. ICOMOS expressed its willingness to develop training and briefing sessions to enable more active collaboration on nomination dossiers and state of conservation reports that would be presented at the next Committee meetings.

The **Chairperson** commended ICOMOS for its work and the improvements made since the previous year.

**ICCROM** elaborated on their contributions to conservation in the field as presented in the report. ICCROM stated that six reactive monitoring missions and one advisory mission were carried out this year in three regions: Africa, Europe and Asia and the Pacific. ICCROM reiterated its commitment as the focal point for capacity-building activities within the framework of the Convention and thanked the Government of Switzerland for its continuous support during the last six years. ICCROM invited other

States Parties to cooperate with ICCROM to develop more capacity-building activities at regional levels.

ICCROM explained that there was a lot of attention devoted to States Parties that suffered from conflicts and natural disasters. ICCROM shared that these activities included partnering with UNESCO, the Government of Japan, the ICOMOS International Committee on Risk Preparedness and the International Committee on Archaeological Heritage Management (ICAHM). ICCROM stated that in this regard, several workshops had been organized. ICCROM thanked the Government of Japan for providing resources for the organization of the workshop on “Heritage and Resilience” that was organized at the 3rd World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction in Sendai, Japan. ICCROM further stated that in partnership with UNESCO Cairo, a training course had been organised for Libyan professionals dealing with first-aid and risk-preparedness for World Heritage. ICCROM also shared that it organised two workshops on first aid to cultural heritage in Syria along with UNESCO and the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage in Bahrain. ICCROM informed the Committee that along with the ICOMOS International Committee on Risk Preparedness, UNESCO and the Smithsonian Institute, it had gone to Nepal to carry out a first needs assessment mission and training on first aid to cultural heritage. ICCROM concluded by thanking the Government of Australia for its financial contribution to the preparation of the scoping study on the Policy guidelines document.

The Delegation of **Philippines** enquired on the development of the World Heritage capacity-building guidance documents and if such capacity-building measures could be offered via online courses.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their presentations and encouraged them to prioritize support to those most in need of expert advice. The Delegation thanked ICOMOS for inviting States Parties to a meeting at its headquarters and suggested that more of these meetings should be held in the future.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** acknowledged the significant role played by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation noted that less attention had been given to state of conservation, and also drew attention to the fact that there was at times a gap between Committee decisions and their implementation.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** apprécie le dialogue développé pour les propositions d’inscription mais souhaiterait que ce dialogue soit étendu à la gestion et à la conservation des sites. Cela signifie davantage de ressources, non seulement financières mais aussi en matière d’expertise.

The **Chairperson** suspended the morning debates in view of the Chairperson’s initiative for World Heritage in Conflict.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> The Bonn Declaration on World Heritage adopted by the World Heritage Committee on 29 June 2015 is at Annex 4.

**FIRST DAY – Monday, 29 June 2015**

**SECOND MEETING**

**3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany) and  
Her Excellency Ruchira Kamboj (India)**

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

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/5B

*Decision:* **39 COM 5B**

Given the time constraints, **ICCROM** sought the agreement of the Delegation of Philippines to discuss the suggestion of having capacity-building activities online during Document WHC-15/39.COM/6 on capacity-building.

**IUCN** related the good wishes from IUCN's new Director-General on IUCN's strong and continued commitment towards World Heritage and that she was looking forward to future discussions with the Committee and States Parties on their ideas for the future of the Convention and IUCN's role in it.

IUCN elaborated on the additional commitment that they were making for World Heritage. IUCN stated that following the evaluation of the IUCN World Heritage Programme that was presented to the Committee at its 38th session, IUCN had increased its funding commitment to World Heritage. IUCN elaborated that the increased funding has enabled IUCN to regionalize their conservation team and encouraged States Parties to take the opportunity to connect with the IUCN team during the present Committee session.

IUCN shared that they have secured welcome support from the MAVA Foundation, IUCN's longstanding partner for the IUCN World Heritage Outlook. IUCN underlined that the work had contributed to gathering better data and transparent access to information on which IUCN based their monitoring on. IUCN further shared that the 2014 assessment had concluded that 63 percent of sites currently have a good assessment and indicated that there was potential for World Heritage to give the leadership that it was supposed to for wider conservation efforts. IUCN also acknowledged that not all sites have a good outlook and this still presented some challenges for the Convention. IUCN said that the next World Heritage Outlook assessment would be made available in 2017.

IUCN noted that the new funding was not available to support additional statutory work requested by the Committee and that the financial constraints of UNESCO and the World Heritage Fund remained a serious concern for IUCN's work. IUCN acknowledged that these issues would be further discussed in the agenda item on the budget and during the budget working group.

IUCN shared that it held the World Parks Congress in Sydney in 2014, which was attended by over 6000 people from over 170 countries. IUCN indicated that the outcome document from the event, the Promise of Sydney, could be seen as a declaration for the next decade as it noted a number of issues that the Convention needed to address in order to restore its credibility. IUCN expressed its view that the Convention was a litmus test to determine if global conservation efforts were succeeding. IUCN stated that the outcomes from the World Park Congress would also be presented at a side event of the Committee on 2 July 2015.

IUCN expressed thanks to the Committee and States Parties for the strengthened dialogue achieved in the past year especially through the ad-hoc working group and a range of interactions through the upstream process. IUCN highlighted that the ad-hoc working group had been a vital platform for IUCN to work together with other stakeholders on solutions and focus on moving forward.

IUCN affirmed that IUCN and ICOMOS had undertaken a consistent approach on transparency and consultation, and would continue to implement changes that at the same time, respect the Advisory Bodies' independent role in the Convention, ensuring that all stakeholders share mutual respect for achievable outcomes.

IUCN expressed thanks to Germany, Norway, the Republic of Korea and Switzerland for their support for IUCN projects. IUCN recalled a proposal made by IUCN's Director-General at the 38th session to move to a two-year cycle for Committee meetings. IUCN noted that no other inter-governmental process that it worked with had such an intense rhythm of meetings and that the frequency of meetings reduced IUCN's ability to follow up with decisions on the ground. In closing, IUCN reiterated the need to use its limited resources to prioritize the support that was needed to dialogue with States Parties and for specific sites.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l'UICN et lui exprime sa reconnaissance pour l'utilité de « WH outlook » et les nouvelles opportunités qu'offre cet outil. Elle soutient la demande de l'IUCN estimant qu'il faut appuyer davantage le personnel pour lui permettre de mieux servir et répondre aux demandes. Elle souhaite que cette demande soit appuyée par les autres.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its appreciation for the good work done by the Advisory Bodies in enhancing the process of dialogue and consultation and acknowledged that the Indian delegation had been the beneficiaries of that process. The Delegation observed that an update was needed on the status of revision of the gap analyses especially by ICOMOS, which was overdue since the last one was prepared in 2014. The Delegation complimented IUCN for their work on gap analyses in the two areas of terrestrial and marine ecosystems which provided a broad framework for the inscription of new sites to address perceived gaps.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their comprehensive report and expressed appreciation for the ongoing dialogue, especially through the ad hoc working group. The Delegation noted the growing workload and financial constraints faced by IUCN. The Delegation also highlighted IUCN's publication on The Benefits of Natural World Heritage and invited all members to participate in the side event where the study would be presented. The Delegation expressed its view

that the discussion on World Heritage should not just revolve around threats and negative impacts, but also on the positive impact that World Heritage has brought to humankind.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its thanks to all three Advisory Bodies for their efforts in capacity-building and contributions to the upstream process. The Delegation welcomed the initiative from ICOMOS and IUCN in building good relationships through the Connecting Practices endeavour. The Delegation underlined that mixed properties and cultural landscapes were becoming more important in the discussion of heritage and would require greater harmonization in the evaluation process as the connection between nature and culture remained a key feature of the World Heritage Convention. The Delegation shared that it had already started to embed the practices of linking nature and culture in its national policies. The Delegation expressed interest to continue sharing such best practices to bring nature and culture closer together.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie les Organisations consultatives pour le travail remarquable effectué sur terrain. Elle pense qu'il y a encore des efforts à faire sur le processus en amont : de l'identification à la préparation de dossiers. Elle estime que l'accompagnement des Organisations consultatives doit être plus serré en termes de renforcement des capacités. Elle trouve que les problèmes en Afrique ne sont pas liés à la VUE mais à la méthodologie et que les organes consultatifs doivent travailler davantage sur cette méthodologie. Elle suggère un débat sur les Orientations pour que les Organisations consultatives changent leurs méthodes, sinon la plus part des pays africains qui n'ont pas de moyens pour répondre aux demandes seront condamnés. Elle propose de déconnecter de la catégorie gestion la VUE, qui est une catégorie à part entière.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed gratitude to IUCN and all Member States of the Convention and emphasized the need for continued sharing of knowledge on the management of protected areas. The Delegation indicated that financial constraints were faced not just in International Organizations, but by countries in South-Eastern Europe. The Delegation emphasized the need for greater regional cooperation on the protection of World Heritage sites, and cited their good relationship with the IUCN Office in Belgrade as an example. The Delegation commended IUCN's World Heritage Outlook as a great tool to help each site improve their performance management. The Delegation also expressed thanks to Germany for organizing the workshop highlighting the benefits of natural World Heritage sites, which had greatly helped the management of sites in Croatia. The Delegation of Croatia expressed the view that even for cultural sites, IUCN also has a role to play in highlighting how well the ecosystem was managed.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** reconnaît les apports significatifs de l'UICN et salue ses efforts pour renforcer la coordination, pour une concertation raisonnée entre les Organisations consultatives elles-mêmes avec les Etats parties. Elle remercie les Organisations consultatives pour leur disponibilité et collaboration pour une meilleure prise en charge du patrimoine. Elle compte sur le groupe de travail qui sera mis en place pour aplanir les difficultés.

**IUCN** thanked the States Parties for their observations on gap studies and the publication on The Benefits of Natural World Heritage Sites, which would be addressed in other parts of the Committee agenda. IUCN also related their appreciation for the positive feedback received on the IUCN World Heritage Outlook. IUCN emphasized that this system was not just intended to measure progress towards good outcomes on a regular basis but also a tool that all constituents could engage in and catalyze action to make World Heritage more relevant.

IUCN responded to the earlier point raised by the Delegation of Senegal on sites in Africa and the approaches undertaken. IUCN agreed that the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger were the most urgent priority for the Convention, with only five nominations for Africa received for the Committee session in 2016 and only one that passed the completeness check. IUCN affirmed that more needed to be done to ensure a steady intake of nominations that did justice to the objectives of having a balanced and representative World Heritage List.

IUCN supported the idea from the Delegation of Turkey to combine the annual Committee meeting with more capacity-building activities. While the Advisory Bodies already had a space for side events, it would be possible to plan for a richer range of side events and training activities. IUCN indicated that it would be a good opportunity for IUCN to have a space in Paris, just like ICOMOS. With its proximity to UNESCO and availability of a meeting room, such a space would be a convenient platform for States Parties to meet with Advisory Bodies. IUCN also affirmed its commitment to provide continued dialogue and accessibility of their work to States Parties in strengthening the Convention.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 5B** was adopted.

## **5C. FOLLOW-UP TO THE DIRECTOR GENERAL'S INITIATIVE "THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION: THINKING AHEAD"**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/5C

*Decision:* **39 COM 5C**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that the elaboration of the present document would be brief. The document's themes – Tentative Lists, nominations, State of Conservation, working methods of the Advisory Bodies, Committee and Secretariat as well as budgetary matters – were linked to other working documents and would hence would be discussed further along in the Committee's agenda: Recommendations of the Evaluation of the Global Strategy (Document WHC-15/39.COM/5E), Progress report on the Upstream Processes (Document WHC-15/39.COM/9A0, the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines* (Document WHC-15/39.COM/11) and Report of the ad hoc working group (Document WHC-15/39.COM/13A).

The Delegation of the **Republic of Philippines** delivered their statement on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The Delegation thanked the Director-General for her support for the "Thinking Ahead" initiative and stated that the Group of 77 and China

attached great importance to the Convention as culture was a driver of sustainable development and contributed to poverty alleviation and growth. The Delegation expressed support for the inclusion of a specific target to safeguard culture and natural heritage in the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The Delegation expressed deep concern over the recent attacks on cultural heritage and applauded the Unite4Heritage initiative launched by the Director-General. The Delegation also expressed solidarity with the people of Nepal in the aftermath of the recent earthquake and acknowledged the loss of human life as well as the destruction to cultural heritage. The Delegation underlined that it was incumbent on the World Heritage Committee and the international community to do all it could to protect sites, as natural disasters become more frequent due to climate change. The Delegation expressed the view that the participation of Least Developed Countries in the Convention's processes should be improved. The Delegation welcomed the changes adopted by the Advisory Bodies in the evaluation processes with a view to enhance communication, dialogue, inclusiveness and transparency. The Delegation reiterated the importance of achieving a balanced, credible and representative World Heritage List in line with the Global Strategy with key tools that have been introduced such as the upstream process. The Delegation stated that the new electoral process recently adopted at the 1st Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly of States Parties had paved the way for further progress in this regard. The Delegation also expressed concerns over the financial status of the World Heritage Fund and stated that in the spirit of universality, there should be no mandatory fees for the submission of new nominations as that would further perpetuate the imbalance.

The Delegation of **Poland** recalled that the "Thinking Ahead" initiative was established back in 2012 during the 40th anniversary of the Convention and stated that the initiative had made good progress. The Delegation expressed its gratitude to the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for their professionalism and commitment to implementing change. The Delegation highlighted that the future of the Convention should also take into account the concept of Outstanding Universal Value and the approach to protecting properties in this regard. The Delegation noted that the World Heritage List internationalized properties and the issues of their protection, but the Delegation also pointed out that politics were a natural part of this equation and voiced concern on the increased lobbying present in the Committee. The Delegation emphasized moderation as the forceful nature of lobbying could deflect attention from important issues, like the conservation and protection of properties.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked the Director-General for the "Thinking Ahead" initiative and welcomed the initiatives taken by ICOMOS and IUCN to enhance transparency, dialogue and diversity in the evaluation process. The Delegation expressed hope that reform would be consolidated with the outcomes of the ad hoc working group and formalized in amendments to the Operational Guidelines. The Delegation endorsed the need to strengthen financial resources especially for emergency measures especially to protect heritage that has affected by conflict and natural disasters. The Delegation shared that it had provided USD 1.5 million to UNESCO for the protection of Iraqi cultural heritage, which included capacity-building and satellite monitoring, as well as financial resources to Nepal through the World Heritage Centre for the rehabilitation of the Kathmandu Valley. The Delegation stressed the importance of establishing common efforts towards a more



representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. The Delegation also expressed the view that the upstream process needed to be further strengthened to increase nominations from underrepresented regions.

The Delegation of **Finland** stressed the need to safeguard the high quality of the World Heritage List and focus on conservation efforts. The Delegation commended the “Thinking Ahead” initiative to address existing challenges and emphasized its continued commitment to actively participate in this process. The Delegation noted that the issues in the “Thinking Ahead” document would be addressed in other items of the Committee’s agenda and agreed with the proposal to discuss the “Thinking Ahead” process in a thematic manner.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended the progress of the “Thinking Ahead” process thus far, but remarked that there was room for more result-oriented and visionary steps. The Delegation stressed that the World Heritage Committee’s report to the General Conference should not just be restricted to modest measures that dealt with existing problems but rather, with increasing challenges and risks, focused more operationally about real solutions. The Delegation suggested establishing a panel of eminent persons to develop action-oriented and innovative ideas for the General Conference to consider.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** welcomed the new initiatives to improve the current system. The Delegation drew States Parties’ attention to the upstream process, and highlighted that thorough identification of potential sites was essential to ensure their sound protection and management. The Delegation emphasized that the upstream process was instrumental as it increased States Parties’ success of having a nomination inscribed on the List. The Delegation elaborated on the contributions of the Korean Funds-in-Trust in the Asia and the Pacific region, such as to the Maldives for the nomination dossier of the Coral Stone Mosques and to the Philippines for the Batanes protected landscapes and seascapes. The Delegation acknowledged the benefits of the upstream process for all stakeholders and expressed its commitment and support to make the upstream process a regular instrument to be employed within the Convention.

The Delegation of **Portugal** praised the “Thinking Ahead” initiative for enhancing the worldwide credibility of the Convention. The Delegation reiterated the importance of establishing strong Tentative Lists in order to promote a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List and said that for Portugal, a screening process for potential sites had been undertaken with the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation highlighted the importance of further developing the World Heritage capacity-building strategy at the national and regional levels. The Delegation also stressed that raising public awareness of the Convention was also crucial, especially with over 1000 sites on the World Heritage List, more sites coming under threat and other emerging challenges. The Delegation of Portugal also stated that while reforms were possible, more resources would also be required in tandem as the current status quo was not sustainable.

The Delegation of **Serbia** acknowledged that dialogue and transparency were strengthened due to the “Thinking Ahead” process and supported reflecting these reforms in the Operational Guidelines to ensure that dialogue was institutionalized.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande au Comité de prendre les mesures nécessaires pour que les élections se passent dans les meilleures conditions. Elle estime qu'une séance d'information pour les Etats parties avant la tenue de l'Assemblée générale sera nécessaire.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie la Directrice Générale et estime que les réflexions sur l'avenir de la Convention ont marqué un temps d'arrêt pour faire un bilan. Elle se demande si le processus ne va pas reconnaître la nécessité de renforcer et consolider la Convention. Elle estime qu'il faudrait peut-être une autre Convention sous forme de protocole et qu'il faudrait qu'un débat soit engagé sur cette question. Elle mentionne que les Orientations sont modifiées tous les 4 ans. Elle pense que certaines dispositions des Orientations doivent être incluses dans la Convention.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** commended the dialogue that had taken place between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties to enhance the evaluation process of nominations. The Delegation was of the view that the results of the ad hoc working group should be reflected in the proposed modifications to the Operational Guidelines. However, the Delegation also recognized that the five days given to the Operational Guidelines working group was very limited and that changes may not be possible within that timeframe. The Delegation therefore suggested introducing a process that could continue discussion on the amendments to the Operational Guidelines after the conclusion of the Committee session.

The **representative from civil society** (Observer) indicated that she was speaking on behalf of civil society organizations who attended the UNESCO World Heritage and the Role of Civil Societies conference hosted by the World Heritage Watch. The representative emphasized the commitment of civil society organizations to the Convention and to safeguard the world's cultural and natural heritage. The represented stated that civil society to protect these properties on a daily basis, raised money for individual sites as well as provided support to Governments in fulfilling their role under the Convention. The representative expressed hope that the Committee would give civil society a role in the process of the Convention in a spirit of open dialogue and cooperation. The representative called upon the Committee to recognize the contributions of civil society to the Convention and welcomed the initiative to hold a civil society conference prior to the annual Committee meeting. The representative also urged the Committee to consider measures to strengthen civil society participation in the implantation of the Convention for consideration at the 40th session of the Committee in 2016 and indicated that the civil society representatives were ready to present their proposals to the Committee should they be invited to do so.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the room that the Secretariat would follow up with the suggestions made, particularly the specific suggestion from Finland to address the issues arising from the "Thinking Ahead" initiative thematically. The Director of the World Heritage Centre further explained that the draft decision for this item did not include a provision for the Secretariat to report back to the Committee on this matter as the intention was to report the outcomes under specific themes for future sessions.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged that the “Thinking Ahead” initiative established by the Director-General was an important one that gave the Committee the impetus to deal with existing challenges and to produce results, in connection with other initiatives already undertaken. The Chairperson also indicated that this was the first time that representatives from civil society have shared their views at this Committee session and that these important exchanges were what gave life to World Heritage. The Chairperson expressed gratitude to civil society for their commitment to protect World Heritage.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 5C** was adopted.

**ITEM 13A WORKING METHODS OF THE EVALUATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF NOMINATION: REPORT OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/13A

*Decision:* **39 COM 13A**<sup>5</sup>

The **Chairperson** recalled Decision **38 COM 13** at its 38th session (Doha, 2014) where the World Heritage Committee established an ad-hoc working group composed of, in principle, two members from each regional group, to meet inter-sessionally to examine the issues related to the working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination and to formulate its recommendations.

The Chairperson further recalled that the working group comprised representatives from the following Member States – Algeria, Finland, Germany, India, Jamaica, Japan, Lebanon, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Senegal, Serbia and Tanzania – as well as representatives from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The ad-hoc working group met three times during the year, with the respective sub-groups for “Advisory Bodies”, “World Heritage Committee” and “Finance” having additional meetings throughout the year as well.

The Chairperson underlined that the ad-hoc working group was committed to meeting the goals of the Convention in protecting World Heritage sites, especially in light of how nominations have become more complex and also with the politicization of the Committee. The Chairperson emphasized that the criteria for inscription and Outstanding Universal Value had to be clear as World Heritage referred heritage of humankind and not just one country alone.

The Chairperson gave an overview of the recommendations from the ad-hoc working group, summarized in seven main points:

1. Dialogue with States Parties should take place as soon as possible.

---

<sup>5</sup> Following the report of the Consultative Bodies and the Committee’s debate, Decision **39 COM 13A** was adopted on 7 July (refer to summary records for 7 July, 9.30 a.m. to 11.30 a.m.).

2. Evaluation reports of the Advisory Bodies should be communicated to the States Parties and relevant experts in the Committee as soon as they are available. The Chairperson noted that this had already been followed up on.
3. For the names of all involved experts and panel members, along with the organizations they represented and their qualifications, to be published. Their terms of office should also be limited. The Chairperson recognized that positive exchanges with the States Parties have taken place.
4. Institutions like UNESCO chairs and universities should also be involved in the evaluation process, and this process should be made more transparent as well.
5. For the cost of each assessment to be clearly shown.
6. To ensure that the evaluation of nominations be freely open to Committee members for their consideration so as to avoid jeopardizing sites and proposals.
7. Finally, the unresolved question of funding had to be addressed. With the growing number of nominations, the outlay for assessment and monitoring was growing and fair solutions needed to be reached. These matters would be further discussed in the budget working group.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** thanked the Chairperson for her able leadership and emphasized that the recommendations were important to strengthen the credibility of the Committee and Advisory Bodies. The Delegation welcomed the responsiveness of IUCN and ICOMOS to welcome dialogue, while respecting the independence of the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation emphasized that it would be important to formalize amendments to the Operational Guidelines and translate the recommendations into concrete steps. The Delegation was of the view that recommendations that did not relate directly to the Operational Guidelines could be taken up through the Rules of Procedure or a general draft Decision by the Committee and that matters related to finance and placing a possible cap on nominations could be discussed jointly by both working groups. The Delegation also indicated that if no further agreement on the issues could be reached at the present Committee session, another working group could be convened inter-sessionally to discuss these issues.

The Delegation of **Finland** acknowledged the severe imbalance between workload and resources. The Delegation underlined the need for flexibility and an open mind for the budget working group to achieve progress at the present Committee session, and encouraged constructive contributions by States Parties to this process.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed the view that more transparency in the designation of experts was needed. The Delegation shared that it had made a voluntary commitment not to submit any new nominations to the Committee during their term as Committee members and expressed hope that other States Parties would follow the same good practice too. The Delegation stressed that further efforts were needed to balance financial resources and emphasized the need for more voluntary contributions as well as to come up with new and innovative ways to increase resources. The Delegation stated that States Parties had a sovereign right to present a nomination and that this right should neither be curtailed, nor should it depend on their ability to pay. The Portugal underlined that all this had to take place on a voluntary basis to explore ways that would be acceptable to all.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Chairperson and concurred with the proposal for the issues to be remitted to the two working groups established. The Delegation acknowledged the clear consensus on the need for enhanced transparency and dialogue and expressed the view that this should be reflected in the Operational Guidelines. The Delegation also recognized that there were some issues with perhaps less consensus, such as the reduction in the number of nominations, for States Parties to exercise self-restraint in putting up new nominations during their mandate as Committee members and finance matters, which may take more time to resolve.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed gratitude for the reflection process which brought hope for the future of the Convention. The Delegation expressed support for the proposals advanced by the Delegations of Philippines and Portugal to move forward on recommendations that have already received broad consensus from all members. The Delegation stated that for issues like the cap on the number of nominations and States Parties refraining from putting up new nominations during their mandate as Committee members, these would require further discussion and could be taken up in the working group with all interested States Parties.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** underlined that the outcomes of the working group would improve working methods, decision making and bring greater clarity to the process. The Delegation acknowledged the outstanding financial issues and proposed the possibility of extending the mandate of the sub-group on “Finance” to further deliberate these issues. The Delegation also emphasized that any decisions made should not compromise the spirit of the Convention to achieve a balanced, credible and representative World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Japan** Delegation expressed the view that the proposal to lower the cap on nominations from 45 to 25 or 30 would have to be carefully examined together with its cost effectiveness. The Delegation recognized that the upstream and preparation process for new nominations was just as important as conservation activities and that it was critical to improve the geographic distribution of the List. The Delegation said that they were open to the idea of introducing new funding mechanisms, such as encouraging States Parties who could afford to do so to contribute more.

La Délégation de **la Colombie** estime que les propositions sur les méthodes et les décisions du Groupe de travail sur les *Orientations* et le financement, concernant les nominations, doivent être prises lors de débats prolongés et participatifs, étant donné qu’un groupe réussi est un groupe qui aboutit à un consensus. De la même manière, la Colombie estime que les Etats Parties ne peuvent pas prendre part à toutes les discussions des deux différents groupes de travail. Néanmoins, la Colombie croit fermement à la proposition de l’abstention de vote pour les Etats Parties membres du Comité concernant leurs propres nominations présentées au Comité durant leur mandat, ce principe étant fondamental.

The Delegation of **Croatia** joined the previous speakers in commending the work of the Chairperson of the ad hoc working group and agreed that the recommendations should be adopted and other outstanding matters should be further discussed and presented at the next Committee Session. The Delegation considered that this was a

very crucial turning point of the Convention and that it would reshape it into a more modern, efficient and inclusive Convention.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that several years ago, before UNESCO started facing financial constraints, there had been a working group convened to discuss the number of nominations to be discussed each year. The Delegation explained that at that juncture, the intention of placing a limit to the number of nominations was not for financial reasons but to reduce disequilibrium in the geographic and thematic representations of nominations and sites inscribed on the List. The Delegation encouraged the Committee to continue with constructive discussions on financial issues.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the Chairperson on the adoption of the Bonn Declaration earlier in the morning. The Delegation expressed support for the work of the ad hoc working group, which was useful in terms of enhancing transparency, dialogue in the evaluation process. The Delegation agreed with previous speakers that there were still various issues that required further discussion.

**IUCN** reminded the room of the additional information documents that had been appended to the working document that should also be taken into consideration.

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its gratitude for the work of the ad hoc working group and expressed its agreement with the working group's suggestion that members of the Committee should refrain from putting forth new nominations during their term as Committee members. The Delegation expressed the view that since many cultural properties were attacked for political reasons, multinational or pluri-national nominations could be a helpful tool to prevent such attacks. In this regard, the Delegation considered that pluri-national nominations should still be able to be submitted even if one of the States Parties involved was a Committee member.

La Délégation de **l'Argentine** remercie la Présidente et l'Allemagne pour l'organisation du Comité et souligne la beauté du bâtiment, qui symbolise la transparence du Comité. L'Argentine est d'accord sur le fait que les Etats parties, membres du Comité, doivent s'abstenir pendant leur mandat. Elle souligne que le Comité se trouve devant un moment crucial et doit lutter contre la destruction intentionnelle du patrimoine. Elle souligne également l'importance des propositions d'inscription transfrontalières qui renforcent la coopération et le dialogue entre les Etats Parties, comme ce fut le cas en Amérique Latine ou en Europe.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee members for their support and stated that the discussion on these matters would continue throughout the Committee session. The Chairperson announced that the Vice-Chairperson would continue chairing the Committee Session after the closure of the present item.

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

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/5D

*Decision:* **39 COM 5D**

The **Secretariat** presented the report which also contained a draft policy document that proposed to integrate a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention. The Secretariat recalled that this had been requested by the Committee in its Decision **36 COM 5C**. The Secretariat stressed that the draft policy did not include any new concepts or proposals which had not already been agreed upon by the member states of the UN and UNESCO. The Secretariat elaborated that the aim of the draft policy was to strengthen policy coherence between the World Heritage Convention, UNESCO cultural Conventions, other policy frameworks and multilateral environmental agreements. The Secretariat further elaborated that the draft policy was also aimed to ensure that the conservation and management of World Heritage would be sensitive to sustainable development.

The Secretariat highlighted that although the protection of World Heritage Sites already implied a contribution to sustainable development, sustainable development was larger than World Heritage and that there would be greater potential to contribute to sustainable development when the focus was greater than just the protection of OUV. The Secretariat underlined that it was also important to ensure that the conservation and management of World Heritage sites did not conflict with the sustainable development agenda.

**ICCROM** highlighted that the draft policy would also be substance to the principles expressed in the fifth “C” for communities, the strategic objective adopted by the Committee in 2007. ICCROM underlined the value of the assessment of benefits associated with World Heritage sites which had been presented in a study finalised in 2014 by IUCN, and that was also supported by the German Federal Agency of Nature Conservation (BfN). ICCROM noted that the study emphasised that the protection of World Heritage could ensure continuous provision of benefits to sites such as water access or employment opportunities.

ICCROM reiterated that the Advisory Bodies welcomed the draft policy on sustainable development and expressed its appreciation for the support of Germany and Viet Nam in this regard. ICCROM supported the Draft Decision and suggested that the precision of the document should be further developed. ICCROM also stated that the Advisory Bodies would be pleased to continue to contribute to the development of the document.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Columbia, Finland and the Philippines.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed to the draft decision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son hésitation quant au fait d'imposer des interdictions trop strictes pour ce qui concerne l'exploitation d'un site du patrimoine, ce qui pourrait faire obstacle au développement économique de certains pays.

The Delegation of **India** concurred with the amendments proposed by the Delegations of the Philippines, Finland and Columbia. In addition, the Delegation endorsed the policy document as well as proposed that specific changes to the *Operational Guidelines* and capacity-building initiatives be undertaken.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** informed the Committee that it had sponsored the inaugural workshop on the issues under discussion. The Delegation underlined the importance of the link between culture and sustainable development. The Delegation expressed its hope that the outcomes of the workshop would be taken into account as a basis for changes in the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed appreciation for the effort made in developing the draft policy on sustainable development but considered that it was necessary to further consult with States Parties before the document was officially submitted to the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the draft policy, particularly the inclusion of a human rights perspective and a peace and security dimension. However, the Delegation considered that in some areas, the policy went beyond the original purpose of the Convention, which was the conservation of the World Heritage sites. Therefore, the Delegation suggested that sustainable development principles should be integrated into the future Policy Guidelines. The Delegation indicated that more guidance should be rendered to States Parties on important issues for World Heritage sites, such as sustainable tourism. The Delegation considered that given financial constraints, the Secretariat should not be overloaded with requests to develop proposals for capacity-building activities. Finally, the Delegation noted with satisfaction the references to sustainable development made in the declaration that resulted from the Youth Forum.

The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the draft policy and agreed with the amendments put forward by Finland and previous speakers. The Delegation commented on paragraph 14 and highlighted that the global study on benefits of sustainable development should be referred to in a footnote of the policy and used to guide implementation. The Delegation also stressed the importance of the reference to the "no-go" commitment, as mentioned in footnote 18 of the policy document, as this stemmed from previous decisions by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the endeavour to integrate sustainable development into the World Heritage Convention. However, the Delegation acknowledged the difficulties in doing so considering different levels of development and the great variety of World Heritage sites. Therefore, the Delegation supported the amendments made by the Delegation of the Philippines, which would enable States Parties to further study and comment on the document.



The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked the Secretariat for the comprehensive report and fully supported the policy document. The Delegation shared that it has been a member of two United Nations working groups and expressed its disappointment that culture had not been fully integrated into the Post-2015 Development goals. The Delegation noted that there were only two meetings remaining before the development goals would be adopted in September 2015 and expressed its wish for more discussion on this matter, and also in relation to food security and comparable issues. The Delegation underlined that there were great opportunities for sustainable development policies to contribute to job creation and economic growth, especially for the less wealthy part of the local population. The Delegation noted that adopting a human rights based approach to heritage would also have the potential to contribute to peace and reconciliation.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited Observers to take the floor.

The representative of **The Zoological Society of London** and **The Wildlife Conservation Society** (Observer) expressed support for the Draft Policy, especially paragraph 6, which requested for the World Heritage Centre to revise, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, the policy documents in order to incorporate the views expressed at the 39th session of the Committee. The representative announced that the two NGO statements would be made available outside the plenary hall after the session. The representative also suggested that footnote 18, which was related to paragraph 23 on adverse impacts on World Heritage properties through extractive industries, should be elevated to the main text of the policy. The representative expressed the belief that the respect of the “no-go” commitment was a fundamental requirement for sustainable development and the protection of OUV.

The representative of the **UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues** (Observer) recalled its recommendations and participation in past Committee sessions and welcomed the new draft policy as it fully recognised that the consideration of the rights of indigenous people was at the heart of sustainable development. However, the representative also insisted that such principles be integrated into more specific operational procedures and to consider if these obligations for States Parties should be made binding. The representative stressed the primacy of the rights of indigenous peoples with respect to other stakeholders, and stood ready to assist the Secretariat in further developing this perspective.

La Délégation du **Mali** (observateur) affirme que le développement devrait être considéré comme une opportunité pour mieux conserver les sites. La délégation estime que, si autant de sites dans les pays en développement sont inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, c'est précisément à cause d'un manque d'investissements pour le développement économique.

The **Secretariat** suggested that for the amendment proposed by Finland on paragraph 9, reference should be made specifically to the policy document being examined by the Committee, which should have been translated into actual procedures through changes in the Operational Guidelines. The Secretariat also reassured the room that the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues had indeed been involved in drafting the document.

The **Vice-Chairperson** continued with the adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1-8 of the Draft Decision **39 COM 5D** were adopted as amended.

The **Secretariat** proposed to use the term “policy document” instead of “Policy Guidelines”.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the suggestion by the Secretariat.

Paragraph 9 and 10 of the Draft Decision **39 COM 5D** were adopted as amended.

Paragraph 11-13 of the Draft Decision **39 COM 5D** were adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 5D** was adopted as amended.

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

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/6

*Decision:* **39 COM 6**

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy and Progress Report on the World Heritage-Related Category 2 Centres.

**ICCROM** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to report on the World Heritage capacity-building strategy that was approved by the Committee in 2011 and generously funded by the government of Switzerland. ICCROM recalled that since the last Committee session, work has continued on the translation of key capacity-building documents and resources into other languages. ICCROM reported that it was currently in the process of finalising a manual on managing natural sites in Russian. ICCROM also shared that printed versions of manuals on Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) were now also available in multiple languages and that the World Heritage capacity-building newsletter 5 would also be available soon.

ICCROM reported that there have been a variety of training activities carried out by ICCROM and its partners. ICCROM stated that a HIA course has been held in China and that IUCN had also supported ICCROM with expertise on EIA and strategic environmental assessment. ICCROM shared that IUCN and ICCROM were collaborating on developing capacity-building courses on the linkages between culture and nature, which would hopefully be carried out in 2016. ICCROM also shared that the preparation of a policy guidance document was in development and was expected to be finalised by the end of the year. In response to the question from the Delegation of the Philippines, ICCROM stated that it was also working on the enhancement of online resources. ICCROM expressed its gratitude to the Delegation

of Switzerland for their generous funding which has allowed these endeavours to move forward.

ICCROM also reported that ICCROM and IUCN were in dialogue with Nordic countries about potential future funding especially regarding the interlinkages between nature and culture. At the regional level, ICCROM highlighted the importance of the work of the World Heritage Centre and the Category 2 Centres as well as the good synergies between the Advisory Bodies, the Category 2 Centres and other organisations. ICCROM concluded that it was unfortunate that in the course of the past year, it was not possible to hold a joint Category 2 Centre meeting as it had been done in past years in Oslo and Shanghai.

The Delegation of **Finland** stated that all Category 2 Centres were important for effective capacity-building work to be carried out and noted the intention of the Delegation of Norway to establish a new Category 2 Centre. The Delegation elaborated that the overall aim was to improve the overall capacity for cultural and natural heritage through an integrated and holistic approach and that the content would be developed in close cooperation with IUCN and ICCROM and other Nordic countries.

The Delegation of **India** commended the efforts of the States Parties and Advisory Bodies regarding the Category 2 Centres and expressed its gratitude to the Executive Board for approving the establishment of a new Category 2 Centre in India.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** souligne l'importance des centres de catégorie 2 pour les formations, les renforcements des capacités, les manuels pour les professionnels du patrimoine. Elle souligne l'importance et la participation des Organisations consultatives pour renforcer les experts et améliorer les formations des experts de toutes les régions. Elle souligne l'importance pour les pays lusophones d'Amérique latine et d'Afrique.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that apart from a precision on paragraph 2, no other amendments to the draft Decision had been received.

Draft Decision **39 COM 6** was adopted as amended.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 pm.*

**SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 30 June 2015**

**THIRD MEETING**

**9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

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

*Document:* WHC-15/39.COM/7

*Decision:* **39 COM 7**

The **Chairperson** opened Item 7 of the Agenda, related to general trends on threats affecting the state of conservation of World Heritage properties and stressed the critical importance of the monitoring process in the framework of the World Heritage Convention.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the report on threats affecting the state of conservation (SOC) of World Heritage properties. The Director noted that over the next three days, the Committee would examine around 140 reports, out of which only some would be open for discussion according to the established procedures. The Director explained that following the review of some of the most recurrent threats affecting World Heritage properties, a new format for the presentation of state of conservation reports by the States Parties had been developed in order to ensure consistency and facilitate the work of the Secretariat in analyzing and compiling the threats for examination by the Committee. Lastly, the Director informed the Committee that over 80 State of Conservation reports submitted had been uploaded online, following the consent of the concerned States Parties.

The Delegation of **Poland** emphasized the importance of the monitoring process for sites of exceptional value, of which the highest professional standards and a coherent approach was required. The Delegation therefore proposed leaving Item 7 open until the review of the State of Conservation of the properties on the Danger List was complete.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the report of the Secretariat. The Delegation expressed deep concerns regarding the inadequacy of management systems at many World Heritage properties, as shown in the report, and underscored the importance of encouraging that the *Operational Guidelines* were respected. The Delegation noted the disproportionate number of African properties on the World Heritage List in Danger. The Delegation also cautioned against recurring proposals for boundary modifications, which consequently needed to be examined with utmost care. The Delegation called on all States Parties to submit reports by the established deadlines. Finally, the Delegation stressed the importance of addressing threats systematically and in cooperation with non-governmental organisations.

The Delegation of **Turkey** reiterated the importance of the Convention in the face of current emergency situations, notably in the Middle East, and requested that the draft decision be amended to reflect the terminology of Security Council Resolution 2199.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** welcomed the progress achieved in compiling information on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, notably the establishment of a comprehensive online database, the public dissemination of many reports which proved extremely useful and the new proposed format for the State Party reports. The Delegation suggested that the guidance from ICOMOS on impact assessment be further enriched by including reference to community benefits.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** welcomed the suggestion from the Delegation of Poland to keep Item 7 open until the discussion of properties inscribed on the Danger List had concluded. The Director noted the amendment proposed by Turkey and stated that it could be examined at the moment when the draft decision would be reviewed.

**ICOMOS**, speaking also on behalf of ICCROM, underscored the need for a more nuanced approach to conservation, particularly in urban areas, in the face of increasing complex of conservation issues. ICOMOS also noted that sustaining social and economic development was essential to maintaining the value of World Heritage properties. ICOMOS further expressed its wish that heritage impact assessments be used for decision-making at the site level, and not only for informing decisions by the Committee. The Delegation also welcomed the suggestion by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea to include considerations about local communities in heritage impact assessments, including the benefits that World Heritage properties could bring to them.

**IUCN** underscored the importance of addressing the issue of alien species, which had affected 62 properties this year. IUCN also highlighted that climate change was reported as having a negative impact on as many as 35 properties. IUCN consequently stressed the need for adaptation measures at site level, noting the importance of the Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention, to be held in December 2015 in Paris as an opportunity to mobilise action on the ground. IUCN also mentioned the ongoing dialogue it was having with the Olympic Committee to ensure that the Winter Olympic Games foreseen in 2022 would not have an adverse impact on any World Heritage properties.

The **Chairperson** announced that Item 7 would remain open and requested for the Secretariat to proceed with Item 7A on the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage List in Danger.

## 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-15/39.COM/7A  
WHC-15/39.COM/7A.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.7 Rev

*Decisions:* **38 COM 7A.1 to 39 COM 7A.48**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the item and noted that many state of conservation reports had been submitted by the concerned States Parties after the established deadline of 1 February, which was the reason why an addendum had to be submitted by the Secretariat to the Committee. The Director also explained the order of the presentation of the reports. The Director stated that three additional reports would be examined, on top of the 21 originally foreseen, as well as a general decision regarding the World Heritage properties of Syria.

## NATURAL PROPERTIES

### AFRICA

#### **Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475) - 39 COM 7A.1**

Le **Secrétariat** explique que ce rapport est ouvert pour discussion en raison de la situation politique et sécuritaire difficile en République Centrafricaine, mais aussi afin de tenir compte du Forum sur la paix et la réconciliation nationale organisé en mai 2015 à Bangui. La mise en œuvre des recommandations de ce Forum pourrait favoriser le rétablissement de la sécurité dans le pays et permettre l'organisation de l'atelier demandé lors de la 33<sup>e</sup> session du Comité (Séville, 2009) afin d'évaluer la faisabilité de la restauration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien et d'élaborer un plan d'action d'urgence. Une mission de suivi réactif pourrait alors avoir lieu et déterminer si la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien est perdue et s'il faut envisager son retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, conformément au chapitre IV.C des *Orientations*.

L'**UICN** ajoute qu'en l'absence de données suffisantes permettant d'analyser l'état de conservation du bien, la disparition de la plupart des espèces phares de grands mammifères reste extrêmement préoccupante et remet en cause la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Elle souhaite que le Comité demande à l'Etat partie d'inviter une mission conjointe de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial / UICN afin d'évaluer s'il reste des perspectives de régénération des caractéristiques justifiant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien ou s'il faut envisager son retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle que les difficultés intérieures rencontrées par l'Etat partie depuis deux ans ont eu des répercussions sur la gestion des ressources naturelles. Les autorités font tout leur possible pour rétablir la paix civile et méritent d'être encouragées. L'indulgence est donc requise. L'Etat partie peut inviter une mission afin de lui permettre de conserver ce bien.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** sympathised with the challenges faced by the State Party, and enquired if timeframe could be set for the proposed workshop which was meant to assess the extent to which the OUV of the property had been impacted.

La Délégation de **Colombie** considère que le pays doit actualiser les informations afin de déterminer si l'intégrité du site peut être restaurée et si les valeurs ayant justifié son inscription sont maintenues malgré les menaces. Le projet de décision prévoit la préparation d'un plan d'urgence subordonné à la tenue d'un atelier. La Délégation estime que ce plan ne peut pas en dépendre et qu'il doit être élaboré sans attendre. Elle invite donc instamment l'Etat partie à mettre en œuvre les mesures correctives proposées par l'UICN afin qu'après la mission des actions puissent être proposées et soutenues par les autorités nationales, la communauté internationale, les pays voisins, le secteur privé et l'UICN et ainsi éviter que le site ne soit retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed extreme concern about the property. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to provide more information on the state of conservation, and to address the security situation in and around the property in a more systematic manner.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted the slight improvement of the situation, but also acknowledged the fragility of the property and the degradation of its OUV. The Delegation suggested that a reactive monitoring mission be undertaken to the property, and requested for greater engagement on the part of the international community. The Delegation also announced that there would be an event on illegal poaching on the sidelines of the Committee session that evening and expressed its support for the proposed draft decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** underscored the importance of encouraging global cooperation to help the State Party in its conservation efforts. The Delegation requested for a mission to the property to be carried out, particularly to reassess criteria (ix) and (x) under which the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation further expressed support for the draft decision and highlighted the need for neighboring countries to join in the conservation efforts.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** commended the State Party's will to protect the property. The Delegation suggested that the property's managers engage with all local stakeholders to show that damage to the property would translate into economic losses.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rappelle que le site est en péril depuis 1997. Les rapports de l'UICN font état d'inquiétudes depuis la 35e session. Le danger pour la VUE est réel en raison de la disparition d'espèces phares qui remet en cause des processus écologiques naturels. Le rapport indique que des mesures correctives ont été

adoptées en vue du retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril avec un calendrier pour leur mise en œuvre. Le Forum pour la paix laisse espérer qu'une mission de suivi réactif pourrait se rendre sur le site et faire un état des lieux définitif quant à l'état de la VUE. La Délégation de l'Algérie demande donc que ce site ne soit pas retiré définitivement de la Liste, et approuve son maintien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation du **Qatar** soutient également le projet de décision pour le maintien sur la Liste en péril. Elle estime que l'Etat partie doit faire face à de nombreux problèmes tels que le braconnage ou les mines d'or illégales. Le Comité a donc l'obligation de le soutenir.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the positions expressed by Germany and Finland. The Delegation stressed the importance of engaging the international community to address the very worrying security situation in and around the property. The Delegation further encouraged the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre-Advisory Bodies mission to provide more information on the state of the property's OUV. The Delegation supported the draft decision, especially the proposal to retain the provision for reinforced monitoring.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed concern over the security situation, and voiced doubt about the possibility of regenerating the property's OUV, given the extent of the damage, with 80% of the wildlife lost. The Delegation further supported sending a mission to collect more information.

The Delegation **Peru** expressed concern over the severe losses incurred because of poaching as well as the very acute and complex security issues at the property, and stated its support for the draft decision. The Delegation further urged the State Party to adopt appropriate emergency measures, and encouraged a prompt reactive monitoring mission to assess the situation. The Delegation was also of the view that it was too early to decide on the possible deletion of this property from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its solidarity with the State Party and expressed support for Jamaica's on the need to set a timeframe for the proposed workshop. The Delegation called on the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to assist the State Party in the organization of the workshop, also including the parties which signed the peace agreement.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments to the Draft Decision had been received.

The Delegation of **Colombia** stated that it had an amendment to submit on paragraph 6, and proceeded to read it out to the room.

**IUCN** asked if the proposed amendment meant that the rest of the paragraph 6, which dealt with the workshop, was to be deleted.

The Delegation of **Colombia** explained its view that the development of the action plan should not be contingent on the workshop's organization. The Delegation



suggested that its amendment could then an additional paragraph, since the workshop originally mentioned in paragraph 6 should indeed take place.

The Delegation of **Croatia** considered that the workshop was a first step and should take place as a preliminary step to the development of the action plan.

The draft Decision **39 COM 7A.1** was adopted as amended.

### **Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227) - 39 COM 7A.2**

Le **Secrétariat** note que la Délégation du Sénégal a souhaité ouvrir le rapport du parc national de la Comoé pour discussion.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** explique qu'elle a un projet d'amendement proposé par la Côte d'Ivoire. Le site fait l'objet d'une grande attention de la part de l'Etat partie, qui a fourni des efforts présentés dans le rapport. L'Etat partie a octroyé des financements ainsi que les ressources nécessaires pour la conservation de ce bien. Il a également bénéficié du soutien de la communauté internationale. La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande que l'Etat partie puisse prendre la parole.

The Delegation of **Germany** raised a point of order as it was under the impression that this item was not supposed to be open for discussion.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the opening of this item for discussion had been proposed by a member of the Bureau at its meeting earlier that morning, and this was in line with established procedures.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) rappelle que le parc national de la Comoé a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril à cause de la crise de 2002. Depuis la fin de cette crise en 2010, la Côte d'Ivoire a pu mobiliser l'aide de nombreux partenaires, tels que la Banque mondiale et le Fonds du patrimoine mondial, pour restaurer le site. Un plan d'aménagement et de gestion a été adopté en décembre 2014. Un comité de gestion local regroupant toutes les parties prenantes a été mis en place. Les survols aériens effectués en 2010 et 2014 ont permis de constater que la faune s'était reconstituée. La pérennisation des financements est un élément important. A cet égard, le Gouvernement a mis en œuvre divers projets sur fonds propres. La gestion du parc a bénéficié, dans le cadre de la conversion de dettes, de la mobilisation de 10 millions dollars E.U. à travers la Coopération allemande. Depuis janvier 2015, 300 millions ont été mis à disposition pour cette même gestion jusqu'en 2018, et à partir de 2018, les fonds placés dans la Fondation des Parcs et Réserves prendront le relais. Un processus a été mis en place avec les universités locales et celle de Wusburg en Allemagne pour les inventaires relatifs aux éléphants. En ce qui concerne les chimpanzés, un film documentaire a été réalisé grâce à des caméras. Inventaires et films prouvent que le Parc est encore en état.

Le **Rapporteur** présente l'amendement soumis par la Délégation du Sénégal, qui modifie plusieurs paragraphes et propose de retirer le parc de la Comoé de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

**IUCN** expressed concern over the number and substance of amendments proposed by Senegal. IUCN recalled that the Committee had decided not to consider in its decisions information presented at such a late stage, since this could not be properly analysed. IUCN stressed that there was an established procedure for the removal of a property on the Danger List, including sending a monitoring mission. IUCN expressed its concern at the deletion of the reference to the mining operations outside of the boundaries of the property, since they could have negative impact on OUV. In conclusion, IUCN suggested avoiding substantially amending the draft decision before giving proper consideration to the new information.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that the amendments were too substantial to be adopted at such a short notice.

The Delegation of **Finland** remarked that working on information submitted shortly before the session was not the best way to deal with the issue, and suggested to postpone discussion on this property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed regret at the hasty way in which new elements were presented to the Committee, and expressed its wish to respect the Committee's rules and operational standards. The Delegation noted that the property was affected by a number of serious issues, including overgrazing, mining, poaching and a lack of adequate management system. The Delegation was of the view that a mission was necessary to assess the situation that it could not support the amendments proposed by Senegal at this stage.

The Delegations of **Turkey** and **Colombia** agreed with the positions expressed by Portugal and Germany.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** pensait que les efforts de l'Etat partie, reconnus dans le projet de décision, auraient mené à la sortie du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle comprend néanmoins que l'exploitation minière illégale et des données insuffisantes ne le permettaient pas. Le plaidoyer de l'Etat partie remis hier démontre la mobilisation de tout un pays avec des partenaires sérieux. Un processus visible et transparent de rétablissement des équilibres rompus est en cours. Mais la Délégation reconnaît qu'il y a un problème de vice de procédure. Elle rejoint la position de la Délégation de la Finlande pour demander la possibilité pour l'UICN et l'Etat partie de débattre des nouvelles informations reçues de revenir à la fin de l'ordre du jour pour discuter ce point.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested for more time to study the new facts presented, and suggested that a new paragraph be included in the decision concerning a mission to be dispatched to the property.

La Délégation du **Liban** accueille favorablement les nouvelles informations apportées par l'Etat partie quant aux améliorations apportées au site. Mais elle considère qu'il est trop tôt pour enlever le site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Il faut une vérification de terrain via une mission du Centre et des Organisations consultatives. Elle propose donc de garder le projet de décision tel quel en attendant la mission et ses résultats.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle qu'elle propose un amendement mais ne décide pas. Elle est d'accord avec la proposition de l'Algérie. Elle peut accepter le maintien du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en attendant l'année prochaine.

The **Chairperson** suggested adopting the draft decision as it was first intended, in view of the majority of the positions expressed. The Chairperson stated that the new elements presented would be retained for consideration by the Committee at its next session.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.2** was adopted.

#### **Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) - 39 COM 7A.4**

Le **Secrétariat** explique que le site a été proposé pour discussion à la suite des déclarations du Premier Ministre de la République Démocratique du Congo envisageant une modification des limites du Parc afin d'exclure le Lac Edouard et autoriser par ce biais l'exploration pétrolière. Si de telles modifications étaient proposées, elles devraient suivre la procédure pour modification majeure des limites conformément au paragraphe 165 des *Orientations*, compte tenu de l'impact d'un tel projet sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Toutefois, le 15 juin dernier, le Ministre de l'Environnement a déclaré dans la presse être opposé à l'exploration pétrolière dans le parc national des Virunga. Le 18 juin, une équipe de patrouille de l'ICCN a été victime d'une attaque au sud du Lac Edouard, se soldant par la mort d'un garde et de 14 soldats ; 11 autres soldats ont été blessés. Cette attaque est attribuée à une coalition de rebelles dirigée par les Maï-Maï, Manga, Shetani avec les FDLR. Des renforts ont été déployés dans le Parc le 25 juin.

L'**UICN** réitère son inquiétude quant à la volonté manifeste de l'Etat partie d'exploiter d'éventuelles réserves pétrolières dans le bien. Une modification mineure des limites du bien afin de faciliter l'exploitation pétrolière est en effet envisagée par le Premier Ministre dans sa lettre du 26 janvier 2015. L'exclusion du Lac Edouard affecterait la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien de manière significative. L'UICN souhaite que le Comité réitère sa position selon laquelle l'exploration et l'exploitation pétrolière sont incompatibles avec le statut de patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle que la modification des limites d'un bien en rapport avec les industries extractives doit passer par la procédure de modification majeure des limites conformément au paragraphe 165 des *Orientations*.

The **Chairperson**, on behalf of the Committee, expressed her condolences to the victims of the recent poachers' attacks at the property, which resulted in the death of some Park rangers. The Chairperson expressed assurance that the Committee would take every possible measure to stop these occurrences.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed full support for the draft decision and joined the Chairperson in expressing condolences for the lives that had been lost. The Delegation noted the major threats affecting the property, including security issues, oil exploration as well as the massive presence of refugees and deforestation. The Delegation supported retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Turkey** highlighted that the Virunga National Park faced similar problems as other parks in the Africa region. The Delegation remarked that considering the fact that refugees had occupied 89% of the park over the last ten years, any proposed boundary modification should be in those areas rather than at Edward Lake, as the latter was an important component of the property. The Delegation expressed appreciation that the State Party had maintained good cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, but acknowledged that the State Party had still continued with plans for oil exploration and had not given up oil permits. The Delegation therefore supported the Draft Decision to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** reconnaît le travail des responsables du parc qui ont fait un travail exceptionnel de contrôle et de surveillance, malgré les situations difficiles. Soutient la proposition sur la base des informations fournies par l'État partie et les évaluations de l'IUCN, en particulier celle faite par le Centre du Patrimoine Mondial en mars 2014. La délégation reconnaît l'importance d'augmenter le nombre de rangers jusqu'à 75% dans le parc, ce qui a des résultats significatifs dans la diminution des effets négatifs. La délégation estime que les actions devraient se poursuivre et devraient être renforcées. Elle exprime sa préoccupation devant l'absence de réponse de l'État partie sur l'annulation de la licence d'exploration de pétrole et de la recommandation de ne pas modifier les limites du site. Demande à l'Etat partie d'envisager de maintenir les limites de la zone de protection. Considère que tout changement de limites menace les valeurs universelles exceptionnelles du site et ce qui devrait être considéré comme significatif.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** a exprimé sa tristesse face à ce qui est arrivé dans le pays et regrette que le sujet des rangers tués pour protéger le site soit un thème récurrent. La Délégation considère ce sont des actes graves qui doivent être pris en considération et au sérieux. La première préoccupation est d'essayer de porter toute l'attention sur les efforts déployés par l'Etat. Elle estime qu'il est utile que les organismes consultatifs, en particulier l'IUCN, discutent avec l'Etat partie pour voir s'il est possible d'envisager un changement des limites de protection tout en respectant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

The Delegation of **Germany** deplored the violence that had resulted in the loss of lives of park rangers who were defending the property. The Delegation emphasized that the Virunga National Park represented an iconic site which contained one of the highest diversity of species and fauna in Africa, including certain flagship species. The Delegation urged the State Party to cancel all current oil explorations, and to take all measures to prevent further oil exploitation on the property. The Delegation noted that the State Party may seek a minor boundary modification to allow for the exploration to proceed and expressed its support for paragraph 9 of the Decision in this regard.

The Delegation of **Finland** applauded the State Party for its success in protecting the site's boundaries. While the Delegation noted the reduction in elephant poaching compared with figures from 2010, the Delegation also noted with concern the proposed plans for minor boundary modification. The Delegation stressed that the proposed boundary modification would negatively impact the OUV and World

Heritage status of the property. The Delegation concluded by expressing support for the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the Decision to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation underscored the need to focus on the management of the property as a whole, in particular engaging the petroleum industry on actions that would have a significantly negative impact on OUV and the site.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its solidarity with the State Party and its condolences to the families of the rangers who had lost their lives in operations for the protection of the property. The Delegation acknowledged the progress made by the State Party with regards to improving the security situation. The Delegation supported the retention of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and stressed the importance of policies for sustainable development for the site.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its sympathies to the families of the rangers who had lost their lives. The Delegation stressed that the Bonn Declaration was both important and timely in this regard. The Delegation of Jamaica also expressed appreciation to the State Party for its efforts in preserving the property and its outstanding universal value, and acknowledged the efforts undertaken to reduce poaching at the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its sympathies to the families of the rangers who had lost their lives. The Delegation underlined that once the natural elements of the property were lost, it could not be recovered or protected, and in this regard, expressed hopes that the State Party would approach development activities near the property with caution. The Delegation proposed that a paragraph be added to the Draft Decision to express the Committee's condolences to the families of the rangers who had lost their lives in protecting the OUV of the site.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** joined the previous delegations to express their condolences for the families of the rangers who had lost their lives in protecting the site. The Delegation stressed that oil extraction would negatively impact both the biodiversity and OUV of the site. The Delegation affirmed its hope that the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo would continue to support efforts to further the sustainable development of the site, and take a firm stand against potential oil explorations.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime sa consternation face à la perte de vies humaines dans le cadre de la protection du bien et demande une minute de silence à la mémoire du défunt.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Committee for their expressions of sympathy and condolences proposed that the Committee observe a minute to silence as a sign of respect for all the rangers who had lost their lives in protecting and conserving the World Heritage site.

The **Committee** observed a minute of silence.

The **Chairperson** reiterated the Committee's condolences for the rangers at Virunga National Park and all others who had lost their lives in the protection of World Heritage, and expressed the Committee's full support in this regard.

La Délégation de la République Démocratique du **Congo** (Observateur) apprécie la sympathie exprimée par le Comité et ses membres pour la perte de vies humaines et indique qu'elle va en faire part à son gouvernement.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of the Democratic Republic of Congo and proceeded to give the floor to the other Observers.

The Representative of the **World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)** expressed WWF's strong support for the World Heritage Convention and affirmed the Committee's position that oil, gas and mineral exploration and exploitation were incompatible with World Heritage status. The representative of the WWF noted that Virunga was Africa's first National Park that contained Lake Edward, an important aquatic corridor, as well as many threatened and vulnerable species, and important landscape features that supported over 100,000 local people. The representative of the WWF affirmed the WWF's support for alternative approaches to sustainability, such as renewable energy, sustainable fisheries and tourism, as well as ongoing conservation efforts. The WWF emphasised that removing parts of the lake would have significant impact on the OUV of the site. The representative of the WWF was of the view that the proposed boundary modifications to allow extraction activities to take place could undermine the World Heritage Convention and set a dangerous precedent for future actions, which would have damaging effects. The representative of the WWF expressed its condolences to the families of the rangers who had lost their lives in the protection of the site.

The **Chairperson** thanked the WWF for the statement and their engagement with the property. The Chairperson clarified that the proposal by the Delegation of Japan to include a line expressing the condolences of the Committee had already been included in the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.4** was adopted as amended.

#### **Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136) - 39 COM 7A.6**

Le **Secrétariat** exprime la préoccupation sur ce site, la mission de suivi réactif demandée par la Décision 38 COM 7A.39 n'ayant pu se rendre sur le terrain compte tenu de l'insécurité permanente dans la région. Le Secrétariat se déclare préoccupé par l'augmentation du braconnage et des attaques menées par des groupes armés dans le parc national qui se sont intensifiées depuis avril 2014. Il ajoute que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien est toujours menacée par le braconnage qui réduit considérablement le nombre d'animaux sauvages ; le Parc compte plus de 150 éléphants tués depuis plus d'un an et les autorités congolaises ont du mal à faire face à ces attaques perpétrées par des groupes de braconniers professionnels et lourdement armés, en dépit des appuis extérieurs.

L'**IUCN** mentionne que le braconnage a contribué à l'extinction du rhinocéros blanc sauvage et à une diminution de la population d'éléphants de 90% en moyenne, de même la population des girafes est menacée. Elle estime que si la situation continue, la menace de perdre la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est réelle. Elle est préoccupé par le fait que l'armée collabore avec les chasseurs et que cette situation va perdurer. L'**IUCN** recommande que le Comité invite la Directrice Générale de l'**UNESCO** à organiser une réunion de haut niveau entre les représentants de la République démocratique du Congo, l'Ouganda et le Soudan du Sud pour tenter d'améliorer la sécurité dans la région et à aborder la question du braconnage.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** expressed its condolences for the rangers who had lost their lives defending the Virunga National Park and the guard killed in operations for the protection of the Garamba National Park. The Delegation expressed its concern regarding poaching activities and the species decline which threatened the OUV of the Garamba National Park. The Delegation supported retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its concerns for the irreversible loss of the OUV of the property. The Delegation highlighted the need for greater collaboration in the protection of such sites, not only within the State Party, but for the international community as well. The Delegation expressed support for the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** exprime ses condoléances et son soutien au personnel du site et reconnaît que l'État partie a pris des mesures pour protéger les éléphants. Cependant, la délégation a noté avec un profond regret que la sécurité du site est menacée et que le nombre d'éléphants a considérablement diminué. Elle a demandé instamment que la menace à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, comme la chasse et le braconnage des animaux, soit évaluée et surveillée. Elle estime que le règlement des zones de chasse doit être évalué et renforcé avec d'autres projets productifs pour remplacer l'exploitation minière traditionnelle.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted the complicated situation in Garamba National Park where the poaching of animals had increased and the population of elephants, among other animals, had decreased by 90%. The Delegation recalled that the site was inscribed under criteria (vii) and (x), and stressed that the OUV of the site would be negatively impacted by poaching activities. The Delegation expressed support for the Draft Decision and called upon neighbouring countries as well as other States Parties to extend their help in enhancing the conservation of the property. The Delegation further underlined that poaching was not just an issue for the States Parties in which poaching activities were taking place, but for all who were engaged in the sale or distribution of poached items.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime ses condoléances pour la mort des soldats de la nature. Elle regrette la vulnérabilité du parc national et demande à la communauté internationale et aux acteurs de la région leur coopération et des ressources pour préserver le bien à long terme.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its deep condolences for those who lost in their lives in the protection of World Heritage. The Delegation also noted that the property faced a number of problems, ranging from poaching to conflicts in the surrounding

areas that endangered the species at the site. The Delegation expressed support for the Draft Decision and also called for more effective regional cooperation as well as global support towards the conservation of the property, with an emphasis on the importance of protecting the mammals in these sites. The Delegation acknowledged the efforts of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Congo, but further emphasized the need for greater global and regional support.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its concern at the continued poaching of elephants, especially the massacre of elephants that had taken place in April 2014. The Delegation underlined that the community was responsible for the loss and should implement immediate actions to avoid the recurrence of such a tragedy. The Delegation emphasized that the reduction of poaching alone was not sufficient and instead, actions should be undertaken to reduce the demand for poached products. The Delegation stressed that this would only be possible through the collective efforts of the international community, to ensure that the biodiversity and OUV of affected sites remain protected. The Delegation affirmed support for the Draft Decision, particularly paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its condolences to the family of the guard killed in protecting the property. The Delegation commended the State Party for their efforts in reducing poaching, but also expressed concerns that both elephant and giraffe poaching were still taking place. In this regard, the Delegation called for an immediate reactive monitoring mission to reassess the State of Conservation of the property and expressed support for the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its condolences to the family of the guard killed in protecting the property. The Delegation called for more effective action to be taken by the Director-General of UNESCO, the State Party, neighbouring countries, and all State Parties who were willing to lend their support.

La Délégation du **Mali** salue la mémoire des soldats de la nature. Elle estime que dans le contexte actuel il faut avoir une résolution votée par le Conseil de Sécurité pour la protection du patrimoine culturel ou naturel, comme dans le cas du Mali. Elle invite les États parties à ratifier la convention de 1954, le second protocole et les documents existants pour la protection du patrimoine.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime également ses condoléances et réitère son ferme soutien envers les autorités pour résoudre les problèmes de sécurité. Elle sollicite une mission de l'UNESCO à fin d'évaluer les faiblesses et exprime la nécessité de voir des actions spécifiques pour surmonter les difficultés rencontrées par les autorités.

The **Rapporteur** informed that the Delegation of Colombia had submitted amendments to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, which requested that the State Party cooperate with other States Parties and international organizations to outline the population recovery plan as well as called on the support of the international community to address the loss of endangered species.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.6** was adopted as amended.



### **Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153) - 39 COM 7A.13**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Senegal to present to the Committee its reasons for requesting to open the State of Conservation report of the Niokolo-Koba National Park.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** informe qu'un amendement a été présenté par la délégation de l'Algérie, qui l'a transmis au Secrétariat. Elle résume les actions menées par l'État partie concernant la conservation du parc. Concernant l'exploitation minière, elle indique qu'il mène une étude d'impact sur l'environnement qui sera bientôt validée par l'État partie. En ce qui concerne le barrage de Sambangalou; rien n'a été fait pour organiser la mise en valeur de la rivière Gambie partagée avec les pays de la sous-région. Elle informe que la carrière de basalte à Mansadala est une source de matière première pour la construction de routes et pour maintenir un développement harmonieux de la région.

In view of time constraints, the **Secretariat** proposed to give the floor directly to IUCN to make its statement on the property.

L'**IUCN** indique que le rapport de mission a été finalisé après la rédaction du projet de décision et qu'il est nécessaire d'harmoniser le projet de décision avec le contenu du rapport. Il propose d'aborder la question avec l'État partie.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Senegal.

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed the actions taken by the State Party. However, the Delegation also expressed concerns about possible threats to the OUV of the site, such as gold mining activities.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient le point de vue du Sénégal sur cette question.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur if any amendments had been proposed to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that Algeria had presented an amendment to the Draft Decision.

Le **Rapporteur** lit l'amendement présenté par l'Algérie.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur and gave the floor to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** sought further clarification from IUCN regarding the consequences of extending the timeline for the State Party to achieve the indicators of the Desired State of Conservation for the property to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger for another two years from 2016 to 2018. The Delegation of Germany also sought clarification on the reason for the proposed deletion of the sentence concerning plant species.

**IUCN** noted that while the State Party had initially committed to closing the basalt quarry by 2016, this proposed closure had been extended to 2018 due to delays reported by the State Party in relation to the construction of roads utilised for the transportation of the materials being mined. IUCN further elaborated that the consequences of the quarry staying open until 2018 were that the disturbances would continue, and as a result, the timeline for the Desired State of Conservation to be achieved would need to be extended to 2018 as well. Secondly, IUCN explained that the property already faced threats from exotic plants and if the State Party did not address these problems, these threats would continue to negatively impact the quarry, and by extension the property as well.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its wish to retain paragraph nine as it was proposed in the original Draft Decision.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** répond sur l'extension proposée en 2016, elle stipule que le Sénégal a des engagements avec des entreprises sur place. Annuler les contrats signifie payer très cher les indemnisations et qu'il faut donner du temps pour finir et pour exécuter les contrats. En ce qui concerne la proposition de mettre en œuvre des mesures pour assurer la remise en état du site, elle considère que la réhabilitation du site a été exprimée en termes génériques y compris toutes les situations indésirables sur le site sont inclus.

La délégation du **Portugal** exprime la nécessité d'être réaliste et pratique en écoutant les arguments du Sénégal et se déclare en faveur de de l'amendement proposé par l'Algérie. Sur le contrôle des espèces exotiques, il soutient la formulation proposée par l'Algérie « assurer la réhabilitation complète du site ».

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.13** was adopted as amended.

## **Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199bis) - 39 COM 7A.14**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the State of Conservation report was submitted by the State Party on 1 February 2015. The Secretariat explained that the State of Conservation report was proposed for discussion by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to take into consideration the results of the recent nationwide elephant survey. This survey was conducted by the Tanzanian Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI) within the “Great Elephant Census” project and released on 1 June 2015 by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania. The Secretariat shared that the survey confirmed the poaching crisis both in the country and at the property. The Secretariat recalled that a steep increase in poaching had led to an alarming 90% decline in the elephant population since the site’s inscription, which led to its Danger Listing in 2014.

The Secretariat acknowledged the political will and intensified efforts of the Government of Tanzania to halt the situation, but also noted the need for a concrete and clear action plan for the property to identify immediate actions that would help in the coordination of various efforts and commitments. The Secretariat informed that the development of a Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR), as well as a set of corrective measures and a timeframe for implementation, should be used as tools to guide the consolidated management response. The Secretariat further noted that a meeting had been organized by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism with the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa office and UNESCO Dar es-Salaam on 11 June 2015 to further concretize these steps. The Secretariat explained that the meeting agreed for the Ministry to set up a Task Force for the next six months to coordinate the preparation of the action plan and a proposal for the DSOCR, in close consultation with key stakeholders. The Secretariat shared that it would also be invited to assist with the preparation of these plans. The Secretariat emphasized that regional and international efforts, including of States Parties which are transit and destination countries for ivory and rhino horn, are needed to support the State Party’s efforts to halt the illegal trade in ivory and other illegal wildlife products.

**IUCN** welcomed the State Party’s commitment to address the challenges faced by the property as demonstrated by the initiation of several conservation projects. IUCN shared that since the State of Conservation report was prepared, the preliminary results of the 2014 worldwide elephant census has been released. IUCN indicated that the census revealed a 60% decline of the Tanzanian elephant population since 2009, a 66% decline in the ecosystem, and that the estimated surviving elephant population in stood at 15,200. IUCN explained that the 2014 survey was larger than in 2013, where the elephant population reported was lower (13,000) and was thus IUCN was of the view that the results indicated the stabilisation of the elephant population. IUCN highlighted the need to ensure that the development of the Desired State of Conservation was aligned with a site-specific anti-poaching strategy and a comprehensive site action plan. ICUN expressed support for the State Party and added that corrective measures should also take into account other threats stemming from anticipated mining operations at the river and proposed dam projects.

The Delegation of **Germany** acknowledged the ongoing efforts of the State Party to address not only poaching, but other issues that were identified in previous years. However, the Delegation recalled that at the 36th session of the Committee, Tanzania had agreed to changes aimed at enhancing the integrity of the property, such as the protection of the corridor. The Delegation welcomed the bilateral protection by Tanzania and Mozambique in this regard. The Delegation further recalled that Tanzania had also committed to a future extension of the property to compensate for past losses and to include additional species. However, the Delegation noted that this commitment still had yet to be implemented, and urged that immediate action be taken.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** reconnaît le travail de la Tanzanie pour conserver la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien et demande aux autres États parties leur soutien contre le braconnage. Elle estime qu'ils peuvent mettre en œuvre des mesures visant à inverser l'impact négatif des barrages dans la région et favoriser la conservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et de développement durable. Elle souligne que tous reconnaissent la valeur du bien pour les espèces migratrices. Prend en charge le projet de décision de maintenir le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et invite l'État partie à poursuivre les activités entreprises.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party for its commitment to refrain from mining activities in the property as well as not undertaking any development activities without prior approval from the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation expressed its concern regarding the continued poaching of both Ivory and Rhino horn, and how the recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission carried out by IUCN in 2013 still have not been implemented. The Delegation expressed support for the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed support for the Draft Decision and commended the State Party for its efforts. The Delegation underscored the urgent need for the State Party to engage with the industries that were causing pollution and destruction to the site, by translating the extent of the damage to OUV into financial terms. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to undertake further communication with relevant UN agencies that deal with disaster mitigation and adaptation, engage academic institutions with a focus on interdisciplinary training, and to mobilise community participation in the strengthening of resilience.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** expressed its support for the Draft Decision and underscored that poaching should be a matter of international concern. The Delegation stated if the international purchasing of poached products could be halted, poaching could consequently be prevented as well.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the retention of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation proposed that the State Party develop a timeframe to establish a buffer zone for the property as well as to share with the Committee the Government's comprehensive emergency plan to halt poaching activities.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** félicite l'État partie pour ses efforts malgré les difficultés et les problèmes graves de la région. Elle indique que le Comité a besoin d'une

réponse systématique à ces situations qui dépassent les capacités de la Convention de 1972 et que, peut-être, il est nécessaire de travailler en synergie avec d'autres conventions. Elle considère qu'on ne peut pas laisser le pays lutter contre les problèmes du braconnage et contre les organisations criminelles transnationales impliquées. Cette situation nécessite un cadre réglementaire différent. La Délégation appelle à la réflexion sur cette question et demande à avoir une autre approche plus large et plus globale qui permettrait de surmonter ces problèmes. Elle souligne que le Comité du patrimoine mondial est obligé d'exprimer sa solidarité.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** a souligné l'importance du travail bilatéral avec la Tanzanie et le soutien international contre les menaces. Elle indique que le soutien devrait dépendre de l'engagement international à long terme. La Délégation a soutenu le projet de cette décision.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** (Observer) expressed its sincere thanks to the Committee for its support and cooperation for the conservation of the Selous Game Reserve. The Delegation noted that the Draft Decision did not contain all the efforts implemented by the State Party towards the prevention of the poaching of animals, which was the reason for the site's inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the first place. The State Party shared that since the Draft Decision was prepared, efforts undertaken included the strengthening of the ranger force from 480 to 700 and the additional mobilisation of financial and technical support. The Delegation expressed its gratitude to Germany and the United States of America for the financial support rendered. The Delegation drew attention to the fact that according to the census of 2014, the population of elephants in the property had increased. The Delegation concluded by affirming its commitment to ensure the site's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger as soon as possible.

**IUCN** acknowledged the comments from Tanzania as well as highlighted its hopes for continued engagement with Tanzania on the site. IUCN indicated that its interpretation of the results of the elephant census signalled a stabilisation of the elephant population, rather than an increase, but still noted that the results were positive. IUCN also noted that the Delegation of Algeria had made some comments that might not have been directly related to the Draft Decision, but were still pertinent broader issues that the Committee may wish to bear in mind.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur if any amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

Le **Rapporteur** lit les amendements présentés par le Sénégal au projet de décision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.14** was adopted as amended.

**LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST  
IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE AFRICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS  
ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155 bis) - 39 COM  
7A.3**

**Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137) - 39  
COM 7A.5**

**Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280) - 39 COM  
7A.7**

**Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 718) - 39 COM  
7A.8**

**General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo  
(DRC) - 39 COM 7A.9**

**Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9) - 39 COM 7A.10**

**Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257) - 39 COM 7A.11**

**Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573) - 39 COM 7A.12**

All the above Draft Decisions were adopted without discussion.

*The meeting rose at 1pm.*

**SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 30 June 2015**

**FOURTH MEETING**

**3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**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)**

*Documents* WHC-15/39.COM/7A  
WHC-15/39.COM/7A.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.7 Rev

*Decisions:* **38 COM 7A.1 to 39 COM 7A.48**

**ASIA-PACIFIC**

**East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854) - 39 COM 7A.16**

The **Secretariat** presented additional information for site that was finalized after the submission of the working document and noted that the State Party did not submit a state of conservation report as requested by the Committee. The Secretariat informed the Committee that with support from the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, the project financed under the World Heritage Marine Programme through the Flanders Fund-In-Trust was well underway. The Secretariat shared that a preparatory mission by IUCN Oceania would be undertaken from 14 to 16 July 2015 and that a second mission would be organized in the second half of 2015 to help the State Party to prepare the Desired State of Conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Secretariat stated that technical assistance from the Netherlands Funds-In-Trust available at the World Heritage Centre would be implemented by the International Centre on Space Technologies for Natural and Cultural Heritage (HIST), a Category 2 Centre under the auspices of UNESCO and that this project aimed to provide satellite image and data information to address conservation issues at the property. The Secretariat further stated that a training workshop would be organized for this purpose as well. The Secretariat was of the view that due to the ongoing situation at the property, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended that the property be retained on the List of WH in Danger as a means to mobilize additional international support and collective efforts in resolving the threats to the site.

**IUCN** expressed the view that in the absence of a report by the State Party, there was limited information on the current state of conservation of the property. IUCN

highlighted that the management plan for the property required updating, and until the new management plan had been approved and implemented, measures should be taken to mitigate the impact from existing logging operations on West Rennell and to halt new logging operations. IUCN also underlined that the potential impact from any plans for bauxite mining on West Rennell should be rigorously assessed to demonstrate that there would be no impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. IUCN stressed that urgent action was required to halt the further spread of invasive rats and to prevent them from entering the property. IUCN welcomed the support offered by the World Heritage Centre to the State Party and was ready to provide any necessary assistance to the State Party in the preparation of the Desired State of Conservation for the property.

The Delegation of **Japan** commended the State Party for seeking advice from the Regional Office of IUCN, and expressed regret that no state of conservation report was submitted. The Delegation further stated that it would be necessary to support the enhancement of communication with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted the threats to the property, and the fact that no state of conservation report was submitted. The Delegation highlighted the dire condition of the Pacific Islands, which may face the risk of a humanitarian disaster due to climate change. The Delegation noted that an Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) report had not been submitted. The Delegation proposed that the floor be given to the State Party for it to explain the difficulties encountered and to outline the kind of help which they may require from the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported the previous speaker's concern on the situation faced by Small Island Developing States (SIDS) and encouraged the State Party to benefit from the programmes supporting SIDS, such as the World Heritage Marine Programme. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and encouraged the State Party to urgently address the issues at hand.

The Delegation of **Turkey** concurred with the previous speakers, and highlighted that despite the offer of technical and financial assistance, there was no response from the State Party. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to provide information, if it should be available, and supported the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** offered the floor to Solomon Islands, and announced that they were not present.

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

The Draft Decision **38 COM 7A.16** was adopted.

#### **LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

##### **Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) - 39 COM 7A.15**



The Draft Decision related to the property listed above was adopted with discussion.

**LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76) - 39 COM 7A.17**

The Draft Decision related to the property listed above was adopted with discussion.

**LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN**

**Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711) - 39 COM 7A.19**

The **Secretariat** recalled that the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2009 at the request of the State Party of Colombia to address specific threats to the OUV. The Secretariat informed the Committee that a Reactive Monitoring Mission was conducted by IUCN in 2015, as requested by the Committee, to assess if the Desired State of Conservation for the property had been achieved. The Secretariat stated that the State Party had made significant progress in the implementation of the corrective measures and the compliance with the indicators set for the Desired State of Conservation, which led the WHC and IUCN to recommend that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Secretariat stated that even though efforts still need to be continued to respond to conservation and management challenges, this case should be considered a good example in terms of community involvement and a good practice of the List of World Heritage in Danger mechanism by a State Party to promote international cooperation in support of its property.

**IUCN** shared that the recent Reactive Monitoring mission had concluded that the State Party had made significant progress in the implementation of corrective measures and complied with the approved indicators of the Desired State of Conservation that was set for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. IUCN noted that significant challenges remained in terms of land use planning and the management of natural resources in the surroundings of the property. IUCN further noted that the property still remained vulnerable and therefore continued efforts were required to ensure that the progress made would be sustained. IUCN highlighted that the ongoing dialogue with indigenous communities, in particular the Wonaan, living within the property provided an important example of the balance between conservation and natural resource use in a natural world heritage property. IUCN underlined that as the State Party had addressed the reasons to why the property was placed on the Danger List, IUCN was pleased to recommend that the property be removed from the Danger List. IUCN agreed with the World Heritage Centre that this was indeed a model of the List of World Heritage in Danger in action.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that putting a property in the Danger List was like sending a patient to hospital to get better and commended the Government of

Colombia for their efforts. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to implement all the recommendations put forth and also encouraged the State Party to cooperate with the Government of Panama on the issues concerning the electricity transmission corridor.

The Delegation of **Portugal** praised the State Party for its achievements and for the significant financial and human resources invested to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation noted the effective response to illegal logging, overfishing and harvesting. The Delegation encouraged the cooperation with the Government of Panama and supported the decision of removing the property from the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** recalled that the Danger Listing was initiated by the State Party of Colombia itself, and supported the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation commended practices of communication with indigenous communities and suggested that these practices be documented and these experiences be shared with other States Parties.

The Delegation of **Finland** recalled that Colombia had requested for Danger Listing and congratulated Colombia for the improvement of the state of conservation of the property. The Delegation highlighted the wise manner in which the Danger List mechanism was applied. The Delegation expressed support for the Draft Decision. The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party for its achievement and praised the strong commitment of State Party. The Delegation requested the State Party to share its experiences and supported the draft decision

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

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

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party of Colombia on behalf of the World Heritage Committee for achieving this important milestone. The Chairperson stated that this case could be seen as an encouragement to all State Parties with properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed gratitude for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation stated that the case was an exception from the general rule, and highlighted the efforts of all stakeholders to make this possible. **The Director of National Natural Parks of Colombia** thanked the Chairperson, Committee members and IUCN for the support. The Director explained that following the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the State Party initiated a process called “sharp plan” to address threats impacting the property. The Director elaborated that this plan was implemented by working very closely with local authorities and local people. The Director further stated that IUCN’s missions from 2011 to 2015 helped to mitigate threats and achieve satisfactory results. The Director recalled Colombia’s clear determination to leave no stone unturned, and also highlighted the enhanced ownership of all communities living in and around the National Park. Finally, the Director thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for their guidance, particularly concerning monitoring and the elaboration of an action plan.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party for the efforts undertaken, and highlighted that their joy was shared by all Committee members. The Chairperson further noted the importance and success of the World Heritage Convention in this regard.

**LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764) - 39 COM 7A.18**  
**Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196) - 39 COM 7A.20**

The Draft Decisions for the properties listed above were adopted without discussion.

**CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

**AFRICA**

**LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE AFRICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev) – 39 COM 7A.21**  
**Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139) – 39 COM 7A.22**  
**Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022) – 39 COM 7A.23**

The Draft Decisions for the properties listed above were adopted without discussion.

**ARAB STATES**

Le **Secrétariat** indique qu'en Iraq, la situation actuelle dans les zones occupées par des groupes armés fait que l'intégrité du patrimoine culturel situé dans ces zones est sérieusement menacée. Parmi les quatre sites du patrimoine mondial de l'Iraq, Hatra et Assour, ont souffert de destructions alors que le Site archéologique de Samarra a été touché par des actes de vandalisme, en particulier sur le symbole du site, le minaret en spirale (Al-Malewiya) datant du IXème siècle. La Citadelle d'Erbil a quant à elle été épargnée jusqu'à présent. Pour ce qui est des sites inclus dans la Liste indicative de l'Iraq, le site assyrien de Nimroud a été sérieusement endommagé suite à la destruction à l'explosif du palais d'Ashurnaspiral II, ainsi que le saccage de bas-reliefs et de sculptures comme vous le voyez sur les écrans.

La Cité ancienne de Ninive, inscrite sur la liste indicative de l'Iraq, a également été endommagée avec plusieurs sculptures détruites. D'autres sites de haute importance historique ont également été touchés, notamment le Tombeau de Jonas à Mossoul, ou le mausolée de l'Imam Dour, un joyau architectural du XIème siècle, ont été totalement détruit à l'explosif.

Le site archéologique de Khorsabad, une des capitales de l'ancien Empire assyrien, a aussi subi les destructions des groupes armés. Le musée de Mossoul a été saccagé et plusieurs sculptures provenant notamment des sites de Hatra, Khorsabad et Balawat, ont été détruites. Enfin, d'autres sources rapportent qu'au moins 19 autres bâtiments importants, essentiellement des mausolées et des lieux de culte, ont été endommagés ou totalement détruits.

L'UNESCO et ses partenaires, ont engagé des actions visant à répondre à la situation critique dans laquelle se trouvent ces sites, sur la base de la réunion d'experts qui s'est tenue au Siège de l'UNESCO le 17 juillet 2014, à laquelle l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM avaient participé, et qui a conduit à l'adoption d'un plan d'intervention d'urgence pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel en Iraq. Deux projets pour la mise en œuvre de ce plan d'action sont en cours de lancement, financés par le Gouvernement du Japon et le gouvernement de Norvège tandis qu'un autre, en cours d'élaboration, sera financé par le gouvernement italien.

**ICOMOS** expressed its sadness at the situation in Iraq and stated that it was ready to contribute to the UNESCO Emergency Response for safeguarding Iraq's cultural heritage.

#### **Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C1130) - 39 COM 7A.25**

Le **Secrétariat** informe qu'au mois d'août dernier, suite à l'occupation d'une partie du site par des groupes armés, des frappes aériennes menées par les forces iraqiennes ont endommagé l'édifice de la mission archéologique allemande ainsi que le mur d'Assour, tout en détruisant la structure en verre qui abrite le cimetière royal. Le bien étant situé encore à ce jour dans la zone de contrôle des groupes armés, les menaces qui pèsent sur lui sont réelles, mais il est très difficile de recueillir des informations exactes quant à son état de conservation. Une analyse de la situation par image satellite devrait être réalisée à cet effet. Il est essentiel de faire une évaluation de l'état de conservation du bien dès que les conditions de sécurité le permettront.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its concern regarding the situation in Iraq and stated that it was not only a human tragedy, but a criminal threat to global civilization. The Delegation stressed the need to be united for action and united for results. The Delegation stated that as a neighbouring country, Turkey's customs authorities and security authorities were committed to work hand-in-hand with the international community and UNESCO for effective global action.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the Delegation of Turkey and expressed its deep regret at the situation in Iraq. The Delegation stated that German experts would go back to the field as soon as the security situation permitted to organize targeted assistance.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the previous speakers and recalled the Bonn Declaration that was adopted the previous day. The Delegation suggested that the Committee should consider the best ways to render support countries in post-

conflict scenarios, when there would be a need to send technical support, advice and possibly assistance to rebuild destroyed historic sites.

La Délégation du **Liban** note que la situation tragique que connaît le patrimoine irakien et le peuple irakien est malheureusement la situation généralisée dans d'autres pays arabes, tel que la Syrie, le Yémen, et dans une mesure moins dramatique en Lybie et dans d'autres pays. Elle rappelle les responsabilités du Comité et note que le travail qu'il est possible de faire est le travail de préparation : un inventaire, notamment inventaire des destructions et de ce qui reste, un inventaire de ce que l'on peut faire pour l'avenir, la formation des professionnels, dans le but de la protection du patrimoine et de sa revitalisation.

**Le Secrétariat** clarifie que le plan d'action pour la sauvegarde d'urgence du patrimoine irakien, élaboré par l'UNESCO avec les organisations consultatives et d'autres partenaires, prévoit exactement les points évoqués par la Délégation du Liban, notamment l'inventaire, la documentation par imagerie satellite (projet financé par le Japon) et la formation (projet financé par la Finlande).

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.25** was adopted.

#### **Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev) - 39 COM 7A.26**

**Le Secrétariat** indique que l'État partie fait savoir que plusieurs attaques perpétrées par des groupes armés ont causé des dommages, souvent mineurs, dans plusieurs parties du bien. D'autres sources rapportent qu'en novembre 2014, une bannière noire a été accrochée sur le minaret en spirale de la Grande mosquée. En mars 2015, une partie du minaret et des murailles d'enceinte ont été recouvertes de graffiti de peinture.

Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a consulté un expert en conservation des peintures murales et transmis une note technique de recommandations pour le traitement de ces graffiti aux autorités irakiennes le 10 avril dernier. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial exprime sa préoccupation quant à tout acte qui pourrait transformer un site du patrimoine mondial en cible militaire.

Le bureau de l'UNESCO pour l'Iraq s'apprête à mettre en œuvre un projet visant à assurer la conservation et la gestion de la Grande mosquée de Samarra et de son minaret, qui font partie du site du patrimoine mondial « Ville archéologique de Samarra ». Outre l'évaluation de l'état de conservation du bien, le projet devrait permettre de renforcer les capacités des autorités nationales et locales sur la base d'une sauvegarde holistique du patrimoine culturel, en particulier celui faisant face à des risques.

**ICOMOS** expressed its regret for the damage caused to the significant structures within the property and expressed its support and readiness to contribute to the Emergency Response Action Plan for safeguarding Iraq's cultural heritage.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.26** was adopted.

### **Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20bis) - 39 COM 7A.30**

Le **Secrétariat** informe que en plus des dommages signalés en 2014 et qui avaient affecté les mosaïques de la mosquée des Omeyyades, restaurées depuis par la direction des antiquités et des musées de Syrie, la citadelle, et plusieurs bâtiments historiques, dans son rapport détaillé sur l'état de conservation. L'Etat Partie indique des dommages liés à des tirs de mortiers sur plusieurs bâtiments, y compris sur la tour ayyoubide nord-ouest de la citadelle, et sur des bâtiments situés dans des faubourgs historiques formant la zone tampon du bien. Ces dommages ont été également confirmés par d'autres sources.

L'Etat partie indique avoir pris plusieurs mesures préventives, conformément au Plan d'intervention d'urgence fourni par le Centre du patrimoine mondial en décembre 2013. A Damas, il est très important de garantir le fait qu'aucun élément architectural de grande hauteur ne soit utilisé à des fins militaires et que les mesures de prévention contre les incendies soient scrupuleusement mises en œuvre.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.30** was adopted.

### **Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 22) - 39 COM 7A.31**

Le **Secrétariat** informe que l'Etat Partie indique que des combats avec des groupes armés, qui ont pris le contrôle du bien le 25 mars 2015, ont causé des dommages mineurs aux structures historiques et le pillage du musée du site. Le rapport indique que grâce à la coopération entre les représentants des communautés locales, un accord a été conclu pour geler les combats au sein du bien et permettre aux professionnels de la direction des antiquités et des musées de Syrie de travailler dans la citadelle et dans le théâtre romain.

Le rapport de l'Etat partie indique qu'en septembre 2014, les services de la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées (DGAM) à Bosra ont pu accéder à certaines parties du bien et a en évaluer les dommages préalablement signalés en 2014 ; ils ont pu constater des dommages supplémentaires, y compris des fouilles illégales et des constructions abusives.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.31** was adopted.

### **Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 23) - 39 COM 7A.32**

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'année dernière, le bien avait fait l'objet de tirs de mortiers dans plusieurs structures antiques y compris dans le temple de Bel, d'utilisation à des fins militaires, de la construction de nouvelles routes dans la zone archéologique, et de vols de pas moins de 60 bustes funéraires dans les tombeaux de la Nécropole.

Depuis la distribution du rapport sur l'état de conservation de Palmyre, de nouvelles informations nous sont parvenues :

- Le 21 mai 2015, les groupes armés ont pris le contrôle du site, et occupé le musée de Palmyre ; Les services de la Direction des antiquités et des musées (DGAM) ont évacué les objets du Musée de Palmyre qui étaient transportables.
- Selon les médias, en prévision d'une riposte du gouvernement syrien, les groupes armés auraient miné le site archéologique.
- Signalons que les images satellites de nos confrères UNITAR-UNOSAT datant du 4 juin 2015, ne relevaient aucun dommage majeur suite aux combats ce qui n'exclut pas que le site soit en grand danger.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.32** was adopted.

### **Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 21) - 39 COM 7A.33**

Le **Secrétariat** indique que depuis la distribution du document de nouvelles informations nous sont parvenues :

- L'Etat partie a pu accéder à une partie du site en mai 2015 et à en évaluer certains dommages.
- De nouvelles destructions ont eu lieu au sein du bien, comme celle de l'Eglise des 40 martyrs.

Le rapport de l'état partie ainsi que d'autres sources, indiquent que depuis le rapport de 2014, de nombreux bâtiments historiques ont été endommagés partiellement ou détruits, notamment par des bombes détonnées dans des tunnels sous la centre historique aux abords de la citadelle et que des éléments architecturaux et objets ont été pillés de certains édifices.

L'Etat Partie indique que la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées (DGAM) d'Alep a pris des mesures pour mettre en sécurité une grande partie des collections du musée national d'Alep. En outre, le Centre du patrimoine mondial vient de terminer une étude documentaire exhaustive sur l'état de conservation d'Alep. En Juin 2015, juste avant le comité, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a organisé une réunion internationale d'experts sur la reconstruction post-conflit dans le contexte du Moyen-Orient où une séance à l'Ancienne ville d'Alep a été dédiée et plusieurs recommandations opérationnelles en ont résulté.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.33** was adopted.

### **Crac des chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1229) - 39 COM 7A.34**

Le **Secrétariat** informe que le rapport indique que la Direction générale des antiquités et des musées (DGAM) a mené une inspection technique du site le 1er mai 2014 afin de documenter les dommages et définir un projet de restauration. Le rapport indique par ailleurs que l'État partie mène des actions de consolidation et de conservation d'urgence pour protéger le Crac des Chevaliers d'autres dommages, comme recommandé par la réunion technique organisée à la fin du mois de mai 2014 par le Centre du patrimoine mondial, en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM. Depuis la distribution du document d'autres sources signalent que les travaux de restauration menés pourraient ne pas être en conformité avec les recommandations de la réunion technique mentionnée car elles vont au-delà aux travaux d'urgence et de prévention des risques.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.34** was adopted.

### **Ancient villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1348) - 39 COM 7A.35**

Le **Secrétariat** indique que le rapport dresse la liste des dommages infligés au bien dans cinq des huit parcs archéologiques de ce site en série, soulignant le fait que certains parcs ne sont pas accessibles en raison de la présence de groupes armés, et notamment le site principal de ce bien en série, Saint Siméon, qui, selon plusieurs sources semble avoir été transformé en camp militaire

L'État partie signale des dommages considérables dus aux fouilles illégales dans plusieurs parties du site, y compris à Serjilla, à l'utilisation d'engins lourds pour briser des pierres des sites antiques afin de les réutiliser pour de nouvelles constructions illégales, ainsi qu'à l'utilisation d'éléments du bien pour abriter des populations déplacées. Ces faits sont confirmés par le rapport UNITAR/UNOSAT de décembre 2014.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.35** was adopted.

### **General Decision on the World Heritage properties of the Syrian Arab Republic - 39 COM 7A.36**

Le **Secrétariat** indique que ce rapport fait état des dommages subis par les sites de la liste indicative de la Syrie, et par une série d'autres sites culturels historiques ainsi que par des musées. Deux informations nouvelles sont à noter : la destruction partielle le 15 juin 2015 par bombardement aérien du Musée de Ma'arrat al Numan à Idleb qui abrite des mosaïques et autres objets en provenance des villages antiques du nord de la Syrie, et la prise en étau par les combats du musée d'Idleb qui abrite



l'importante collection d'objets en provenance du site archéologique d'Ebla, inclus dans la liste indicative de la Syrie.

Ce rapport détaille les actions de l'Unesco et des organes consultatifs, sur les plans diplomatique, statutaire et opérationnel, pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine syrien, et notamment la mise en œuvre par notre bureau à Beyrouth, d'un projet pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine syrien financé par l'union européenne, en partenariat avec l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM.

Ce rapport émet également des recommandations qui s'appliquent à tous les biens syriens, qui sont reflétés dans le projet de décision. Notons en particulier l'appel à ne pas utiliser les sites à des fins militaires, à coopérer au niveau régional pour lutter contre le trafic illicite y compris d'objets fouillés illégalement sur les sites archéologiques, et la recommandation demandant que toute intervention pendant le conflit soit limitée à des actions minimales d'urgence jusqu'à ce que la situation du pays permette des interventions réfléchies et programmées selon les standards scientifiques internationaux.

**ICOMOS** expressed its regret at the scale of damage that had been inflicted on the World Heritage sites in Syria. ICOMOS noted that the State Party's report and other sources showed that the damages did not just result from armed conflict, but also from looting, deliberate destruction as well as vandalism and illegal excavations. ICOMOS highlighted that it had contributed to various UNESCO initiatives related to the emergency safeguarding of heritage and were ready and ailing to support to State Party with advice on remedial measures and documentation and the development of plans for reconstruction approaches as soon as the situation in the country would allow. ICOMOS underlined that in the immediate term, ICOMOS hoped to continue its partnership with CyArk and other local partners and proposals to digitize the old city of Damascus as a detailed record that could form the basis for future actions.

The Delegation of **Peru** condemned all the acts of violence and terrorism that have affected the heritage of Syria and Iraq. The Delegation stated that the role of UNESCO in UN system must be strengthened to fight against the illicit trafficking of cultural property in the context of armed conflict.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Bonn Declaration reflected a commitment to take a stand against the destruction of heritage and express solidarity with the affected countries. The Chairperson also emphasized that the present decision was significant in illustrating that the Committee would not condone any form of terrorism.

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime sa tristesse quant à la situation en Syrie. Le Liban salue la politique du silence évoquée par le Pérou, mais indique que dans cette partie du monde, il faut une politique musclée. Il rappelle que le §23 de la Déclaration de Bonn propose une solution pratique, recommandant que le Conseil de Sécurité analyse la possibilité d'introduire une dimension spécifique de la protection du patrimoine dans les mandats des missions de maintien de la paix. Le Liban indique qu'il accueille le plus grand nombre de réfugiés syriens, et a pu néanmoins endiguer le trafic illicite de biens culturels. À ce titre, le Liban souligne l'apport de l'UNESCO,

par le biais de l'antenne régionale spécialisée au Bureau de Beyrouth, financée par la Communauté européenne, laquelle a réalisé un travail exemplaire et mérite une amélioration en effectifs et en moyens.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** rappelle qu'à sa 37<sup>e</sup> session, le Comité avait reconnu la nécessité d'inscrire les sites syriens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. L'Algérie souligne que, malheureusement, la destruction s'est généralisée pour atteindre des proportions criminelles qui ont conduit le Conseil de sécurité à adopter une résolution condamnant les destructions ainsi que des mesures contraignantes contre le trafic illicite. L'Algérie rend hommage aux professionnels du patrimoine qui continuent à œuvrer sur le terrain, notamment pour limiter les fouilles illégales et le trafic illicite. Grâce aux actions de l'UNESCO, des mesures ont été prises en collaboration avec d'autres États, Organisations internationales et Organisations consultatives comme l'ICOMOS, que l'Algérie remercie pour leur engagement dans des conditions particulièrement difficiles. L'Algérie encourage la reconstruction post-conflit au Moyen-Orient et espère qu'elle aura un effet positif.

La Délégation du **Portugal** indique que l'action de l'UNESCO est plus indispensable que jamais pour combattre la violence et l'extrémisme quels qu'ils soient. La destruction du patrimoine culturel a atteint une ampleur jamais vue et représente une menace pour la sécurité et la stabilité internationales, et le Portugal indique que la mise en œuvre de la décision de février 2015 du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU doit être une priorité, et qu'il s'attend à ce que l'UNESCO, avec ses compétences spécifiques, y contribue de façon déterminante. Le constat sur l'état de conservation des six biens syriens est alarmant, en particulier concernant l'ancienne ville d'Alep, et la récente prise de Palmyre par des groupes terroristes est le dernier exemple de ces avancées tragiques, non seulement contre le patrimoine, mais aussi contre la diversité culturelle et religieuse, contre les valeurs de paix, de liberté et de justice, contre les droits humains. Le Portugal indique qu'il faut continuer à s'engager pour défendre l'histoire et la vie humaine, que ce soit en Syrie, en Iraq, en Lybie, au Yémen ou ailleurs, et qu'il ne faut pas céder face à la violence et à l'obscurantisme. Le Portugal fait deux suggestions pour la protection du patrimoine : d'une part, d'inclure dans le mandat de paix des organisations des Nations unies la dimension de protection du patrimoine culturel ; d'autre part, de suivre la logique de la Résolution 2199, d'élargir son champ d'application et de la renforcer en la dotant de moyens de sanction.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed regret at the situation in the region and stated that an initiative such as the Bonn Declaration would make a difference in the present situation. The Delegation noted that UNESCO's voice would be the key, and that Jamaica strongly supported this message as having a collective voice was important in this regard.

La Délégation de **Serbie** rappelle l'exemple héroïque des maçons du Mali entendu plus tôt, et exprime son soutien aux interventions du Liban, de l'Algérie et du Portugal. Exprimant son inquiétude quant à l'augmentation de l'ampleur du terrorisme et de la criminalité, la Serbie indique que les migrations que l'on observe suite à la destruction des biens culturels et matériels sont bien plus que le terrorisme ou la criminalité, et que l'UNESCO doit penser dans cet ordre de grandeur. Avec la Déclaration de Bonn et le projet de décision présenté, l'UNESCO a montré qu'elle

est à la hauteur du défi, et la Serbie souligne que l'UNESCO est la seule organisation dans le monde capable de parler avec force et détermination de ces aspects, alors même que les autres organisations ont beaucoup perdu de leur crédibilité.

La Délégation du **Qatar** exprime son accord avec les interventions précédentes. Le Qatar indique que s'il n'est pas possible pour ce Comité d'attribuer des responsabilités précises, le Rapport des Nations unies évoqué par le Secrétariat pointe lui vers des responsabilités précises ; elle indique que chaque partie doit prendre ses responsabilités. Le Qatar soutient la Serbie concernant l'importance du rôle de l'UNESCO pour la protection du patrimoine mondial, et regrette que l'on ne parle du monde arabe, très riche en culture mais faisant face à des défis très importants, que dans ce cadre. Le Qatar fait appel à la sagesse de tous pour que ces attaques contre l'humanité cessent.

La Délégation du **Viêt-Nam** souligne que c'est l'indignation qui se cache sous le silence. Le Viêt-Nam exprime sa tristesse face aux photographies montrées par les Organisations consultatives, et regrette que la Directrice générale n'ait pu rester pour cette discussion, qui aurait pu avoir lieu avant l'adoption de la Déclaration de Bonn. Le Viêt-Nam indique qu'il n'accepte pas ces actes de terrorisme, et remercie l'Allemagne et ses partenaires pour leur initiative avec la Déclaration de Bonn.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime sa plus forte indignation quant à ce qui se passe dans les pays arabes et au Mali. Après avoir vu le cas du Mali, le Sénégal souligne son optimisme que l'intelligence triomphera sur la barbarie, et souligne qu'il faut relever la tête et toujours continuer de reconstruire.

The Delegation of **Argentina** (Observer) acknowledged the efforts of UNESCO in this area, but also stated that declarations and resolutions were not enough. The Delegation remarked that this represented a crime against all humanity and that all States Parties would have to work together with the support of Advisory Bodies and the other UNESCO Culture Conventions in order to jointly develop new normative tools that could help in this crisis.

The Delegation of **Croatia** agreed that the present situation reflected the destruction of human values and noted that UNESCO was a great cultural platform to mobilize expertise. The Delegation recalled the case of Mali, where reconstruction efforts were very quick. The Delegation commended the efforts in Mali and expressed hope that this positive development would take place in Syria and other states as well.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** indique qu'elle est horrifiée par ce qui a été présenté, et rappelle son intervention de la veille concernant la Déclaration de Bonn qui, si elle est clairement une excellente chose, reste insuffisante faute de contenir un instrument juridique applicable et contraignant. La Tunisie indique qu'une Déclaration ne suffit plus aujourd'hui, et qu'il faut passer à des actions concrètes. Elle exprime le souhait que les représentations régionales de l'UNESCO puissent prendre le relais et avoir une action mobilisatrice par le biais de séminaires, de conférences. La Tunisie souhaite que la réflexion permette d'éviter le pire, à savoir une déferlante de barbarie, et exprime son inquiétude que la Lybie ne puisse faire face aux mêmes attaques que la Syrie ou l'Iraq.

La Délégation du **Maroc** indique que malheureusement, le terrorisme se veut universel et ne se limite pas à une région déterminée, et exprime son inquiétude qu'il pourrait ne pas se limiter aux seules régions arabe et africaine. Le Maroc rappelle que, comme l'indique la Déclaration de Bonn, la sauvegarde du patrimoine est la responsabilité de tous, mais qu'il faut toutefois traduire cette responsabilité en actes concrets.

The **Chairperson** recognized that all States Parties present had been deeply moved by the images and reports concerning the destruction in Syria. The Chairperson expressed admiration for the brave actions being undertaken at these sites, even in dangerous situations. The Chairperson acknowledged that presenting the reports of destruction in conflict regions before the adoption of the Bonn Declaration would have illustrated how the Bonn Declaration was the logical solution that the Committee could present. However, the Chairperson emphasized that the joint adoption of the Bonn Declaration and the launch of the Global Coalition for Unite4Heritage was also strategic in showing the Committee's commitment to stand against the destruction of heritage and take action in this regard. The Chairperson emphasized that greater focus must be placed on preventive measures and underlined that if a heritage site was destroyed; endeavors must be taken to aid in its reconstruction. The Chairperson acknowledged that while tools like digitization were helpful, reconstruction efforts may inevitably result in the loss of authenticity in some cases.

The Chairperson stressed that terrorism would not only be prevented with declarations and statements, but that taking action and providing support in the field would also be important. She noted that this had already begun in Iraq, and expressed hope to see the same in other situations like Syria as well. The Chairperson stated that along with the Director-General, the Bonn Declaration had been brought to the attention of the United Nations, particularly the matter of integrating heritage protection into peace missions. The Chairperson encouraged all States Parties to ensure that the principles of the Bonn Declaration were upheld, discussed and implemented at national level and beyond. Finally, the Chairperson emphasized the importance of the collective will of the international community in making these efforts possible.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment from the Delegation of Turkey on paragraph 8 of Decision **39 COM 7A.36**.

The Delegation of **Turkey** proposed an edit to the wording of the amendment in paragraph 8 of the draft decision to comply with the UN Security Council resolution 2199 by deleting the reference to "neighboring countries".

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed that they had no problems with the proposed amendment, but indicated that the amendment should be more specific on the "Member States" referred to in the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** read out the UN Security Council resolution 2199, and said that the reference to "Member States" in this context meant all the Member States of the United Nations. The Delegation was therefore of the view that in this case, the

reference to “Member States” in the amendment should refer to all Member States of UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed agreement, as long as the scope of the decision was not reduced, which was the aim of the proposed Turkish amendment in the first place.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.36** was adopted as amended.

### **Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611) - 39 COM 7A.37**

Le **Secrétariat** présente une introduction générale sur la situation du patrimoine culturel au Yémen et en particulier sur les dommages encourus par les sites du patrimoine mondial et par ceux inscrits sur la liste indicative, et donne un aperçu sur les actions accomplies par l’UNESCO pour documenter et préserver le patrimoine du Yémen.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that Yemen continued to endure political and social disturbances and expressed dismay at the escalation of conflict in the country, which had resulted in the destruction of cultural heritage, such as the National Museum of Dhamar. ICOMOS recognized the efforts of the UNESCO office in Doha and the Ministry of Culture in Yemen in conserving heritage as far as current circumstances permit and stated that ICOMOS was pleased to extend its support to the State Party.

With an exceptional application of Rule 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure, the **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Yemen.

The Delegation of **Yemen** (Observer) regretted that the terrible conflict situation in Yemen had caused the loss of human lives as well as the destruction of both tangible and intangible heritage, which had also affected the nation’s collective memory and civilization. The Delegation expressed hope that with UNESCO’s instruments such as the 1954 Hague Convention and the 1972 Convention, that international organizations and peacekeepers could take on the responsibility and necessary measures to stop the war and provide assistance for the protection of heritage. The Delegation called for an emergency plan and long-term roadmap to be adopted, to ensure the reconstruction and rehabilitation of all that has been destroyed. The Delegation emphasized that this plan should include the obligation of neighboring countries to prevent the leakage of moveable cultural property across their borders. The Delegation thanked the Government of Bahrain, Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH), UNESCO Doha and the World Heritage Centre for their support. The Delegation also thanked the Government of Norway for enabling its participation at this meeting and the Government of Germany for their support in the implementation of important projects that contribute to the cultural development of Yemen.

Le représentant de la Délégation du **Qatar** considère que le Comité se retrouve à traiter un autre cas de pays arabe faisant face à des problèmes de conflit qui causent des destructions. Il considère également que ceci est un autre cas où on ne peut pas pointer une responsabilité claire quant à la destruction du patrimoine et qu’il est donc

important d'appeler les parties concernées à un dialogue constructif pour la paix. Cet appel doit aussi s'adresser au peuple yéménite pour que des discussions et des consultations constructives permettent d'arriver à la paix.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended Yemen for the efforts undertaken despite the difficult conditions and insufficient resources, especially the establishment of a national strategy for the preservation of historic cities, sites and monuments. The Delegation also agreed that the security situation in the country compelled an urgent call for the international community to provide financial and technical support for the preservation of Yemen's World Heritage properties. The Delegation expressed its hope that Yemen would start implementing the international assistance request as soon as the security situation permits.

Le **Secrétariat** présente le rapport sur l'Etat de conservation de la Ville historique de Zabid.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged the commitment of Yemen's Ministry of Culture and its employees to conserve cultural heritage within the Historic Town of Zabid despite constrained circumstances. ICOMOS welcomed the preparation of the National Strategy for the Preservation of Historic Cities, Sites and Monuments 2016-2020, prepared by the General Organization for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen, in collaboration with the German Agency for International Cooperation. ICOMOS indicated that it was important for the national strategy to be followed through with a desired action plan and with the engagement of local communities. ICOMOS highlighted the need to involve local communities in the work for stabilization and preservation. ICOMOS stated that the action plan should be implemented as soon as circumstances allow.

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed the commitment of the Ministry of Culture in Yemen for the progress made despite the difficult circumstances and affirmed the continued support of the Germany Agency for International Cooperation towards the development and implementation of the national strategy in Yemen. The Delegation noted that a small part of Zabid had already been restored and expressed its readiness to support the State Party in developing its action plan.

La représentante de la Délégation de l'**Algérie** constate que l'Etat Partie a fourni des efforts qui dénotent sa volonté de protéger le patrimoine de Zabid. Elle considère qu'il est attendu du projet de politique nationale pour la préservation des villes, des sites et monuments historiques pour 2016 et 2020 qu'il prévoie d'engager des travaux de conservation dans le cadre d'un plan d'action. Elle salue par ailleurs le soutien constant à l'Etat partie de l'agence de coopération allemande (GTZ), qui a contribué à l'élaboration de ce plan et note l'implication des populations locales. Elle note dans le rapport que les stratégies de la politique de préservation comprennent les éléments d'un plan d'action d'urgence qui devrait être produit courant 2015 et qui nécessite des financements. La représentante de la Délégation de l'Algérie rappelle que ces financements pour Zabid sont sollicités depuis plus de trois ans et qu'aucun écho du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour soutenir cette demande du Yémen n'a été reçu. La Délégation de l'Algérie déclare qu'il faut par conséquent y répondre car l'accompagnement de l'Etat Partie par l'UNESCO est indispensable. La représentante de la Délégation de l'Algérie estime que la définition de la forme et des

mécanismes de cet accompagnement pourront être déterminés lors d'une réunion concertée entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial, les Organisations consultatives et les Etats parties pour arrêter une démarche consensuelle et concertée.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** acknowledged that the fragile security situation and political instability had debilitated all conservation efforts. The Delegation complimented the national strategy which provided a roadmap for the preservation of historic sites. The Delegation remarked that it would be a long and arduous journey, but the Committee and Advisory Bodies must be committed to support the State Party in building national confidence and building up the moral fiber of the people of Yemen to deal with the situation.

The Delegation of **Finland** joined the other Committee Members in stating that despite the difficult situation, the State Party had been able to deliver on their draft national strategy and work in cooperation with international organizations and local communities. The Delegation stressed that these efforts would be crucial in maintaining the OUV of the site.

Le représentant du **Centre régional des Etats arabes pour le patrimoine mondial (ARC-WH)** (Observateur) souhaite apporter un élément d'information au sujet de Zabid. Il indique que les ministres de la Culture et des Affaires religieuses du Yémen étaient présents à la 37<sup>ème</sup> session du Comité du patrimoine mondial en 2013 et qu'ils se sont engagés à mettre en place le plan de sauvegarde développé pour le bien. Il indique également que l'ARC-WH s'est depuis engagé en faveur de Zabid et qu'à cet effet trois missions ont eu lieu et un projet pilote a été lancé. Il indique que la situation actuelle de guerre civile ne permet pas d'aller plus loin. Il croit qu'il y a un vrai engagement des autorités yéménites qui ont donné des instructions claires pour que les destructions et les constructions illégales stoppent et ont nommé un nouveau gouverneur à Zabid.

The **Secretariat** responded to the point raised by the Delegation of Algeria on UNESCO's support for Yemen. The Secretariat shared that following the present Committee session, there would be a meeting held with Yemen in mid-July to discuss an emergency action plan, along with institutional partners including ICOMOS. The Secretariat also stated that there were plans for an information session, presided over by the Director-General of UNESCO. The Secretariat informed the Committee that the invitation to attend this information session would be sent to UNESCO Member States once the final date is set.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.37** was adopted.

#### **LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE ARAB STATES REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90) - 39 COM 7A.24**

**Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem (Palestine) (C 1433) - 39 COM 7A.28**

**Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines - Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir (Palestine) (C 1492) - 39 COM 7A.29**

The Draft Decisions related to the properties mentioned above were adopted without discussion.

**ASIA-PACIFIC**

**Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C211 rev) - 39 COM 7A.38**

The **Secretariat** shared that following the technical mission held in October 2014 which revealed the further inclination of the Minaret, the Government of Afghanistan had requested for Emergency Assistance under the World Heritage Fund and this request was approved by the Chairperson in March 2015. The Secretariat elaborated that implementation of the international assistance request would include a technical mission which was being prepared by the Government of Afghanistan in close co-operation with UNESCO Office in Kabul, expected to take place in August 2015. The Secretariat explained that this technical mission would determine the most appropriate type of monitoring equipment required to measure the further inclination of the Minaret as well as establish a comprehensive action plan for the conservation of the Minaret and other crucial archaeological remains. The Secretariat stated that upon the establishment of this action plan, a revised time frame for the implementation of corrective measures identified by the World Heritage Committee at its 31st session would be established, so as to achieve the Desired State of Conservation for removal of the property from the list of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that achieving the Desired State of Conservation for the property would take time and expressed support for undertaking physical conservation efforts in a logical, values-based sequence. ICOMOS therefore agreed with the proposal to extend the timeframe accordingly. Nevertheless, ICOMOS noted that immediate actions were required to safeguard and protect the property from short-term threats to its OUV. ICOMOS shared that the expert mission undertaken in October 2014 had identified that the minaret had declined since 2006.

ICOMOS underscored that a high precision monitoring system should be installed to determine the type of intervention that would be most appropriate in this situation, and for technical and as financial support to be provided as well. ICOMOS underlined that reliable data could assist in determining if intervention to the minaret itself, or associated works to reduce dangers from flooding, or both, should be undertaken. ICOMOS emphasized that the archaeological remains which contribute to OUV could only be managed if they were properly identified and documented. ICOMOS explained that an essential next step in this project would be to use the detailed topographic map prepared in 2012 in the framework of the UNESCO Italy Funds-in-Trust as the basis for the comprehensive archaeological survey. ICOMOS stressed that this work would be an important precursor for the identification of the property boundary and buffer zone, and preparation of the long-term conservation policy, required under desired the Desired State of Conservation adopted by the Committee in 2007.



The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.38** was adopted.

### **Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (C 208 rev) - 39 COM 7A.39**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the State Party had reported some progress in the implementation of corrective measures. However, a timeframe for the completion of corrective measures was still not indicated. The Secretariat shared that presently, the implementation of recommendations made by the ICOMOS technical Advisory mission undertaken in May-June 2014 had not been undertaken. The Secretariat indicated that the Government of Afghanistan was currently in consultation with various relevant stakeholders to discuss the technical details of implementation. The Secretariat elaborated on Phase V of the Japanese Funds-in-Trust for Safeguarding the Bamiyan Valley, currently being finalized between UNESCO and the Government of Japan where an international symposium was being planned for to brainstorm on possible options for the reconstruction of the Eastern Buddha niche. The Secretariat thanked the Government of Japan for its generous support. The Secretariat also related appreciated to the Government of Italy for funding conservation work at other sites the Bamiyan valley and the Government of Korea for funding the establishment of the Bamiyan Cultural Centre.

**ICOMOS** noted the approval of the ICOMOS advisory mission to the property for the modification to the base of the Eastern Buddha niche. ICOMOS indicated that further recommendations from the mission were to develop an overall conservation policy based on the OUV of the property. ICOMOS underlined that progress would only be made when the new phase of the UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust had started. ICOMOS highlighted two concerns. First, ICOMOS stated that there was the apparent reliance of the State Party on external funds for developing conservation approaches and in producing reports for the Committee. Second, ICOMOS noted with concern the absence of information on many aspects of the cultural landscape and regretted the fact that no new information was forthcoming from the State Party. ICOMOS expressed concern regarding issues such as the lack of management plans and uncontrolled development. ICOMOS underscored the need for further action on management plans, measures to mitigate development as well as to support capacity building efforts. ICOMOS highlighted that resources were needed to achieve these measures and supported the call to the international community to provide financial support in this regard.

The Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged that the site still faced significant challenges and expressed its support for the draft decisions that emphasized the need for further conservation efforts. The Delegation agreed with ICOMOS's strategy on the overall long-term approach for the treatment of the property and encouraged all involved to engage in wider stakeholder consultation. The Delegation affirmed Japan's commitment to work with the World Heritage Centre, the Afghan authorities and all stakeholders in support of conserving Afghanistan's important heritage.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** shared that the Government of the Republic of Korea had contributed US\$5.4 million to the development of the Bamiyan Cultural Centre, which would be a space for conservation efforts and exhibitions on

cultural heritage in the Bamiyan valley. The Delegation indicated that the Centre would contribute to improve conservation efforts in the region, capacity building for the local community and job creation. The Delegation supported retaining the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to secure its sound conservation in the long-term. The Delegation regretted that the State Party did not submit a State of Conservation report and that the Secretariat's report had to be prepared based on donor country project reports. The Delegation expressed hope that the State Party would submit an updated report in due course.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed concern that no State of Conservation report was submitted by the State Party, and that the available information did not adequately address all issues put forth, especially regarding development pressures threatening the site. The Delegation emphasized that it was important for the State Party to work with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to review the timeframe for corrective measures.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the contributions of States Parties in support of Afghanistan, and suggested that contributions be broadened to include both in-kind and cash transfers. The Delegation highlighted that capacity-building programmes and awareness-raising for the local communities were important not just for reconstruction efforts, but also to enhance future conservation efforts.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.39** was adopted.

## **EUROPE**

### **Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710) - 39 COM 7A.40**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Poland to present its request to open the State of Conservation report of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery for discussion by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Poland** highlighted that this property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage Danger as well as had a significant boundary modification proposed. The Delegation underlined that these discussions were correlated and proposed the postponement of the discussion on the State of Conservation report until the decision on the proposed boundary modification has been taken by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Croatia** welcomed the draft decision. The Delegation strongly supported efforts by the State Party to protect the property and to explore the future removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation pointed out that the site represented a good example of contrast on the List of World Heritage in Danger, compared with monuments that are threatened with destruction

The Delegation of **Germany, Finland** and **Turkey** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Poland.

The Chairperson postponed the discussion on Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.40** until after the decision on the proposed significant boundary modification had been undertaken by the Committee.

## **Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708) - 39 COM 7A.41**

The **Secretariat** shared that new information had been received concerning new actions undertaken by the Georgian authorities that complied with the corrective measures proposed. The Secretariat stated that during a meeting with Georgian officials on 29 June 2015, the Minister of Culture and Monument Protection in Georgia had formally informed the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies that a special regime of urban development regulations in Mtskheta had been approved by all ministers and a political decision had been taken by the Government of Georgia for a moratorium in the specific area referred to in the draft decision until the urban masterplan becomes operational. The Secretariat and Advisory Bodies were of the view that this was positive new information concerning the corrective measures and that it should be reflected in the draft decision. The Secretariat informed that the revised decision was proposed by the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM.

**ICOMOS** welcomed the new information received from the State Party, particularly on the proposed moratorium on the area around the property. ICOMOS underlined that this provides the necessary foundation for the Urban Land-Use Master Plan recommended by the Advisory Mission as a way to reduce planning difficulties associated with the property. ICOMOS welcomed the inter-ministerial approach undertaken for this property. In light of the new information received, ICOMOS shared that the State Party could begin to execute corrective measures associated with the desired State of Conservation. ICOMOS proposed that the progress on the implementation of the corrective measures be examined at the 40th session of the Committee in 2016, with a possible view to removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested for the floor to be given to the Delegation of Georgia as they had information to add to the report presented.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the revised decision.

The Delegation of **Georgia** affirmed that safeguarding World Heritage was a top priority of Georgia's new leadership. The Delegation drew the Committee's attention to the moratorium on development and land privatization within the heritage zone that had been approved by the Government of Georgia. The Delegation expressed its thanks to the inter-ministerial committee in Georgia, the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and the World Bank for their support and cooperation to ensure the sustainable implementation of the recommendations. The Delegation also highlighted that Georgia was committed to strengthen its national and legal policies to protect its heritage and expressed its hope that the Committee would consider removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in due course.

The Rapporteur read out the draft amendments proposed.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.41** was adopted as amended.

### **Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) (C 724 bis) - 39 COM 7A.42**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Germany to present their request to open the State of Conservation report of the Medieval Monuments in Kosovo for discussion by the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Germany** said that the present circumstances were not right for the debate on this property and proposed to adjourn the debate until the next World Heritage Committee session.

The Delegations of **Croatia, Portugal** and **Peru** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Germany.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adjournment of the debate.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.42** was adopted.

### **Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1150) - 39 COM 7A.43**

The **Secretariat** stated that at the time when the State of Conservation report for Liverpool had been issued, the report from the joint WHC/ICOMOS advisory mission that had taken place in February 2015 had not been finalized as yet. The Secretariat indicated that taking into account the comments from the State Party; this was an opportunity to adjust the timeline for the finalization of the Desired State of Conservation and the conditions which need to be met. The Secretariat informed that a draft revised decision has been proposed by the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that Liverpool continued to face strong challenges from approved large scale development. From the joint advisory missions, ICOMOS observed that genuine progress had been made in improving the State of Conservation of the property through repair and reuse of historical structures previously at risk. However, ICOMOS was of the view the major threat to the OUV posed by overdevelopment within the property and its buffer zone remained.

ICOMOS recalled that it had consistently advised that the proposed Liverpool Waters development at its intended scale would adversely impact the OUV of the property. ICOMOS stressed that the approval of the development had increased the direct threat to the OUV of the property. ICOMOS expressed regret at the apparent misalignment between the obligation of the State Party and the ability of the local planning authority to grant approval to development plans which would have adverse effects on World Heritage properties. ICOMOS explained that the outline planning consent granted in 2012 permitted the proposed development and that neither the State Party nor the local planning council could now intervene except to seek design refinement within the parameters of what has already been approved.

ICOMOS expressed the view that this arrangement did not address the threat to OUV, which would require a substantial reduction in the density and height of the buildings. ICOMOS expressed its understanding that this could only be achieved

through engagement between the Liverpool City Council, the developer and Historic England, and suggested that the State Party could contribute to facilitating such discussions. ICOMOS considered that the Desired State of Conservation, which identifies precisely how the approved scheme should be refined, was needed, together with the necessary corrective measures. ICOMOS underlined that these should inform the changes to the proposed scheme, prior to the consideration of any further detailed planning proposals.

The Delegation of **Poland** recalled that at the point of inscription, the property had already faced some development concerns and that subsequently, it was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2012 due to the Liverpool Waters development project. The Delegation noted that the previous Decisions for this property in 2012, 2013 and 2014 contained a paragraph that “reiterates the (Committee’s) serious concern over the potential threat of the proposed Liverpool Waters development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property...” but that this paragraph was missing in the 2015 decision. The Delegation sought ICOMOS’s clarification on this issue.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed worry on the situation facing the property, especially after hearing from ICOMOS. The Delegation sought clarification on whether there was really a moratorium and an undertaking not to alter the situation before the 1 December 2016.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** (Observer) shared that the newly elected Government of the United Kingdom was keen to give a positive example on how the Convention should be implemented. The Delegation expressed its commitment to ensure the successful removal of Liverpool from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation welcomed the report of the Advisory Mission, which was both helpful and constructive. However, the Delegation noted that some of the recommendations may be difficult to implement, as they came under the jurisdiction of a different municipal authority. The Delegation informed the Committee that a series of technical workshops would be organized and expressed their hope to continue dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies on achievable actions to be undertaken. The Delegation welcomed the additional time to enable discussions to take place before the desired State of Conservation report was due to be submitted by 1 December 2016. To address the point raised by the Delegation of Portugal, the Delegation affirmed that there was broad agreement in the United Kingdom that no new developments would take place within the central docks area of the World Heritage property and buffer zone. However, the Delegation underlined that it would not be feasible to place a development moratorium on the entire property as that would hinder some beneficial projects.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland for the clarification and requested for ICOMOS to comment on this matter.

**ICOMOS** stated that the situation faced by the State Party had remained unchanged since 2012 when the Liverpool Waters project was approved by local authorities in

2012. ICOMOS recalled that the Committee had advised on a number of occasions that if the Liverpool Waters development were built to its fullest extent, it would result in irreversible damage to the OUV of the property. ICOMOS underlined that by virtue of the statutory arrangements in the United Kingdom, it was a valid approval that has been given by the city of Liverpool. ICOMOS explained that the basis on which corrective measures could take place would rely on engagements and discussions with the State Party, English Heritage, the city of Liverpool and the development company concerned. ICOMOS reiterated the importance of a strong and clear resolution from the Committee on a Desired State of Conservation which ensured clarity on the expectations and requirements in order for the threat to be removed. ICOMOS recalled that there were several attempts taken to draft the Desired State of Conservation but ICOMOS was of the view that these drafts were focused more on processes whereas the desired State of Conservation needed to present clarity on the matters of height and density.

ICOMOS expressed its understanding that the State Party had affirmed that until a Desired State of Conservation report is prepared (i.e. 1 Dec 2016), there would be a moratorium on the approval of sub-plans that are required to implement the Liverpool Waters development. ICOMOS also clarified that this moratorium was only subject to the Liverpool Waters development, and not to other beneficial actions that are taking place in the property.

The Delegation of **Poland** said that ICOMOS's statement had clarified the concerns expressed by the Committee and expressed hope that these provisions would be duly implemented.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked ICOMOS for the clarification.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.43** was adopted.

**LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST IN DANGER LOCATED IN THE LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**City of Potosi (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C420) - 39 COM 7A.44**

**Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178bis) - 39 COM 7A.45**

**Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135) - 39 COM 7A.46**

**Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366) - 39 COM 7A.47**

**Coro and its Port (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (C 658) - 39 COM 7A.48**

The Draft Decisions for the properties listed above were adopted without discussion.

*The meeting rose at 6.30pm.*

**THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 1 July 2015**

**FIFTH MEETING**

**9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

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

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

*Documents* WHC-15/39.COM/7B  
WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.7 Rev

*Decisions:* **38 COM 7B.1 to 39 COM 7B.92**

**NATURAL PROPERTIES**

**AFRICA**

**Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407) - 39 COM 7B.1**

La Délégation du **Sénégal** explique que l'Etat partie a fait beaucoup d'efforts pour maintenir ce bien extrêmement riche en biodiversité. Le rapport produit par les Organisations consultatives montre cet effort important fourni par l'Etat partie. La Délégation propose donc qu'une partie du paragraphe 9 soit modifiée pour être en phase avec le rapport de la mission. Elle estime que cela n'enlèverait pas de cohérence à l'ensemble du projet de décision, et demande que l'Etat partie puisse s'exprimer sur ce point.

L'**UICN** demande à voir le texte à l'écran.

Le **Cameroun** (Observateur) explique qu'il subit actuellement des exactions du groupe terroriste Boko Haram, et que cela ne permet pas une mise en œuvre efficiente des mesures recommandées. Néanmoins, il a été possible de finaliser les termes de référence de l'évaluation environnementale et sociale stratégique avec l'aide du Bureau de l'UNESCO à Yaoundé. Le Cameroun sollicite donc une assistance internationale pour la réalisation de cette étude, conformément aux recommandations du Comité. Dans ce cadre, le Cameroun invite une mission conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial / UICN. Il ajoute que la présence de deux ministres, celui de la Culture et celui des Forêts et de la Faune montrent bonne foi et la détermination de l'Etat partie de poursuivre les efforts louables déjà consentis.

L'**UICN** est d'accord pour entreprendre une mission de conseil.

Le **Rapporteur** lit l'amendement soumis par le Sénégal sur le paragraphe 9.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.1** was adopted as amended.

#### **Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis) - 39 COM 7B.4 Rev**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the original report decision had been prepared before the requested monitoring mission could be carried out. Therefore, the Secretariat stated that a revised draft decision was being prepared by the Secretariat in consultation with IUCN to reflect the findings and recommendations of the mission report, notably addressing the need for a strategic environmental impact assessment which would include an assessment of cumulative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

**IUCN** underscored the importance of the bilateral talks between Kenya and Ethiopia to reduce the impact of the proposed dam on the property. IUCN noted that very significant impacts were expected from this development, and emphasized the need for the two States Parties to carry out a joint environmental assessment exercise on the Turkana Basin. IUCN also expressed concern over the lack of progress by the State Party in relation to the implementation of conservation measures unrelated to the dam project, for example concerning overfishing and overgrazing.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that while hydrological data was available, the biological impact of the dam project on the property had not been clarified and this prevented the Committee from identifying and recommending specific remedial actions. The Delegation proposed two amendments to paragraphs 8 and 11 of the Draft Decision and suggested that a mission be carried out to look specifically to biological impacts from the proposed dam development.

The Delegation of **Croatia** welcomed the bilateral efforts of Kenya and Ethiopia, and expressed its confidence that the results from the strategic environmental assessment would be available as of September 2015.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** rappelle que l'aménagement du territoire est une question cruciale pour les pays en voie de développement en général. Il faut trouver la bonne combinaison entre cette question et l'impératif de préservation d'un bien du patrimoine mondial. L'évaluation sur les impacts doit être menée à son terme afin de s'assurer de manière documentée et scientifique de l'impact sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. La discussion entre les deux Etats parties doit être encouragée. La Convention doit se montrer optimiste et généreuse et elle doit tirer les enseignements d'une telle crise pour en sortir renforcée.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed concern over the impact of development activities at the property, and voiced its support for the Draft Decision. The Delegation requested that the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Poland be made available in writing.

The Delegation of **India** noted that considerable progress had been made at the property by the State Party. The Delegation welcomed the bilateral efforts of the two



concerned States Parties, and supported the request for an updated report as proposed in the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** underscored the importance of striking a balance between development and conservation. However, the Delegation also expressed its concerns over the possible impact of the dam project on the property. The Delegation expressed its wish for a prompt and comprehensive environmental assessment report, and stressed the importance of the ongoing bilateral dialogue regarding the preservation of the property, noting how such issues could result in conflicts between neighboring countries.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** estime que le Comité est toujours à la recherche d'un équilibre entre développement et conservation. Elle note avec satisfaction l'aboutissement des discussions entre les Etats parties du Kenya et de l'Ethiopie, dont les résultats sont encourageants. L'Etat partie du Kenya est encouragé à mettre en œuvre le projet conjoint du PNUE sur le développement durable du lac Turkana et à réaliser les études d'impacts. La décision de créer un groupe d'experts conjoints pour la gestion des ressources naturelles constitue un signe très positif. La Délégation propose donc de donner le temps à l'Etat partie de poursuivre le dialogue afin de répondre aux recommandations émises par le Comité, et d'en faire rapport à la 40e session.

The Delegation of **Serbia** acknowledged the complexity of the case, and expressed its support for the Draft Decision. The Delegation also highlighted the importance of paragraph 5 as a precondition for successful property management.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the bilateral process and encouraged the undertaking of a timely environmental assessment. The Delegation suggested that the concerned States Parties define a detailed monitoring plan, including concrete performance indicators addressing the particular impact on local communities. The Delegation further requested that the State Party of Kenya be given the floor to address the issues raised by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** welcomed the bilateral discussions which took place between the concerned States Parties, and noted that failure to finalise a strategic environmental assessment would jeopardise the results of the bilateral efforts. The Delegation requested that the State Party be given the opportunity to voice its stance on this issue.

The Delegations of **Finland, India, Portugal, Turkey, Viet Nam, Kazakhstan** and **Malaysia** supported the revised Draft Decision and welcomed the cooperation between the concerned States Parties.

The Delegation of **Kenya** (Observer) informed the Committee of the creation of a new military unit established by the Government to address the issue of poaching at the property. The Delegation further shared that the Observer Delegation of Ethiopia would deliver a statement on behalf of both States Parties.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** (Observer), on behalf of both the Delegations of Ethiopia and Kenya, informed the Committee that much progress had been made since the

previous Committee meeting, including bilateral consultations held in February 2015, following the monitoring mission of April 2015. The Delegation noted that the mission did not recommend that the property be placed on the Danger List and requested for the support of the Committee for this bilateral effort, including resources needed to undertake the required systematic environmental assessment of the entire property. The Delegation further appealed to the Committee to support the revised Draft Decision.

Le **Rapporteur** lit en français les amendements soumis par les Délégations du Sénégal et de la Pologne.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to paragraph 10 and highlighted an issue with terminology. The Director requested for the Delegation of Poland to clarify on the party that should organise the specialist mission proposed, and to elaborate on the type of mission, if this was proposed to be of a monitoring or advisory nature.

The Delegation of **Poland** clarified that the mission proposed was an advisory mission to be organised by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the amendments submitted by Poland, but rejected all amendments submitted by Senegal.

The Delegation of **Portugal** sought clarification with regards to the absence of specific deadlines for the report referred to within the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Senegal.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande à la Délégation de l'Allemagne sur quel point exactement elle n'est pas d'accord, et propose qu'une date appropriée pour la soumission du rapport soit ajoutée au paragraphe 12.

The Delegation of **Germany** reiterated its wish to maintain the revised decision as it was, without the amendments proposed by Senegal, given that the Committee did not receive any justification for the proposed amendments.

**IUCN** stressed the importance of the strategic environmental assessment being conducted prior to the implementation of the proposed development, and that it should consider the impact on OUV. The Delegation also considered that it would be desirable for a progress report to be presented to the Committee at its 40th session. IUCN underlined that the report should also address other issues directly concerning Kenya but not necessarily related to the dam project. Overall, IUCN was of the view that the revised Draft Decision as presented to the Committee had a strong internal logic.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked IUCN for the clarification, and expressed support for the revised Draft Decision, without amendments.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** explique que les amendements prennent en compte les nouvelles informations données par les Etats parties.

La Délégation du **Portugal** estime que la question décisive est l'accord qui devra intervenir entre les parties concernées. Les amendements proposés par la Délégation du Sénégal peuvent être acceptés, mais les coupures ont fait perdre leur sens à certains paragraphes.

The **Chairperson** requested for IUCN to state the amendments that it could accept.

**IUCN** went through the amendments proposed by Senegal and explained its position on each of them. Regarding the amendment on paragraph 6, IUCN reiterated that implementation should follow the assessment. On the amendment to paragraph 7, IUCN noted that the original language of the decision, before the amendment proposed by Senegal, was useful, but not essential. Similarly, on the proposed deletion of the former paragraph 7, IUCN considered that this included advice from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body, which the Committee could wish to ignore if it wished to do so. IUCN also stressed that it had suggested reviewing the assessment to be conducted by the State Party with a view to providing its advice, and proposed to retain the related language in the decision. The Delegation suggested that the amended paragraph 12 resulted in a less precise language that would not be as helpful to the State Party and reiterated its view that the Committee should examine a progress report at its next session.

The Delegation of **Finland** opposed the proposed amendment, and sought clarification on the difference between a revised Draft Decision and an amended Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed the wish to retain the revised Draft Decision, without amendments.

Le **conseiller juridique** explique que le projet de décision révisé a été distribué aux membres du Comité sur papier bleu. Par la suite, des amendements ont été proposés par la Délégation du Sénégal. C'est au Comité de décider quelle version il va adopter : celle sur papier bleu ou celle soumise par la Délégation du Sénégal.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed the wish to retain the revised decision, as it was on the blue paper distributed in the room, without amendments.

La Délégation de **Colombie** appuie la position des Délégations de l'Allemagne et de la Finlande.

The **Chairperson** enquired if Committee members could to retain the revised decision without any amendments.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** proposed that the two concerned States Parties have a consultation on the issue, and produce an amended text for consideration by the Committee at a later stage.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and **Turkey** reiterated their willingness to accept the amendments submitted.

The Delegations of **Poland** and **Peru** proposed discussing the amendments point by point, as they considered that there was no opposition to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Poland.

The **Chairperson** noted that three Committee members were in favor of retaining the revised decision without amendments, and that there were others who were willing to accept the amendments. The Chairperson therefore asked if the three Committee members in question would be willing to go along with the view of the majority.

The Delegation of **Croatia** voiced its support to the revised Draft Decision, without amendments.

The Delegation of **India** supported the amendment by Senegal.

The Delegation of **Philippines** joined the Delegation of Viet Nam in requested that the two parties concerned consult with each other so that the Committee could review an amended text reflecting consensus at a later stage.

The **Chairperson** requested that the two parties concerned work together with IUCN on a new text to submit for consideration by the Committee later during the session. The Chairperson therefore deferred the decision until the new text was prepared.

#### **Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley (Kenya) (N 1060rev) - 39 COM 7B.5 Rev**

The **Secretariat** explained that the item had been opened at the request of Senegal based on new information received from the State Party of Tanzania. The Secretariat stated that the proposed development at the property would depend on the outcome of the strategic environmental assessment that was currently being undertaken.

**IUCN** clarified the documents on which the amendment had been based. IUCN further clarified that the amendment suggested by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN had been discussed with the concerned State Party and was reflected in a revised Draft Decision presented to the members of the Committee.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** explique que l'accord entre les deux Etats parties (Kenya et Tanzanie) nécessitait une révision du projet de décision. L'étude d'impact, lorsqu'elle aura été réalisée, pourrait atténuer les préoccupations du Comité.

Le **Rapporteur** lit les amendements proposés par le Sénégal sur la version révisée du projet de décision (modifications aux paragraphes 6 et 9 et suppression du paragraphe 8).

**IUCN** presented two amendments to resolve the issue. IUCN stated that the potential developmental threats in the Natron Lake meant that the State Party of Tanzania could not proceed with any activities without clearance, taking into account what IUCN had already said about the construction of a soda ash factory at Lake Natron. IUCN considered that the language used on the blue form was accurate enough and

expressed the view that the amendment suggested by the Delegation of Senegal was not helpful for Tanzania. The Delegation also noted that if the Committee saw the necessity for IUCN to revisit the site, IUCN would do so.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** est consciente que des discussions étaient en cours lorsqu'elle a soumis son amendement. Elle estime qu'il y avait une répétition entre les paragraphes 6 et 8 et demande que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie de la Tanzanie.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** (Observer) explained that there was nothing currently happening in Tanzania in relation to this project and that some feasibility studies were underway. The Delegation noted that according to Tanzanian law, any project must be subjected to Environmental Impact Assessment. The Delegation stressed that Tanzania was conscious that the result of the Environmental Impact Assessment should be communicated to the World Heritage Centre as required in Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Peru** suggested further amendments to the Draft Decision. The Delegation sought clarification from the Legal Advisor on the amendments which should be dealt with first, in order to proceed according to the rules.

Le **conseiller juridique** explique que selon l'article 23 du Règlement intérieur du Comité, ce dernier doit examiner en premier l'amendement le plus éloigné par rapport à la proposition initiale.

The **Chairperson** stated that given the advice from the Legal Advisor, the Committee should at first instance proceed with examining the amendment from Senegal.

La Délégation du **Portugal** estime que l'avis donné par le conseiller juridique s'applique lorsqu'il y a un vote, mais pas nécessairement au cours de discussions. Elle suggère de procéder à l'examen de l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Sénégal paragraphe par paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Germany** enquired if Tanzania was more comfortable with the amendments proposed on the blue form, or the amendments that were proposed by Senegal.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** (Observer) stated that it preferred the amendments from Senegal.

The Delegation of **Peru** considered that the intervention of the Delegation of Tanzania helped the Committee to make its decision. The Delegation therefore requested that the Committee look through the amendments proposed by Senegal paragraph by paragraph.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** considère que l'amendement du Sénégal est encore plus fort que celui du Secrétariat et de l'UICN, car il exige l'engagement de l'Etat.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed with the amendment by Senegal.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.5 Rev** was adopted as amended.

The **Observer** from the indigenous community of Lake Bogoria noted that their community was not consulted regarding the site. The Observer stated that the Government completely ignored the community at the time of the site's nomination. The Observer requested that the Committee endeavour to ensure that the Government did not use the inscription of the Lake Bogoria to deny the rights of indigenous people residing in and around the community.

**LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST  
LOCATED IN THE AFRICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Sangha Trinational (Cameroon / Central African Republic / Congo) (N 1380rev) -  
39 COM 7B.2**

**Lakes of Ounianga (Chad) (N 1400) - 39 COM 7B.3**

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

**ARAB STATES**

**LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST  
LOCATED IN THE AFRICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE  
PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1263) - 39 COM 7B.6**

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

**ASIA-PACIFIC**

**Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154) - 39 COM 7B.7**

The **Secretariat** presented the report.

**IUCN** stated that the Great Barrier Reef was deteriorating and faced major challenges. IUCN noted that the 2050 long term sustainability plan that was proposed by the State Party to address the key threats and define a vision for its long-term conservation was an ambitious plan which had been put in place through a multi-stakeholder process. IUCN shared that it had attended the meeting of the stakeholder groups chaired by the Minister for Environment and that the process was beneficial for all in terms of interaction between the participants. IUCN underlined that the upstream process should also apply to monitoring. Both IUCN and World Heritage Centre noted that the investment strategy that was critical to the implementation of the plan should be completed and that several commitments were still required to translate the plans to legislation. IUCN encouraged the State Party to ensure that the implementation of the plan was effective and that the investment strategy would be established. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre recommended that for the State Party to report back to the Committee on the progress made by

December 2016 and also recommended for the Committee to request for the State Party to submit a State of Conservation report for examination at its 44th session in 2020.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the State Party of Australia had been criticized a year ago in Doha for not caring enough care for the largest barrier reef of the world. The Delegation noted that according to the report received this year, the situation of the site seemed more promising. The Delegation expressed its appreciation that the State Party had acted upon the Decision made in Doha and noted that the presence of the Delegation of Australia in this session demonstrated their commitment to the preservation of this site. The Delegation stated that the election of a new Government in Queensland had positive outcomes in that the challenges faced by the reefs were addressed. The Delegation also acknowledged the significant contribution of many other stakeholders, including several NGOs, in this process. The Delegation underlined the importance of working consistently towards the 2050 sustainability plan to improve the health of the reefs and it further noted that the full implementation of this plan required adequate legislation, funding, sustained political will and close cooperation with multiple stakeholders. The Delegation stressed that only in this manner could the plan move forward with common purpose and mutual understanding. The Delegation expressed its view that the sustained action for preservation and conservation of the Great Barrier Reef was essential and the Delegation encouraged all stakeholders to actively participate in this collective endeavor.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** agreed with the remarks in the report of IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation congratulated the State Party for their accomplishments in the past year and noted that this should be a positive lesson for all.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** welcomed all the corrective measures that had been put in place to reduce pollution by 80% in 2020, improve the quality of water and limit developments on new ports, and commended the State Party for their efforts. The Delegation noted that 90% of the deterioration of the property was caused by climate change, cyclones and starfish eating corals. The Delegation further noted the difficult task of reconciling the desire to protect the reefs with the need for strong social-economic development in the surrounding area. The Delegation expressed its belief that the actions taken for the Great Barrier Reef reflected strong political will among all stakeholders – the federal and national government, local community, and indigenous people. The Delegation also acknowledged the support of international community, including international NGOs. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision and expressed confidence that the State Party would be able to fulfill its commitment in the future and set a good example in the history of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Finland** underlined the remarkable efficiency of the State Party's achievements in addressing the severe situation in the Great Barrier Reef through the long-term sustainability plan. However, the Delegation expressed concerns over the negative trends of many biodiversity values in the property. The Delegation strongly encouraged the State Party to address the impacts of climate change and the increase of ship traffic affecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation emphasized the contribution of the civil society in the protection of heritage and supported the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** welcomed the efforts and actions of the State Party of Australia since the previous Committee session in Doha. The Delegation stated that the progress was remarkable and the attention that the site had received both nationally and internationally demonstrated the power of the Convention. The Delegation was of the view that the power and influence of the Convention should continue to be harnessed for the protection of World Heritage. However, the Delegation expressed concerns that the overall outlook of the property still remained poor and that major threats as well as accumulative impacts presented considerable challenges to the future management of the site. The Delegation recalled that the Decision taken by the Committee in the previous year stated the need to ensure that the development inside the port did not threaten the OUV. The Delegation also stated that the long-term sustainability plan was the first but important step towards the future of the reefs and stressed the importance of its effective implementation. The Delegation underlined that sustainable financing needed to be secured and that the additional investment of AUD 200 million was most welcomed. The Delegation noted that the task of the Committee was to ensure follow-up actions and continue a close dialogue on the implementation of a long-term sustainability plan. The Delegation supported the draft decision as proposed by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged the commitment of Australia in the improvement the management of this site financially, scientifically, administratively to remedy existing threats. The Delegation expressed confidence in the State Party's ability to remedy the issues, but acknowledged that this would be a long process. The Delegation also noted the concerns of the indigenous communities and NGOs. The Delegation supported the draft decision proposed.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** apprécie les efforts du gouvernement fédéral d'Australie et du Queensland pour la suite réservée aux décisions prises par le Comité en 2014 à Doha par rapport au dossier de la grande barrière de corail, ce qui dénote de l'importance du site et de la préoccupation de l'Etat partie pour sa préservation. Cette préoccupation était palpable lors du Congrès mondial des parcs tenu à Sydney en novembre 2014 car plusieurs réunions ont été organisées sur les problématiques du bien. Elle exhorte l'Etat partie à maintenir le cap pour la sauvegarde de ce site au combien important, pour permettre à tout le monde, à l'Etat partie, à la province, aux communautés locales, de tirer au mieux les avantages dans un aménagement cohérent, dans une démarche très participative. Elle estime qu'il faudrait suivre de très près ce qui se passe sur le site et exprime son soutien au projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its satisfaction with the efforts of the Australian Government and Queensland Authorities with regards to the implementation of the 2050 plan. The Delegation stated that the draft decision by IUCN and World Heritage Centre was a balanced compromise. The Delegation acknowledged the vulnerability of the Great Barrier Reef and its need for constant monitoring, and was of the view that the implementation of the measures in the draft decision would properly secure the site. The Delegation also thanked the civil society for their active involvement in this process.



The Delegation of the Republic of **Philippines** recognized the measures undertaken by the State Party as well as its commitment to ensure the Outstanding Universal Value and long-term sustainability of the site. The Delegation noted the establishment of Reef 2050 Advisory committee comprising representatives from the community and industry. The Delegation also noted that the vastness of the property added to the complexity of the situation. The Delegation remarked that the collaboration between the State Party of Australia and Queensland have responded well to previous Committee decisions. The Delegation recognized that a management protection plan was in place and strong legal instruments as well as substantial financial investment supported the long-term sustainability plan. The Delegation expressed its appreciation for the efforts to improve water quality and for the monitoring programmes dedicated to the health of the water. The Delegation recommended that the State Party should undertake a programme that would address both environmental and social issues. The Delegation noted that the State Party had been vigilant in the protection of coral reefs and recommended that the same level of vigilance be applied to the rest of the ecosystem as well. The Delegation expressed its hope that the State Party would report back to the Committee on the progress undertaken in due course.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged that the State Party had taken key steps for the management of the site and expressed its hope that the 2050 plan would not only stop further degradation, but also restore the property. The Delegation noted with satisfaction the State Party's commitment to stop the dumping of dangerous material in the property and to improve water quality. The Delegation expressed its hope that further funding would be forthcoming if necessary. The Delegation stated that the concerns of civil society were important and encouraged the State Party to implement the 2050 long-term sustainability plan and keep the Committee informed about the future progress.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated that the health and sustainability of the Great Barrier Reef was a global concern and was pleased that Australia addressed this concern. The Delegation welcomed the long-term sustainability plan and the involvement of all stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous people. The Delegation supported the Decision presented by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Turkey** emphasized the importance of the future implementation of this decision and stated that the degradation of heritage sites by natural disasters or human action was a major concern. The Delegation underlined the need for corrective and remedial actions and encouraged the State Party as well as civil society to work together and promote the spirit of a collective future. The Delegation supported the draft decision presented.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the draft decision and noted that the State Party had undertaken steps to support the vitality of the Great Barrier Reef. The Delegation expressed its hope that the positive synergy with civil society and NGOs would continue in the implementation of the long-term sustainability plan.

La Délégation du **Peru** a estimé que la Grande barrière de corail a été gravement affectée par des facteurs naturels et anthropiques. Elle a indiqué que le

réchauffement climatique faisait mourir le corail, que les cyclones et les tornades touchent de manière récurrente la barrière, que les phénomènes biologiques comme les actions destructrices des étoiles de mer ainsi que le dragage de gros œuvres, l'utilisation d'engrais sur les berges et les cotes causaient des dommages. Elle a estimé que solutions ne relèvent pas seulement de la volonté politique mais que l'implication de la recherche scientifique et technique était indispensable. Elle a indiqué que l'adoption de la Décision du Comité serait synonyme de création d'une grande alliance mondiale des gouvernements et de la société civile en faveur du bien.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the Draft Decision and acknowledged that it was the product of the involvement of a wide range of stakeholders. The Delegation emphasized the importance of taking care of the vitality and health of the property, in order to enhance its resilience. The Delegation also acknowledged the difficulties of protecting site due to its size and expressed its hope that the State Party of Australia and Queensland would continue to work together to ensure the sustained implementation of the 2050 plan.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the commitment of the State Party to protect the site, but at the same time, noted the vulnerability of the property to environmental challenges which impacted the reef. The Delegation acknowledged the close cooperation between the State Party of Australia, IUCN, the World Heritage Centre and civil society. The Delegation expressed its support for the long-term sustainability plan and was of the view that the plan would help the State Party conduct evaluation and monitoring in a systematic manner.

The Delegation of **Colombia** welcomed the Draft Decision presented and the joint efforts of the national and state Governments of Australia to commit funds dedicated to safeguarding the property in the long term. The Delegation expressed its belief impact assessments should be carried out to identify possible threats to the property and to properly define further measures to be undertaken. The Delegation of Colombia also expressed its appreciation for the report presented by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** estime que la grande barrière de corail est d'une importance considérable pour la biodiversité d'intérêt mondial et que la protection de sa VUE nous interpelle en raison des différents facteurs complexes qui l'affectent. Elle note avec satisfaction que l'Etat partie a répondu à des inquiétudes exprimées lors de la 38ème et de la 37ème session. Les recommandations formulées par le Comité concernent les mesures à prendre sur le plan de développement, la gestion de la qualité de l'eau. Elle note dans le rapport de l'Etat partie que des mesures concrètes sont prises sur la qualité de l'eau, sur la restriction des nouveaux projets dans les limites du bien et pour garantir la cohérence avec le plan de zone du bien et de convenir avec les différentes parties prenantes de réaliser les évaluations de performance à des échéances arrêtées. Elle note l'engagement ferme d'interdire les déversements en mer des matériaux de dragage qui ont fait réagir les ONG de protection de l'environnement à juste raison. Elle salue l'engagement effectif de l'Etat partie à dégager des fonds en faveur du bien. Elle le félicite pour ses engagements à soutenir la conservation du bien et soutient le projet de décision.

La Délégation du **Qatar** félicite l'Etat partie pour le plan de gestion durable du bien conformément à la décision prise à Doha en 2014, ce qui selon elle constitue une preuve de grande responsabilité et d'efficacité. Elle estime que le projet de décision reflète bien les efforts déployés par l'Etat partie et y apporte son soutien.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that the State Party had responded to the concerns of the Committee by establishing the 2050 plan. The Delegation expressed its hopes that the State Party would reduce the negative environmental impacts to the reef, continue scientific research and implement the sustainability plan.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the Draft Decision. The Delegation underlined that the measures in the 2050 plan would adequately ensure the safeguarding of the property. The Delegation acknowledged the challenges encountered by the State Party and expressed hope that a gradual progress report of the status of the Great Barrier Reef would be presented by 2017.

The Delegation of **Australia** (Hon. Greg Hung MP, Minister for the Environment) stated that the Great Barrier Reef was not only Australia's greatest natural icon, but it was also the world's greatest Barrier Reef. The Delegation stated that in this regard, Australia had clearly heard the concerns of the Committee over the last five years, and responded accordingly. The Delegation thanked the Committee, and in particular Germany, for their support and shared that all the Committee's recommendations have been implemented. The Delegation shared about the accomplishments made, such as the proposals to place capital dredge material in the Marine Park being reduced from five to zero, and that the disposal of capital dredge in the Marine Park and entire World Heritage area had been banned. The Delegation also underlined that Australia and Queensland have projected more than \$2 billion for investment in reef management and research activities over the coming decade, with a further \$200 million recently announced for water quality improvement.

The Delegation acknowledged that climate change and the water quality were real challenges and explained that the new Reef 2050 Plan would be a game-changing 35 year blueprint to help protect and build the resilience of the Reef. The Delegation elaborated that the plan had been developed in partnership with all levels of Government, the community, traditional owners, industry, civil society and the scientific community. The Delegation also highlighted that the Plan has been given the force of both national and state laws. The Delegation underlined that the implementation of the plan would be supported by an independent expert panel, chaired by Australia's chief scientist and a Reef Advisory Panel led by the Chair of the Australian Institute of Marine Science. The Delegation also stated that civil society would have an ongoing role on the Advisory Panel as well. The Delegation assured the Committee that the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority would ensure that the plan builds on the best management and scientific advice. The Delegation announced that Australia would commit an additional \$8 million for enhanced reef monitoring by the Marine Park Authority. The Delegation reiterated that Australia would ensure that the Reef continues to be the best protected marine system in the world. The Delegation thanked the Chairperson and the Committee for the success of the Convention and fully endorsed the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for their commitment in protecting the site.

The representative of **Greenpeace** stated that there was widespread acknowledgement that the Great Barrier Reef was in Danger and that the Australian Government should cease all activities that would further harm the reef, and work towards a healthy Great Barrier Reef. The representative called upon the Committee to continue to closely monitor the Australia Government's actions towards the property.

The representative of the **World Wildlife Fund (WWF)** stated that there were strong expectations for the Committee to stand up for Great Barrier Reef. While the representative supported the Draft Decision and acknowledged the efforts of the State Party, the representative also remarked that plans alone did not save the reefs and that urgent action was needed. The representative thanked the Committee, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre for compelling Australia to take urgent action to safeguard the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** (representative from the Queensland Government) expressed its strong commitment to address the concerns of the Committee and recalled that Queensland had recently appointed a new minister to protect the reef, undertaking measures such as the restriction of future port development and ensuring good water quality. The Delegation expressed its appreciation for the efforts of World Heritage committee and IUCN, the contributions of civil society NGOs such as WWF and Greenpeace. The Delegation underlined the importance of the Great Barrier Reef for the people of Australia, welcomed the draft decision, and affirmed their commitment to address the impact of climate change on the reef.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.7** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** noted that the global importance of the Great Barrier Reef had been demonstrated by how all 21 Committee members had spoken during the debate. The Chairperson thanked the Australian Government, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and civil society NGOs such as Greenpeace and WWF and underlined that these accomplishments were the result of Australia acting on Committee recommendations from the previous year and ensuring financial commitment for the implementation of plans. The Chairperson welcomed the continued dialogue among all stakeholders involved and encouraged the State Party to share its experience so that all could benefit from it.

#### **LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798) - 39 COM 7B.8**

**Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083 bis) - 39 COM 7B.9**

**Wulingyuan Scenic and Historic Interest Area (China) (N 640) - 39 COM 7B.10**

**Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338) - 39 COM 7B.11**

**Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) - 39 COM 7B.12**

**Shiretoko (Japan) (N 1193) - 39 COM 7B.13**

**Phoenix Islands Protected Areas (Kiribati) (N 1325) - 39 COM 7B.14**

**Chitwan National Park (Nepal) (N 284) - 39 COM 7B.15**

**Puerto-Princesa Subterranean River National Park (Philippines) (N 652 rev) - 39 COM 7B.16**

**Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev) - 39 COM 7B.17**

The Draft Decisions for the properties listed above were adopted.

### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

**Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) - 39 COM 7B.22 Rev**

The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation report for Lake Baikal and introduced the revised draft decision, proposed by WHC and IUCN, further to the outcomes and recommendations included in the report of the reactive monitoring mission to the State Party of Mongolia.

The Delegation of **Poland** stated that paragraph 6(b)(iv) of the Draft Decision was not necessary and could be omitted, and paragraph 6(b)(v) should be modified.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party of Mongolia for having hosted the reactive monitoring mission and encouraged the State Party to conduct an the Environmental Impact Assessment as stated in the report for examination by the Committee at its next session in 2016.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested for the Secretariat to clarify the differences between paragraph 6(b)(iv) and paragraph 7 regarding the impact assessment.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** welcomed the joint effort of both State Parties and supported the revised draft decision.

The delegation of **Serbia** supported the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that due to the late submission of the report by the State Party of the Russian Federation, no detailed information, except for the mission report was available. The Delegation was pleased that the Mongolian Government had hosted the mission and contributed to the reactive monitoring process. The Delegation was of the view that it would be better to discuss the state of conservation of this property at the next Committee meeting when more information would have been provided by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported retaining paragraph 7 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Mongolia** (Observer) stated that it recognized the potential impact of the project on the OUV of the site. The Delegation shared that they had invited an internationally recognized company to conduct research on the hydrological and ecological impact on the river and lake. The Delegation affirmed its intention to protect the site from negative impacts and its commitment to comply with the intergovernmental agreement between the Russian Federation and Mongolia. The Delegation assured that the measures proposed in paragraph 6(b)(iv) would be undertaken.

The **NGO representative** from Rivers without Boundaries supported the revised draft decision and requested that a joint assessment be conducted by Mongolia and Russian Federation before the next meeting.

**IUCN** explained that paragraph 6(b)(iv) concerned the environmental impact assessment that would be undertaken for the dams cumulatively rather than separately, while paragraph 7 requested for a strategic environmental impact assessment in both countries regarding the hydropower dams in Russia that may impact the property. IUCN underlined that actions could only be undertaken once the results from the impact assessments were received.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that the best solution would be to have a common hydrological expertise for all inflows and outflows connected to Lake Baikal and asked to exclude paragraph 7 from the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** stated that it was neither against the necessity of the assessment nor the draft decision, but disagreed with paragraph 4 that requested for Mongolia to do a cumulative Impact Assessment of all dams and reservoirs because it would be very challenging for a developing country like Mongolia to conduct this research at such an immense cost.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported keeping the revised draft decision as proposed by WHC and IUCN.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested for IUCN's clarification on the importance of the assessment and noted that they shared the concern expressed by the Delegation of Viet Nam.

**IUCN** stated that a project with such an investment budget necessitated the impact assessment be undertaken before the project was carried out, and hence paragraph 7 expressed the need for a broader Environmental Impact Assessment addressed to both State Parties. IUCN noted that this decision was reflected appropriately to address development projects in both States Parties.

The meeting rose at 1.00pm.

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 1 July 2015

SIXTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)

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

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

*Documents* WHC-15/39.COM/7B  
WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.7 Rev

*Decisions:* **38 COM 7B.1 to 39 COM 7B.92**

**Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) - 39 COM 7B.22 Rev**

The **Chairperson** re-opened item 39 COM 7B.22 Rev.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** reported that it came to an agreement with the other Delegations.

The **Rapporteur** reported that an amendment had been received that was submitted by four Delegations: Germany, Viet Nam, Poland and Japan.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.22rev** was adopted as amended.

**LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE NORTH AMERICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Wood Buffalo National Park (Canada) (N 256) - 39 COM 7B.18**

**Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (Ukraine / Germany / Slovakia) (N 1133bis) - 39 COM 7B.19**

**Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765) - 39 COM 7B.20**

**Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev) - 39 COM 7B.21**

**Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) - 39 COM 7B.23**

**Lena Pillars (Russian Federation) (N 1299) - 39 COM 7B.24**

**Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023 rev) - 39 COM 7B.25**

**Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis) - 39 COM 7B.26**

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

## **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

**Cerrado Protected areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1035) - 39 COM 7B.27**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN had proposed to open this item for discussion as this property was proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Secretariat stated that on 4 February 2015, a report on the state of conservation was submitted by the State Party of Brazil and on 26 June 2015, the State Party had submitted an additional report providing information about the launch of a public consultation process to discuss the expansion of the Park and the development of a series of ongoing biodiversity conservation initiatives, such as fire management, land restoration, public use structure, and endangered species protection programs to improve the land management and environmental action in the Chapada dos Veadeiros.

**IUCN** acknowledged the progress made by the State Party of Brazil but pointed out that some issues remain unresolved, such as the lack of legal protection of the site. Consequently, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre jointly suggested that the Committee should consider inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Portugal** explained that it had proposed amendments to the Draft Decision as there had been progress at the site. The Delegation highlighted that there was a memorandum of understanding in place and that land management and environmental action at the site had improved. Consequently, the Delegation proposed giving one more year to the State Party of Brazil to continue with this endeavour.

The Delegation of **India** supported the amendments of the Delegation of Portugal. The Delegation acknowledged that issues concerning the conservation of the site still remained, but also requested that Brazil be given another year as well.

The Delegation of **Peru** shared the analysis and conclusions by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. The Delegation noted that existing problems still undermined the preservation of the site. However, the Delegation acknowledged the firm political will, expressed by Brazil, to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and



therefore agreed with previous speakers to postpone the final decision on potential Danger Listing of the site to the 40th session in 2016.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient l'intégralité de la proposition du Portugal.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the amendments proposed by Portugal but at the same time acknowledged that the State of Conservation of the site was still unacceptable. The Delegation recognized Brazil's commitment to ensure that the OUV would not be adversely affected. The Delegation noted that significant measures to improve the State of Conservation of the site were still underway and that more measures were being developed. The Delegation agreed with the proposal to give Brazil another year to improve the conditions at the site.

The Delegation of **Finland** recalled that the Committee had for several years requested for the State Party to provide more information on the state of the site. The Delegation underlined the importance of legal protection and stated that an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be a logical step. However, the Delegation expressed its willingness to join the growing consensus for Brazil to have another year to improve conditions at the site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** agreed with previous speakers and acknowledged the conservation efforts of the State Party of Brazil and the development of action plans which included public consultations. The Delegation acknowledged that significant progress had been made to address the lack of protection and therefore the Delegation agreed that the State Party should be given an additional year.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party of Brazil for its efforts while at the same time, encouraged the State Party to do more to protect the site. The Delegation requested that the floor be given to the State Party.

La Délégation de **Colombie** reconnaît les difficultés du gouvernement brésilien, et, compte tenu de son engagement, elle soutient pleinement la proposition du Portugal. The Delegation of **Germany** said that it agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Portugal for the reasons outlined by the Delegation of Finland.

Compte tenu des efforts entrepris par l'Etat partie et des nouvelles informations reçues, la Délégation d'**Algérie** se rallie à la proposition du Portugal, tout en comprenant la position de l'UICN.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** welcomed the commitment made by Brazil and supported the proposal of the Delegation of Portugal.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted the progress made by Brazil and agreed with the previous speakers that Brazil should be given an additional year to improve the situation at the site.

La Délégation du **Qatar** remercie l'UICN pour le rapport de qualité et appuie l'amendement du Portugal.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed understanding towards the difficulties faced by Brazil and agreed with the proposal to give Brazil another year before the decision on Danger Listing was taken.

The Delegation of **Brazil** (Observer) thanked the Delegation of Portugal for its proposal and expressed its full commitment to the preservation of the property. The Delegation stated that its own remote sensing observations had revealed that the native vegetation was in good health and initiatives to enhance the protection of the biodiversity and endangered species were underway. The Delegation underlined that the whole area, including the buffer zones, was now part of an environmental protection area with a status of legal protection on state level. The Delegation highlighted that with a new public administration in place this year, significant progress has been achieved. The Delegation also shared that a memorandum of understanding had been signed with the responsible state of Goiás to implement land management and environmental actions. The Delegation concluded that the efforts to restore full protection of the property were underway and that it appreciated if the Committee could take the information into consideration and allow one more year for Brazil improve the State of Conservation of the property.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.27** was adopted as amended.

#### **Area de Conservacion Guanacaste (Costa Rica) (N 928) - 39 COM 7B.29**

La Délégation de **Colombie** a présenté une proposition d'amendement permettant à l'Etat partie d'envoyer l'étude de l'impact environnemental requis en février 2016. Elle souhaite encourager une mission consultative afin d'assister l'Etat partie, si besoin, à identifier les impacts environnementaux potentiels sur le site et à travailler de manière coordonné avec l'IUCN.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre had received a letter from the Ministry of Environment and Energy of the State Party of Costa Rica on 26 and 29 June 2015, where the State Party informed that studies have already been undertaken for these specific requirements. The Secretariat explained that one of these requirements was Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which included a biodiversity impact assessment and an evaluation study on cumulative effects. The Secretariat also indicated that the assessment of current and potential impact on the OUV of the property would also be included in the Terms of Reference of the current studies.

**IUCN** stated that the proposal by Colombia appeared to be acceptable in principle but indicated that they may request to take the floor again when detailed amendments have been displayed.

The Delegation of **Peru** fully supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed, in principle, with the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Colombia, but requested for the amendments to be displayed on the screen.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.29** was adopted as amended.

### **Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290) - 39 COM 7B.31**

Le **Secrétariat** a souhaité apporter une clarification concernant le paragraphe 7 du projet de décision. Ce paragraphe indique que le rapport demandé par le comité doit être préparé par l'Etat partie dans lequel se trouve le bien, et ce, en consultation avec les autres Etats parties concernée.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.30** was adopted as amended.

## **LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis) - 39 COM 7B.28**

**Morne - Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica) (N 814) - 39 COM 7B.30**

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

## **MIXED PROPERTIES**

### **AFRICA**

**Ngorongoro Conservation Area (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C/N 39bis) - 39 COM 7B.34**

The **Secretariat** reported that the State Party had submitted the State of Conservation report on 6 January 2015 and that it was proposed for discussion by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in consideration of development projects that have already been undertaken or were currently being planned for. The Secretariat noted that the State Party had provided the assurance that these developments would be subject to Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs). The Secretariat underlined that since a second set of hominid footprints had been discovered, an advisory mission was recommended to give advice on the conservation needs of both sets of footprints. The Secretariat also recommended that the update of the management plan in 2016 should be aligned with the various development plans at the property and that the State Party should develop a

sustainable tourism strategy in consultation with the sustainable tourism program of the World Heritage Centre.

**ICOMOS** strongly supported the intention to conserve and interpret the footprints in a manner that contributed to the property's Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS stated that a recent report from the international advisory committee for the conservation of the footprints encouraged conducting a cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). In this regard, ICOMOS advised that a document for the overall project implementation should be prepared. ICOMOS welcomed the convening an international advisory committee to undertake a feasibility study of the construction of the proposed museum is welcome. ICOMOS stated that both ICCROM and ICOMOS would be willing to provide assistance. However, ICOMOS emphasized that the commencement of the construction works should not pre-empt the outcome of the feasibility study and of the HIA.

**IUCN** noted that the construction projects would be shifted towards ecologically less sensitive areas and requested for these locations to be further clarified. IUCN recommended that the Committee request for the State Party to conduct an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), which should include all criteria under which the site has been inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite qu'avant son intervention, la parole soit donnée à l'Etat Partie de la République-Unie de Tanzanie.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** recognised the efforts of the State Party of Tanzania in managing this complex site, noting that the issues on the site were very diverse. The Delegation underlined that the State Party was able to develop a management plan enabling an effective protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, with the guidance of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation requested to hear an update from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party of Tanzania for establishing its cultural heritage department, recognizing the dynamic issues present concerning mixed sites. The Delegation welcomed the relocation of development projects and the efforts to address the negative impacts from increased livestock raising. The Delegation acknowledged a UNESCO workshop conducted at the site and emphasised the significant amount of work that needed to be done. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision as presented by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the site was a popular tourist attraction and has been subject to extensive archaeological research that shed light on the evolution of human-environment dynamics. The Delegation expressed the view that the discovery of new footprints demonstrated the potential of the site to further deepen the knowledge on human evolution and the need for sound protection. The Delegation expressed their concern regarding potential plans for geothermal exploitation.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the conservation of the area was significant and congratulated the State Party of Tanzania for its achievements in conserving the site. Nevertheless, the Delegation underlined the need for cultural and natural

heritage to continue to be well preserved and noted that there was an obvious need to take further action.

La Délégation de **Colombie** soutient également le projet de décision mais souhaite souligner qu'il faut traduire de manière concrète l'engagement politique pour assurer la durabilité et la préservation des attributs du site.

The Delegation of the United Republic of **Tanzania** (Observer) informed the Committee that it came to an agreement with the Advisory Bodies on the modifications to the Draft Decision. The Delegation assured the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies that it was committed to do everything to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. The Delegation stated that concerning geothermal energy, it was not undertaking any developments for energy exploitations in this area except for feasibility studies of which the World Heritage Centre has been informed. The Delegation therefore expressed surprise to find that this issue was mentioned in the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed by Senegal.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.34** was adopted as amended.

#### **LIST OF MIXED PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE AFRICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147rev) - 39 COM 7B.32**

**Maloti-Drakensberg Park (Lesotho / South Africa) (C/N 985bis) - 39 COM 7B.33**

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

#### **LIST OF MIXED PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181quinquies) - 39 COM 7B.35**

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

#### **LIST OF MIXED PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) - 39 COM 7B.36**

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

## CULTURAL PROPERTIES

### AFRICA

#### AFRICA

##### **Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev) - 39 COM 7B.41**

Le **Secrétariat** précise que ce rapport a été soumis pour discussion par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives suite au fait que la mission de suivi réactif demandée par la décision 38 COM 7B.50 n'a pas pu être organisée par l'Etat partie, en raison de la fragilité de la situation sécuritaire au Mali. Le Secrétariat note l'importance de cette mission pour évaluer l'état de mise en œuvre du plan d'action d'urgence adopté par le Comité en 2014 et étudier en cas de confirmation d'un danger avéré ou potentiel pour la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site, l'inscription possible du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en Péril.

Il rapporte que les principales menaces qui pèsent sur le bien portent sur les sites archéologiques, sur la pression urbaine, l'empiètement par les animaux et l'érosion et dont le tissu urbain ancien sur la dégradation des bâtiments anciens. Ces problèmes ont été exacerbés par la crise qu'a connue le Mali en 2012. Le Secrétariat souligne que l'Etat partie a fourni de nombreux efforts pour assurer la mise en œuvre de la décision 38 COM 7B.50 mais ses efforts hélas demeurent insuffisants eu égard aux nombreux problèmes et menaces qui pèsent sur l'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien. Le Secrétariat estime donc qu'une mobilisation de la communauté internationale est donc indispensable pour soutenir le Mali dans la mise en œuvre du plan d'action d'urgence.

**ICOMOS** underlined that the impact of conflicts on the site had negatively affected the tourism in the region. ICOMOS stated that the implications of this were that an important source of income of the local communities, vital for the maintenance of the buildings at the site, had been severely threatened. ICOMOS noted that recent information provided by the State Party of Mali had set out the development of an integrated approach to tackle these issues and that coordinated efforts were now being established by the relevant ministries. ICOMOS commended this interdisciplinary initiative and stressed that further measures were needed to implement the emergency action plan. ICOMOS expressed its hope that an advisory mission would be possible in the near future in order to establish more details on how challenges might be met and on the types of assistance that could be offered.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.41** was adopted.

##### **Stone Town of Zanzibar (Tanzania, United Republic of) (C 173rev) - 39 COM 7B.45**

The **Secretariat** pointed out that the State of Conservation report, submitted by the State Party on 1 February 2015, was proposed for discussion by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies following a large scale breakdown in the management of the property, in part due to the non-implementation of the

Management Plan and the specific legislation for conservation and development (2010 Stone Town Conservation and Development Act). The Secretariat reported that several meetings between the State Party, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies have been held since 2011 to find solutions for the development challenges facing the property. The Secretariat recalled that a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring Mission in October 2014, invited by the State Party of Tanzania, found that the Mambo Msiige project was symptomatic of the mismanagement of the property. The Secretariat stated that given the recommendations of the mission, the proposed development projects, the absence of an adequate and effective management and the generally deteriorated state of the buildings in the Stone Town, it was recommended that the Committee considered inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS** stated that the project to build a hotel had been discussed in detail prior to the construction and at present, the building had a negative impact on the OUV of the property. ICOMOS stressed that an effective management needed to be established urgently. ICOMOS expressed the view that there would be serious potential threats in the future unless a strengthened management system was put in place that allowed those responsible for the conservation to have input into the development projects at the earliest possible stage of their development. ICOMOS underlined that while Zanzibar had been the subject of several advisory missions, the subsequent recommendations remained largely unaddressed. ICOMOS considered extensive support was needed and therefore supported the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS underscored that Danger Listing should be perceived as opportunity to begin with intensive measures against the adverse impacts on the site and offered its support to the State Party in this regard.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** considère que pour aider l'Etat partie et la Convention à récupérer ce bien, il faudrait écarter très probablement cette demande de mise en péril et essayer d'accompagner l'Etat partie. Elle estime qu'une stratégie nationale de développement spatiale est en cours et ne concerne pas seulement Zanzibar mais toutes les zones du territoire sont en train d'être inclut dans ce plan, mais il est demandé que l'Etat partie nous apporte plus d'éléments là-dessus. De plus, la transmission de lignes directrices de planifications est notée ainsi que la mise en place de structures de gestions mixtes, qui concerne spécialement la Ville de pierre. La délégation estime donc que l'Etat partie fait énormément d'efforts, que ce dernier a une très grande et ancienne pratique de la Convention. Elle soutient les recommandations du rapport de l'ICOMOS et considère que les organisations consultatives doivent l'accompagner et qu'un délai raisonnable doit être fixé au terme duquel l'Etat partie devra produire un plan de gestion cohérent et applicable.

La Délégation du **Liban** reconnaît les difficultés auxquels doit faire face les pays en voie de développement pour assurer la protection de leur site inscrit à cause de la pression du développement et d'un manque de ressources. Néanmoins, elle soulève que dans ce cas spécifique, le Comité a adopté trois décisions successives à ses 35<sup>ème</sup>, 36<sup>ème</sup> et 38<sup>ème</sup> session demandant expressément à l'Etat partie d'arrêter les travaux sur la construction de cet hôtel monumental et sur le développement sur les parties protégées, et ce sans résultat. La délégation rappelle que l'Etat partie a lui-même reconnu dans son rapport SOC de 2015 l'impact négatif que ces travaux ont eu sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Le représentant de la délégation

du Liban considère que dans ce cas-là, la crédibilité du comité est en jeu et qu'il faut absolument signaler à l'Etat partie que cela ne peut plus continuer comme ça. La délégation convient qu'il faut l'aider mais considère que c'est l'inscription sur la liste en péril qui permettra d'une part de donner le signe et d'autre part probablement d'enclencher un processus de concertation, de développement, d'analyse, de dialogue de façon à pouvoir récupérer ce bien qui est en train de disparaître.

The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the position of the Delegation of Lebanon and stated that sustainable development was not only a challenge for developing countries. The Delegation expressed regret that a management plan was not in place despite the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The Delegation supported the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the United Republic of **Tanzania** (Observer) thanked the members of the Committee for the constructive comments and reassured it was committed to address the challenges faced by the property. The Delegation stated that Zanzibar was a city that attracted a large number of visitors and that the Government of Zanzibar was doing all that it could to deal with the challenges and in particular, address the matter of the hotel development. The Delegation stated that it had been in dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre and developed a matrix for action. However, the Delegation pointed out that it had submitted a letter to which the World Heritage Centre never responded. The Delegation requested for more time for discussion with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation said that it was not afraid of Danger Listing, but expressed that it would not know how to proceed after Danger Listing. The Delegation stated that if it were given an additional year, it would be able to comply with the requirements.

**ICOMOS** underlined that inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be seen as an opportunity to take action. ICOMOS reiterated that the management system seemed inadequate to protect the property and pointed out that in light of the developments, there were more problems than the State Party had acknowledged. ICOMOS was reassured to hear that the State Party of Tanzania was committed to solving these problems. ICOMOS was of the view that the proposed corrective measures and Desired State of Conservation needed to be developed to resolve these issues quickly and avoid Danger Listing.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande une fois de plus aux membres du Comité et à l'ICOMOS de comprendre que la bonne méthode c'est d'aider à rectifier les choses, c'est d'aider à apporter des mesures correctives dans l'action positive. Elle pense que l'Etat partie de la République Unie de Tanzanie est extrêmement motivé, justifiant l'octroi d'un délai d'un an supplémentaire. Selon la délégation, ce délai sera plus positif qu'une inscription dans la Liste en péril, perçue comme sanction et leur donnera le temps de travailler avec les organisations consultatives, afin de revenir à la prochaine session avec un plan de développement et de résolution des anomalies partagées.

La Délégation du **Qatar** appui la proposition du Sénégal.



The Delegation of **Croatia** agreed with the previous speakers that after all the efforts undertaken by the State Party of Tanzania; it should be given at least one more year.

The **Secretariat** stated that the Reactive Monitoring mission had provided evidence that mismanagement has been the real cause of the problems. The Secretariat indicated that there have been consultations and negotiations with the State Party since 2011 and expressed that it was a painful decision for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to consider that the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Secretariat highlighted that Danger Listing was proposed to enable the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to take action and to move forward. The Secretariat underlined that regardless of whether the decision on Danger Listing was taken in the present year or postponed to the following year, the most important thing would be to work together with the State Party to resolve the issues at hand. The Secretariat highlighted that inscription on the Danger List would be the appropriate way to go about it.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** joint sa voix à celle du Sénégal et du Qatar pour donner une année supplémentaire et souhaite que l'Etat partie soit accompagné techniquement et matériellement.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to the Draft Decision which would change the current paragraphs 3, 4, 5, 8, 12 and 14 and which would add a new paragraph 15.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that it disagreed with the wording and expressed its preference to stick with the original wording of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the Delegation of Germany.

La délégation du **Liban** estime que le paragraphe 4 doit rester dans sa version initiale car le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives ne peuvent pas être mises en cause alors qu'il y a trois décisions du comité du patrimoine mondial qui n'ont pas été prises en compte par l'Etat partie. Pour ce qui est du dernier paragraphe, la délégation du Liban accepte de donner à l'Etat partie un an supplémentaire mais il faut utiliser exactement la même terminologie utilisée dans ce cas-là. C'est-à-dire « demande à l'EP d'inviter une mission conjointe du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'ICOMOS et de remettre au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'ici à 2016 un rapport afin de considérer l'inscription éventuelle du bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. » Elle souhaite également voir apparaître sur la décision une date en 2016.

La Délégation du **Portugal** estime être disposé à donner un an de plus à l'Etat partie du moment que cela est fait dans le langage agréé et consacrée. Elle souhaite que le paragraphe 4 reste tel quel mais ne considère pas qu'il faut éliminer de la décision des données de fait. Par exemple, au paragraphe 5, « comme le soulignait le rapport de la mission de 2014... » n'a pas à être supprimé puisqu'il s'agit de données de fait.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** partage également le même point de vue que le Portugal et considère qu'il faut lui accorder encore une chance et fixer une date, un échéancier avant de prendre une décision.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the Delegation of Germany.

The Delegation of **Germany** took the floor and read out a proposed amendment which stated a possible listing on the List of World Heritage in Danger List in 2016.

The **Secretariat** stated that with regards to paragraph 3 concerning the communication between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre, the proposed wording in the amendment was not acceptable.

**ICOMOS** stated that it had the correct wording for the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that there still seemed to be some divergences on the exact terms of the Draft Decision and suggested that the Committee revert to the discussion at a later stage to further harmonise the language.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** appuyé par la Délégation du **Portugal**, suggère néanmoins de procéder avec la discussion du projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the Committee to proceed with adopting the decision paragraph by paragraph.

La Délégation de **Viet Nam** propose d'accorder un délai d'un an supplémentaire à l'État partie, et propose d'ailleurs de revenir sur la version original du projet de la décision sans la référence à l'inclusion dans la Liste en péril, appuyé par la Délégation de l'Allemagne.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.45** was adopted as amended.

#### **LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE AFRICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323bis) - 39 COM 7B.37**

**Historic Town of Grand-Bassam (Côte d'Ivoire) (C 1322rev) - 39 COM 7B.38**

**Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15) - 39 COM 7B.39**

**Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055) - 39 COM 7B.40**

**Le Morne Cultural Landscape (Mauritius) (C 1259bis) - 39 COM 7B.42**

**Osun-Osogbo Sacred Groove (Nigeria) (C 1118) - 39 COM 7B.43**

## **Fossil hominids sites of South Africa (South Africa) (C 915bis) - 39 COM 7B.44**

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

### **ARAB STATES**

#### **Hatra (Iraq) (C 277rev) - 39 COM 7B.51**

Le **Secrétariat** rapporte que, selon l'Etat partie, avant l'occupation du site par les groupes armés, il avait pu tirer profit d'une situation calme sur le site pour y effectuer des travaux de conservation. Cependant, depuis son occupation, les autorités responsables n'ont plus été en mesure d'accéder au bien; le site a été transformé en camp militaire. Les informations disponibles proviennent essentiellement des médias et des réseaux sociaux de propagande. Ces dernières font état de destructions intentionnelles des têtes sculptées sur les murs comme le montrent les images sur l'écran. Ces destructions ont été menées au moyen de marteaux, d'armes, d'explosifs et de bulldozers. Il n'est néanmoins pas possible de préciser l'ampleur de la destruction. Le bien étant menacé par des périls prouvés et potentiels, tels que décrits dans les paragraphes 177 à 179 des Orientations, le Comité du patrimoine mondial pourrait envisager d'inscrire Hatra sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, tel que proposé dans le projet de décision.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged with regret that armed conflict continued to damage and threaten Iraq's cultural heritage and militated against conservation activities. ICOMOS stated that Hatra was within a highly-volatile conflict area and that it was not possible to monitor the situation on the ground nor to assess damage. However, ICOMOS underlined that the occupation of the property by ISIL, its use as a military camp, and reports of destruction of sculptures and other site elements provided indisputable testimony of the potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as outlined in the Operational Guidelines. ICOMOS expressed its readiness to contribute to the UNESCO Emergency Response Action Plan for the Safeguarding Iraq's Cultural Heritage. ICOMOS highlighted that protective measures and 'first-aid' were the first priorities and that the 'Desired State of Conservation' should be prepared as soon as possible. ICOMOS further stated that once security conditions allowed access to the property, a rapid assessment could occur and well-informed conservation initiatives, which responded to the 'Desired State of Conservation', could be implemented expeditiously.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party for the actions taken to protect the site and noted that there was a need for greater security measures to protect what remained. The Delegation emphasized that inscription on the List of World Heritage list in Danger should be seen as a way to protect the site and not as a form of punishment.

La délégation du **Liban** souligne pertinence de la déclaration de Bonn pour ce cas précis, en particulier le paragraphe concernant le maintien de la paix.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** déplore les actes de violence sans précédent et rappelle le Comité qu'il est impossible d'accéder au bien et qu'il est difficile d'estimer ce que pourront faire les autorités nationales à ce stade.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its deepest sympathies with the State Party. The Delegation joined with previous speakers and declared that inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was a collective expression of solidarity and not punishment.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the Draft Decision to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger to draw the attention of the international community towards urgent need to protect this World Heritage property.

La Délégation du **Qatar** exprime sa solidarité avec le peuple iraquien espérant que la paix vaincra, et condamne les actes qui détruisent un patrimoine de cette importance.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** underlined that the Draft Decision was in line with the Unite4Heritage campaign and therefore expressed its full support.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** considered that the Draft Decision was in line with the Bonn Declaration, and emphasized the importance of post-conflict strategies for the reconstruction of destroyed sites and capacity-building.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its deepest sympathies and solidarity with the people in Iraq and strongly supported the Draft Decision to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

En réponse à la délégation des Philippines, le **Secrétariat** rappelle au Comité qu'il avait organisé avant en juillet 2015, avant le comité, une réunion concernant la reconstruction du patrimoine post-conflit dans le contexte du Moyen Orient et souligne que la réflexion à ce sujet a déjà commencé.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.51** was adopted.

### **Petra (Jordan) (C 326) - 39 COM 7B.52 REV**

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Lebanon to explain the reasons for opening the State of Conservation report for Petra.

La Délégation du **Liban** ne se rappelle pas avoir demandé l'ouverture de ce rapport sur l'état de conservation de Petra et mais demande de continuer la discussion.

Le **Secrétariat** clarifie que la discussion sur ce rapport avait été ouverte à cause de nouvelles informations reçues par l'Etat partie. Il souligne que le rapport et les documents soumis par l'Etat partie offrent des informations détaillées sur le vaste programme d'initiatives prises par l'Etat partie pour la conservation, la protection et la gestion du bien. A l'invitation de l'Etat partie, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a entrepris une mission à Petra en février 2015 afin de discuter les progrès réalisés et

des besoins actuels concernant la zone tampon, les mesures pour la réduction des risques dues aux problèmes de détachements rocheux et d'inondations, le plan d'action de conservation de Petra adopté en décembre 2014, la stratégie de gestion des visiteurs et le renforcement des capacités du personnel.

L'État partie a réalisé des progrès considérables dans le traitement des questions soulevées par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 37<sup>e</sup> session et aux sessions précédentes. Néanmoins, au vu de l'importance des défis et des tâches à venir il reste important de maintenir une attention particulière à la mise en œuvre des mesures prises par l'état partie, des projets envisagés, et des décisions précédentes du comité.

L'état partie a récemment fourni des éléments supplémentaires au Centre du patrimoine mondial et à l'ICOMOS concernant ses actions en faveur du site ainsi que des clarifications supplémentaires. Ainsi, un projet de décision révisé a été distribué pour approbation du Comité.

**ICOMOS** welcomed the considerable progress that has been made in a range of important issues such as the Conservation Action Plan, the Tourism Action Plan and the development of an extensive buffer zone with proposed regulatory zones, which would be submitted for evaluation in 2016 after public consultations have been completed. ICOMOS underscored that until final approval was given for the Buffer Zone, there was a need to ensure that the proposed planning zones were respected in relation to development and that further urban encroachment was avoided. ICOMOS noted that over the past four years, positive results were achieved towards putting in place a coordinated and structured approach to management of this property. ICOMOS further noted that an integrated approach to management was already in place and that the State Party was in the process of developing an overall management plan that would draw together all existing planning documents.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** also supported the revised Draft Decision and requested for clarification on the terminology used on architectural plans.

**ICOMOS** explained that the wording had been changed to avoid any misunderstanding.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** revient sur le point 6 de la décision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recognised that the State Party had worked hard to protect the property and therefore supported the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also supported the revised Draft Decision and remarked that the State Party seemed very committed to implement the Committee's suggestions. The Delegation also enquired if the State Party still required additional funds for its work.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS on point 3 of the Draft Decision.

**ICOMOS** clarified that the communities were not living outside the boundary of the property and that the purpose of this decision was to support communities and their livelihood.

Le **Secrétariat** rapporte que lors de la mission de février 2015, des discussions avec les autorités Jordaniennes ont été tenues sur la question très complexe de la communauté déplacée et le nouveau plan d'aménagement développé par la Jordanie qui intègre cette question mais requiert des moyens importants et des investissements conséquents pour rendre le plan durable et acceptable. Le Secrétariat pense que au vu la complexité des enjeux, les gestionnaires du site et la direction des antiquités auraient besoin d'un grand soutien de la part du gouvernement pour mettre en œuvre ces mesures.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** approuve la décision révisée mais souhaite avoir des explications sur ce qui a justifié la rédaction du point 6 afin de pouvoir donner un avis définitif. Bien que comprenant les préoccupations, n'est pas d'accord avec le libellé du point 6 sur la base de la souveraineté des Etats, et considère que le Comité peut discuter d'un plan d'aménagement mais ne peut donner des instructions à un Etat partie quant aux ressources à fournir à une communauté donnée.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne combien la problématique de la prise en compte des communautés dans les sites du patrimoine mondial est complexe mais rappelle que les Etats ont des obligations envers les communautés. La Délégation du Sénégal considère qu'il est possible de demander à l'Etat partie de travailler avec les communautés pour aller vers un développement durable dans les plans d'aménagement.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to share their views on point 6.

La Délégation du **Portugal** partage le souci concernant la souveraineté nationale, mais ne pense pas que ce soit utile de relancer le débat sur ce point. De plus, la Délégation du **Portugal** ajoute que si le paragraphe 6 pose problème, alors le paragraphe 5 devrait également poser problème.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Lebanon for clarifications regarding point 6.

La Délégation du **Liban** ne souhaite pas ouvrir le débat sur la question de la souveraineté.

The Delegation of **Jordan** (Observer) explained that Petra covered an area of over 264 km<sup>2</sup> and that they would always require assistance from the international community to protect the site. The Delegation also underlined its responsibility to take care of its local communities and explained that the burden was greater now that the number of citizens had increased from 300 to 3000.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** précise que ce n'est pas son intention d'ouvrir un débat politique, mais elle confirme qu'elle n'est pas d'accord avec la formulation de l'article 6 et considère que cela ferait un précédent regrettable.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee of the important role of communities in the management of World Heritage properties, as encapsulated in the 5 “C”s. The Director underlined that in the case of Petra, the World Heritage designation had disadvantaged a certain part of the community and it was the obligation of the Committee to ensure that State Party could take care of it.

La Délégation du **Portugal** propose que la Délégation d’Algérie revoie la formulation de l’article et propose de revoir quelque peu le vocabulaire et propose l’emploi du terme « encourage ».

La Délégation d’**Algérie** réaffirme que c’est la rédaction du point 6 qui pose problème et cela ne veut pas dire que ce qui est en jeu ne fait pas partie des préoccupations de l’Algérie. L’Algérie serait d’accord pour revoir la formulation.

The **Chairperson** requested for Algeria to propose an alternative formulation and drew the Committee’s attention to the rewording proposed by Portugal.

La Délégation d’**Algérie** confirme qu’elle d’accord pour revoir la rédaction.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** requested for the Draft Decision to be put on the screen in order to better follow the discussion.

The **Chairperson** requested for the Draft Decision to be put on the screen and gave the floor to Algeria.

La Délégation d’**Algérie** propose un libellé : Encourage l’Etat partie à mettre en place les conditions de prise en charge durable des communautés locales déplacées du bien du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** read out the amendment proposed by Algeria and gave the floor to the Delegation of Peru.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the proposed amendment.

La Délégation du **Portugal** appuie la proposition de l’Algérie mais note qu’il y a un problème avec la version française et suggère de modifier légèrement la proposition.. La Délégation propose d’inclure « déplacée » au lieu de « expulsée ».

La Délégation du **Liban**, appui la proposition de l’Algérie.

The Delegations of **Qatar**, **Croatia** and **Kazakhstan** agreed with the proposed amendment.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appui la proposition.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the wide agreement in the Committee and adopted paragraph 6 as amended.

The Draft Decision **39COM 7B.52 REV** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** moved to the State of Conservation report for the Archaeological site of Cyrene (Libya).

### **Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190) - 39 COM 7B.56 REV**

Le **Secrétariat** prévoit une introduction générale sur la Lybie mais faute de temps propose de faire cette présentation le lendemain matin et représenter l'état de conservation du bien uniquement. L'Etat partie n'a pas soumis de rapport au vu de la situation exceptionnelle. Le Secrétariat a fait part de la taille et de l'étendue du site, de la situation sécuritaire. Il a expliqué les mesures prises par la Direction des antiquités, comme le renforcement du bureau de Cyrène, ou l'implication des communautés locales, ou encore le suivi régulier et l'entretien quotidien. Le Secrétariat rapport qu'il est essentiel de revoir le plan de l'habitat de la zone où se trouve le site et que la formation est une question prioritaire ainsi que l'appui de la communauté internationale.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that conditions on the ground in Cyrene militated against conservation activities and threatened the cultural heritage of the property. ICOMOS stressed that protection and first aid were the immediate priorities. ICOMOS acknowledged that positive actions had been undertaken to prevent vandalism and illegal encroachment, but stated that in the absence of information from the State Party on the State of Conservation of the property, it was difficult for ICOMOS to provide effective support or advice at this stage.

La Délégation du **Portugal** appuie les propositions faites et demande au Secrétariat, et aux Organisations consultatives de préciser qui sont les interlocuteurs en Libye et quelle est leur crédibilité.

Le **Secrétariat** a expliqué que son interlocuteur est le Directeur des Antiquités en charge du patrimoine culturel désigné par le Gouvernement de Toubrouk. Le Secrétariat a indiqué qu'il avait aussi d'autres interlocuteurs au niveau technique et qui ont suivi des formations de l'UNESCO sur la gestion des risques.

**ICOMOS** explained that formal information coming from Libya was missing and as a result, they have relied on informal reports coming from Government officials on the ground. ICOMOS acknowledged that while this was not information of a definite caliber, and there was a critical need for a formal understanding of the State of Conservation, the availability of information ultimately depended on the security situation. ICOMOS clarified that there was a working group composed of people from the entire region which aimed to inform through both formal and informal channels on the damages occurred in the region, which would serve as an additional source of information as well.

The Rapporteur informed that no amendments to the revised Draft Decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.56 REV** was adopted.

*The meeting rose at 6.30pm.*



**FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY 2 July 2015**

**SEVENTH MEETING**

**9.30a.m. – 1.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

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

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

*Documents* WHC-15/39.COM/7B  
WHC-15/39.COM/7B.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.7 Rev

*Decisions:* **38 COM 7B.1 to 39 COM 7B.92**

Le **Secrétariat** donne une présentation sur l'état de conservation général des sites en Libye. La situation difficile qui prévaut actuellement en Libye suscite l'inquiétude quant à l'état de conservation des cinq sites du pays inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ainsi que sur les capacités des autorités nationales à en assurer la protection. Celles-ci n'ont en effet plus aucun contrôle sur quatre des cinq sites. Seul le site archéologique de Cyrène reste accessible aux inspecteurs de la Direction des Antiquités mais là encore les difficultés sont nombreuses. Outre les dommages résultant du conflit, le vandalisme, le pillage, la prolifération des constructions illégales et le manque de gouvernance sont les principales menaces qui pèsent sur ces biens. Le Secrétariat précise que l'UNESCO déploie beaucoup d'efforts pour soutenir la Libye durant la crise en cours.

Depuis le début de la crise, les bureaux de l'UNESCO à Tripoli et au Caire ont mis en œuvre de nombreuses activités dont 8 ateliers et réunions entre janvier 2013 et décembre 2014, principalement axés sur le renforcement des capacités dans la gestion des sites et des musées, et ce en coopération avec l'ICCROM et l'ALECSO et les secrétariats des conventions de 1972 et 1970.

En avril 2015, un atelier destiné à renforcer la sécurité des musées et sites du patrimoine mondial en Libye a été organisé à Tunis, en collaboration avec le Centre du PM et l'ICCROM. Deux autres ateliers ont eu lieu au début de ce mois de juin, toujours en collaboration avec l'ICCROM, pour former des professionnels libyens au renforcement de la sécurité et à la mise en place de mesures anti-terrorisme dans les musées et sur les sites archéologiques, ainsi qu'à la conservation préventive et à la préparation aux risques pour le patrimoine culturel. Sur la base des résultats de ces deux ateliers, une session de formation de deux semaines sur la préparation aux risques devrait avoir lieu au mois d'août prochain.

En outre, le Secrétariat note que la Libye n'a pas de liste indicative malgré la grande richesse patrimoniale du pays. Le patrimoine culturel et naturel de la Libye est donc également menacé par les conséquences du conflit et en particulier par les destructions intentionnelles potentielles. L'image sur l'écran montre un exemple des actes de vandalismes intentionnels qui ont visé plusieurs mosquées dans la capitale Tripoli, et un grand ombre de mausolées soufis.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged with regret that the conditions in Libya generally militated against conservation activities and threatened cultural heritage. ICOMOS emphasized that protection and first aid were immediate priorities and stated that it supported the efforts of UNESCO and ICCROM towards the training of Libyan professionals to facilitate protection and site security.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no comments from the floor and moved on to the State of Conservation for the Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus, Libya.

### **Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287) - 39 COM 7B.57**

**Le Secrétariat** informe qu'au moment de la préparation du document devant être examiné par le Comité du patrimoine mondial, l'Etat partie n'avait pas soumis de rapport sur les avancées de la mise en œuvre des recommandations adoptées dans la décision 37 COM 7B.54, prise par le Comité à sa 37e session (Phnom Penh, 2013). Le relatif isolement du bien et son éloignement des principales zones de conflit depuis la révolution de février 2015 ont fait que celui-ci est moins menacé que d'autres sites plus exposés. Néanmoins, de sérieuses préoccupations demeurent quant à son état de conservation car dans le passé, il avait subi du vandalisme sous la forme de graffiti comme le montre l'image projetée sur l'écran.

**ICOMOS** noted that the remote location of the site exacerbated the problem faced by the property and gave rise to additional concerns. ICOMOS said that without up-to-date information on the State of Conservation of the property, it would not be possible at present to provide effective advice or support.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated that rock art heritage sites were among the best examples of pre-historic documentation that captured the way of life of people, not only in terms of the data that could be extracted from the works, but from the evident artistic ingenuity. The Delegation stated that the Latin America and Caribbean region was endowed with a number of these sites and that it was grateful to ICOMOS for conducting research in this area. The Delegation underlined that every effort should be made to continue working with the State Party of Libya to tackle the problems of vandalism affecting the site. The Delegation acknowledged the security issues that prevailed and called on the State Party to provide a State of Conservation report and develop recovery measures as a matter of urgency, for the reason that these were distinctive sites and every effort should be made to protect and preserve them.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.57** was adopted.

## **Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) - 39 COM 7B.59**

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité que l'État partie rapporte que les conditions de sécurité, socio- économiques et politiques se sont aggravées au début de 2015 et ont compromis les cadres institutionnels, ce qui a entraîné l'arrêt des activités de développement et de conservation.

Depuis la distribution du document de nouvelles informations sont parvenues au Secrétariat en lien avec les développements récents au Yémen:

La vieille ville de Sanaa, a été lourdement bombardée le 11 mai et le 12 juin 2015, détruisant 3 de ses fameuses maisons-tours, mettant en péril tous les immeubles adjacents dans le quartier al Qasimi, a proximité du fameux jardin urbain de Miqshaamat al Qaasimi.

La Mosquée à coupole al-Mahdi datant du 12eme siècle et les maisons environnantes ont été endommagées par l'explosion d'une voiture piégée. De plus, suite à l'explosion d'une voiture piégée dans le centre historique de Sana'a, la mosquée Mahdi du XII siècle et les bâtiments adjacents ont été partiellement endommagés.

Le 9 juin dernier, l'ensemble urbain ottoman al-Ordhi, situé à quelques mètres de la Vieille ville de Sana'a, dans sa zone tampon, a été bombardé ce qui a causé des dommages dans sa partie ouest (a cote de bab al Yaman).

En général, la plus grande partie des vitres et des portes colorées et décorées des maisons de Sana'a, si caractéristiques de son architecture domestique, ont explosé ou ont été endommagés.

Le 26 mai 2015, le Musée de Sana'a a été légèrement atteint par les frappes aériennes, mais ces dommages ont considérablement affaibli ses conditions de sécurité et l'exposent ainsi au saccage ou au vol.

Malgré la situation actuelle, le directeur adjoint de GOPHCY met en œuvre l'assistance internationale pour Sana'a et élabore une documentation détaillée et digitalisée de la ville grâce à une documentation existante, à partie du centre régional pour le PM à Manama, sous la direction du bureau de l'Unesco à Doha. Cependant, il fait savoir que les ressources disponibles sont encore insuffisantes. Le Secrétariat informe que la mission conjointe de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS n'a pas pu avoir lieu en raison de la situation sécuritaire au Yémen.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that Yemen continued to endure political and socio-economic disturbances, which have recently escalated into conflicts that affected both people and cultural heritage places. ICOMOS stated that the inability of international experts to visit Yemen at present had prevented the proposed World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission. ICOMOS observed with regret that a capacity-building project for the Old City of Sana'a was terminated in December 2014, and that there was no longer the presence of the German Agency for International Co-operation, which had previously provided substantial support.

ICOMOS stated that the preparation of the draft "*National Strategy for the Preservation of the Historic Cities, Sites and Monuments 2016 – 2020*" was an important and welcome initiative. ICOMOS further underlined that the National Strategy should be followed through with a proposed Action Plan which would address the current situation in the Old City of Sana'a, include provisions for a Conservation Plan and for local projects including water and sewerage rehabilitation, building conservation, and local community awareness. ICOMOS also indicated that media images of collateral destruction of cultural heritage within the property demonstrated that there was ascertained damage to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Germany** explained that due to the security situation, it had requested the termination of the capacity-building project and for the German Agency for International Co-operation to end its work there. The Delegation proposed that dialogue between the site managers and citizens should take place to ensure the successful preservation of the site and requested for the State Party to develop an action plan in this regard.

The Delegation of **Turkey** appreciated the presentation and requested to hear from the State Party of Yemen on shifting the support and international assistance to the present year instead of the following year, as the Delegation observed that the Draft Decision proposed that Danger Listing be considered only at the 40th session in 2016.

The Delegation of **Serbia** agreed with the delegation of Turkey.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** souligne que les conditions liées à la sécurité ont des conséquences non-négligeables par rapport à la dégradation des biens de Patrimoine Mondial déjà très vulnérables. La Délégation constate que l'État Parti continue de prendre des initiatives pour maintenir la conservation des biens. Malgré ces efforts, les dangers sont toujours présents. La Délégation souligne que les problèmes sont immenses et qu'il est nécessaire de soutenir l'État Parti avec des actions de formation et de renforcement de capacités, à l'exemple des actions menées par l'agence allemande. La Délégation demande de donner la parole à l'Etat Partie.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que la destruction du Patrimoine Mondial n'est pas acceptable et qu'il faut la condamner.

The **Chairperson** underlined that it was a difficult political situation and that more technical information would be needed.

The Delegation of **Yemen** stated that the country has suffered through conflict since 2011 and shared that just the day before, one of the historical tombs in Yemen had been destroyed by Al-Qaeda. The Delegation underlined that danger listing was not enough to protect heritage and that only stopping the war would. The Delegation highlighted that immediate action was needed and requested for the Committee's support in this situation. The Delegation also expressed its gratitude to Germany for its help and expressed hope that this support would continue.

**ICOMOS** expressed its regret at the destruction that had taken place. ICOMOS stated that with reference to recent media reports, the situation in Yemen had changed since the State of Conservation report was prepared, and hence requested that the Committee take that into consideration.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.58** was adopted.<sup>6</sup>

### **Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen) (C 192) - 39 COM 7B.60**

Le **Secrétariat** remarque que l'État Partie continue à connaître de graves troubles politiques et socio- économiques qui affectent la conservation et le développement, et que le bien subit des dégradations provoquées par des facteurs naturels tels que la pluie et de nombreuses inondations. Le Secrétariat informe que l'État partie signale qu'aucun programme de conservation du milieu physique n'est actuellement en cours et que le contexte sécuritaire empêche tout financement par des donateurs ou tout soutien administratif. Les autorités locales sollicitent une aide d'urgence. Des dommages dus au conflit actuel ont été rapportés mais le Secrétariat ne dispose pas de photos ou d'informations détaillées à ce sujet.

**ICOMOS** noted with regret that the Old Walled City of Shibam had been subject to significant floods in 2013, which resulted in significant physical damage and degradation and left more than 100 significant buildings damaged. ICOMOS stated that while the Daw'an Market Brick Architecture Foundation provided support for some conservation works in 2014, there was currently no conservation program, nor donor support. ICOMOS welcomed the preparation of draft "National Strategy for the Preservation of the Historic Cities, Sites and Monuments 2016 – 2020" by the General Organization for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen, in collaboration with the German Agency for International Co-operation. ICOMOS underlined that the National Strategy should be implemented through the proposed Action Plan which included provisions for fostering community support and awareness, international involvement in heritage management, as well as identification of physical conservation requirements.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.60** was adopted.<sup>7</sup>

The **Chairperson** expressed regret at the devastating situation in Yemen and remarked that both people and cultural goods should be protected. The Chairperson thanked all who had supported Yemen during this time.

### **LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ARAB STATES REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

#### **Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565) - 39 COM 7B.46**

---

<sup>6</sup> Decision **39 COM 7B.58** was further amended by the Committee. Please refer to the end of the summary records for 2 July 2015.

<sup>7</sup> Decision **39 COM 7B.60** was further amended by the Committee. Please refer to the end of the summary records for 2 July 2015.

**Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193) - 39 COM 7B.47**

**Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192ter) - 39 COM 7B.48**

**Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87) - 39 COM 7B.49**

**Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89) - 39 COM 7B.50**

**Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093) - 39 COM 7B.53**

**Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299) - 39 COM 7B.54**

**Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850) - 39 COM 7B.55**

**Ksar Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444) - 39 COM 7B.58**

The Draft Decisions for the properties listed above were adopted.

## **ASIA-PACIFIC**

**Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121bis) - 39 COM 7B.69**

The **Secretariat** reported on the main conservation issues for the Kathmandu Valley, in particular those arising from the recent earthquake. The Secretariat stated that an assessment of the situation on the ground has been carried out by the Department of Archaeology of Nepal in collaboration with the UNESCO Kathmandu Office, and an Emergency Assistance request was submitted to the World Heritage Centre by the State Party. The Secretariat further noted that the State Party had taken action in response to the devastating earthquake despite of the difficulties experienced. The Secretariat reported that according to the information provided by the Department of Archaeology as of 7 June 2015, the Kathmandu Valley and other districts in and outside the valley had 813 damaged monuments including temples, chaityas, stupas, sattal, shrines and durbar complexes where 184 had completely collapsed and 629 were partially damaged. The Secretariat further noted that the monuments, historic buildings and heritage assets within the seven monument zones have suffered extensive damage, where out of 190 surveyed monuments, 33 have completely collapsed (18%) and 157 (82%) were partially damaged.

The Secretariat shared that in response to the threats of the natural disaster, UNESCO (including its Director-General, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Kathmandu Office) as well as the international community have been mobilized to provide support for the collective protection of this property. The Secretariat reported that an Emergency Assistance project had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre on 19 May 2015 and was approved by the Chairperson on 21 May 2015. The Secretariat stated that the approval of the Emergency Assistance requested by Nepal was possible thanks to the voluntary contributions made

available by the Republic of Korea and Finland and that the project was currently under implementation.

The Secretariat further reported that a UNESCO, ICCROM, ICOMOS/ICORP (International Scientific Committee on Risk Preparedness), ICOM and Smithsonian Institution assessment mission was carried out to the property on 19 May 2015. The Secretariat elaborated that at the initiative of the Government of Nepal (the Finance Minister); the International Conference on Nepal's Reconstruction (Towards a Resilient Nepal) was organized on 25 June 2015.

The Secretariat underlined that considering the extensive damage of the earthquake to the property, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM recommended that the Committee may wish to consider inscribing the Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

**ICOMOS** expressed its deep regret at the recent disaster in Nepal and stated that the major damage to OUV needed emergency measures. ICOMOS expressed appreciation for the measures undertaken by the State Party and added that a great deal of resources would be needed for further action to be undertaken. ICOMOS underlined that there was a need to determine how best to save what had been damaged and expressed its belief that Danger Listing would be helpful in this regard.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Advisory Bodies that a lot of work was needed to support Nepal. The Delegation recalled the International Conference on Nepal's Reconstruction that had recently taken place in Kathmandu and noted that concrete plans were developed by the State Party and also acknowledged the quick response and the commitment of Nepalese people to restore the damages. The Delegation recommended that a joint Reactive Monitoring mission by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre should take place prior to considering the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed regret at the impact of the earthquake on Nepal's heritage and urged the international community to provide full assistance to Nepal. The Delegation shared that it had offered its support in humanitarian assistance as well as dispatched rescue teams and helped in the development of a reconstruction and restoration plan. The Delegation remarked that an action plan was needed as soon as possible.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its commitment to work closely with Nepal in the restoration of Nepal's heritage and agreed with the point raised by the Delegation of India on the need for a Reactive Monitoring mission.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its deep condolences and proposed that the site be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Germany** affirmed its continued support for preservation works in the Kathmandu Valley. The Delegation requested for the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to conduct a Reactive Monitoring mission before the end of this year to facilitate the reconstruction efforts.

The Delegation of **Finland** commended the excellent cooperation of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies with Nepal and also expressed its condolences to Nepal. The Delegation stressed the need for continued united support to Nepal and agreed with India's proposal on sending a Reactive Monitoring mission.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its condolences to Nepal and thanked the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies for the emergency assistance rendered. The Delegation agreed with India's proposal for a Reactive Monitoring mission, supported the recommendation for the property to be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested to hear from the State Party of Nepal.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique être solidaire avec l'État Partie. La Délégation remarque que tout ce qui a été dit par les autres Délégations va dans le bon sens et qu'il faudrait donner la parole à l'Etat Partie concerné.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** agreed with India's proposal for a Reactive Monitoring mission and supported the recommendation for the property to be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** regretted the loss of cultural property and human lives in Nepal and recalled that an earthquake had taken place in Malaysia two months ago, albeit on a smaller scale, and expressed its sympathy with Nepal.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with India's proposal.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that international coordination was needed to support Nepal and expressed that it could agree to postpone the decision on placing Kathmandu Valley on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** exprime sa solidarité avec l'Etat Partie qui doit faire face à cette situation tragique causée par le tremblement de terre exceptionnel. La Délégation remarque que le pays a pris des mesures pour agir dans cette situation de catastrophe. Elle appuie la proposition de l'Inde d'inscrire le site sur la liste de Patrimoine Mondial en Péril.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for their rapid reaction and supported the proposal of India on the Reactive Monitoring mission.

La Délégation du **Liban** rejoint les autres Délégations et exprime sa solidarité. La Délégation soutient aussi la proposition de l'Inde de prendre des actions pour permettre une mission du suivi réactif sur place. Néanmoins, la Délégation ne comprend pas pourquoi le site ne devrait pas être sur la liste de Patrimoine mondial en Péril. La Délégation clarifie que la mise des sites sur cette liste n'est pas une sanction et que c'est absolument claire que ce site doit être inscrit sur cette liste.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** rejoint les autres en exprimant sa condoléance. En outre, elle encourage l'État Partie de continuer à coopérer étroitement avec le Centre de Patrimoine Mondial et l'ICOMOS pour faire un bilan de perte et la Délégation soutient la proposition de l'Inde.



La Délégation du **Qatar** exprime également ses condoléances et soutient la proposition de l'Inde.

The delegation of **Croatia** supported sending the Reactive Monitoring mission as soon as possible.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** exprime aussi sa solidarité. Elle soutient la proposition de l'Inde et elle souhaite entendre les commentaires de l'État Partie de Népal.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported sending a Reactive Monitoring mission and stated that Danger Listing of the property should be postponed.

The Delegation of **Poland** stated that inscription on the List of the World Heritage in Danger would help to mobilize international support and also supported sending the Reactive Monitoring mission.

The **Chairperson** expressed regret at the impact of the earthquake on human lives and Nepal's cultural and natural heritage. The Chairperson expressed gratitude for the support offered by the States Parties, UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies to Nepal. The Chairperson highlighted that the engagement of civil society was crucial in mobilizing action. The Chairperson underlined that the reconstruction and conservation of the World Heritage sites was crucial and that technical and financial resources were needed to support the Nepalese population. The Chairperson emphasized that in light of the Bonn Declaration, the focus should not solely be on regions in conflict, but also sites suffering from natural disasters. The Chairperson concluded by affirming that the State Party of Nepal would continue to receive help and support to deal with the difficult situation.

The Delegation of **Nepal** (Observer) stated that its Department of Archeology had already started on restoration works which would require one year for completion. Therefore, the Delegation requested that the decision for Danger Listing be postponed and thanked the Committee members, Advisory Bodies and UNESCO for their support.

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

**ICOMOS** stated that it welcomed the recommendation for a Reactive Monitoring mission as well as the development of an emergency action plan in consultation with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that sending a Reactive Monitoring mission did not preclude declaring that the property should be placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.69** was adopted as amended.

**LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Cultural Landscape of Honghe Hani Rice terraces (China) (C 1111) - 39 COM 7B.61**

**Historic Monuments and Sites in Kaesong (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) (C 1278rev) - 39 COM 7B.62**

**Levuka Historical Port Town (Fiji) (C 1399) - 39 COM 7B.63**

**Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241bis) - 39 COM 7B.64**

**Hill Forts of Rajasthan (India) (C 274rev) - 39 COM 7B.65**

**Cultural Landscape of Bali Province: the Subak System as a Manifestation of the Tri Hita Karana Philosophy (Indonesia) (C 1194rev) - 39 COM 7B.66**

**Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 115) - 39 COM 7B.67**

**Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481) - 39 COM 7B.68**

**Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143) - 39 COM 7B.70**

**Historic City of Ayutthaya (Thailand) (C 576) - 39 COM 7B.71**

**Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (C 602rev) - 39 COM 7B.72**

**Samarkand – Crossroad of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603rev) - 39 COM 7B.73**

**Historic Centre of Shakhrysb (Uzbekistan) (C 885) - 39 COM 7B.74**

The Draft Decisions for the properties listed above were adopted.

**EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

**Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400bis) - 39 COM 7B.79 Rev**

The **Secretariat** presented the new report for the site and explained the background for the revised draft decision proposed by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Finland** shared that further to a discussion with the State Party of Hungary, they would support the revised draft decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.79 Rev** was adopted.

**Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527bis) - 39 COM 7B.85**

The Delegation of **Germany** was given the floor to explain the reasons for requesting the opening of the State of Conservation report for Kiev for discussion and for proposing amendments to the draft decision.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that while no new information had been received since the draft decision was issued, however, a day before the meeting, the World Heritage Centre had received letters from the Mayor of Kiev and an NGO.

**ICOMOS** recalled that the Committee had been concerned about uncontrolled new construction in the buffer zone in the bank of the river. ICOMOS also recalled that in 2012, the Committee had requested a moratorium and the modification of development projects in the buffer zone. ICOMOS underscored the need for continued monitoring and stated that, further to the received new information, the State Party was willing to undertake measures to conform to the Committee's recommendation.

The Delegation of **Germany** requested that the State Party of Ukraine be given the floor.

The Delegation of **Ukraine** agreed with the proposed amendments to the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** indicated that the Committee had not received prior notice that the State of Conservation of Kiev would be discussed.

The Delegation of **Germany** explained that the proposed amendment concerned reduction of the height of buildings and that the amendment to the draft decision had been sent the Rapporteur the day before.

The delegation of **Portugal** accepted the explanation of Germany and expressed its full support for the proposed amendment.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.85** was adopted as amended.

**Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1215) - 39 COM 7B.86 REV**

The Delegation of **Poland** requested for clarification from the Advisory Bodies on the State of Conservation and proposed draft decision for the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape.

The **Secretariat** informed that it had received new information from the State Party on 19 June, after the State of Conservation report was issued. Further to the new information received, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies proposed a revised

Draft Decision taking into account the new developments which had taken place after the Reactive Monitoring mission and the publication of the state of conservation report.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation on the State of Conservation of Cornwell and West Devon Mining Landscape.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted the challenges of dealing with a vast living landscape where change was part of the nature of the property. The Delegation further noted the need to balance the threats caused by development with the potential positive impact that these changes could have on the property. The Delegation acknowledged the commitment of the State Party to protect the site and requested that the State Party present updated information on the current planning situation. The Delegation was of the view that it would be justified to mention Danger Listing in the draft decision at the present time, and proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** (Observer) thanked the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for the Reactive Monitoring mission that had been undertaken. The Delegation expressed their commitment to respond promptly and positively to the recommendations in the mission report. The Delegation indicated that a Heritage Impact Assessment would be conducted for new projects and that negotiations would take place with developers to ensure that World Heritage considerations are accommodated in a proper and timely manner, without losing sight of the centrality of OUV. The Delegation acknowledged that while progress had been made, there was still work to be undertaken and that the delegation looked forward to continued close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to respond to the Committee's recommendations. The Delegation further acknowledged that while the developments had an impact on OUV, it did not consider the impact to be substantive and therefore welcomed the revised Draft Decision, along with the amendment proposed by Poland.

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

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested for clarification regarding the position of the Advisory Bodies on the deletion of paragraph 8.

**ICOMOS** acknowledged that continued development should be allowed, but shared the Committee's concerns regarding specific developments that may compromise the integrity of the site. ICOMOS highlighted that the recommendation was not for the property to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at this juncture, but rather to adjourn this discussion to a future Committee meeting. ICOMOS further underlined that strong collaboration with the State Party would be instrumental in achieving progress, and expressed its hope that a positive outcome would be reached, as with Australia and the Great Barrier Reef.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked ICOMOS for the clarification and indicated that it was foreseen that the Committee would revisit this matter in two years instead of one year. The Delegation highlighted that in the case of Australia, the prospect of Danger

Listing had helped keep pressure on the State Party and therefore the Delegation could not support the deletion of the paragraph as proposed by Poland.

The Delegation of **Poland** clarified that pressure would still be on State Party via the reactive monitoring process but that the Delegation would also take the comments of Committee members into consideration.

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported the views of the Delegation of Portugal.

The Delegation of **Portugal** reiterated that in the case of Australia, the pressure and prospect of Danger Listing had featured in the Draft Decision and that Australia was given one year to report back to the Committee.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** a dit qu'au vu du rapport établi, il y a des risques réels sur le bien et les constructions sont irréversibles. Elle conclut qu'il est donc nécessaire de maintenir l'article 8 de la décision estimant qu'elle est une sage; en la prenant, nous adoptons la même approche que celle adoptée pour la Tanzanie et déclare qu'elle rejoint la position du **Portugal**.

La délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la position de l'Algérie.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** stated that States Parties to the World Heritage Convention were afraid of their properties being placed on the List of World Heritage List in Danger for several reasons. Therefore, the Delegation emphasized that it was the responsibility of the Committee to ensure that States Parties have a proper understanding of this matter. The Delegation supported the previous speakers and expressed its wish to have a success story from this property. Therefore, the Delegation did not support the deletion of the paragraph in question.

La délégation du **Liban** déclare appuyer la proposition du Portugal. Concernant la définition de la Liste en péril, la délégation du Liban propose que dans toute session d'information aux membres du comité, on invite les états parties à relire la convention car elle est très claire sur la liste en péril. Elle explique que l'inscription sur la liste en péril n'est pas un épouvantail mais qu'elle aide à sortir un bien de la liste en péril en question.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was an increasing consensus not to delete the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Poland** affirmed its commitment to follow the majority view even though they had not changed their opinion regarding this matter.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that paragraph 8 would not be deleted.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.86 REV** was adopted.

**LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED  
IN THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS  
ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569bis) - 39COM 7B.75**

**Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784) - 39COM 7B.76**

**Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85) -  
39COM 7B.77**

**Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066) - 39COM 7B.78**

**Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C  
829) - 39COM 7B.80**

**Van Nellefabriek (Netherlands) (C 1441) - 39COM 7B.81**

**Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545) - 39COM 7B.82**

**Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356) - 39COM 7B.83**

**L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865bis) - 39COM 7B.84**

**Palace of Westminster and Westminster Abbey including Saint Margaret's  
Church (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 426bis) -  
39COM 7B.87**

**Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033) - 39COM 7B.94**

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

**LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

**Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445) - 39 COM 7B.88**

The **Secretariat** read out an editorial clarification regarding the Draft Decision **39  
COM 7B.88** on Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445).

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.88** was adopted as amended.

**LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

**Churches of Chiloé (Chile) (C 971) - 39COM 7B.89**

**Historic Quarter of the Seaport City of Valparaíso (Chile) (C 959rev) - 39COM 7B.90**

**Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129) - 39COM 7B.91**

**Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis) - 39COM 7B.92**

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

**OMNIBUS - 39 COM 7B.93**

The **Secretariat** introduced two properties within the Omnibus Decision where the States Parties had addressed challenges successfully and therefore the reports did not require discussion by the Committee.

**Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 1208)**

**Rio de Janeiro, Carioca Landscapes between the Mountain and the Sea (Brazil) (C 1100rev)**

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.93** was adopted.

**Old City of Sa'na (Yemen) (C 385) - 39 COM 7B.59**

**Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen) (C 192) - 39 COM 7B.60**

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that the discussion on item 7 had been postponed until all properties had been discussed, and requested that the Committee return to this matter before the closing of the present day's session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the discussion on item 7 would be postponed until all the other properties had been discussed, including nominations, and proposed to return to this subject on Monday.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** brought to the Committee's attention a misunderstanding regarding the decision taken on the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen). The Delegation expressed its wish to reopen the discussion on placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that reopening of a decision would require the agreement of two-thirds of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted the statement of the Chairperson and requested that the agenda item be reopened for the Committee's discussion.

The **Chairperson** enquired if there were any objections from the Committee concerning the reopening of the decision on the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen). The Chairperson noted that there were no objections which demonstrated a clear consensus from the Committee that the decision should be reopened.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** highlighted that after receiving information regarding the destruction that occurred at the site, all the Arab States agreed that the Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) should be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger. The Delegation underlined that this would garner the support from the international community and help in the reconstruction and preservation of the site. Therefore, the Delegation proposed to modify the Draft Decision accordingly.

**ICOMOS** highlighted that the new information received presented clear evidence that there was damage to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Therefore, ICOMOS was of the view that the conditions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger were clearly met.

The Delegation of **Lebanon**, assisted by ICOMOS, proceeded with the modification of the Draft Decision to reflect that the property should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Yemen** (Observer) confirmed that the conflict was still in progress and that the situation at the site was dangerous, given the floods and major violations such as the absence of authorities in Shibam. Therefore, the Delegation requested that the Committee also place the site of Shibam on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** requested to hear the Advisory Body's opinion on Shibam.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.59** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** reopened the Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.60** on Shibam (Yemen).

**ICOMOS** stated that the lack of information on the conflict and the State of Conservation of the site clearly illustrated that there was potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The **Chairperson** suggested to amending the Draft Decision to inscribe Shibam on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.60** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed the session.

*The meeting rose at 1pm.*



**FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 3 July 2015**

**EIGHTH MEETING**

**9.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**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 2015, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/8A

*Decisions:* **39 COM 8A**

The **Secretariat** presented an overview of the status of the Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2015. The Secretariat stated that out of the 191 States Parties that have ratified the convention, 179 States Parties or 94 percent, have submitted Tentative Lists. Since 15 April 2014, 41 States Parties have submitted new Tentative Lists or modified their existing lists. and the number of new properties added to the Tentative List was 130. The Secretariat further stated that the number of new properties added to the Tentative List was 130, which brought the total number of sites on the List to 1630.

The Chairperson noted that there were no comments from Committee members and no amendments submitted to the Draft Decision, and proceeded to move to the adoption of the Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8A** was adopted.

**8B. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/8B  
WHC-15/39.COM/8B.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/8B.Corr  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B1  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B1.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B2  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B2.Add  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B3  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B4

*Decisions: 39 COM 8B.1 to 39 COM 8B.52*

The **Chairperson** gave an overview of the documents for the item. The Chairperson stated that Document WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B3 comprised nominations received by 1 February 2015, with an indication of those that were deemed complete and that these nominations were foreseen for discussion at the 40th session of the Committee in 2016. The Chairperson further stated that Document WHC-15/39.COM/INF.8B4 presented factual error notifications from States Parties concerning the Advisory Body evaluations. The Chairperson invited the Secretariat to read out the list of nominations for which factual error notifications has been received, and to provide some explanations in this regard.

The **Secretariat** read out the list of factual error letters that States Parties had submitted for their nominations (the names of properties in the list here below are the names as adopted by the Committee):

China – Tusi Sites

Denmark – Christiansfeld, a Moravian Church Settlement

Denmark – The par force hunting landscape in North Zealand

Denmark / Germany / Iceland / Latvia / Norway – Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe

Georgia – Gelati Monastery (Significant boundary modification of “Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery”)

Germany – Speicherstadt and Kontorhaus District with Chilehaus

Germany – The Naumburg Cathedral and the Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut – Territories of Power in the High Middle Ages

Iran (Islamic Republic of) – Cultural Landscape of Maymand

Israel – Necropolis of Bet Sha’arim: A landmark of Jewish Renewal

Jamaica – Blue and John Crow Mountains

Japan – Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining

Mexico – Aqueduct of Padre Tembleque Hydraulic System

Mongolia – Great Burkhan Khaldun Mountain and its surrounding sacred landscape

Mongolia / Russian Federation – Landscapes of Dauria

Norway – Rjukan-Notodden Industrial Heritage Site

Republic of Korea – Baekje Historic Areas

Saudi Arabia – Rock Art in the Hail Region of Saudi Arabia

Spain – Routes of Santiago in Northern Spain

Turkey – Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape

Turkey – Ephesus

United Kingdom – The Forth Bridge

United States of America – San Antonio Missions

Viet Nam – Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park

The **Secretariat** informed that in the event that the factual errors had an impact on the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the amendments had already been introduced to the statements that would be shown on the screen to the plenary. The Secretariat stated that only notifications submitted by the deadline and

in the appropriate format have been made available, and that the Advisory Bodies' comments were located in the present document. The Secretariat explained that it was compulsory for States Parties to submit factual errors in the requisite format as outlined in the Annex 12 of Operational Guidelines for the avoidance of the circulation of documents concerning nominations which could not be verified under the current procedure.

The **Chairperson** noted that since there were no objections, the Committee could now proceed to examine the item on the proposed changes to the names of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that one request for a change to the name of a World Heritage property had been received from the Czech Republic for the Holašovice Historical Village Reservation, inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1998. The Secretariat stated that the Committee was requested to approve the name change of the Holašovice Historical Village Reservation to the Holašovice Historic Village in English and Village historique d'Holašovice in French.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the name change and proceeded to adopt the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.1** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to read out the list of nominations that had been withdrawn or postponed at the request of the States Parties.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that two nominations had been withdrawn from the present Committee session and after the publication of Document 8B. The two nominations were Hall in Tirol – The Mint and Monumental Ensemble of Târgu Jiu (Romania). The Secretariat also informed that two nominations have been postponed. The two nominations were Delhi's Imperial Capital Cities (India) and The Ahwar of Southern Iraq: refuge of biodiversity and the relict landscape of the Mesopotamian Cities (Iraq). The Secretariat explained that following these withdrawals and postponements, the Committee would, at its current session, be examining 36 nominations, comprising 5 natural sites, 1 mixed site and 30 cultural sites.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no comments and proceeded to move on to the examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List. The Chairperson recalled the procedure for which the Committee would examine the nominations put forth by the States Parties.

## A. NATURAL SITES

### A.1. AFRICA

#### A.1.1. Extensions of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Cape Floral Region Protected Areas</b> (extension of the property “Cape Floral Region Protected Areas”)
Id. N°	<b>1007</b>
State Party	<b>South Africa</b>

**IUCN** presented its evaluation of the property.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the effective management of the property was the responsibility of the Director-General of Environmental Affairs of South Africa and expressed its support for the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se félicite également de cette extension qui renforce les valeurs du site qui est exceptionnel. Elle retient néanmoins les recommandations de l’UICN par rapport à la stratégie globale de gestion et que l’Etat partie est déjà engagé au niveau institutionnel étant donné qu’un cadre environnemental de gestion est déjà en train d’être mis en place. Elle félicite l’Etat partie d’aller dans ce sens et de respecter les recommandations de l’UICN par rapport à la gestion.

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

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that the proposed extension would strengthen the property’s integrity and add to the Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation requested for IUCN’s clarification on the inconsistency of the dates mentioned in paragraph 6 and paragraph 7 of the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported the draft decision and congratulated the State Party for taking the initiative to propose an extension to the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted that the site was a good example of how a State Party could protect the integrity of a site by extending its boundaries. The Delegation also recognized the great effort undertaken by the State Party and supported the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l’Etat partie pour les efforts déployés qui permettent une plus grande connectivité de ce bien très important et spectaculaire et considère que l’extension proposée est complémentaire aux mesures effectives nécessaires pour garantir l’intégrité du site, en particulier la protection de la diversité de la faune et de la flore caractéristiques de cette région sud-africaine. Elle souligne que ceci aura pour résultat une aire suffisante et bien connectée avec des mécanismes de protection bien définis. La Délégation de la Colombie souhaite souligner l’importance pour l’Etat partie de suivre les recommandations de l’UICN

quant au renforcement de certains mécanismes et réitère ses félicitations à l'Etat Partie et soutient le projet de décision tel que présenté.

La Délégation du **Qatar** remercie l'IUCN pour son travail et félicite l'Afrique du Sud d'avoir proposé cette extension qui est enrichissement du patrimoine mondial pour les sites naturels.

La Délégation **Liban** considère que le dossier est extrêmement important. Elle précise avoir eu l'occasion de visiter le site en 2005 et que celui-ci est extraordinaire. Elle insiste sur le fait que l'extension du bien donne à celui-ci une dimension supplémentaire et permet de renforcer la synergie à l'intérieur de ses limites. La Délégation considère qu'il y a une synergie très claire entre ce site et le patrimoine urbain de la ville du Cap dans une perspective d'approche centrée sur le paysage urbain historique. Il estime qu'il serait intéressant que l'Etat Partie commence à réfléchir à cette synergie entre ce site et le patrimoine urbain de la ville du Cap car ils sont partie intégrante d'un même ensemble.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party for the extension of site's boundaries. The Delegation stated that the modification added to the biodiversity values of the site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party and thanked IUCN for its thorough evaluation. The Delegation commended the State Party and IUCN for their cooperation on the boundary extension.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat Partie pour la qualité du travail effectué qui a nécessité des efforts considérables pour offrir à l'humanité une biodiversité remarquable qui participe à la protection environnementale mondiale. Elle appuie la proposition d'extension du bien.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party and noted that the extension enhanced the conservation of the exceptional floral species at this site.

The Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the distinctive flower species present at this site. The Delegation congratulated the State Party for its efforts to extend the boundaries of the site, which would enhance the site's integrity.

The Delegation of **Croatia** commended the State Party for its commitment towards the extension of boundaries and the management of property.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed support for the draft decision. The Delegation congratulated the State Party for the extension of the site, which would serve to strengthen the integrity of the site.

**IUCN** explained that the environmental framework mentioned in both paragraphs were consistent and also stated that there were three different existing management plans for this site.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment on paragraph 6 as proposed by Senegal.

The Delegation of **Germany** proposed that the State Party present its report on the site by 1 December 2017 rather than 1 February 2018 in order to have enough time to review the report before the 42nd session of the Committee in 2018.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne que l'Etat partie est déjà engagé dans le processus de sauvegarde et de gestion environnementale et qu'il y a un agenda établi ainsi que des agences et des structures qui travaillent avec l'Etat partie. Elle considère que l'extension du bien suppose la mise en place d'une stratégie de gestion et que c'est la raison pour laquelle souhaite qu'un an supplémentaire soit accordé par le Comité. La Délégation du Sénégal considère en outre qu'il n'est pas possible de décider à la place de l'Etat partie car celui-ci a sa planification interne et qui est le plus à même, avec ses structures de planification techniques et institutionnelles, d'estimer le temps nécessaire pour la mise en place d'une stratégie de gestion intégrant la partie ajoutée par l'extension du bien. La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande s'il est possible de donner la parole à l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **South Africa** agreed with the proposal of Germany.

**IUCN** requested for the State Party to present its report on the site to the Committee by 1 December 2017, as proposed by the delegation of Germany.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.2** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its happiness at the decision and affirmed the State Party's commitment extend greater protection to its World Heritage site. The Delegation underlined that the property was exceptional for the flower species found in that area and further assured the Committee that the property would be managed with high standards.

#### **A.1.2. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

Property	<b>Sanganeb Marine National Park and Dungonab Bay – Mukkawar Island Marine National Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>262 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Sudan</b>

**IUCN** presented its evaluation of the site.

The Delegation of **India** complemented the State Party's efforts and appreciated its achievements on the management of the site.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie l'UICN pour l'excellent rapport très documenté et détaillé qui renseigne sur la valeur du bien. Elle rappelle que le bien a été proposé pour inscription il y a trois décennies et qu'il a fait l'objet d'une décision de différé en raison d'une protection juridique insuffisante. Elle estime que la proposition d'inscription revient avec une indication claire sur la détermination de l'Etat partie,

soutenu par la communauté locale dans les efforts en vue d'une possible inscription. La Délégation de l'Algérie félicite l'Etat partie des efforts déployés dans ce sens. Elle déclare, considérant la nécessité de protéger ce bien dont la biodiversité d'intérêt mondial est reconnue, avoir présenté un amendement dans le sens d'un renvoi du dossier par le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour permettre à l'Etat partie de mettre en œuvre les recommandations de l'UICN, notamment la révision des limites du bien et de la zone tampon. La Délégation de l'Algérie demande à entendre l'Etat partie au sujet des efforts qu'il a déployés dans le sens d'une protection et également l'UICN sur l'amendement proposé par l'Algérie concernant la zone tampon et les délimitations.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the site was an important Marine site in the region. The Delegation noted that while the boundaries did not sufficiently cover the OUV of the site, the Delegation acknowledged that the State Party had indicated that it could modify the boundaries of the site.

The Delegation of **Qatar** stated that the Outstanding Universal Value of this site was beyond doubt. The Delegation proposed that the criterion (viii) should also be taken into consideration, and proposed that the nomination be referred rather than deferred. The Delegation proposed for the State Party to take into account adjustments to the boundaries, buffer zone and the integrity of the site, on the basis of criteria (vi), (viii) and (ix).

La Délégation de la **Colombie** se rallie au point de vue de la Finlande et du Qatar. Elle tient tout d'abord à féliciter l'Etat partie pour le site extraordinaire et les mesures de conservation prises jusqu'à présent. Elle considère que le travail fait par l'UICN est très important car il a permis d'identifier les éléments qui devraient être inscrits. Elle exprime son souhait d'inviter l'Etat partie, le Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN à accélérer le processus d'approbation de cette proposition d'inscription. La délégation de la Colombie estime que le manque de ressources n'a jusqu'à présent pas été un problème pour la conservation du bien et elle soutient par conséquent un renvoi du dossier.

The Delegation of **Turkey** opined that the site deserved to be inscribed on the World Heritage List and that the nomination should be referred rather than deferred. The Delegation expressed the view that the integration and management issues could be solved in one year and stated its wish that the site be inscribed as soon as possible.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the referral of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se rallie à la Finlande, au Qatar et à l'Algérie et après avoir étudié le dossier, considère qu'un travail extraordinaire a été accompli depuis des décennies et que le bien proposé présente de manière incontestable une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle considère d'ailleurs que rien ne se serait opposé à son inscription dès cette année mais suit les autres membres du Comité dans un esprit de consensus. La délégation du Sénégal souhaite néanmoins relever un point dans le rapport d'évaluation qu'elle considère extrêmement grave. Elle déclare avoir la conviction qu'un pays qui n'a pas les moyens de bien gérer son site comme demandé ne peut pas l'inscrire. Elle cite le point 2.C du projet de décision qui dit « démontrer de manière significative que les ressources financières et les capacités

en personnel ont été considérablement accrues pour garantir une gestion efficace du bien proposé et donner au Comité du patrimoine mondial l'assurance que les engagements à maintenir le financement durable permanent seront tenus ». La Délégation estime que cela n'a aucune relation avec la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle considère que dire qu'un site ne peut pas être inscrit parce qu'il n'y a pas de capacité de gestion revient à instaurer un suffrage censitaire qui fait que seuls les pays qui ont les moyens de gérer leurs sites verront leurs sites classés car ils répondront à un standard établi par les organisations consultatives. La Délégation estime que le Comité est en train d'atteindre une ligne rouge rédhibitoire à une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée et représentative.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the referral and suggested that a mission be sent to the site before the boundaries were modified.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** commended the State Party for its efforts and requested that the State Party follow the IUCN's recommendations concerning the boundaries. The Delegation stated that the extension of boundaries was needed and therefore supported referral.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère, à la lecture du rapport complet et détaillé de l'UICN, qu'il est clair que le site a une valeur universelle exceptionnelle et que les critères (vii), (ix) et (x) s'appliquent, avec peut-être également le critère (vii). Elle considère que le problème des limites se pose et qu'au vu des contacts établis avec l'Etat partie et sa disponibilité à travailler avec l'UICN pour modifier les limites et travailler sur un plan de gestion plus développé pour l'ensemble du site, elle appuie la proposition d'un renvoi.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted the legal protection of the property commended the involvement of the local community in decision-making processes. The Delegation supported the referral of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Serbia** expressed its support for referral. The Delegation emphasized the uniqueness of the site and acknowledged the State Party's commitment to take responsibility over the management of the site. However, the Delegation also cautioned the State Party to ensure that the recommendations were met as the nomination came close to a deferral.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the move towards a referral.

The Delegation of **Philippines** expressed appreciation for the legislative efforts undertaken by State Party for the protection of the site and its biodiversity, and supported the referral decision. The Delegation proposed that capacity-building and community involvement be well-integrated into the management plan as pillars for sustainability.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the move to a referral.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported referral and acknowledged the commitment of the State Party in taking proper actions to address the concerns raised.



La délégation du **Viêt-Nam** déclare se joindre aux orateurs qui l'ont précédée sur les trois points évoqués, à savoir le fait que le site peut satisfaire les trois critères, l'avis sur le lien qui existe entre la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et la gestion, surtout la question des limites du bien et enfin le fait que le bien appartient à la catégorie écomaritime qui n'est pas bien représentée sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La délégation du Viêt-Nam demande aux Organisations consultatives de tenir compte, dans le futur, de cette question pour leur travail d'évaluation et ce afin d'avoir un meilleur équilibre en termes de biens naturels sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La délégation du Viêt-Nam conclut en soulignant la priorité qui doit être donnée à l'Afrique dans cette démarche.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported referral and requested for IUCN to support the State Party to improve the management of the site.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its recognition of the commitment that the State Party had to the improvement of the site and its collaboration with IUCN for its evaluation.

The Delegation of **Sudan** (Observer) stated that the boundaries were intact at the moment and that there was another reef to be included to the buffer zone. The Delegation further stated that it accepted the modification of the buffer zone as proposed by IUCN. The Delegation underlined that the site was managed by two different management plans for the two components.

**IUCN** expressed that it was pleased to see the consensus on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. IUCN opined that the criterion (viii) was not that clear for this site and that in this regard, it recommended the deferral of the nomination so that the State Party could improve the boundaries of the site. IUCN also stated that if the Committee decided on the referral of the nomination, IUCN would collaborate with the State Party to improve the management.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments for to change the recommendation from a deferral to referral and to include the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Qatar regarding criterion (xiii), (ix) and (x).

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.3** was adopted as amended.

## **A.2. ASIA-PACIFIC**

### **A.2.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Landscapes of Dauria</b>
Id. N°	<b>1448</b>
State Party	<b>Mongolia / Russian Federation</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for the nomination.

**IUCN** presented its evaluation of the site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged the uniqueness of this property and supported the need to improve the capacity at the site. The Delegation noted the possibility for the future extension of the site. The Delegation expressed its satisfaction at the commitment of the State Parties and requested for them to follow through with the recommendations by IUCN. The Delegation expressed its belief that the site should be placed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **India** complemented both State Parties for their efforts on this nomination. The Delegation stated that the evaluation of IUCN showed that how both States Parties managed the site was different. The Delegation noted that the site also met criterion (x) as the site was the habitat for a great number of bird species. The Delegation proposed that the nomination should be referred rather than deferred.

The Delegation of **Japan** praised the cooperation of the three countries of China, Mongolia and Russian Federation for the management of the site and noted the effectiveness of the management in the buffer zone

The Delegation of **Lebanon** endorsed India's proposal for referral.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported India's proposal for referral.

La Délégation du **Qatar** félicite les deux Etats parties d'avoir présenté le dossier et appuie la proposition de renvoi de celui-ci.

The delegation of **Portugal** supported India's proposal for referral.

The delegation of **Germany** thanked IUCN for its thorough evaluation and the State Parties for their effort on this nomination. The Delegation noted that the site met criteria (xi) and (x) and supported the deferral of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Viêt-Nam** déclare soutenir pleinement la proposition faite par la délégation de l'Inde.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient également la proposition de renvoi faite par l'Inde.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted that the site demonstrated Outstanding Universal Value and met the criteria (xi) and (x). The Delegation requested to hear from the States Parties on whether they could incorporate the modifications proposed within the timeframe requested.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutient la proposition de l'Inde pour le renvoi du dossier.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** (Observer) stated that the nomination was a serial nomination and that its values would be extended in the future. The Delegation requested for the site to either be inscribed in the World Heritage List or be referred for discussion at the following year.

The Delegation of **Mongolia** stated that agreed with the statement of the Delegation of the Russian Federation and requested for a referral rather than a deferral.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted the States Parties' willingness for cooperation and enquired if IUCN had further comments. The Delegation expressed its support for referral.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested to see the amended draft decision on the screen.

**IUCN** stated that the boundaries of this site needed to be modified and a new mission would help in the reconsideration of the configuration of the property. IUCN clarified that the property was not a serial nomination. IUCN stated that regarding the adequacy of protection of the buffer zone, 30% of the property was in a protected area within the Russian Federation and 80% was in a protected area in Mongolia. IUCN noted that the regulation of activities within the buffer zone of the Russian Federation was on a stronger level than in Mongolia, as the latter was more traditional.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment from the Delegation of India for the referral of the nomination.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.4** was adopted as amended.

Property	<b>Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex</b>
Id. N°	<b>1461</b>
State Party	<b>Thailand</b>

**IUCN** presented its evaluation and recommendation and suggested that the nomination should be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** underlined that the nomination of this Indo-Malayan eco-region covered an area of more than 123,000 ha with over 800 vertebrate species recorded and comprised mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds and fish as well as over 2700 species of vascular plants. The Delegation highlighted that this area was the home of endemic plant species and globally endangered species. The Delegation emphasized that the nomination corresponded to criterion (x) on biodiversity and threatened species and that the Outstanding Universal Value of the nomination was clearly established. The Delegation also stated that there was a lack of consultation with the local Karen communities living within the Kaeng Krachan National Park on the World Heritage nominated site and proposed an amendment in this regard. Finally, the Delegation welcomed the Roadmap to address the concern of the local Karen communities.

The Delegation of **Finland** underlined the Outstanding Universal Value of this site. The Delegation welcomed the Roadmap as a clear sign that the Thai Government was committed to take into account the concerns of local communities. The Delegation also welcomed the cooperation with Myanmar to clearly define the boundaries of the nominated site.

The Delegations of **Jamaica**, **Poland** and **Kazakhstan** supported the amendment proposing stronger community involvement in the management of this site.

The Delegation of **Japan** emphasized that the nomination merited inscription on the World Heritage List and that the Outstanding Universal Value of this property was undoubted. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision to refer the nomination back to the State Party given the number of outstanding issues to be addressed. The Delegation encouraged Thailand to collaborate with the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (UNOHCHR) to find a satisfactory resolution.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that there was no doubt that this nomination should be inscribed on the World Heritage List in the future. However, the Delegation expressed the view that Thailand needed to solve issues on Human Rights as raised by the UNOHCHR with respect to the rights of the Karen community to remain in Kaeng Krachan National Park. The Delegation of Portugal supported the referral proposed by IUCN.

The Delegation of **Philippines** underlined that certain threats such as farming, settlement, forest-product collection, wildlife hunting, wildlife poaching and illegal trade needed to be addressed. The Delegation commended the Thai government for having improved the conservation and the management of the area.

La Délégation de **Colombie** félicite l'Etat Partie pour la protection de ce site assurant la connectivité entre les espèces. La Délégation soutien la recommandation de l'IUCN et appuie le renvoi du dossier. La Délégation invite l'Etat Partie à mettre en place le dialogue avec les communautés locales et souligne que des mesures de sauvegarde de ce site doivent être élaborées en accord avec tous les groupes et communautés impliquées.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the Outstanding Universal Value of the site as well as the protection and management efforts undertaken by the Thai government. The Delegation underlined that local communities needed to be involved to ensure the collaborative and sustainable management of Kaeng Krachan National Park. The Delegation welcomed the willingness of the Thai government to implement the Road Map and supported the referral of this nomination.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated Thailand for this nomination. The Delegation appreciated the concerns of IUCN on Human Rights issues such as violent forced evictions, harassment of ethnic minorities and weak consultation on the World Heritage nomination. The Delegation also underlined the importance to inscribe the site in order to ensure the protection of threatened species such as the Black Tiger.

La Délégation de **Pérou** soutient l'amendement présenté par le Viêt-Nam.

The Delegation of **Turkey** underlined that there was no doubt regarding the uniqueness and the integrity of this nomination. The Delegation stated that the Roadmap prepared by the Thai government addressed adequately the concerns of IUCN to resolve all conflicts with Karen people.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicitant l'Etat Partie et l'IUCN pour ce dossier souligne les menaces qui pèsent sur les espèces. La Délégation soutient le projet de décision proposé.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient l'amendement présenté par le Viêt-Nam.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicitant l'Etat Partie et l'IUCN pour ce dossier encourage l'Etat Partie d'assurer le dialogue avec les communautés. Le processus participatif est long à mettre en place. La Délégation appuie le renvoi du dossier.

La Délégation du **Qatar** note le consensus pour le renvoi du dossier, allouant le temps nécessaire pour résoudre les problèmes et insérer le critère (ix) en plus du critère (x).

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Thailand** that made the following statement:

*"Thank you for allowing me to take the floor. It is regrettable that the inscription of the Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex under criterion (x) is recommended to be referred this year. We are strongly confident that the Site has qualified Outstanding Universal Value and merits inscription. The fact that the draft Decision encourages Thailand to consider nominating the property under criterion ix confirms the values and significance of the ecosystem of the complex. However the referral is acceptable for Thailand. On the concern of the Karen community, the Thai government has been taking care of more than seven hundred thousand Karen people in the country since Thailand has a long tradition of protecting the rights of diverse groups living across the country. The number of registered Karens in this complex is initially three hundred but later, more than two thousand Karens have migrated from outside, some from across the border. The Thai Government has undertaken many development projects to improve their quality of life long before the nomination. Let me inform the Committee that the Thai government has now approved the Roadmap for sustainable management of the Complex aiming to promote conservation of OUV in holistic manner with time-limited participatory process of all stakeholders including the Karen community. Thailand is committed to fully implement the road map. We firmly believe that the complex is a heritage of mankind, it does not belong to any particular group, we need to have a balanced approach, improving livelihood must be balanced with taking ownership and common responsibility to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the complex. We look forward to the inscription of the Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex as a Natural World Heritage Site in the next session, if not by this session. Thank you Madame Chair."*

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Portugal** proposed to keep the line "free, prior and informed consent" in the Draft Decision in order to adequately address the issue raised by the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner on Human Rights (UNOHCHR). The Delegation underlined that Human Rights issues were of universal value and importance and should lead the work of the World Heritage Committee in its decision-making.

The Delegations of **Finland, Viet Nam, Algeria, the Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, Qatar, Senegal** and **Japan** requested for the deletion of the mention of "free, prior and informed consent".

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.5** was adopted.

#### **A.2.2. Extensions of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List**

Property	<b>Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park</b> (re-nomination under criteria (ix) and (x) and extension of "Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park")
Id. N°	<b>951 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Viet Nam</b>

**IUCN** presented its evaluation and recommendation concerning the re-nomination of the property under criteria (ix) and (x) and extension of Phong Nha-Ke Bang National Park.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the State Party of Viet Nam on the successful re-nomination and invited it to enhance the management and protection of this site. The Delegation supported the extension of the property's boundaries.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated Viet Nam for the extension and re-nomination. The Delegation expressed the view that the World Heritage property should be protected as it was one of the oldest ecosystem in South East Asia and therefore should be safeguarded for the World Heritage community.

The Delegation of **Turkey** highlighted the geological values of the property with its limestone karst and associated cave systems and features and supported the Draft Decision. The Delegation expressed concern concerning the tourism development and called upon the State Party of Viet Nam to take into account the concerns expressed by IUCN, notably the impact of increased tourism and related development on the property's values that required increased attention and strong protection and management measures.

The Delegation of **India** recalled that the property was already inscribed in 2003 for geological values and supported the re-nomination and extension under biodiversity criteria (ix) and (x) because of the species richness of this area.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicitant l'Etat Partie et l'IUCN pour ce dossier souligne les menaces qui pèsent sur les espèces. La Délégation soutien le projet de décision proposé.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** also supported the re-nomination and extension of the property and welcomed the efforts of the park Management Board to

respond adequately to the potential impacts on the conservation and management of the property.

The Delegation of **Philippines** stated that the property was a hotspot which represented one of the largest protected karst landscapes in South East Asia and thus responded to the biodiversity criteria (ix) and (x). The Delegation therefore strongly supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed satisfaction with the efforts of the State Party of Viet Nam to address the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee to offer a more intact ecosystem with additional protection to the water catchments that were critical to the integrity of karst landscapes.

The Delegation of **Germany** underlined that this re-nomination added significantly to the natural values of the site, provided for a much more robust property and contributed to the global biodiversity. The Delegation expressed the view that this re-nomination should be seen as a model for other States Parties that planned an extension of their poverty.

The Delegation of **Croatia** also complimented the State Party of Viet Nam for the efforts to meet the conditions of integrity, protection and management and stressed that the re-nomination should be taken as a good example for an extension.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat Partie et l'IUCN pour ce dossier et encourage l'Etat Partie à assurer le dialogue avec les communautés. Le processus participatif est long à mettre en place. La Délégation appuie le renvoi du dossier.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.6** was adopted without amendments.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed its sincere thanks to the Committee Members, Advisory Bodies, and especially scientists and the local community. The Delegation underlined its continued commitment to fulfill the recommendations expressed by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation suggested that this nomination should be taken a case study for developing countries. The Delegation shared that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List since 2003 and Viet Nam had applied for an extension after 12 years when the capacity of the State Party had improved to respond to the conservation and management needs of this property. The Delegation informed the Committee that the site had attracted much interest as a consequence of a broadcast on "Good Morning America" as the American morning television show had contributed to the better knowledge and understanding of the Phong Nha – Ke Bang National Park. Finally, the Delegation invited all States Parties to visit the caves and karst features that were open to a restricted number of 500 visitors per year.

## B. MIXED SITES

### B.1 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

#### B.1.1. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	<b>Blue and John Crow Mountains</b>
Id. N°	<b>1356 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Jamaica</b>

**IUCN** and **ICOMOS** presented their evaluation and recommendation and suggested that the nomination should be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii), (vi) and (x).

The Delegation of **Philippines** highlighted that the inscription was Jamaica's first site to be inscribed on the World Heritage list. The Delegation stated that the mixed site stood as an outstanding example of landscape that was also inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity. The Delegation underlined that as a cultural site, it deserved inscription based on its tangible cultural heritage associated with the Maroon story and as a natural site, it deserved inscription due to its exceptional biodiversity including the having the highest number of endemic land bird species among sites in the oceanic islands of the world.

The Delegation of **Japan** recalled that the site was nominated in 2010 and that in 2011, the Committee decided to defer the nomination under both natural and cultural criteria to allow the State Party to address major integrity concerns, undertake a fuller assessment of the potential of the Cockpit Country Forest Reserve and bring back a new nomination with the strongest potential for inscription onto the World Heritage List (Decision 35 COM 8B.16). The Delegation was of the view that the recommendation to inscribe this mixed site could therefore be seen as a great success and another step to improve the representativeness of the World Heritage list. The Delegation called upon Committee Members as well as the Advisory Bodies to provide assistance in order to ensure the adequacy of staff and financial resources for the long-term conservation of the site.

The Delegation of **Finland** underlined the outstanding value of the mixed site with the natural values of the intact tropical and montane rainforest as well as the cultural values of the Maroons. The Delegation congratulated Jamaica for its efforts in responding to the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation highlighted that the management system put into place with the participation of the civil society and local communities was successful. The Delegation of Finland concluded that this nomination was an excellent example for a mixed site and should be inscribed on the World Heritage list.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its satisfaction with the nomination of this forest area and welcomed the efforts of the State Party to recognize the rights of the local communities and to involve them in the management of the site to ensure the best balance between biodiversity conservation and socio-economic development.



The Delegation concluded that this nomination, which had been deferred in 2011, was an excellent example of how a deferral could lead to a stronger nomination. The Delegation stressed that the re-nomination of this site recognized both the cultural and natural values of the site and was an excellent mixed nomination.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its gratitude to the State Party of Jamaica for the impressive and rich nomination dossier. The Delegation underlined that with its revised boundaries, the nomination met the conditions of authenticity and integrity. Furthermore, the Delegation expressed the view that the property was an example of the improved dialogue with populations residing within the nominated property. The Delegation highlighted that this mixed nomination would contribute to a balanced and credible World Heritage List, as mixed nominations were currently still underrepresented.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party for its nomination.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** précise que c'est le premier site de l'Etat Partie. Les valeurs de ce site mixte sont exceptionnelles. Les valeurs intangibles sont déjà reconnues au titre de la Convention 2003. L'Etat Partie a émis toutes les garanties et a mis en place toutes les mesures adéquates.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** commended the State Party of Jamaica for responding to the World Heritage recommendations concerning the change of the name of the property, the addition of criterion (iii), the reduction of the boundaries of the nominated property and the expansion of the buffer zone. The Delegation expressed the view that the nomination was a case study where the potential of a nomination had been strengthened through a deferral and as a result, Jamaica would celebrate its first site inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation fully supported and endorsed the nomination.

The Delegation of **India** encouraged the State Party of Jamaica to protect the site from the risk of future mining due to ambiguous legislation, high level approval and licenses. The Delegation underlined that the State Party should commit to not permitting mining in the property and supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed its satisfaction with this nomination for three reasons. Firstly, the Delegation expressed the view that the nomination showed that a deferral was not a punishment but the occasion to ensure a strong nomination. Secondly, the Delegation underlined that this nomination was an example of the interrelation of the different cultural conventions, namely the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and the World Heritage Convention. Thirdly, the Delegation highlighted that the inscription served a triple aim to protect the mixed site, to safeguard the intangible values of the site and to conserve the tangible values of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Portugal** underlined that there was no doubt regarding the Outstanding Universal Value of this nomination. The Delegation stressed that the site should be preserved and safeguarded through an inclusive and participatory management approach that took into account the local communities in the management efforts.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party of Jamaica for its efforts to safeguard the natural and cultural heritage of this site as well as the intangible tradition of the Maroon culture. The Delegation highlighted that the nomination was an excellent example of a holistic approach to culture and how to preserve and conserve this culture.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l'Etat Partie pour ce premier bien et propose un amendement au projet de décision pour renforcer le contrôle dans la zone forestière, ainsi que le rôle de la communauté des Marrons. La Délégation demande également qu'une étude d'impact environnementale concernant les extractions minières soit faite par l'Etat Partie.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** stated that this nomination was the happy ending of a long and fruitful nomination process and congratulated the State Party of Jamaica for this nomination.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** underlined that the cultural and natural heritage of this site should be preserved as an exceptional example for future generations.

The Delegation of **Serbia** fully supported the inscription and expressed its satisfaction that this first Jamaican World Heritage site would contribute to the better representativeness of the World Heritage list.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Etat Partie pour une collaboration étroite avec les organisations consultatives qui s'est traduite par la reconnaissance des valeurs naturelles et culturelles.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the inscription of this proposal. The delegation also welcomed the first inscription by Jamaica and stressed the importance of the intangible value of this nomination that should be preserved and safeguarded.

La Délégation du **Perou** adhère à toutes les interventions et félicite l'Etat Partie et les organisations consultatives.

The Delegation of **Colombia** presented an amendment to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.7** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** took the floor and delivered the following statement:

*"Madam Chair, Colleagues, I speak on behalf of the Government and people of Jamaica in humbly expressing our gratitude to the World Heritage Committee for its decision to inscribe the Blue and John Crow Mountains to the World Heritage List. This inscription represents the first World Heritage site for Jamaica and the first mixed site for the Caribbean sub-region. This has been quite a journey for us as a country. The experience has taught us many things, and among them, we have learnt to appreciate our distinctive natural and cultural heritage even more.*

*You see Madam Chair, there is a natural mystic that belies who we are as a county and as a people. A small nation with unabashed resolve and courage giving to the world the King of Reggae Music Bob Marley, jerk chicken, and the fastest Man and woman on land; Usain Bolt and Shelly Ann Frazer Pryce. Our history, in particular, the struggles and defiance of our Maroon People helped to mould us into being distinctly Jamaican. To this end, we want the world to not only drink our outstanding Blue Mountain Coffee but to see the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the Blue and John Crow Mountains, a site that the world can embrace as its own, exhibiting the natural and cultural values that will give an understanding of our "Jamaicanness."*

*We respect the World Heritage Committee and recommit our obligations to uphold the tenets on which the World Heritage Convention was developed. We will ensure that the OUV, the integrity and the authenticity of this site are maintained, not only for Jamaica and Jamaicans, but for peoples of the world. We are equally conscious that maintaining a site such as this one requires additional financial resources and management. My Government understands, and appreciates this and, we have given the assurances for these requirements to be in place. That said I wish to emphasize the legal protection of the property that is already in place to ensure among other issues that no mining, prospecting licenses and/or operations will be permitted within the nominated area. The Ministries of Science, Technology, Energy and Mining and Water, Land, Environment and Climate Change and Tourism are working with my Ministry to ensure that these commitments are maintained. The fact is that we are aware and again extremely humbled that as the first mixed site in the region much is expected from us. Madam Chair, I am heartened by the Strategic Objectives of the World Heritage Convention, the Five "Cs" that have guided this convention and to which we have been held accountable as unofficial custodians of our respective heritages and those of the world in general. We are especially appreciative of UNESCO's push to enhance the role of Communities in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention and specifically their presence and participation in the management of World Heritage sites. Our communities are at the heart of everything we do as a country. It is for this reason Madam Chair that I ask for your indulgence in allowing the floor to Colonel Wallace Sterling, Maroon Chief in Moore Town, one of our indigenous communities located in the site.*

*In closing, please allow me a moment to express my sincerest thanks to our friends and colleagues who have been nothing less than supportive and encouraging throughout this process. First, to the members of the World Heritage Committee, past and present; to the staff of the World Heritage Centre headed by Mr. Kishore Rao. Mr. Rao, You have been the gentle giant in settings such as this, motivator to many in a process that can be arduous. My heartfelt thanks to the Advisory bodies, ICOMOS and IUCN for their professional oversight of the evaluation process, their patience and general guidance provided to our technical team. I must express our gratitude to Governments and people of Latin America and the Caribbean who have supported Jamaica in building its presence in World Heritage. Finally, to our Jamaican technical team that led this process from Ministry of Youth and Culture and our agencies. Deborah Kay Palmer, Dorrick Gray, Susan Otuokon, Selvenious Walters, Bernard Jankee, Carla Gordon, Marlon Beale, Tracy Commock, Thera Edwards, Colonel Wallace Sterling, Colonel Frank Lumsden, Janice Lindsay and my PS, Mrs. Sherrill O'Reggio Angus and Amb. Vilma McNish. To all other stakeholders within and outside Jamaica. Thank you for getting us here. Madame Chair we will*

*remain resolute as members of the World Heritage Committee to uphold the tenets of the Convention and to serve the interests of Small Island Developing States in World Heritage. Thank you once again and we look forward to your company on July 5 as we proudly present to you the natural and cultural heritage of Jamaica and Caribbean SIDS. One Love"*

Statement by Wallace Sterling, Colonel of the Moore Town Maroons:

*"Madam Chair, Colleagues, I bring you greetings from the people of Jamaica and the Maroon communities in particular. I am certain you will understand that we are extremely pleased with this inscription. For us this is a statement about the value the world places on the indigenous cultures of the world, our customs and traditions that are embedded in the maroon heritage. We know our ancestors are looking down on this moment, very proud that this universal prestige is being given to us, in part because they were selfless, committed, strong, cunning and resourceful persons who found ingenious ways to dismantle a system that blighted peoples of the region. Their efforts to put an end to one of the darkest periods of our history are what we acknowledge and celebrate as Maroons today. Importantly, we hail the legacy passed on to us by our ancestors - they have helped to shape our identity of self, and community. The Blue and John Crow Mountains is the place we call home. The land where the mountains are tall, rugged and wild. Which man does not take care of his castle? We will continue as we have always done to fearlessly, unapologetically, fiercely protect the boundaries of our home, we will protect the treasures of our home, we will protect the distinctive assets of our home, we will herald the traditional principles that are the soul of our home. The Blue and John Crow Mountains will be a place that the rest of the world can visit at any time and feel safe and proud that it is a true representation of a site of outstanding universal value. In the name of our National Heroine and Leader, Queen Nanny, we commit to protecting the Blue and John Crow Mountains on behalf of the peoples of this world. Thank you! Thank you a thousand times for your generosity and kindness that you have shown to our effort to continue our traditional way of life. In the words of our ancestors we say "Medasi" – thank you."*

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

**FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 3 July 2015**

**NINTH MEETING**

**3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany) and  
Her Excellency Ruchira Kamboj (India)**

**ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE  
LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND  
CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)**

**C. CULTURAL SITES**

**C.1. Africa**

**C.1.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Thimlich Ohinga Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1450</b>
State Party	<b>Kenya</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the nomination for Thimlich Ohinga Cultural Landscape.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique avoir examiné attentivement la proposition d'inscription mais souhaite faire une remarque préalable à la discussion sur la proposition d'inscription. En examinant la liste des sites proposés, elle note que la convention évolue vers le sectarisme et l'exclusion et qu'il n'y aura plus de sites africains si on continue ainsi. Elle ajoute que si on effectue une relecture et une analyse contextuelle du travail remarquable des organes consultatifs, on aboutit à une autre lecture que je partage. En effet, quand on regarde la logique du dossier d'inscription et de l'analyse, il est clair que ce site n'est pas un paysage culturel mais un site culturel. Dans cette logique, toutes les conditions requises par l'ICOMOS sont remplies.

L'**ICOMOS** clarifie son analyse de la page 109 et souligne que l'intégrité, l'authenticité, les critères iii et iv sont justifiés au niveau du site et ajoute que sur la base de l'analyse de l'ICOMOS, il est possible de classer ce site dès cette session et de travailler avec l'état partie pour que cette 39eme session ne se traduise pas par l'exclusion d'une partie de l'Afrique.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed the view the evaluation dossier lacked adequate detail and requested to hear from the Delegation of Kenya.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted the great value of the site but considered that the proposal did not entirely fulfil the chosen criteria. The Delegation recommended organising extensive archaeological research. The Delegation emphasized that it would be happy to see the site being inscribed but highlighted the necessity of a redrafted nomination file and suggested that the State Party request help from the Advisory Body in this regard.

The Délégation de l'**Algérie** déclare que le Kenya propose un projet magnifique mais la qualification de paysage culturel n'a pas été retenue par les organes consultatifs. Elle ajoute que l'Etat partie a fait savoir le comité qu'il était prêt à reformuler sa proposition et qu'il accepte de considérer le site comme étant un site culturel et non un paysage culturel. Elle demande d'écouter l'Etat partie et l'ICOMOS sur ces questions.

The Delegation of **Croatia** thanked ICOMOS and the State Party of Kenya for presenting an invaluable property from Africa and supported the State Party's motivation for inscription. The Delegation recalled that ICOMOS has acknowledged the potential OUV of the site, but not when it was presented as cultural landscape. The Delegation considered that the site should be referred rather than deferred.

The Delegation of **Japan** thanked ICOMOS and the State Party of Kenya for the comprehensive presentation and agreed with the Delegation of Algeria. The Delegation recognized the importance of the heritage for the country and the enthusiasm present in Kenya. The Delegation also recognised the strong potential to prove the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and requested to hear from ICOMOS on how the OUV of the site could be best presented through the nomination criteria.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party of Kenya for its significant nomination and acknowledged the State Party's dilemma on whether the property should be nominated as an archaeological site or as a cultural landscape. The Delegation requested for ICOMOS to shed light on this issue and also requested for clarification from the State Party on the direction that it would prefer to proceed with.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested to hear from both the State Party and ICOMOS. The Delegation agreed with Senegal's statement that the site should be considered as an outstanding example of a human settlement and not as a landscape. The Delegation suggested that additional archaeological research should be conducted rather than inscribing the site immediately, in order to allow enough time for the State Party to respond.

La délégation du **Qatar** approuve l'intervention de la délégation du Sénégal sur la nécessité d'avoir un autre regard sur ce site et soutient cette position ; elle demande d'écouter l'état partie.

La délégation du **Liban** souligne que le rapport de l'ICOMOS considère que les critères iii et iv sont applicables si le site est présenté comme site archéologique et

non comme paysage culturel. Elle conclut qu'il y a un problème de présentation du site par l'état partie mais note qu'en changeant de logique, le problème des limites et la question de l'archéologie se poseront. Elle demande à écouter d'abord l'ICOMOS et ensuite l'état partie, sur leurs recommandations tout en soulignant qu'elle est en faveur d'un renvoi car le bien porte bien une VUE potentielle, mais considère que la décision finale dépendra de l'état partie.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** commended the efforts made by the State Party to achieve an inscription of this important property. The Delegation expressed that it could support the proposal by the Delegation of Senegal, but requested to first hear from the State Party of Kenya and ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Germany** commended the State Party for the impressive nomination and expressed its support for ICOMOS. The Delegation requested to hear from the State Party on how they might wish to revise the nomination.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended the State Party of Kenya for the preparation of the nomination and underlined the high chances for inscription through referral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** (Observer) thanked the Committee members for their comments. The Delegation highlighted that since the property was a pastoral site, the Delegation was willing to nominate Thimlich Ohinga as a site and not as a cultural landscape as suggested. The Delegation expressed its belief that by nominating the property as a cultural site, the boundaries would encompass and protect all the important elements and that nominating a larger area may prevent sufficient protection. The Delegation stated that if enough resources were available in subsequent years, the Delegation would consider extending the site's boundaries and consequently, its protection. The Delegation underlined that most of the work on the comparative analysis was based on archaeological research and reiterated the site's potential to prove its Outstanding Universal Value.

**ICOMOS** remarked that the reformulation of the nominated property would imply a deeper comparative analysis, aligned to the nomination of the property as a cultural site. ICOMOS acknowledged the potential of the site to prove its Outstanding Universal Value. ICOMOS stated its willingness to work together with the State Party to ensure that the site would be properly protected.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** déclare qu'après avoir écouté l'état partie et l'ICOMOS il convient de revenir au rapport de l'ICOMOS page 40 concernant les critères iii et iv et où il est dit que sous le critère iv, le paysage culturel n'est pas justifié mais le site culturel est bien justifié. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS si l'inscription serait justifiée en excluant les critères iii et iv.

**ICOMOS** reiterated the evaluation of the site revealed a clear potential for inscription, but ICOMOS was of the view that the chances for inscription would be better if the nomination was reformulated and looked at in a different context. ICOMOS stated that at the moment, it was difficult for ICOMOS to see the Outstanding Universal Value justified on the basis of these criteria and it would not be possible for ICOMOS to take a position on these criteria during the present session.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the State Parties and ICOMOS for their statements and expressed its understanding for the issues raised by Senegal. The Delegation acknowledged the State Party's eagerness to see the nomination being inscribed on the list, but also recognized that ICOMOS' points were valid and hence suggested a referral to give the State Party time to reformulate the nomination.

La Délégation du **Liban** rejoint la position du Portugal en optant pour le renvoi, mais déclare être prête à suivre un consensus pour l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the proposal for referral.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** mentionne qu'après avoir écouté l'ICOMOS, elle pense que la requalification risque de poser des problèmes immédiats mais se déclare prête à aller vers un consensus en cas d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** shared the views expressed by the Delegation of Algeria and expressed its hesitation to go for inscription as there remained various issues from a technical point of view. The Delegation considered that given the emerging consensus, referral should be supported.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its belief that the necessary work for the State Party to undertake in reformulating the nomination would be best facilitated through a deferral rather than a referral. However, the Delegation could agree with a consensus for a referral.

The Delegation of **Portugal** underlined that a referral would be in Kenya's interest and suggested that the Committee should accept a referral.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated it would support a consensus.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the positions of the Delegations of Portugal and Finland and would accept a referral.

La délégation de la **Colombie** déclare que suite aux explications fournies par ICOMOS, il est nécessaire de reformuler le dossier et se prononce d'accord pour le renvoi du dossier d'inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the proposal for a referral.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** pense que la décision est lourde de conséquences et qu'il y a en jeu la question de l'exclusion d'une partie des états parties de la convention, ce qui serait assez grave. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS d'expliquer pourquoi ayant révisé les critères de paysage culturel à site, il ne prend pas acte de la déduction nécessaire. Il explique que ce qui est demandé en relation avec l'analyse du site, la gestion et les aspects juridique reste inchangeable. Elle déclare qu'elle ne change pas d'avis sur leur proposition mais que comité est souverain. Il conclut en disant que la clarté de l'analyse justifiait entièrement l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the proposal for referral.



The Delegation of **India** reiterated its earlier position to support a referral but enquired if the Advisory Bodies could support a referral as well.

**ICOMOS** stated that from its perspective, it sounded possible to shift the nomination from the cultural landscape category to a site. ICOMOS would therefore support any decision that facilitated consultations with the concerned State Party on how to draft a different Nomination dossier.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère qu'il y a un problème de base dans ce dossier car le site est présenté comme paysage culturel mais l'ICOMOS considère que le site est un site culturel. Elle ajoute que si le processus en amont avait été suivi et le dialogue établi, on aurait évité le problème dès le début et le résultat en aurait découlé et considère que les organes consultatifs doivent concentrer leur aide aux états qui en ont besoin; en effet, nous avons vu que pour le site des Vikings, l'ICOMOS et l'état partie ont eu un grand nombre de réunions. Elle demande que nous concentrons l'argent et l'aide là où on en a besoin, essentiellement en Afrique.

Le **Rapporteur** présente l'amendement proposé par les délégations du Sénégal et de l'Algérie demandant l'inscription du site et la création d'un paragraphe 3 prenant note de la VUE provisoire et supprimant le reste du paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that it was not possible to decide on a statement of OUV unless it was provided in writing.

La Délégation du **Portugal** remarque avec regret qu'en voulant aider et bien faire, le Comité aboutit à des précipitations, qui ne vont pas dans le sens de la crédibilité, de l'efficacité, et de notre soutien à l'Etat partie à construire un dossier solide, comme nous le voulons tous, car nous voulons cette inscription. Elle conclut que le renvoi serait la meilleure solution et exprime son intention d'appuyer le renvoi si un autre Etat partie le demandait également.

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

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the proposals of the Delegations of Portugal and Finland.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** rejoint la position du Portugal et de la Finlande mais reste confuse sur la position des membres du comité entre renvoi ou inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the previous speakers and supported a referral.

The Delegation of **Croatia** expressed its support for a referral.

La Délégation du **Liban** constate qu'il y a consensus sur le renvoi du dossier mais regrette que l'état n'ait pas été aidé et demande que cette situation ne se répète pas ou très peu.

The **Rapporteur** stated that no further amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the growing consensus for a referral.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that if the Committee were to decide on a referral, the Committee should have a draft text that included the language proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon in order to ensure that the nomination file would be proposed for inscription at the next Committee session.

The **Vice-Chairperson** suggested that the Delegations of Lebanon and Japan jointly propose an amendment to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se joint à la position libanaise et déclare que l'Afrique a besoin d'aide, qu'elle appelle, qu'elle fait ce qu'elle peut avec les moyens qu'elle a. Elle explique que le Kenya a proposé deux sites et a réussi à les présenter. Elle exprime son appui au projet d'amendement sachant que la proposition d'une déclaration révisée de VUE est un défi. La délégation de l'Algérie veut que la voix de l'Afrique se fasse entendre sur cette question.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose d'ajouter un point demandant à l'ICOMOS d'apporter son aide à l'état partie afin de permettre la préparation d'une proposition d'inscription révisée, conformément à la recommandation du comité du patrimoine mondial et demande l'avis de l'ICOMOS sur cette formulation.

**ICOMOS** expressed its support for the language and formulation of the amendment by the Delegations of Algeria and Lebanon.

La Délégation du **Liban** explique qu'en cas de renvoi à l'Etat partie, on n'adopte pas de déclaration de VUE, mais qu'on le fait c'est uniquement au moment de l'inscription.

**ICOMOS** stated that the standard language for the Decision would be that the State Party of Kenya requested for ICOMOS to carry out an advisory mission.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted a redundancy in paragraph 5 and 6 and suggested to merge both paragraphs.

The **Vice-Chairperson** requested for the Delegation of the Republic of Korea to suggest an alternative formulation to the Committee.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** suggested that paragraph 5 should be deleted and that the term "upstream process" inserted into paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** agreed with the Delegation of the Republic of Korea.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.8** was adopted as amended.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took the floor to comment on interventions that pointed to a lack of support and assistance by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The Director underlined that since the upstream process has been launched in 2009, at least a dozen of workshops were conducted

to give guidance for the drafting of nominations and that the process has been continued with the help of the African World Heritage Fund, the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat. The Director also reminded the Committee of the September deadline for draft nominations to be submitted. The Director encouraged States Parties to submit their draft Nominations by that deadline in order to provide sufficient time for dialogue and revisions before the final submission of the nominations in the following year.

The **Vice-Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Delegation of Italy had requested for its nomination to be examined earlier and sought the Committee's agreement in this regard.

The **Committee** agreed with the proposal.

Property	<b>Nyero and other hunter gatherer geometric rock art sites in eastern Uganda</b>
Id. N°	<b>1491</b>
State Party	<b>Uganda</b>

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of Nyero and other hunter gatherer geometric rock art sites in eastern Uganda.

The Delegation of **Germany** regretted that only a small number of sites in the Africa region have been inscribed and expressed that it was therefore disappointed by ICOMOS's recommendation of deferral. The Delegation stated that it was impressed by the high value of the rock art sites which well documented the life of the peoples in that region. The Delegation also commended the State Party's commitment to the Nomination and emphasised that it was important to find ways to effectively protect these sites. The Delegation expressed the view that even it was not possible to inscribe the property at this stage, it would be crucial to organise help and support for the State Party in a different way.

The Delegation of **Japan** commended the State Party of Uganda, despite the recommendation for deferral. The Delegation underlined the potential to justify the Outstanding Universal Value of the site, especially through a wider comparative analysis and the improvement of protective measures.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its appreciation that the State Party had put forward the nomination and thanked ICOMOS for the report on the site. The Delegation agreed with the ICOMOS's recommendation and expressed its regret that thematic studies on rock art in Africa have not been completed and therefore could not be used in the nomination process.

**ICOMOS** commented on the interventions of the Delegations of Germany and India stated that before another evaluation process was carried out, substantial research would be need to be undertaken and the results would need to scientifically underpin the OUV. ICOMOS also underlined that the thematic study on rock art mentioned by

the Delegation of India did not cover the concerned nomination at the moment. ICOMOS was of the view that further research would be needed before the State Party presented the nomination to the Committee again.

The **Rapporteur** reported to the Committee that no amendments had been submitted.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** demande que l'on clarifie si la décision à adopter mentionne ou non le renvoi du dossier d'inscription et si un projet d'amendement dans ce sens existe.

The **Vice-Chairperson** clarified that the possibility of a referral was currently being discussed.

The Delegation of **Croatia** agreed with the Delegation of Germany and others and enquired if the State Party of Uganda would be able to respond to the Advisory Bodies' requests before the next Committee Session.

The **Chairperson** noted that no representative of the Delegation of Uganda was present in the room.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its support for a referral.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that it would need the promise of the State Party to accommodate the requests of ICOMOS before supporting a referral.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the move to referral and underlined the high scientific potential of the site.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** fait savoir que l'état partie est tout à fait prêt à prendre ses dispositions et qu'elle en a eu la confirmation.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** reported that there were also rock art sites in the Caribbean and expressed its awareness of the challenges connected with the conservation of those sites. The Delegation acknowledged the great amount of work required and therefore expressed uncertainty about the ability of the State Party of Uganda to complete the required work within the next year.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that it supported the view of the Delegations of Germany and Jamaica.

La Délégation du **Liban** indique que la situation est plus compliquée que dans le cas de Timlich Ohinga discuté préalablement et se déclare prête à approuver un renvoi du dossier si le comité envoie une mission des organes consultatifs.

The **Vice-Chairperson** stated that there were two schools of thought among the Committee members.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** mentionne qu'à la lecture du courriel envoyé par la délégation de l'Ouganda, l'état partie accepte cet engagement ; elle exprime son

accord avec la proposition libanaise qui lui semble être un bon consensus et demande à la présidente si elle souhaite que le courriel soit lu aux membres du comité.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that regardless of the Committee's decision, both an advisory mission as well as additional research and a statement by the State Party of Uganda would be required.

The **Vice-Chairperson** enquired of ICOMOS if the requested scientific research could be carried out during an advisory mission.

**ICOMOS** responded that it was unlikely that such scientific research could be conducted during the short duration of a mission. ICOMOS therefore recommended that long-term archaeological research in the concerned region should be carried out instead.

La Délégation du **Liban** explique que bien évidemment une mission ne pourra pas faire la recherche scientifique et que celle-ci devrait être faite en parallèle avec la mission, mais se demande si trois ans sont suffisants pour effectuer les recherches archéologiques.

**ICOMOS** responded that approximately three years of research could be sufficient but that this would also depend on the funding available for archaeological research within those three years.

The Delegation of **Germany** underscored the importance of scientific research and the advisory mission by ICOMOS. The Delegation reiterated that it would need a clear statement from the State Party of Uganda before supporting a referral.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** lit le courriel signé par le conservateur en chef en Ouganda, qui exprime son engagement à soumettre le dossier révisé dans la limite de 18 mois et à tenir les parties concernées au courant du progrès.

The Delegation of **Germany** agreed with the recommendation for referral having heard the email statement.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the move towards referral as well.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.9** was adopted as amended.

## C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

### C.4.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Arab-Norman Palermo and the Cathedral Churches of Cefalú and Monreale</b>
Id. N°	<b>1487</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>

L'**ICOMOS** présente l'évaluation du site.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** soutient cette inscription sur la base de la synchrétisation entre les cultures arabe, normande et byzantine.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the inscription of Arab-Norman Palermo and the Cathedral Churches of Cefalú and Monreale and congratulated the State Party of Italy for the nomination. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to abide by ICOMOS's recommendations.

The Delegation of **Turkey** fully supported the inscription of Arab-Norman Palermo and the Cathedral Churches of Cefalú and Monreale and highlighted the important role of the site in inter-religious dialogue.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the Nomination presented by the State Party of Italy and underlined its significance as a serial property.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** echoed previous speakers, congratulated the State Party of Italy for its nomination and the holistic management concept and supported inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se joint aux autres membres du comité pour féliciter et encourager l'Italie pour la proposition d'inscription de ce site.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the State Party of Italy and pointed out that Arab-Norman Palermo and the Cathedral Churches of Cefalú and Monreale represented a crossroad of civilizations and was an outstanding example of church architecture.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party of Italy and emphasised the multicultural character of site's the historical heritage.

The Delegation of **Finland** fully supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party of Italy for this nomination.

The Delegation of **India** fully supported the inscription on the World Heritage List and congratulated the State Party of Italy.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** soutient et se demande pourquoi il n'avait pas été inscrit avant. La synthèse d'éléments architecturaux et monumentaux déjoue le concept de clash de civilisations.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite l'Italie et la remercie d'avoir choisi ce complexe pour la proposition d'inscription.

La Délégation du **Qatar** se demande si le site est arabe tellement il illustre les influences diverses et montre la coopération entre les civilisations et ajoute que ce site est un bel exemple qui met en évidence comment les destructions actuelles du patrimoine dont nous sommes témoins, sont faites par méconnaissance de cette histoire très belle. Elle conclut en félicitant l'ICOMOS et l'Italie.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party for the outstanding nomination.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that both cathedrals were iconic and therefore endorsed the inscription.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party for the inscription.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated that the outstanding character of the Arab-Norman Palermo and the Cathedral Churches of Cefalú and Monreale merited inscription and expressed its full support.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'Italie pour l'inscription et l'ICOMOS pour l'excellent travail fait pour enrichir le corpus artistique et loue l'inter-religiosité, la symbiose des œuvres d'art entre religions et civilisations dans ce site proposé pour inscription.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.28** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Italy** (Observer) expressed its gratitude for the inscription and affirmed that it would persist in its longstanding commitment to the safeguard the preservation of heritage. The Delegation and informed the Committee of a conference organized for the Milan Expo on 31 July 2015, on the topic of heritage protection at times of conflict.

The **Mayor of Palermo** voiced his gratitude for the inscription. The Mayor underscored the significance of the site as proof that diversity could be coupled with equality and peace, a testimony to multi-layered identities and a common universal heritage, and a call for the respect of the human right to freedom of movement.

## C.2. ARAB STATES

### C.2.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Baptism Site “Bethany Beyond the Jordan” (Al-Maghtas)</b>
Id. N°	<b>1446</b>
State Party	<b>Jordan</b>

The **Secretariat** clarified that no factual error letter had been received for the nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented the nomination and noted that the additional information received after the established deadline could not be taken into account. ICOMOS informed the Committee that the property fulfilled OUV criteria (iii) and (vi), and met both integrity and authenticity requirements. ICOMOS also acknowledged the existence of legal protection and adequate conservation mechanisms. However, ICOMOS noted that these measures needed further improvement and thus recommended issuing a construction moratorium and the modification of the buffer zone. ICOMOS further noted that the protection of landscape elements that fell on the opposite side of the Jordan River, i.e. outside the territory of the concerned State Party, was critical to ensure the integrity of important vistas. ICOMOS therefore recommended for the nomination to be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** said that while it shared ICOMOS’s concerns, the Delegation also stated that in the past, properties with similar weaknesses had been recommended for inscription. The Delegation argued therefore, that for the sake of equity, the property should be inscribed and presented a revised draft decision in this regard.

The Delegation of **Portugal** underscored the religious significance of the property and expressed the view that inscription would serve as a strong message in line with the Bonn Declaration. The Delegation also stated that the State Party had provided assurances that measures had been taken to address ICOMOS’ concerns.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged the commitment of the State Party towards the protection of the property and noted that the regulations currently in place would be sufficient to control building activities. The Delegation therefore supported inscription and requested that the State Party develop additional building guidelines recommended by ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Qatar** félicite la Jordanie d’avoir présenté ce site pour inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Ce site prend son importance car selon la culture chrétienne, Jésus-Christ y a été baptisé et cela lui confère une importante VUE. L’Etat-partie a distribué, avant le début du Comité, une décision des autorités jordaniennes contenant le moratoire demandé par l’ICOMOS. Quant aux autres questions de gestion, nous pouvons faire confiance à l’Etat-partie pour faire parvenir au Comité, lors des prochaines sessions, les rapports de mises en œuvre des



recommandations demandées dans la Décision. Aussi, le Qatar est en faveur, tout comme le Liban et Portugal, de l'inscription du site.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported inscription and the revised draft decision, and said that it was confident of the State Party's ability to address the issues raised.

The Delegation of **Serbia** highlighted the significance of the property in the context of the current political climate in the region and beyond: a religious site associated with Christianity protected by a State Party predominantly Muslim. The Delegation thus supported the inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime qu'au vue de l'universalité du bien et des recommandations des délégations précédentes, le Sénégal appuie l'inscription du bien.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the statements of previous speakers.

The Delegation of **Turkey** joined the consensus, and invited the State Party's neighbours to work together for the protection of the site, including areas that were beyond Jordan's border. The Delegation requested that the State Party share with the Committee the measures that were currently in place or would be undertaken in the future.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported inscription, and encouraged the State Party to continue pursuing its preservation efforts.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** indique avoir examiné avec attention et intérêt le dossier présenté par l'Etat-partie de la Jordanie, et tient à exprimer son admiration et sa satisfaction à l'Etat-partie et à ICOMOS pour la qualité du dossier d'inscription qui remplit les conditions de la VUE et les critères pour son inscription. Elle réitère son admiration car ce dossier a été élaboré dans un contexte, politique difficile et instable dans la région Arabe, marqué par la désolation et la tragédie. La Délégation estime qu'on ne peut renvoyer ce dossier pour des considérations de gestion, quand elles sont prises en charge, dans leur grande majorité, par les plus hautes autorités du pays. Pour toutes ses raisons, la Délégation algérienne appuie l'inscription de ce bien soutenu par les recommandations émises par l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported inscription and expressed confidence in the State Party's ability to deal with the issues raised. The Delegation agreed with Turkey and called on concerned States Parties to also contribute towards strengthening the integrity of the property.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** considered that the OUV of the property was apparent, and invited the State Party to report on the issues raised by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the State Party's efforts and supported Lebanon's revised draft decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported inscription and noted the importance of the intangible heritage dimension in this case.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** estime que la VUE et l'engagement de l'Etat-partie font que la Colombie appuie l'inscription du bien. Elle félicite la Jordanie pour avoir protégé le bien et d'avoir mis en œuvre les recommandations de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** se rallie au consensus de la salle et elle soutient l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation appuie l'inscription du site pour les trois raisons suivantes : ce site mérite d'être inscrit pendant ce comité compte tenu de la VUE et de son caractère sacré. En outre d'un point de vue technique, la Délégation estime que les raisons pour lesquelles l'ICOMOS propose le renvoi du dossier ne sont pas justifiées. Il s'agit de choses minimales qui peuvent être mises en place pendant le processus de gestion (ex : tourisme). Le dernier point, l'inscription d'un site sacré constitue un message très fort du Comité vis-à-vis de la communauté internationale, en ligne avec la Déclaration de Bonn, car elle transmet un message de paix, de partage et de réconciliation entre les différentes religions.

The Delegation of **Peru** thanked ICOMOS for their report and supported the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Poland** joined the other speakers in supporting the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** joined other Delegations in its support for the revised draft decision.

The Delegation of **Jordan** (Observer) informed the Committee that the construction moratorium requested by ICOMOS had been issued on 26 May 2015. The Delegation also stated that the buffer zones had been adapted and tourism and disaster risk management measures had already been integrated in the plan of the property, in line with ICOMOS's recommendations.

**ICOMOS** confirmed it had received information regarding the moratorium being issued, albeit beyond the established deadline. ICOMOS also stated that all additional material submitted by the State Party satisfactorily responded to the issues raised.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment submitted by Lebanon. The Rapporteur informed the Committee that the revised draft decision proposed inscription of the property on the basis of criteria (iii) and (vi). The revised draft decision also requested that the State Party report back on the Committee on its implementation of ICOMOS's recommendations.

**ICOMOS** informed the Committee that a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been prepared but stated that the provisional statement needed to be modified to integrate the new information received, before being added to the Decision text.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested a further modification to the revised draft decision, since the construction moratorium had already been put in place.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.10** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Jordan** (Observer) thanked the Committee and emphasized the unique features of the property and the important message of tolerance and unity embodied by the site. The Delegation underscored the efforts it had undertaken in protecting a place holy to the Christian community.

Property	<b>Rock Art in the Hail Region of Saudi Arabia</b>
Id. N°	<b>1472</b>
State Party	<b>Saudi Arabia</b>

The **Secretariat** acknowledged the receipt of a factual error letter concerning the nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented the nomination and noted that the property met criteria (i) and (iii), as well as the conditions of integrity and authenticity. ICOMOS further noted that while management mechanisms were considered satisfactory, the buffer zone had yet to be deemed appropriate. ICOMOS therefore recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** disagreed with ICOMOS's recommendation and reiterated the earlier point made that in the past, properties with similar weaknesses had been recommended for inscription. In particular, the Delegation highlighted how in some previous cases, ICOMOS had referred to the existence of a "de facto" buffer zone around the nominated property, and stated that this was considered acceptable. The Delegation considered that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List, and submitted a revised draft decision in this regard.

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

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated the State Party on its nomination and supported inscription. The Delegation also highlighted the precedent of the inscription of the Baptism Site: "Bethany Beyond the Jordan", where ICOMOS had not objected to the absence of a buffer zone on one side of the nominated property.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** félicite l'Etat-partie pour le travail rendu fait en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS. La Délégation n'est pas tout à fait d'accord avec les recommandations faites par l'ICOMOS, notamment celles concernant la zone tampon. Elle estime qu'au-delà de la VUE confirmée, la reconnaissance d'un site préhistorique millénaire est en soit un acte fondamentalement symbolique dans la région. La Délégation algérienne encourage l'inscription de cette catégorie de sites qui concilient les peuples avec leur histoire profonde. Dans le cadre de la proposition d'inscription, le site d'art rupestre de Hail présente tous les éléments, les valeurs et les attributs en faveur de son inscription. Aussi la Délégation algérienne adhère à

l'inscription du site, mais elle se réserve de donner son avis quant au projet de Décision par la suite.

The Delegation of **Serbia** endorsed the proposal of the Delegation of Lebanon.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** estime que les sites d'art rupestre ont une valeur universelle incontestable, ils rendent compte de 6000 ans d'histoire, mais également d'un savoir-faire et d'une technicité exceptionnelle. Le rapport de l'ICOMOS reconnaît qu'au moins deux critères prêtent à l'inscription et que la protection et la gestion sont appropriées. Aussi les ajustements proposés par l'ICOMOS auraient pu simplement être des recommandations pour engager l'Etat partie à prendre les mesures nécessaires, mais elles ne devraient pas empêcher l'inscription du site. Le Sénégal est donc en faveur de l'inscription du site, et la Délégation félicite l'Arabie Saoudite.

La Délégation du **Qatar** estime que le site d'art rupestre de la région de Hail jouit d'une VUE comme le souligne le rapport de l'ICOMOS. Dans ce même rapport, il est souligné que ce site ne peut être comparé à aucun autre de la région. Le Qatar félicite l'Arabie Saoudite pour ce dossier présenté avec un grand professionnalisme et préparé en collaboration avec l'UNESCO et l'ICOMOS. Le Qatar se joint au Liban, et aux autres Etats parties, et souhaite que le site soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** agreed with the previous speakers.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the move towards inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** requested for the State Party to clarify if the areas proposed by ICOMOS for inclusion in the revised buffer zone would be spared from development plans. The Delegation said that if the areas were spared from developed, it would endorse inscription.

The Delegation of **Croatia** requested for the State Party to respond to the concerns raised, and supported the move to inscription.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged the significance of the property, the commitment shown by the State Party and supported inscription in this regard. The Delegation underlined that the only issue which remained to be addressed was that of visitor infrastructure, but the Delegation expressed confidence that the State party would be able to adequately address this.

The Delegations of **Germany** and **Turkey** supported the move towards inscription.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** requested to hear from the State Party on the question raised by the Delegation of the Philippines, and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Peru** voiced its support for the revised draft decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the State Party for its nomination and stressed that this was a successful example of the upstream process. The

Delegation requested for the State Party to provide the assurance that they have taken steps towards the implementation of appropriate management measures, and voiced its support for inscription.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** appuie l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial car elle reconnaît la VUE du bien selon les critères indiqués par l'ICOMOS. Elle félicite l'Etat-partie et l'ICOMOS pour la qualité de la nomination. Le Vietnam appuie le commentaire fait par la Délégation des Philippines et il encourage l'Etat-partie à mettre en œuvre les recommandations de l'ICOMOS, notamment celle portant sur la nécessité de l'extension de la zone tampon du site. Elle servira à long-terme à une meilleure protection et valorisation du site. La Délégation du Vietnam est en faveur de l'inscription du site.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested to hear from the State Party and ICOMOS and supported inscription.

The **Saudi Arabia** (Observer) informed the Committee that all the recommendations from ICOMOS had been taken into account, including the requested enlargement of the buffer zone, and corrective measures had been implemented.

**ICOMOS**, on the basis of the statement of the Delegation of Saudi Arabia, stated that it would agree with the Committee's decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee of the revised draft decision submitted by the Delegation of Lebanon which proposed the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and requested for the State Party to report on progress of the implementation of ICOMOS recommendations by 1 December 2016.

**ICOMOS** informed the Committee that as it was customary in such cases, ICOMOS had prepared a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value, ready to be integrated in the revised draft decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.11** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Saudi Arabia** (Observer) thanked the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their support in the nomination process, and thanked Germany for its efforts in facilitating the work of the Committee.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

**SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY 4 July 2015**

**TENTH MEETING**

**9.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany) and  
Her Excellency Ruchira Kamboj (India)**

**ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE  
LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND  
CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST *(Continuation)***

**C.3 ASIA-PACIFIC**

**C.3.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Tusi Sites</b>
Id. N°	<b>1474</b>
State Party	<b>China</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee had received a factual error notification for this nomination and the information has been reflected in minor changes to the Draft Decision.

**ICOMOS** delivered its presentation on the Tusi Sites.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated China for the intact series of Tusi Sites and noted that in particular, the sites of Laosicheng, Tangya and the Hailongtun Fortress expressed the synergistic amplification of local traditional management with central governance. The Delegation recognized that mass tourism was taking place in China and agreed with ICOMOS's recommendation to strengthen the tourism management of the sites. The Delegate underlined that the indigenous knowledge systems of the traditional ethnic minority groups would continue to contribute to national cohesion and nation building.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** acknowledged the value of the property which captured the unique system of administration. The Delegation also recognized that the local tribes and minorities played an important role in retaining the local social structure of Tusi within the history of China. The Delegate commended China for the nomination and supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** underlined that the nominated property demonstrated OUV and that the three nominated sites identified best represent the Tusi system. The Delegation acknowledged the protected status of these sites and noted that the sites

were still inhabited by ethnic minorities which still practiced their cultural traditions. Therefore, the Delegation supported the site's inscription and recommended that the State Party continue to ensure sustainable management of the sites.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated China on the nomination of this property.

The Delegation of **India** underlined that the nomination was the exceptional testimony of the Chinese civilization over three different periods and therefore supported inscription.

La Délégation du **Qatar** félicite Etat partie pour ce dossier de candidature; et remercie ICOMOS pour le travail d'évaluation accompli.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient l'inscription et remarque que cette nomination représente un testimonial remarquable à la civilisation Tutsi.

The Delegations of **Jamaica, Finland and Kazakhstan** congratulated China and supported the inscription of the Tusi Sites.

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported ICOMOS's recommendation and congratulated China and ICOMOS for the excellent work. The Delegation highlighted that the site was a good example of cultural diversity as it retained strong association of the living cultural traditions of minor ethnic groups.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the ICOMOS's evaluation confirmed the OUV of the site and fully supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated China and stated that the sites manifested the OUV as the architectural sites and the remains displayed a high level of conservation among human cultural properties.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed full support for inscription as the property demonstrated a way of running a big country with different cultural backgrounds and ethnic minorities. The Delegation underlined that the property demonstrated living together with different cultures and ethnic groups, while at the same time, maintaining national unity. The Delegation congratulated China for demonstrating a good model of governance.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'Etat partie pour la qualité du travail sur le dossier de nomination qui reflète la diversité culturelle dans ce pays.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported inscription.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The draft decision **39 COM 8B.12** was adopted.

The Delegation of **China** (Observer) expressed its appreciation to the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. The Delegation also thanked ICOMOS for sharing its experience on the conservation and management of the archaeological sites in China

last year. The Delegation underlined that the sites were important serial heritage in the Southwest China and that the sites bore witness to the formation and development of the Tusi system from the 13<sup>th</sup> to the early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries as well as embodied the ancient Chinese wisdom in governing the country. The Delegation emphasized that the Tusi Sites clearly demonstrated the exchange of values between local ethnic cultures and national identity. The Delegation highlighted that the inscription of the site was a guarantee of continued cultural diversity and the constant development of the region. The Delegation assured the Committee that its government was committed to ensure the conservation, management and effective monitoring of the Tusi Sites to improve the livelihoods of the local population.

Property	<b>Susa</b>
Id. N°	<b>1455</b>
State Party	<b>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</b>

**ICOMOS** delivered its presentation on Susa.

La Délégation du **Liban** remarque que Susa est un des plus anciens sites archéologique et a joué un rôle central dans les échanges culturels de la région. De plus il profite d'un système de gestion appropriée et ce pour ces raisons que la Délégation soutient pleinement cette inscription.

La Délégation du **Qatar** félicite l'Etat partie sur la qualité et professionnalisme de son travail accompli et souligne l'importance de ce site pour l'humanité.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party and fully supported the inscription. The Delegation requested for ICOMOS's clarification on the type of ad-hoc indicators mentioned in the Draft Decision used to monitor the effectiveness of the recently signed inter-institutional agreement.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party for its nomination of Susa which reflected two great civilizations of the world. The Delegation commended and complimented the excellent dossier presented by Iran and the evaluation made by ICOMOS. The Delegation fully supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated Iran for the nomination and acknowledged that Susa had a clear OUV as one of the earliest urban settlements in the world and the capital of two empires. The Delegation underlined that the strategic position of the site meant that it also enjoyed many cultural influences and stood out as a centre of religion, commercial, administrative and political importance that clearly justified the OUV. The Delegation acknowledged that there were some vulnerable elements of the site that required strong management strategies to ensure long-term protection and conservation.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party and underscored that the State Party should follow ICOMOS's recommendations.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated Iran for the nomination and supported



inscription. The Delegation acknowledged the challenges that had been identified, that in particular, increased protection would be required for the buffer zone and the landscape component of this serial property. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to follow through with ICOMOS's recommendations in the Draft Decision to address the issues at hand.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** note l'excellent travail de l'État partie ainsi que d'ICOMOS qui rend compte de l'importance de ce site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated Iran and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Columbia** expressed its support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the high importance of Susa in the exchange of cultures and civilizations and fully supported the inscription.

Le Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne la qualité de ce dossier de nomination que reflète l'histoire économique, culturel et social de cette région remarquable.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party for the nomination and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Finland** commended the State Party for the nomination. The Delegation underlined the urban history and archaeological significance of the site expressed its full support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Vietnam** fully supported the inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** underlined that more than 150 years of archaeological study had demonstrated the OUV of the site. The Delegation acknowledged the State Party's efforts in ensuring the protection of the site and welcomed ICOMOS' recommendations.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** thanked Iran for presenting this nomination and supported inscription.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to answer the question raised by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea.

**ICOMOS** highlighted that the agreement between the national and local authorities demonstrated the importance of having the specific monitoring indicators concerning management effectiveness. ICOMOS underlined that these monitoring indicators were slightly different from the ones concerning the state of conservation of the property. ICOMOS stated that for these reasons, ICOMOS had recommended having specific types of indicators that could allow the State Party and local authorities to better protect the archaeological site in an urban setting.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The draft decision **39 COM 8B.13** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited Iran to deliver a two-minute statement.

The Delegation of **Iran** expressed its sincere thanks to the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their support which resulted in Susa being inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation also expressed its gratitude to the Government of Germany for hosting the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation underlined that Susa had more than 6,000 years of history and was a well-known global reference for archaeologists and researchers all over the world. The Delegation further underlined that Susa had enjoyed the position of being one of the oldest and continuously inhabited cities and had been the capital city of many majestic empires. The Delegation stressed its great responsibility to protect the OUV of Susa, given the devastating attacks to World Heritage properties in the region. The Delegation expressed its commitment to implement ICOMOS's recommendations and to preserve Susa. The Delegation further affirmed its cooperation and involvement in regional and global programmes on conservation and management to protect Susa for future generations.

### **C.3.2. Properties referred or deferred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

Property	<b>Cultural Landscape of Maymand</b>
Id. N°	<b>1423 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</b>

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the nomination of Cultural Landscape of Maymand.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error letter for this property had been received.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** remercie l'ICOMOS pour avoir souligné la fragilité du site et remercie l'Etat partie d'avoir proposé ce site remarquable pour nomination, renforçant ainsi sa protection.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** acknowledged that the property reflected traditions that melded both tangible and intangible elements. The Delegation recognized the involvement of communities in the site and stressed that this would continue to be valid in the face of the rapid globalization. The Delegation underlined that the management plan for the site should have provisions to mitigate the negative effects of tourism, in particular to effect to safeguard the traditional way of life of communities. The Delegation expressed their full support for the site's inscription.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the site's inscription and acknowledged that all issues raised by ICOMOS at the 37th session (Phnom Penh,

2013) were successfully addressed. The Delegation stated that it was pleased to see legal protection envisaged for the entire property.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the property comprised elements of nomadic culture which was currently under-represented on the World Heritage List. The Delegation recognized this as a successful case of a referral, and congratulated the State Party for their efforts in demonstrating the OUV of the property.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party for the nomination. The Delegation noted that the site represented agro-pastoral and trans-human elements which were currently under-represented on the World Heritage List. India expressed its full support for the inscription which would enhance the value and credibility of the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that the nomination had been referred by the Committee at its 37th session (Phnom Penh, 2013) and that the State Party had used the time to implement ICOMOS's recommendations and complete the nomination file. The Delegation supported inscription and stated that this site would fill an existing gap on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the World Heritage Centre and congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS. The Delegation stated that the semi-nomadic population of Maymand is could continue to carry out its ancient practices for managing the cultural landscape. Portugal underlined that this was a vulnerable site which required enforced protection and management of the site with the participation of local communities.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** commended the State Party for being able to address the concerns of the Committee and stressed that this property represented the long history of the culture and livelihood of the area. The Delegation expressed support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated ICOMOS and State Party for their efforts and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Finland** commended the active consultation with local communities and stated that it was very inspiring to see that a great deal of inventories and research had been undertaken on many elements of the site. The Delegation expressed support for inscription.

La Délégation du **Qatar** souligne que ce dossier démontre le grand professionnalisme des autorités nationales pour la préparation du dossier de nomination pour ce site remarquable, ainsi que l'ICOMOS pour le travail effectué:

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked ICOMOS for its recommendations that outlined the OUV of the proposed site and for its remarks regarding sustainable development and tourism. The Delegation expressed support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS for this nomination, composed of a living and evolving landscape in response to the natural

environment, and that continued to play an active role in contemporary society. The Delegation requested for the State Party to outline their plans to manage the increased number of tourists and to avoid commercialization of the small villages.

The Delegation of **Serbia** stated that while referred and deferred nominations were often perceived negatively by States Parties, this nomination was an excellent example of cooperation between the Advisory Body and the State Party. The Delegation expressed support for inscription.

La Délégation d'**Algérie** soutient l'inscription et félicite l'État Partie et ICOMOS pour le travail accompli.

The Delegation of **Peru** affirmed the importance of ICOMOS's recommendations to ensure the protection of the property in a sustainable manner and supported the inscription.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Iran to address the points made by the Delegation of Turkey on the issue of tourism.

The Delegation of **Iran** stated that the Governor of the Province was present in the room to witness the Committee's decision and that the State Party was committed to protect the property from commercialization in accordance with ICOMOS's recommendations.

The **Chairperson** requested for ICOMOS to provide clarification on the tourism issue.

**ICOMOS** indicated that two additional recommendations had been made: the first to develop a sustainable management framework for the property and the second to develop a cultural tourism plan. ICOMOS underlined that both plans should be put forward in parallel in order to reinforce each other for better protection of the property.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.18** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited Iran to deliver a two-minute statement.

The Delegation of **Iran** expressed its sincere gratitude to the Committee members, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and all who helped the State Party with this nomination. The Delegation stated that the nomination for referral was both meaningful and useful for the State Party as it provided the opportunity to engage with different levels of stakeholders and institutions at the provincial and central levels to address ICOMOS's recommendations.

Upon a special request made by the Republic of Korea, the **Chairperson** requested for Mongolia's agreement to have the Republic of Korea's nomination of the Baekje Historic Areas before the Mongolian nomination of the Great Burkhan Khaldun Mountain and its surrounding sacred landscape.

The Delegation of **Mongolia** agreed for its nomination to be discussed after the nomination from the Republic of Korea.

### C.3.1. New Nominations *(continuation)*

Property	<b>Singapore Botanical Gardens</b>
Id. N°	<b>1483</b>
State Party	<b>Singapore</b>

The **Chairperson** then invited the Committee to consider the nomination of the Singapore Botanical Gardens.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the Singapore Botanical Gardens.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated Singapore for presenting its first nomination. The Delegation stated that the site was a cultural landscape with vast botanical values and excelled in landscape design. The Delegation noted the importance that IUCN had placed on the property and recognized that its ex-situ conservation values were important at an international level. The Delegation expressed its hope that the natural and cultural values of the site would continue to be protected and well-managed for the future. The Delegation fully supported the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Columbia** supported the inscription and acknowledged the scientific value of the site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated Singapore for its first inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation highlighted that Singapore was its nearest and closest neighbor, not only physically but historically and culturally as well and therefore stated that it shared in the happiness of the State Party. The Delegation stated that as the greenest city-state in the world, the Singapore Botanical Gardens was significant as an exceptional example of a British tropical colonial garden in Southeast Asia and illustrated the interchanges of magnificent botanic and horticultural technological values. The Delegation expressed support for inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'Etat partie pour cette nomination remarquable pour ce site qui séduit par sa beauté, diversité de faune, vivacité et sa bonne gestion.

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime son soutien à l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste patrimoine mondial pour un site exceptionnelle en terme d'expérimentation de techniques et sa place unique dans l'histoire botanique. La délégation souligne les la recommandation de l'ICOMOS concernant le renforcement la zone tampon pour protéger le site des projets de développement qui pourront avoir un impact sur le bien.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its support for the inscription and stated that like Jamaica, Singapore was inscribing its first site on the World Heritage List. The Delegation underlined that it spoke well for the future of the List that sites in two small states were being inscribed at the same session of the Committee. The Delegation

highlighted that while based on the classic English garden, Singapore had succeeded in making the gardens uniquely Singaporean as a centre of learning, a scientific institution and a place of conservation and recreation. The Delegation further highlighted the role that the gardens played in terms of scientific knowledge in tropical botany and horticulture, which it had shared with countries in Southeast Asia and beyond.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the Singapore Botanical Gardens was an outstanding example of a British tropical colonial garden which acknowledged the important role that the gardens had played in the advancement of scientific knowledge in the field of tropical botany and horticulture. The Delegation stated that the gardens' development of plantation rubber was well-recognised across the world and acknowledged the gardens' contributions in developing exotic orchids. The Delegation commended the State Party's efforts in protecting and managing the site, and expressed support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** highlighted that the property was an outstanding example of the evolution of the British tropical colonial botanic garden in the English landscape style to a modern and world-class botanic garden. The Delegation underlined that the variety of landscape features, plants, building, collections and scientific facilities were unique. The Delegation congratulated Singapore for its first inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party for its successful nomination and stated that the OUV was unquestioned. The Delegation underlined that the Garden had played an important role in spearheading rubber cultivation in the 19th century, pioneering hybridization and continued to deliver through its research programmes. The Delegation stated that a potential question mark was ensuring the protection of the visual integrity of the site when situated in a fast-growing metropole with limited space available for construction. The Delegation stated that from its discussions with the Urban Redevelopment Authority in Singapore, it was assured that that protection of the site was well-ensured.

The Delegation of **Serbia** strongly supported the inscription. The Delegation emphasized that in the moment when humanity was losing the harmony between nature and man, the Singapore Botanical Gardens was encouraging proof that humans could recreate lost and destroyed paradise. The Delegation stated that a precondition for this was harmony among people in different racial, social and religious communities. The Delegation acknowledged that Singapore had managed both and expressed its congratulations to Singapore.

The Delegation of **Croatia** fully supported the inscription and highlighted that this was a perfect example of the nomination how to be presented. The Delegation underlined that the Gardens had OUV not only because of its exceptional beauty but also for its role in the interchange of human ideas, knowledge and expertise, which was the role of UNESCO itself.

La Délégation du **Qatar** exprime son soutien et affection pour ce site et ses orchidées avec des noms symboliques et témoigne au Comité du dévouement des gestionnaires de protéger et faire vivre ce site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated Singapore for its well-prepared first nomination dossier and welcomed the presence of the Singapore's Minister of Culture, which underlined the importance of the nomination. The Delegation acknowledged that the property was a unique and exceptional example of the 19th century British tropical colonial botanic garden and was the best preserved of its kind. The Delegation stated that the landscape layout and the buildings demonstrated well the different stages of the gardens' developments since their inception and constituted an outstanding cultural, scientific and educational landmark. The Delegation underlined that with more than 170 years of history; the garden had a unique and a significant place of history in Singapore and the region, and succeeded in encapsulating both cultural and natural heritage. The Delegation further stated that the gardens had retained its importance as the botanic reference centre for fostering the scientific and agricultural development for Singapore and the region. The Delegation acknowledged that the challenge of the human social, economic and cultural multi-layered realities of Singapore had been addressed in a far-reaching and forward looking matter, a testimony to the country's urban landscape and management policy. The Delegation underscored that the Gardens were indeed a good example of well-developed planning that permitted it to appropriately respond to the constraints that geography dictated. The Delegation strongly supported the inscription which coincided with Singapore's 50th anniversary celebrations.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the inscription of the Gardens and stated that the site was a vivid example of how natural wonders could be used as a means to promote the vision of a green city. The Delegation stated that the property had well-defined cultural and historical features and was also a living centre for plant science, research and conservation. The Delegation commended Singapore for the nomination and congratulated the State Party for its first inscription on the List, in the same year where the country was celebrating its 50th anniversary.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** commended the State Party for its first inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation underlined that the site was well-preserved, illustrated the British tropical colonial garden and played a key role in scientific knowledge to the world. The Delegation acknowledged the Gardens' plant collection as definitive in the region, and stated that the conservation and monitoring approaches of digital inventories of living plants, archival plans, built heritage, biodiversity and other attributes of the cultural landscape that nurture discovery and creativity were exceptional.

The Delegation of **Peru** fully endorsed the inscription of the site. The Delegation stated that the Gardens were a typical and historic example of a botanic garden from the 19th century and both satisfied OUV requirements as well as met authenticity criteria. The Delegation acknowledged the site's contribution to scientific knowledge with regards to tropical botany and horticulture. The Delegation agreed with ICOMOS's recommendation for a particular protection in the buffer zone from the impact of tourism and congratulated Singapore on the inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that the site had been a centre of plant research in Southeast Asia since the 19th century and played a leading role in the exchange of ideas, knowledge and expertise in tropical botany and horticultural

sciences. The Delegation congratulated Singapore for the nomination and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also supported the inscription of the site. The Delegation stated that it was highly encouraged by IUCN's parallel engagement with the site. The Delegation commended the integrity of the site and the State Party's maximization of land use, and further stated that the State Party could become world leader in this area and be an example for other States Parties with similar sites.

The Delegation of **Japan** fully supported the inscription of the site. The Delegation underlined the importance of the site in representing botanical diversity of Southeast Asia and its role in the exchange of culture and customs between the United Kingdom and Southeast Asia. The Delegation commended the State Party for having finalized its nomination file only three years after its ratification of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** fully supported the inscription of the site and stated that it was an outstanding example of a British tropical colonial garden and played an integral role in the exchange of ideas, knowledge and expertise in tropical botany and horticultural science in Southeast Asia and beyond. The Delegation noted that the site was situated in the heart of Singapore and acknowledged the threat of development. In this regard, the Delegation encouraged the State Party to take measures to limit the height of new buildings in the buffer zone, as recommended by ICOMOS. The Delegation expressed its belief that the State Party would be able to fulfil the commitments for its first World Heritage site.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite et remercie l'Etat partie pour l'excellente qualité du dossier de nomination, ainsi que pour la beauté exceptionnelle et le parfait état de conservation du bien, qui force l'admiration.

**IUCN** stated that it had provided advice to ICOMOS on the cultural landscape nomination. IUCN concluded that the ex-situ conservation values of the property were internationally important and that the site was recognized as among the most important botanic gardens both currently and historically in the world. IUCN further stated that the laws, regulations, institutions and community support for Singapore were a model for the protection and management of the botanic gardens and of protected natural areas in urban settings. IUCN also underlined that such areas were of growing importance in an urbanizing world and that the significant and important lessons from the way the site was managed should be shared internationally. IUCN underscored that its conclusions were very much coherent with the positive recommendations from ICOMOS.

L'**ICOMOS** confirme que cette nomination constitue un très bon exemple de dialogue avec l'UICN tout au long du processus d'évaluation, qui a permis l'intégration d'une recommandation notamment dans le domaine des politiques de collecte d'information sur les végétaux vivants.

The **Chairperson** noted that there was full consensus on the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.17** was adopted.



The Delegation of **Singapore**, represented through the Minister of Culture of the State Party of Singapore, made a short statement to express appreciation and gratitude for the State Party's first inscription on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>Baekje Historic Areas</b>
Id. N°	<b>1477</b>
State Party	<b>Republic of Korea</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error letter for this nomination had been received.

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of Baekje Historic Areas recommended for inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated the State Party of the Republic of Korea and supported the inscription of the site. The Delegation stated that the nominated site was an exceptional testimony of cultural and religious exchanges and that this episode of history reminded the world of progress and tolerance achieved between different civilizations.

The Delegation of **Japan** fully supported the Nomination and praised the long-term efforts undertaken in archaeological research and good management practices.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its complete agreement with ICOMOS' evaluation. The Delegation underlined that the property exhibited an interchange between ancient kingdoms and was a great testimony to the exchanges between the civilizations China, Korea and Japan. The Delegation congratulated the State Party of the Republic of Korea for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Germany** highlighted that the site was a great testimony to the exchanges between China, Korea and Japan in creating an original civilization that has led to the development of unique architecture features. The Delegation supported inscription and congratulated the State Party of the Republic of Korea.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the nomination which comprised eight remarkable archaeological sites. The Delegation stated that the property was a testimony to the development of city planning, technology, religion and arts in an ancient culture. The Delegation underlined that the site's components contained all elements necessary to represent Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the inscription of the serial property to the World Heritage List. The Delegation congratulated the State Party of the Republic of Korea for this inscription and commended the remarkable efforts undertaken towards the conservation of the site.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite la République de Corée pour ce bien qui a une forte signification pour l'ensemble de la région concernée, ce qui démontre l'importance des interactions culturelles au-delà des frontières. La délégation se félicite des mesures prises par la République de Corée en matière de gestion du site

et en ce qui concerne la stratégie de développement du tourisme autour du site. Enfin, le Sénégal se félicite pour l'inscription du bien dans la Liste du Patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** appuie le projet de décision portant sur l'inscription de ce bien, composé de huit éléments, dans la liste du Patrimoine mondial. Elle complimente la République de Corée pour l'organisation du festival culturel Baekje, bon exemple d'initiative susceptible de maintenir vive la tradition de Baekje en y associant toute la communauté. Enfin, la délégation félicite la République de Corée pour l'inscription du bien dans la Liste du Patrimoine mondial et pour la protection et la bonne gestion assurées au site.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que le site archéologique de Baekje a une valeur universelle exceptionnelle car qu'il témoigne des échanges entre les anciens royaumes d'Asie de l'Est, ainsi que sur la diffusion du bouddhisme, mais aussi parce qu'il apporte un témoignage exceptionnel et unique sur la culture, l'art et la religion de l'ancien royaume de Baekje. Toutes les conditions sont réunies pour que ce bien soit inscrit dans la liste du patrimoine mondial: valeur universelle exceptionnelle, intégrité et bonne gestion. La délégation félicite la République de Corée pour l'inscription de ce site magnifique sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the State Party for putting forth an excellent nomination. The Delegation underlined that the site was an exceptional testimony of cultural creativity and the Baekje kingdom. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to consider undertaking a sustainable development perspective in order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the site.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** agreed with ICOMOS's evaluation that the OUV had been fully exhibited in the proposed property. The Delegation underlined that the site was an exceptional testimony of the Baekje kingdom and the unique exchange between Korea, Japan and China.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** underlined that the proposed nomination met the conditions of authenticity, integrity and OUV. The Delegation noted the main threats to the site as highlighted by ICOMOS and acknowledged that the State Party intended to extend the management plan and integrate a sustainable tourism strategy to protect the property in the future. The Delegation supported inscription and expressed its congratulations to the State Party of the Republic of Korea.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party for the nomination. The Delegation highlighted that the OUV of the site was justified, endorsed inscription and congratulated the State Party.

La délégation du **Qatar** joint sa voix à celle des Membres du Comité déjà intervenus en faveur de l'inscription de ce bien, dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle ne fait aucun doute, dans la Liste du Patrimoine mondial.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** soutient l'inscription du site dans la Liste du Patrimoine mondial et félicite la République de Corée pour son excellent travail, qui rend compte

de la qualité de la coopération pour la promotion des valeurs interculturelles régionales.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported inscription and congratulated the State Party for its nomination. The Delegation stated that the nomination dossier well-illustrated the OUV of the property and highlighted urban historical records that could shed light on past urban planning methods and other scientifically interesting issues.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party for the very well prepared nomination which emphasised the cultural and historical interchange in Eastern Asia. The Delegation welcomed the site's inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Poland** joined the previous speakers in supporting inscription.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.16** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Republic of Korea for their successful inscription.

The **Republic of Korea** delivered a short statement to thank the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The two Governors of the province where the property was located also delivered short statements to thank the Committee and underscored the importance of intergenerational heritage transmission.

Property	<b>Great Burkhan Khaldun Mountain and its surrounding sacred landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1440</b>
State Party	<b>Mongolia</b>

The **Secretariat** indicated to the Committee that a factual error letter had been received for this nomination file.

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of Great Burkhan Khaldun Mountain and its surrounding sacred landscape and recommended that the site be referred back to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** highlighted the value and sacredness of the site and remarked that this was well presented in the nomination dossier. The Delegation commended the efforts of the State Party of Mongolia and the evaluation of ICOMOS. The Delegation requested for ICOMOS to provide clarification on the level of legal protection demanded. The Delegation requested for the State Party to report to the Committee on its efforts undertaken in addressing ICOMOS's recommendations as well as with regards to redefining the boundaries of the property.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that the huge size of the property should be taken into account with regards to the question of boundaries, the level of protection and in particular concerning tourism. The Delegation considered that although some work still needed to be done, this could still be undertaken following the inscription of the property. The Delegation recommended the immediate inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** requested for a response from the concerned State Party before continuing the debate. The Delegation posed two specific questions. First, while the Delegation agreed with the formulation of ICOMOS's arguments, the Delegation requested for ICOMOS to clarify the point on the lack of evidence for the continuity of worship, and the extent to which this affected the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value. Second, the Delegation enquired of ICOMOS on how it would redefine the boundaries of the site.

The Delegation of **Mongolia** (Observer) expressed its commitment to define the property's boundaries more clearly in order to better protect the OUV of the site. The Delegation stated that the current boundaries were sufficient to protect both the material and intangible attributes of the site, and that the area was strictly protected. The Delegation further stated that as the mountain was worshipped at distance, the boundaries and buffer zone covered large distances, going well beyond the mountain itself. The Delegation also stated that it was ready to provide a long-term management plan. The Delegation underlined that inscription on the World Heritage List would help in the adoption of new legal protection and management measures. The Delegation assured the Committee that any industrial development was strictly forbidden within the area of the property and in the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that as representative of Central Asia, it wished to emphasise the importance of the proposed property for the region. The Delegation underlined that ICOMOS's presentation had illustrated that authenticity and integrity were in place and from the report of the State Party, protection and conservation measures were adequate. The Delegation also underscored the important point that a new law devoted to safeguarding the heritage was passed by the Mongolian parliament. The Delegation said that if there was consensus among the Committee members, the Delegation proposed inscription under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked the State Party of Mongolia for the clarifications.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the OUV was clearly defined and that the conditions of authenticity and integrity were met. The Delegation considered that the concerns raised through ICOMOS were now answered by the State Party of Mongolia. The Delegation underlined that the traditional management of the property was still in place and remained very strong. The Delegation fully endorsed inscription.

The Delegation of **Croatia** underlined that the site met the requirements for Outstanding Universal Value and represented a valuable landscape in connection with intangible heritage. The Delegation expressed the view that any shortcomings concerning the boundaries, legal protection and management could be resolved after

the inscription of the proposed property, which would serve to strengthen this process.

The Delegation of **Germany** said that it was pleased to hear from the State Party legal protection was in place and that mining and industrial development were forbidden at the site. The Delegation endorsed the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** welcomed the State Party's commitment to the management plan and endorsed inscription.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** acknowledged the challenges associated with the site but expressed appreciation for the commitment of Mongolia to address the challenges at the property.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated the Outstanding Universal Value of the site was evident. The Delegation highlighted the unique indigenous practices present at the site and agreed with the Advisory Bodies that criterion (v) did not apply as strongly as the other two criteria proposed. The Delegation acknowledged the legislation put in place by the Mongolian Government and commended the efforts of the State Party in this regard. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

La délégation du **Sénégal** dit qu'après avoir écouté la Mongolie les choses sont claires : il faut envisager l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial, vu que toutes les réserves émises par l'ICOMOS sont levées, y compris celles en matière d'archéologie.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** affirme que les réserves de l'ICOMOS ne reflètent pas la situation présente mais des appréhensions sur des possibles dangers futurs, notamment en matière d'augmentation du flux touristique, d'activités minières, et concernant le renforcement de la protection légale et la redéfinition des limites. Après avoir écouté la Mongolie, ces préoccupations semblent dissipées. L'Algérie appuie par conséquent l'inscription du site sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** highlighted that the property would be a valuable contribution to sacred landscapes on the World Heritage List. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted that the property was the land of the legendary Dschinghis Khan and his ancestors. The Delegation recognised that the OUV of the property was fulfilled and that the State Party had satisfactorily answered ICOMOS's queries. The Delegation therefore supported the inscription of the site.

La Délégation du **Qatar** affirme que ce site possède sans aucun doute une valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La Délégation fait observer que le nom mongol de ce site, la grande montagne « burkhan », signifie « volcan » en langue Arabe, tandis que le nom Khaldun évoque le nom de 'Ibn Khaldun.

**ICOMOS** responded to the comments made by the members of the Committee and the State Party of Mongolia. ICOMOS said that it was pleased to hear the new information from the State Party of Mongolia regarding the legal protection of the site.

ICOMOS expressed concerns on whether all aspects of the property were adequately protected and if the legal protection was sufficient to prohibit adverse developments including mining and the construction of roads. ICOMOS therefore stated that it was pleased to hear from the State Party that mining would not be allowed in the future.

ICOMOS stressed that the property's proposed boundaries should be marked so that the people could understand them. ICOMOS clarified that it recommended a property management strategy that complemented traditional management practices in order to ensure protection from development pressures. ICOMOS stated that its concern regarding criterion (iii) was that the site may not be as unique and outstanding with regards to spirituality and religious values as mountain worship was widespread all over the territory of Mongolia. Furthermore, ICOMOS considered that this may not necessarily be different from mountain worship practices in other places. ICOMOS suggested that if the Committee wished to include criterion (iii), it would be helpful to have a clear understanding of the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (iii). ICOMOS also proposed that it would also be helpful to have the State Party of Mongolia report back to the Committee at a future session.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee of the amendment received to change the Draft Decision from a referral to an inscription under criteria (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** agreed with ICOMOS's view to not inscribe the property under criterion (iii). The Delegation suggested that the State Party of Mongolia could re-nominate the property for inscription at a future Committee Session or as soon as the Outstanding Universal Value was fully justified for criterion (iii).

**ICOMOS** stressed that paragraph 4 should be replaced by a recommendation requiring the State Party of Mongolia to submit an updated report to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December 2018 to provide information on the implementation of the required measures, to be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd Session in 2018.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** reiterated its support for the amended Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.16** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Mongolia** (Observer) delivered a short statement to thank the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the inscription of its site on the World Heritage List.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

**SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY 4 July 2015**

**ELEVENTH MEETING**

**3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

**8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST** *(Continuation)*

**C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

**C.4.1. New Nominations**

Property	<b>Christiansfeld a Moravian Church Settlement</b>
Id. N°	<b>1489</b>
State Party	<b>Denmark</b>

The **Chairperson** opened invited the Committee to consider the nomination dossier for “Christiansfeld, a Moravian Settlement”, submitted by the State Party of Denmark.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error letter for this nomination dossier had been received.

**ICOMOS** presented their evaluation of the nomination dossier “Christiansfeld, a Moravian Settlement”, submitted by Denmark, and recommended that the site be inscribed based on criteria (iii) and (iv). ICOMOS further recommended that the name of the site be changed to “Christiansfeld, a Moravian Church Settlement.”

The Chairperson thanked ICOMOS for their presentation and gave the floor to the Committee members.

La Délégation du **Liban** explique qu'elle a écouté la présentation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et a reconnu la valeur, mais elle encourage l'État partie à renforcer la protection juridique du site afin d'assurer une protection plus complète. Elle demande l'adoption du plan de gestion, en notant que l'ICOMOS a seulement demandé à l'État partie d'achever le plan de gestion; alors elle demande des éclaircissements quant à savoir si le plan de gestion devait être adopté ou finalisé.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the draft decision submitted by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged the values of the site and commended the State Party for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** highlighted the distinctive cultural elements that were part of the property's OUV.

The Delegation of **Philippines** congratulated Denmark for its successful inscription. The Delegation noted the number of unused buildings within the site and encouraged the use of these buildings to keep the associated values intact. The Delegation also suggested that this could become the beginning of a series of sites of Moravian churches.

The Delegation of **Germany** said this site was a great testimony of a found settlement and that OUV was demonstrated. The Delegation agreed that the site should be part of the World Heritage List and congratulated Denmark for the nomination.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated Denmark and ICOMOS for this nomination with strong OUV.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that this was a significant site where the OUV was well demonstrated and congratulated the State Party.

The Delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the previous speakers that there was no doubt this site had OUV. The Delegation supported inscription and agreed with ICOMOS's suggestion to change the name of the site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged the OUV of the site and congratulated the State Party of Denmark.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed that the site deserved World Heritage status and requested to hear from the State Party on how it intended to address the concerns raised by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** agreed that the site deserved inscription on the World Heritage List.

Les Délégations du **Qatar**, du **Viêt Nam**, du **Sénégal** et de l'**Algérie** appuient l'inscription de ce bien et félicitent l'État Partie et l'ICOMOS pour son travail.

**ICOMOS** pointed out that the questions related to two different aspects. ICOMOS shared that while the management plan had been formally adopted by the City Council, and that different authorities in charge of the implementation of the plan have also approved the plan, the plan still needed to be enhanced. ICOMOS underlined that the additional work requested by ICOMOS regarding risk preparedness and the disaster response plan still needed to be completed. ICOMOS stated that regarding legal protection, key historic buildings in the settlement were protected as historic monuments at the highest level. ICOMOS pointed out that the current legislation did not cover the larger streetscapes of the settlement. ICOMOS



recommended that these additional elements be covered by legislation at the highest possible level in order to prevent any threat to OUV in the future.

La Délégation du **Liban** remercie le Président et l'ICOMOS pour avoir répondu à sa question.

The **Chairperson** enquired if the Rapporteur had received any amendments to the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Chairperson that no amendments were received.

The **Secretariat** informed the Chairperson that the State Party had agreed to the proposed name change and this had been reflected in the draft decision.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for the clarification.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested that the floor be given the State Party of Denmark for their response before going forward with the adoption of this decision.

The Delegation of **Denmark** (Observer) responded that they fully supported the recommendations from ICOMOS, and assured the Committee that the Government and municipality would follow-up with the implementation as soon as possible.

The **Chairperson** enquired of Finland if the reply received was adequate.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed.

The Decision **39 COM 8B.20** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to Denmark for a brief statement.

The **Vice Director of the Danish Agency for Culture, Morten Lautrup-Larsen** made the following statement:

*Thank you Madam Chairperson,*

*Let me first express how happy we are that the committee has approved Christiansfeld a Moravian Church Settlement as World Heritage, and we thank you. We have so been looking forward to this to happen.*

*We appreciate the work of the ICOMOS in evaluating Christiansfeld a Moravian Church Settlement. It has been a great pleasure working with you and to experience the professionalism and thoroughness with which you have evaluated this and other nominations.*

*Please allow me also to thank the World Heritage Centre for the perfect cooperation in the entire nomination process, and our German hosts for a warm welcome and a very well planned session here in Bonn, which will be another reason that we shall never forget this day.*

*The nomination is a result of a truly remarkable cooperation between state players, municipal authorities, the Moravian Church in Christiansfeld as well as other local*

residents. It is an example of how local efforts and collaboration can in the end lead to the taking of important diplomatic and political decisions.

It is therefore my pleasure – with your permission, Madam Chair - to pass the floor to the mayor of Kolding Municipality, who has played an important role in the accomplishment of this nomination and who will speak on behalf of the local community.

The **Chairperson** then passed the floor to the **Mayor of the Kolding Municipality, Mr. Jørn Pedersen** who gave the following intervention on behalf of the local community:

*Thank you Madam Chair,*

*On behalf of the Moravian Settlement of Christiansfeld and the Municipality of Kolding, I am very grateful to the Committee for having inscribed us.*

*For many years it has been a big wish to have Christiansfeld restored. But, only during recent years we have really learned why the buildings and the town centre of Christiansfeld should be preserved for posterity.*

*Christiansfeld is in top form, and together with private funds we have restored buildings, streets and alleys for more than 35 million EURO during recent years.*

*Prior to the foundation of Christiansfeld in 1773, a detailed town plan was worked out. These years we see an increasing urbanisation worldwide, and today we might even learn from past time's town planners!*

*There are several Moravian settlements built according to the same principle as Christiansfeld - which by far is the most well-preserved. We are of course at your disposal if you want to follow our example.*

*Thank you very much for inscribing us on UNESCO's List!*

Property	<b>The par force hunting landscape in North Zealand</b>
Id. N°	<b>1469</b>
State Party	<b>Denmark</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for serial nomination “The par force hunting landscape in North Zealand”.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS.

The representative from **ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the serial nomination “The par force hunting landscape in North Zealand”.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that concerning the recent Christiansfeld inscription, it agreed with the need for improved legal protection and management as well as the need to include other Moravian settlements in the property. The Delegation further stated that concerning the second nominated site in North Zealand, the Delegation agreed with the proposed OUV of the property. The Delegation applauded the full-fledged cooperation between ICOMOS and the State Party, which to the inscription the property on the World Heritage List with an additional criterion that was not initially proposed. The Delegation called on the

Committee to see this as a way forward for future nominations and congratulated the State Party in this regard.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the nominated property had clearly demonstrated OUV and that the criteria were justified. The Delegation underlined that the site presented a unique cultural landscape and supported the nomination.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered the property had unique features and agreed with the Advisory Body's recommendation to include criteria (iv). The Delegation noted that this represented a case of successful dialogue between the State Party and the Advisory Body.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted the site's influence by European trends, and acknowledged the OUV of the property. The Delegation congratulated Denmark on its second inscription of the day.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party of Denmark on the nomination and noted that the site was an interesting addition to the World Heritage List in an under-represented category. The Delegation thanked ICOMOS for the dialogue and excellent work together with the State Party, which had resulted in a favourable outcome.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l'État Partie pour l'inscription de ce bien en soulignant ses grandes valeurs sociales et sa facture.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** agreed with the inscription of the site, and encouraged further study on this genre of sites. The Delegation congratulated Denmark for this magnificent site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party for the inscription of the unique cultural landscape, and accepted ICOMOS recommendations on the statement of OUV for the site.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the site's inscription and congratulated Denmark on its success. The Delegation recognized the values of the site and said it awaited the survey as recommended by ICOMOS to discover new elements that could be associated with the site.

The Delegations of **Jamaica** and **Croatia** commended the work on this nomination, supported the site's inscription and congratulated the State Party.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se joint aux États Parties pour féliciter l'inscription de ce site et les efforts menés en suivant les recommandations d'ICOMOS.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne que le site mérite l'inscription mais elle a une question concernant la recommandation de l'ICOMOS d'avoir besoin de mener encore des études sur les valeurs des réseaux de chemin. La Délégation recommande mener encore d'autres études sur ses valeurs pour faciliter une compréhension complète sur l'ensemble du bien. En outre, elle recommande d'envisager la suppression de l'infrastructure qui traverse le bien dans la partie du

sud. La Délégation support l'inscription du bien mais elle souhaite des clarifications de l'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the State Party of Denmark for the nomination and noted that the site fully satisfied the OUV, protection and management requirements.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS to reply to the queries from the Delegation of Algeria.

**ICOMOS** stated that through a process of dialogue, ICOMOS had been able to identify features of the site that would be indispensable in representing OUV. ICOMOS underlined that the features included in this serial property were expanded following dialogue with the State Party as those that could sustain the OUV of the site. ICOMOS also explained that it recommended continued study of parts of North Zealand that could be included in the nominated property.

The **Chairperson** asked if Algeria was satisfied with the reply, and gave the floor to Senegal.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** fait confiance à l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie l'ICOMOS pour sa clarification et soutien la décision.

The **Chairperson** enquired if the Rapporteur had received any amendments to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** stated that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The Decision **39 COM 8B.21** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Denmark on behalf of the entire Committee, and gave the floor to Denmark for a brief 2-minute statement.

The Delegation of **Denmark** expressed sincere thanks to the World Heritage Committee for the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

Property	<b>Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe</b>
Id. N°	<b>1476</b>
State Party	<b>Denmark / Germany / Iceland / Latvia / Norway</b>

The **Secretariat** announced that a factual error notification had been received for the nomination of “Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe” submitted by Denmark, Germany, Iceland, Latvia, and Norway.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS.

**ICOMOS** presented their evaluation of the nomination of “Viking Age Sites in Northern Europe.”

The Delegation of **Japan** recommended that the States Parties abide by ICOMOS’s recommendations, in particular that the States Parties could benefit from the upstream process.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that the proposal had been presented as a new nomination but acknowledged that the site contained two component parts from Denmark and Iceland that were already been inscribed on the basis of the same values. The Delegation expressed the view that the relationship between the nominated component parts and the parts of the site that were already inscribed was not clear from the procedural point of view. The Delegation underlined that this could set a precedent for the future of the World Heritage List. The Delegation further noted that the proposed boundaries for those two component parts already inscribed were different from those proposed for inscription. The Delegation requested for ICOMOS’s clarification on the general approach towards the nomination of already-inscribed properties. The Delegation remarked that in the case of cultural properties, it had observed an alteration in the way nominations were constructed and the way the justification was formulated. The Delegation underlined that these changes comprised a shift from inscribing properties for which history and state of preservation justified their inscription, to including stories rooted in physical space, and told through symbolic elements. The Delegation concluded by expressing its concern that this would pose a severe threat to the credibility of the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Croatia** suggested that the nomination be referred to further align with the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies, especially for the comparative analysis and other missing information such as the buffer zone. The Delegation reiterated its support for a referral.

La Délégation du **Liban** remarque que le dossier préparé pour l'inscription de ce bien comme tous les dossiers de candidature en série et transnationaux est très complexe. Les sites proposés sont des exemples de l'Europe du nord-ouest. Elle note qu'un comité de pilotage a été formulé afin de suivre ce dossier, et que l'ICOMOS a participé à ce comité. La Délégation du Liban ajoute également que les États parties qui ont présenté cette proposition d'inscription ont fait circuler des notes d'information aux membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, mais que ces informations ont rendu le Comité encore plus confus car il a semblé que les pays n'étaient pas d'accord-- la Norvège n'était pas en accord avec les autres pays. Ensuite, la Délégation a souligné le fait que certains pays, comme la Suède, n'ont pas été représentés dans ce dossier; par conséquent, la Délégation du Liban n'a pas considéré ce dossier comme assez mature. La Délégation soutien la recommandation de l'ICOMOS et suggère que les États Parties prennent encore plus de temps pour revoir l'ensemble du dossier pour le compléter.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that the nomination dossier represented considerable collaboration among the States Parties involved. The Delegation further noted that ICOMOS’s recommendation for deferral was to allow more time for research. The Delegation suggested that a thematic study be

undertaken following the methodology used for the Silk Roads. The Delegation acknowledged that the OUV had been recognized and enquired if ICOMOS would conduct an overall study to gradually expand this nomination as recommended in draft decision. The Delegation considered that the nomination has OUV.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the previous speakers and congratulated the States Parties which had presented this nomination to the Committee. The Delegation stated that that ICOMOS's observations were very relevant, particularly the suggestion for the nomination to be based on migratory patterns rather than the formation of states in Northwest Europe. Furthermore, the Delegation pointed out that ICOMOS's objection focused on the *raison d'être* of the nomination, which indicated that there was a problem with the specific nature of the OUV of the component parts. The Delegation suggested that the Committee should refer the nomination back to the States Parties to clarify the *raison d'être* of the OUV, including a full historical analysis. The Delegation therefore agreed with ICOMOS's recommendations.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked the States Parties for the nomination and noted ICOMOS's recommendations. The Delegation underscored the difficulties of a serial nomination, as evidenced from its own participation in the Silk Roads nomination process. The Delegation suggested that parts of the nomination dossier could be strengthened and considered that the nomination should be referred back to the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the States Parties for the nomination. The Delegation noted that beyond the merit of this nomination, recognizing shared cultural historical heritage was always tricky and that such nominations should be a way of bringing countries together rather than driving them apart. The Delegation also noted that some routes crossed the Portuguese coastline. The Delegation stated that it saw merit in the nomination but agreed that it would be wiser to follow the ICOMOS's recommendation for the States Parties to consult with each other again and invite other States to participate in the process, so as to avoid conflict.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** requested for clarification on the number of sites that were encompassed in this serial nomination and on the criteria for which the final nominated sites were selected. The Delegation noted the numerous interpretations of this subject and supported the proposal for ICOMOS to develop a thematic study on this topic. The Delegation encouraged the States Parties to develop a stronger narrative for the Viking sites.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS to respond to questions from Poland and the Republic of Korea.

The representative of **ICOMOS** stated that the Persian Gardens and Loire Valley were examples of sites already inscribed being included in a serial nomination. ICOMOS cited an example where one of the sites concerned had been inscribed for its relation to Christianity whereas in the Viking nomination, it was being noted for its pagan qualities. ICOMOS explained that the elements of the sites proposed for inscription were not the same the sites that were already inscribed and therefore stated that ICOMOS would not consider it as an extension.

The **Vice Chairperson** asked if Poland and the Republic of Korea were satisfied by the clarifications from ICOMOS, and gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.22** was adopted.

Property	<b>Climats, terroirs of Burgundy</b>
Id. N°	<b>1425</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS for their evaluation of “Climats, terroirs of Burgundy”, nominated by France.

The representative of **ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** remarque que l'ICOMOS recommande l'inscription du bien comme paysage culturel même si la candidature est présentée comme un bien culturel. Sans s'opposer à la décision de l'ICOMOS, elle suggère de retourner à la désignation culturelle. Quant à la recommandation de renvoyer cette proposition afin de permettre une plus grande protection de la gestion, elle a noté que ce site est un site classé avec protection juridique existante et donc devrait être inscrit plutôt que renvoyé.

The Delegation of **Portugal** proposed that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List and submitted an amendment to the Draft Decision. The Delegation considered that this nomination was just as robust as the Champagne nomination and fulfilled all the criteria for inscription. The Delegation further considered that the outstanding measures recommended by ICOMOS could be swiftly dealt with by the State Party. The Delegation underlined that the protection and land planning measures in place satisfied the requirements for inscription. The Delegation further stated that any doubts regarding management or boundary modification should be referred to the State Party of France.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that the site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation noted that OUV had been acknowledged by ICOMOS. The Delegation further noted the concerns regarding management issues but considered that the State Party would be able to address these issues swiftly.

La Délégation de **Viêt Nam** souligne que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et la diversité des valeurs caractéristiques sont représentés. La Délégation demande à l'État Partie de répondre aux questions de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne les qualités exceptionnelles du bien et indique que les critères (iii) et (v) sont justifiés. Elle souligne que la valeur universelle

exceptionnelle est représentée et elle soutient l'inscription du site. La Délégation exprime le désir d'entendre les commentaires de l'État Partie.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that ICOMOS had recommended that the site be referred back to the State Party. The Delegation stated that since the State Party was finalizing the landscape plan, the State Party could be trusted to ensure protection and management.

The Delegation of **Peru** noted that the climats had special characteristics linked with production, and agreed with ICOMOS's report that the site was exceptional. The Delegation considered that the characteristics of each climat, the composition of the soils, the interaction of the climats combined with the knowledge of winemaking and the nature of the area, were sufficient for the site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation further noted that ICOMOS's reports had acknowledged the OUV of the property, and that integrity and authenticity had also been demonstrated. The Delegation expressed the view that the State Party had demonstrated its commitment to put in place legal instruments necessary for the protection of the property. The Delegation reiterated its assurance that the State Party would ensure that the OUV of the site was well-protected and supported inscription.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** considère que le dossier constitue un parfait exemple du dialogue entre l'Etat partie et ICOMOS qui a permis de clarifier certains points relatifs à la valeur universelle du bien ainsi que sur son système de gestion et de protection. Elle insiste néanmoins sur le fait que l'Etat partie devrait améliorer le dispositif réglementaire pour la protection du bien. Elle se prononce en faveur de l'inscription immédiate du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sous la catégorie de paysage culturel conformément à la proposition d'ICOMOS et appui l'amendement proposé par Portugal.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the well-developed landscape of the property bore witness to the strong ancestral values and cultural rituals of the local community, and demonstrated the indigenous nature of the site. The Delegation added that the site showed the evolution of wine production, patronage and the protection of nature. The Delegation noted that France was in the process of extending the regulatory protection of the site, and that these plans would be operational from 2016. The Delegation said that the site was a well-deserved inscription for the State Party and requested to hear from the State Party on their commitment and plans for the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Japan** affirmed that the nominated property was an important example of a cultural landscape deeply connected to the production process of wine. The Delegation underlined that the ICOMOS evaluation recognized that all criteria have been met and justified inscription in this regard. The Delegation opined that the only issue appeared to be the protection of the site, but noted that the State Party had clear intentions to strengthen regulatory and protection instruments. The Delegation also recognized the longstanding involvement and strong will of local stakeholders to protect the site throughout history, and expressed support for its inscription.



La Délégation de l'**Algérie**, félicite ICOMOS et l'Etat partie pour l'excellente collaboration et la qualité du dossier de nomination et de l'évaluation tout en soulignant que le rapport a permis de saisir la spécificité de ce bien et sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle et que l'inscription se justifie amplement. Elle insiste néanmoins sur le fait que compte tenue des divers instruments juridiques et le complexe et rigoureux système de protection légal appliqué à ce bien, ce système n'aurait de sens et d'efficacité que s'il est acceptée et partagée par les communautés qu'y vivent y travaillent et demande l'Etat partie de se prononcer sur ce point.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie les Etats parties du Comité qui ont soutenu le dossier et ICOMOS pour la qualité du rapport d'évaluation qui reconnaît la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Elle souligne également la qualité du dialogue avec ICOMOS après et avant l'évaluation.

Concernant la première question portant sur le mécanisme de protection, la Délégation précise qu'ICOMOS a validé la protection pour l'essentiel ces aspects et que seulement une partie minime de 2% fait l'objet d'une interrogation. Elle précise que sur ces parties, une certaine protection est en place, y compris sur cette partie minime, mais qu'elle peut être renforcée et que la France dispose des outils réglementaires et de protection avec des instruments juridiques appropriés qui malgré leur complexité s'appliquent à ce bien particulier afin de garantir une protection adéquate. C'est donc la complémentarité de ces outils qui assurent la protection du site en pleine conformité avec les exigences de la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

Sur la deuxième question concernant la carrière et le paysage qui se situent dans la zone tampon et qui ne sont pas visibles, elle précise que ces carrières ainsi que le paysage participent pleinement à l'intégrité et à la valeur universelle du bien et que la pérennité de cette exploitation qui est séculaire est une partie intégrante du bien. Il ajoute que le plan de gestion sur le paysage sera mis en œuvre dès le début 2016 et complétera le système actuel et s'engage solennellement à assurer une protection sur l'ensemble du bien et à tenir au courant le Comité sur les mesures prises.

Sur la question de l'Algérie, la Délégation de la France précise que le climat du vignoble de Bourgogne témoigne d'une forte tradition culturelle transmise de génération en génération et que cet aspect ancré sur la tradition constitue une garantie pour la parfaite préservation du site pour les générations à venir.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to the Draft Decision as proposed by the Delegations of Viet Nam and Portugal.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon that the nominated property was put forth by the State Party as a cultural site, and the change to a cultural landscape would cause problems for the draft decision as the site was not evaluated as a cultural landscape. The Delegation requested to hear from ICOMOS on this issue.

**ICOMOS** explained that the ICOMOS panel had discussed at length the issue of the site being presented as a cultural site and not a cultural landscape, as the ICOMOS panel found that the nominated property was possibly one of the best examples of

cultural landscapes that could be inscribed on the List; not just based on the visual dimension but because of the progressive construction of the knowledge and relationship between the people, the land and the soil. ICOMOS informed that in particular, criteria (v) applied very well to cultural landscapes. ICOMOS stated that inscription as a cultural landscape would reflect the OUV of the property, and therefore expressed the support for the amendment as proposed by the Delegations of Viet Nam and Portugal.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère qu'au niveau scientifique, il serait mieux d'inscrire ce bien en tant que site culturel, mais elle n'est pas opposée à la proposition d'ICOMOS et d'autres pays.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** exprime son soutien à la proposition présentée par le Liban.

The Delegations of **Peru, Germany and Kazakhstan** supported the amendments suggested by the Delegations of Viet Nam and Portugal to inscribe the property as a cultural landscape.

La Délégation de la **Croatie** soutient l'amendement proposé par le Portugal d'inscrire le site sous la catégorie de paysage culturel.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to the draft decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.23** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **France** exprime ses remerciements aux experts d'ICOMOS et aux membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle affirme son engagement à se montrer digne de cette inscription.

Le Président du domaine Romanée Conti remercie les membres du Comité en soulignant qu'il s'agit d'un bien où il y a une grande interaction entre la terre, le climat et un vignoble. Il souligne enfin que le dossier de nomination reflète bien le Patrimoine viticole français qui devient désormais patrimoine du monde.

Property	<b>Champagne Hillside, Houses and Cellars</b>
Id. N°	<b>1465</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** s'interroge sur le fait que ce bien ne se soit pas encore inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. De son point de vue, justice est faite avec cette inscription.

The Delegation of **Finland** opined while they were many vineyards on the list, Champagne would take a special and unique place on the list. The Delegation expressed the view that the comparative analysis, authenticity and integrity have all been justified, adequate protection was in place, and therefore supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** highlighted that the nominated property demonstrated a specific agro-industrial system where the legacy of winemaking had been developed across the centuries. The Delegation noted that as a cultural landscape that had evolved since the 17th century, the nominated property was a unique testimony to the birth and spread of champagne, and supported its inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed its appreciation to the French experts for putting up a dossier that demonstrated the rich history of winemaking. The Delegation noted that the ICOMOS report was comprehensive and that the integrity and authenticity of the property were all well supported. The Delegation expressed its support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that the nomination was an excellent example of a cultural landscape for three reasons. Firstly, the Delegation highlighted that while the Champagne region may not have been suitable for wine-growing due to its geographical circumstances, it developed a particular production method for sparkling wine, and this site-based enterprise was now known all over the world. Secondly, the Delegation underlined that traditional methods of production at the site have been preserved. Thirdly, the Delegation stated that Champagne had maintained an excellent infrastructure for grape cultivation and wine production, and that the cultural and architectural landscape made the nominated property exceptional. The Delegation expressed their support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** underlined that the citizens of Champagne had perfected the manufacture of champagne wine over 200 years and was an exceptional example of the interaction between humans and the natural landscape. The Delegation expressed its support for the inscription of the site.

La Délégation du **Vietnam** exprime son soutien plein et entier à l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, tout en espérant que l'art de champagne sera un jour classé dans la Liste du patrimoine immatériel de l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** commended the State Party for its exemplary dossier outlining the evolution of wine production from a cultural, industrial and geographical perspective, and supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** affirmed that the cultural values of the site were felt well beyond the borders of France. The Delegation was of the view that the OUV of the nominated property was diverse and far reaching, and that the site bore witnesses to an exceptional living tradition, with its unique and prestigious architecture as well as underground heritage in the wine-growing cellars of Champagne. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **India** recognized that ICOMOS's evaluation of the site testified to its OUV. The Delegation commended the State Party for its outstanding nomination and by-product.

The Delegation of **Poland** commended the State Party for its nomination which represented an exceptional and sophisticated example of the whole process of wine production from growing grapes to the underground cellars and champagne houses. The Delegation also acknowledged the work undertaken to prepare the nomination dossier over many years, and the support by the resident population, local authorities and communities.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully supported the proposal for inscription.

La Délégation de **Croatie** souligne que le dossier propose un système qui montre l'économie locale et constitue un paradigme de la joie de vivre à la française et félicite la France pour l'inscription de ce dossier sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Portugal** félicite la France pour les deux grands crus inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de **Qatar** félicite la France pour ce dossier de nomination de ce bien sur lequel ne voit aucune doute sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle comme lieu des cultures, de la terre, mais aussi des échanges entre les communautés locales et d'autres communautés d'Europe qui vient d'autres lieux à aider pendant la période des récoltes et soutient l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** se félicite de l'inscription de deux sites et les offre à la santé de la France.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** affirmed the unique significance of the nominated property and its OUV, and fully supported its inscription.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** félicite la France pour la qualité du dossier de candidature et pour son inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Peru** affirmed that the aspects of authenticity and integrity had been proven in the nomination dossier, and that the site demonstrated the interconnectedness between humans and nature. The Delegation expressed its full support for the inscription of the site.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** Se félicite également de l'inscription et considère que le Comité avait tardé à inscrire ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Liban** se dit favorable avec l'inscription de ce site en tant que paysage culturel.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.24** was adopted.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie l'ICOMOS et les Membres du Comité et considère qu'il s'agit d'un grand jour pour la France avec l'inscription de deux de ses plus belles régions. Elle se félicite que le monde entier connaisse le Champagne et désormais connaîtront LA Champagne et annonce que les champenois feront le nécessaire pour préserver ce site désormais inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle précise également que les territoires concernés par cette inscription sont très fiers d'apporter leur engagement total au travail de l'UNESCO pour faire grandir ce patrimoine tout en soulignant qu'il s'agit d'un événement historique pour la Champagne et un moment de réconciliation, de bonheur et de paix.

Property	<b>Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1488</b>
State Party	<b>Turkey</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that in the ICOMOS evaluation, the OUV of the property had been acknowledged and that only protection remained an issue. The Delegation expressed the view that in the context of urban development, there was a need for a comprehensive management scheme to strengthen the protection of the property. The Delegation supported the inscription of the property rather than a referral, and was of the view that outstanding issues could be treated as additional recommendations. The Delegation proposed that the State Party be requested to report back to the Committee on its progress following inscription.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Delegation of Japan that the State Party had put forth a nomination for an outstanding site that reflected several layers of history and civilization. The Delegation was of the view that the elements for protection were available, although there remained the need to link them. The Delegation noted that the ICOMOS report had stated that controls were in place, but that the management of the property and the buffer zone needed to be integrated. The Delegation expressed its support for inscription under criteria (iv).

The Delegation of **Serbia** endorsed the views of previous delegations in supporting inscription rather than referral. The Delegation highlighted the need to strengthen the buffer zone, which could be undertaken through continued efforts to engage with the local communities to support conservation and the development of the nominated property. The Delegation underlined that the main threats to the property related to

population pressures such as unregulated occupation. The Delegation highlighted that one important, lasting and beneficial impact of the inscription would be the improvement in the living conditions of the local communities through their involvement and active integration in the project.

The Delegation of **Portugal** emphasized that OUV was clearly demonstrated in the multicultural nature of the nominated property and the intertwined relationship between the people and the natural landscape. The Delegation noted the reasons put forth by ICOMOS against the immediate inscription of the property, but underlined that it had received strong assurance that Turkey was committed to further improving the legal protection of the site, including the buffer zone, as well as the management system. The Delegation commended the inclusive approach undertaken in the preparation of the nomination, and the historical relationships that communities of different cultures and religions had cherished with the fortress and natural environment.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que ce bien est un exemple de ville frontière qui a joué un rôle dans l'histoire entre l'Occident et l'Orient et qu'il s'agit d'un paysage culturel qui justifie du critère iv. Elle propose qu'en consistance avec le site de Cristian Feld qui sera discuté demain, et malgré ses déficiences, le Comité procède à l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, tout en demandant à l'Etat partie de prendre en considération les recommandations concernant la gestion et la conservation du bien.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** considère que le rapport d'ICOMOS ne met pas en cause la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, que le dossier est bien fait et justifie l'inscription. Il se prononce en faveur de son inscription et demande à l'Etat partie de prendre en compte les recommandations effectuées par ICOMOS.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** acknowledged the merits of the site as a cultural landscape and frontier border city between the east and the west, and a testament to significant stages in world history. The Delegation noted that the commitment of Turkey to follow up on the legal protection, management plans as well as in the continued engagement of local communities, should assure the Committee of the site's inscription on the list.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged the significant OUV of the nominated property, which had existed since the 4th century and represented unique heritage that had been expanded on by many great eras of civilizations. The Delegation noted that Turkey had started to work closely with the Advisory Body to strengthen the legal protection and management of the buffer zone, and to implement an action plan in this regard. The Delegation expressed its satisfaction that these requirements would be fulfilled and supported inscription. The Delegation requested for Turkey to be given the floor to share about the efforts undertaken to improve legal protection and management of the property, as well as the specific concerns highlighted in the ICOMOS report on the possible negative impact of dam construction on the property.

La Délégation de **Viet Nam** soutient l'inscription immédiate du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base du critère (iv) et demande également à l'Etat partie de suivre les recommandations d'ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged the deep-rooted history and rich culture of the site, and expressed support for inscription.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the site for its remarkable OUV and how it had preserved several layers of history. The Delegation stressed the importance of establishing a management system that would include a provision for community involvement. The Delegation requested for Turkey to be given the floor to address concerns regarding the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed satisfaction that the OUV of the nominated property had been assured and that the State Party would be able to address the concerns expressed by ICOMOS. The Delegation requested for Turkey to provide the Committee with an update on the legal and management requirements.

The Delegation of **Croatia** affirmed that the OUV, authenticity and integrity of the site had been demonstrated and requested for Turkey to share about how management issues would be addressed.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the nominated property for its great significance to global heritage and stated that its OUV was more than adequate. The Delegation noted the reservations by ICOMOS related to management issues and requested for Turkey to be given the floor to address these concerns. The Delegation expressed confidence that Turkey had the vast experience to fill existing gaps, and supported the site's inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported inscription and requested that Turkey be given the floor to share on their plans for the protection of the site.

La Délégation **d'Algérie** considère que ce site mérite l'inscription sur la catégorie de paysage culturel, malgré le fait qu'il ait quelques lacunes dans le système de gestion et tout en reconnaissant que certaines améliorations ont été mise en place par l'Etat partie. Il précise que des mesures colossales ont été entreprises, comme l'annulation des projets hydroélectriques, l'arrêt de travaux de restauration qui ne sont pas dans les normes et que cela montre la détermination pour préserver le site par les communautés concernées.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the previous speakers that OUV was evident and supported the move to inscription. The Delegation remarked that the authenticity and integrity of the site was demonstrated, but the Advisory Bodies had recommended a referral due to inadequate measures for protection. The Delegation considered that in accordance with the Convention, Article 2 stated that a prerequisite for inscription was the ability to demonstrate OUV. The Delegation stated that the Convention thus did not appear to establish protection as a prerequisite for inscription because the World Heritage List was established by determining sites that meet the criteria of OUV. The Delegation expressed the view that while the idea of management and protection was closely linked with OUV, they did not necessarily

establish the standards for inscription. The Delegation proposed that this idea be discussed further.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** explained that the nominated property faced significant legislative shortcomings in the early 2000s due to the lack of experience. However, the Delegation recognized that through the upstream process, interagency cooperation, as well as dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies, all stakeholders were able to respond effectively and put in place majority of the actions recommended by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation expressed its hope to improve the Upstream Process through its experience with this site. The Delegation underlined that the management plan had been fully completed and put in force. The Delegation further underlined that the regional council had included the entire site under full protection under Turkish Law and that all conservation principles required by the Advisory Bodies had been incorporated accordingly as well. The Delegation highlighted that all development projects were stopped to conserve the site. The Delegation underscored that the Government of Turkey had also abolished the plans for the hydroelectric plant and that the dams had been relocated. The Delegation also shared that the Turkish Ministry of Culture would continue to protect sites from the impact of new projects. The Delegation affirmed its commitment to set an exemplary model for the effective implementation of the Convention.

**ICOMOS**, in response to the points raised by the Delegation of Peru, recalled that on the basis of Paragraph 78 of the Operational Guidelines, to be deemed as having Outstanding Universal Value, the property must not only meet the conditions of integrity and authenticity, but an adequate protection management system must be in place as well. ICOMOS said that the inscription of this property was welcome, but reminded the Committee that management was indeed a prerequisite for OUV.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that the Operational Guidelines were not legally binding and were just to assist with the implementation of the Convention. The Delegation stressed the need to get to a higher degree of protection and management, and emphasized that there was currently no prerequisite for OUV through a criteria of protection and management.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.32** was adopted as amended.

**ICOMOS** exprime son accord avec le Liban de rajouter la mention du bien en tant que paysage culturel sur la base du critère (iv)

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime son accord avec la proposition d'inscrire le site sous la catégorie de paysage culturel, et, en réponse au Pérou, précise que les Orientations établissent la nécessité de prendre des mesures de protection appropriées comme condition à l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its gratitude to UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation affirmed the values of the nominated site, and expressed the commitment of Turkey to continue to safeguard UNESCO's values. The Delegation shared that the property was an outstanding example of a property



that had survived many centuries of continued habitation of human civilizations as well as presented a new spirit of unity and harmony in the region at the time when the relationship between the East and West was undergoing a major test. The Delegation expressed its hope that the cultural recognition of this property accorded through inscription would contribute to regional peace and stability, as well as help UNESCO raise its voice in line with the Organization's mandate.

The first Co-Mayor of Diyarbakir expressed thanks to the Chair and World Heritage Committee for the successful inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. The Mayor stated that the Tigres River was the point of origin for many regions and the crossroad of many great cultures. The Mayor highlighted that the site was where various civilizations had lived over time and represented the legacy of all humanity. The Mayor assured the Committee that they would do their utmost best to ensure that the property would be adequately managed and safeguarded for future generations. The Mayor expressed cognizance towards heritage under threat in conflict regions and affirmed that Turkish World Heritage properties would work towards cultivating cities of culture and peace, where cultural values would prevail. The Mayor thanked all present for their support.

The second Co-Mayor of Diyarbakir affirmed the commitment of the city to work together with all communities and acknowledged their role as the custodian of cultural heritage. The Mayor pledged commitment to safeguard the site which had just been inscribed.

*The meeting rose at 18h30.*

SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 5 July 2015

TWELFTH MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany) and  
Her Excellency Ruchira Kamboj (India)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST  
OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL  
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	<b>Rjukan-Notodden Industrial Heritage Site</b>
Id. N°	<b>1486</b>
State Party	<b>Norway</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for the nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its report on Rjukan-Notodden Industrial Heritage Site.

The Delegation of **Philippines** expressed its support for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Germany** noted that OUV had been justified and therefore recommended inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated the State Party of Norway for the successful preparation of the nomination dossier. The Delegation noted the innovative approaches used in the property and acknowledged that the nominated property was one of the most important among industrial heritage sites.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the nominated property was a pioneering industry in its own environment, and congratulated Norway for its excellent preparation of the nomination dossier. The Delegation congratulated Norway for putting forth a successful nomination.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated that the proposed property deserved World Heritage Status, and added that it fully supported the nomination.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** remarked that the site fully demonstrated the OUV, and congratulated Norway for its successful nomination.

The Delegation of **India** stated that it was pleased to see the nominated property on the World Heritage List, and warmly congratulated the State Party on its excellent nomination.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** est extrêmement heureuse de cette proposition et la soutient, d'autant plus qu'elle témoigne d'une exploitation des ressources en harmonie avec un développement agricole conséquent. En faisant une remarque générale, la Délégation constate l'asymétrie existante dans les discussions du Comité, notamment quand on parle de l'exploitation des ressources en lien avec les sites les Organisations consultatives nous identifient à des « génocidaires du patrimoine mondial ». Il faut changer cela, sinon les sites africains risquent de devenir des parcs zoologiques. Il faut réfléchir sur la question de l'exploitation des terroirs en harmonie avec la conservation des sites.

La Délégation du **Qatar** soutient cette inscription et remercie l'Etat partie pour le dossier.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** évoque un excellent exemple d'innovation sociale, des solutions de transport et de communication, et félicite la Norvège pour la proposition.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party and noted that the dossier fully complied with the OUV requirements. The Delegation expressed its support for the draft decision.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** commended ICOMOS for its comprehensive report and congratulated the State Party on its successful inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the State Party on submitting an excellent nomination dossier and expressed its support for the draft decision.

La Délégation du **Liban** appuie l'inscription et note qu'elle s'inscrit pleinement dans la stratégie pour une Liste plus équilibrée et crédible. Le patrimoine industriel est sous-représenté, ainsi cette inscription remplit un des vides dans la Liste (« gaps »).

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** trouve cette proposition intéressante dans la mesure où elle s'inscrit dans la catégorie des « sites » sous-représentés dont il faut encourager l'inscription. Le site est parfaitement conservé, et il faut continuer ce travail, malgré le défi de tenir le fonctionnement des installations sans porter atteinte à la nature magnifique environnante. Le fonctionnement continu des installations est toujours un défi. Ce site pourrait constituer un exemple de bonne entente entre les besoins de développement et de la conservation.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed its fully support for the nomination under criteria (ii) and (iv), and congratulated the State Party of Norway.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the proposed property was an outstanding example of 20th century industrial heritage and congratulated Norway for the excellent preparation of the nomination.

The **Rapporteur** reported that no amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.29** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Norway** (Observer) delivered a short statement to thank the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their support and for recognizing the Rjukan–Notodden Industrial Heritage Site as a World Heritage Site.

Property	<b>La Rioja and Rioja Alavesa Wine and Vineyard Cultural Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1482</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for the nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the La Rioja and Rioja Alavesa Wine and Vineyard Cultural Landscape.

The **Chairperson** opened the debate on this item. As there were no comments from Committee members, the Chairperson gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The Rapporteur informed the Committee that no amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.31** was adopted.

Property	<b>Speicherstadt and Kontorhaus District with Chilehaus</b>
Id. N°	<b>1467</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for the nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the Speicherstadt and Kontorhaus District with Chilehaus.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that the nominated property well-represented OUV and supported its inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation agreed with the modification to the name of the property that was proposed by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Finland** highlighted that the proposed property was a good example of the architectural and technological developments of the 20th century and hence expressed its support for ICOMOS's evaluation.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that the property was one of the greatest examples of architecture and industry at the beginning of the 20th century, and fully supported its inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** underlined that modern heritage was a complicated category of heritage to manage, and expressed its support for inscription.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l'Etat partie pour cette proposition qui a des qualités exceptionnelles et est un exemple important d'architecture industrielle du début du siècle. Elle se félicite aussi de l'excellente coopération entre les autorités de ce site et les pays de l'Amérique latine.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS on the nomination dossier. The Delegation stated that it was pleased to see the growing number of nominations of architecture at the beginning of the 20th century.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the proposed property was an exceptional testimony to rapid development of trade in the beginning of the 20th century and supported the property's inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Philippines** expressed its support for inscription.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite l'ICOMOS et l'Etat partie. Ce site témoigne d'un complexe de patrimoine moderne de la fin du 19<sup>e</sup> siècle significatif pour l'expansion du commerce. Elle se joint à l'ICOMOS en recommandant fortement que la protection juridique soit apportée dans la zone tampon.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the property was an outstanding and rare example of the industrial heritage and that it was a testimony to the increasing international trade of the 19th and 20th centuries. The Delegation expressed its belief that OUV was well-justified. The Delegation agreed with the revision of the property's title as proposed by ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'Etat partie pour un dossier de qualité, tout en notant les préoccupations de l'ICOMOS concernant l'aménagement urbain. Elle est sûre que l'Etat partie prendra toutes les mesures nécessaires pour préserver le site. Ce site aussi présente un exemple d'une combinaison heureuse entre le développement durable et la conservation, témoignant ainsi de la nécessité d'ouvrir les possibilités de développement tout en préservant un site.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** expressed support inscription.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** remarked that the State Party had submitted a dossier of excellent quality. The Delegation noted ICOMOS's recommendation regarding the buffer zone and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and congratulated the State Party on its successful nomination.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party of Germany on its successful inscription to the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Qatar** soutient cette inscription et félicite l'Etat partie pour la proposition.

La Délégation du **Pérou** félicite l'ICOMOS et l'Etat partie pour la présentation de ce magnifique dossier et appui son inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle l'importance de cette période de la fin du 19<sup>e</sup> siècle pour l'Europe et pour le monde et se félicite de cette proposition.

The **Rapporteur** reported that no amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.25** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Germany** expressed its gratitude to all Committee members for their support and thanked ICOMOS for its cooperation throughout the nomination process. The Delegation expressed delight that the ensemble of Speicherstadt and Kontohaus District with Chilehaus would be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation stated that the property was the largest logistics centre of its time and was still the world's largest ensemble of uniform warehouses today. The Delegation also underlined that the property had a worldwide impact on evolution of office architecture. The Delegation reiterated its responsibility to preserve site's heritage.

Property	<b>The Naumburg Cathedral and the Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut – Territories of Power in the High Middle Ages</b>
Id. N°	<b>1470</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for the nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the Naumburg Cathedral and the Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut – Territories of Power in the High Middle Ages.

The Delegation of **Croatia** stated that in spite of the recommendation made by ICOMOS, the Delegation expressed its belief that there was potential to develop OUV.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that it had thoroughly examined the nomination dossier as well as the evaluation by ICOMOS and concluded that the property demonstrated potential for OUV. The Delegation acknowledged the issues pointed out by ICOMOS but nevertheless, reiterated its view that the property could meet the requirements for OUV as outlined in the Operational Guidelines. The Delegation proposed to move the nomination towards a deferral.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** reconnaît que l'ICOMOS a fait un bon rapport sur la base des critères proposés, surtout en ce qui concerne l'analyse comparative et les biens allemands de la même nature déjà inscrits. Elle précise toutefois que la présentation du dossier pourrait plutôt se baser sur le critère (iii), et, auquel cas, selon la Délégation, la VUE serait justifiée. Elle se réfère aux démonstrations de la lutte entre les pouvoirs spirituels et puissances séculaires, à travers lesquelles se reflète une période exceptionnelle pour l'Europe entière. Elle rappelle que les questions sur les limites du bien doivent être résolues, mais la VUE pourrait être clairement établie. La Délégation précise qu'elle a une modification substantielle à présenter à la proposition de décision.

The Delegation of **Serbia** agreed that there was potential to develop OUV and agreed with the proposal for a deferral.

The Delegation of **India** acknowledged the comprehensive evaluation made by ICOMOS. The Delegation requested for ICOMOS's clarification on why it did not consider the term "territories of power" to be adequate.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the proposal for deferral.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that while it shared ICOMOS's opinion, the Delegation nevertheless expressed its belief that the property merited further research to develop OUV.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged that the experts from Germany had been working on this dossier for a long time and expressed the view that the proposed nomination should be given another chance to develop OUV.

La Délégation du **Qatar** soutient la proposition de différer l'inscription et souhaite entendre la réponse de l'Etat partie sur les questions de l'ICOMOS

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported the move towards a deferral.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the proposed property had unique features and that it deserved another chance for the OUV to be developed. The Delegation expressed support for deferral.

La Délégation du **Pérou** exprime son accord avec les délégations précédentes en proposant de différer cette proposition.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported deferral.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** appuie également le différé.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle les problèmes soulevés par l'ICOMOS et le fait que les critères proposés (iv) et (v) ne soient pas justifiés. Ce site partage en effet nombre de points communs avec d'autres biens, et cette catégorie est de ce fait surreprésentée. La Délégation est d'accord avec l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, néanmoins, vu le grand nombre d'Etats ayant proposé de différer l'inscription afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de concentrer le dossier sur les seuls éléments pouvant posséder une VUE, elle souscrit à cette approche.

The Delegations of the **Republic of Korea, Finland** and **Jamaica** expressed support for deferral.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Germany and ICOMOS to respond to queries from Committee members.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked ICOMOS for its recommendations and at the same time, acknowledged that the Delegation and ICOMOS differed in opinion over a few matters, such as the use of the term "territories of power". The Delegation clarified that this was a customary technical term for archaeologists and settlement geographers. The Delegation underlined that the site comprised a number of important monuments that were a testimony to the High Middle Ages planned cities and settlement process characteristic of the region. The Delegation further underlined that Naumburg represented the high aristocracy as well as the knightly and courtly culture of the High Middle Ages both significantly and dignifiedly. The Delegation urged the Committee to give Germany a second chance through a deferral recommendation and pledged its commitment to work together with ICOMOS to enhance the OUV of the property.

**ICOMOS** clarified that it did not consider the conceptual model of "territories of power" negative in its use, but considered that it did not highlight the specificity of the property as the conceptual model was mainly used in archaeological and geographical scholarship. ICOMOS acknowledged that while the term had been used for many properties to highlight aspects of historical events, ICOMOS reiterated that it did not consider the model to be an approach that highlighted the specificity of the property with respect to others.

The **Chairperson** stated that the Committee could consider a paragraph by paragraph adoption of the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that amendments had been submitted by the Delegations of Croatia and Viet Nam to defer the nomination. The Rapporteur noted that there were some differences in the amendments proposed by the Delegations of Viet Nam and Croatia.

The **Chairperson** noted the amendments and gave the floor to the Delegation of Viet Nam to provide clarification.



The Delegation of **Viet Nam** explained that there had been no time for Viet Nam to consult with Croatia to come up with a unified amendment, but acknowledged there were complementary elements in the amendments proposed. The Delegation suggested that the Committee proceed by going through the amendments to ascertain the extent to which the amendments could be accommodated. The Delegation clarified that its amendments were proposed to allow the State Party to re-present the nomination through a possible renaming of the property and redefining the boundaries.

The **Chairperson** requested for the Rapporteur to take the Committee through the amendments proposed.

The Delegation of **Portugal** questioned if there was a need to go through an extended drafting exercise and stated that the Delegation of Croatia's proposal was sufficient to encompass all the necessary points.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** suggested that it could work closely with Croatia to develop unified amendments to the draft decision. The Delegation acknowledged that while the consensus was for deferral, both Viet Nam and Croatia may have different areas that they wished to stress, for example Croatia on authenticity and Viet Nam on the criteria.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** pointed out some inconsistencies with the amended draft decision, such as the proposed mission to the property being mentioned twice.

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

The **Chairperson** stated that one possibility was to give the two Delegations of Viet Nam and Croatia time to come up with unified amendments to the draft decision, and to revert to the decision once the drafting had been completed.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported Viet Nam's proposal to put the decision on hold to finalise the draft amendments, and to move on to the next nomination in the meantime.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the proposal of Portugal and Finland

The Delegation of **Serbia** supported the proposal to establish a small drafting group.

The Delegation of **Colombia** supported Portugal's proposal.

The **Chairperson** announced that the two Committee members concerned, and another interested Committee members could work together on a draft decision, and that the Committee would move on to the next nomination in the meantime. The Chairperson also suggested that ICOMOS could join the drafting group.

**ICOMOS** stated that it agreed to join the drafting group.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to move on to the next nomination to be discussed.

Property	<b>Necropolis of Bet She'arim: A landmark of Jewish Renewal</b>
Id. N°	<b>1471</b>
State Party	<b>Israel</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the Necropolis of Bet She'arim: A landmark of Jewish Renewal submitted by Israel and recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Vice Chairperson** noted that there was a clear recommendation by ICOMOS for inscription.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked ICOMOS for their consistent support and congratulated Israel on this unique property. The Delegation noted the OUV of the site and expressed optimism that Israel's national authorities would ensure the protection and preservation of this site.

The Delegations of **Germany** and **India** noted the OUV of the site and supported its inscription.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that this site represented the cosmopolitan history of the Middle East. The Delegation noted that ICOMOS did not see a link with criteria (iv), but suggested that the intangible cultural heritage of the site should also be protected. The Delegation added that underground inventories of the site and its buffer zone should be undertaken. The Delegation congratulated Israel and fully supported the inscription of the site on the List.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** recognized that Israel's nomination fulfilled two of the three requirements for inscription. The Delegation supported the ICOMOS recommendation for a seismic study in the framework of risk preparedness, and thanked ICOMOS for its thorough evaluation.

The Delegation of **Vietnam** agreed that OUV was demonstrated and recommended inscription under criteria (ii) and (iii).

La délégation de la **Colombie** félicite l'Etat partie pour l'inscription de ce site qui est un lieu de manifestations artistiques et funéraires exceptionnelles. Elle félicite également Israël pour assurer la protection de ce bien exceptionnel. Elle appuie la nomination de ce site.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the draft decision submitted by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and congratulated the State Party for the nomination.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** highlighted the values of the site, and supported the inscription of the site. The Delegation also noted the risk of climate conditions and encouraged the State Party to follow ICOMOS's recommendations.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party of Israel for its nomination, which was an example of cross-cultural interactions. The Delegation noted that there was some work to be done by the State Party in relation to this site but nevertheless supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated ICOMOS on its report and Israel for its nomination. It agreed that there is a sufficient representation of OUV. It was pleased to see the good condition of the catacombs.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the values of the site and its conservation, preservation and maintenance. The Delegation supported the draft decision and the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked ICOMOS for its excellent presentation and supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. The Delegation congratulated Israel for this inscription.

The Delegation of **Serbia** strongly supported the inscription of this site on the List.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that the property was a strong archaeological site, supported its inscription, and congratulated Israel.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se rallie au consensus autour de cette proposition d'inscription et félicite l'ICOMOS pour le travail accompli et Israël pour la qualité du dossier. La Délégation se félicite surtout pour la procédure consensuelle qui a guidé la discussion concernant ce dossier.

The Delegation of **Poland** strongly supported the inscription.

The **Vice Chairperson** noted the Committee was unanimous and asked the Rapporteur if any amendments were received..

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendments to the draft decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.27** was adopted.

The **Vice Chairperson** congratulated the State Party and gave the floor to Israel for a brief 2- minute intervention.

The Delegation of **Israel** delivered the following statements:

The following speech was delivered by **Mr. Carmel Shama Hacohen, Ambassador of Israel** to UNESCO:

*Your Excellency, Madame Chairperson, dear excellencies, dear colleagues,*

*We are all thrilled together when facing the birth of a new World Heritage site inscribed on the World Heritage List.*

*The conservation, the safeguard and the power of the World Heritage go beyond borders, these are walls breakers and can bridge, at least for one moment of applause, between foes and rivals. This moment is even stronger when it concerns Israel, within International Organizations.*

*For Israel, having a non-political, professional, positive and solemn moment, is a rare moment. It surely intensifies our excitement. I would have truly liked to speak, make an eulogy and praise my country. Mainly, because most of the times, I have to defend my country from strange, automatic and unfortunate attacks.*

*Nevertheless, the merit and the honor should be reserved to my Alternate here in Bonn, Prof. Eli STERN.*

*I thank you very much and with your permission, Madame Chairperson, I will pass the floor to Prof. STERN.*

The following speech was delivered by **Prof. Eli Stern, Head of the Israeli Delegation** to the 39<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee:

*Dear Madam Chair, dear Committee members and our dear Host country,*

*We are glad and thankful that the values and qualities of Beit Shearim's necropolis is gaining an international recognition as part of the world's cultural heritage. It is a treasury of eclectic art works and inscriptions in Greek, Aramic and Hebrew. Its catacombs show the influence of classical Roman art including human images, inscriptions and iconographic motifs. But, it is inscribed not only for presenting these cross-cultural interactions but also for constituting an exceptional testimony to ancient tolerant Judaism in its period of revival and survival under the leadership of Rabbi Judah the Patriarch. Rabbi Judah composed the Jewish religious and social codex still used today. He used to say: "Much have I learned from my teachers, more from my colleagues, but most from my students". He encouraged his students to avoid slander and to actively support their co-students, their group, and all their community. Let this inscription be a tangible testimony to such pluralism and tolerance.*

*On behalf of Mr. Carmel Shama Hacoheh - Israel's Ambassador to UNESCO, Israel's World Heritage Committee, and myself- the chairperson of Israel's World Heritage Committee, I thank you dear members of UNESCO World Heritage Committee and ICOMOS, for this important inscription.*

*I also thank Dr. Tzuk, the chief archaeologist of Israel's Nature and Parks Authority, Mrs. Ben-Haim, an expert, who jointly prepared the dossier, as well as to M. Weiss the Beit She'arim manager, all present here, and to Israel Commission for UNESCO, for their dedication and hard work. Thank you all again. God bless us all.*

Property	<b>The Forth Bridge</b>
Id. N°	<b>1485</b>
State Party	<b>United Kingdom</b>

The **Secretariat** noted the factual error notification received concerning the SOUV, which had already been introduced into the draft decision **39 COM 8B.33**.

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of The Forth Bridge in the United Kingdom, and recommended its inscription on the World Heritage List.

La délégation du **Liban** soutient la proposition d'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial qui correspond à une catégorie de biens sous-représentée. Elle considère que cette inscription contribue donc à combler ce manque. La délégation du Liban demande à l'ICOMOS d'expliquer le concept de zone tampon « de facto » qui n'a jamais été utilisé dans le cadre de l'évaluation de dossiers de proposition d'inscription. Elle déclare y voir un précédent qui pourrait poser des problèmes à l'avenir et un risque de manque de consistance entre les analyses comme cela a été vu pour des biens examinés plus tôt lors de la présente session et pour lesquelles l'ICOMOS s'est montré plus pointilleux quant à la délimitation de la zone tampon.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recalled that the International Committee for Industrial Heritage published a paper on World Heritage bridges. The Delegation stated that the authors of the publication had included a suggested 100 bridges across the globe worthy of World Heritage inscription and noted that the list included the Forth Bridge. The Delegation highlighted the OUV of the site and wholeheartedly supported its inscription. The Delegation added that Jamaica also had a bridge on the list of bridges suggested by the publication and stated that this inscription had inspired them.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party for nominating the Forth Bridge, which was a masterpiece of civil engineering. The Delegation suggested that the nomination file could be used as an example for future nominations of this type, and fully supported its inscription.

The Delegations of **India, Colombia** and **Finland** noted the OUV of the Forth Bridge as an engineering masterpiece, congratulated the State Party for a well-prepared nomination and fully supported its inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the inscription of the Forth Bridge on the World Heritage List, and congratulated the State Party. The Delegation highlighted the importance of following the recommendation by ICOMOS to have key viewsheds established, and suggested that a timeline for their establishment should be elaborated.

The Delegation of **Japan** considered that the property was a masterpiece of civil engineering and recognized its OUV. The Delegation fully supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party of the United Kingdom.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully supported the inscription. However, the Delegation expressed concerns regarding the wording of a “de-facto” buffer zone and as it such terminology may introduce problems for other sites in the future. The Delegation requested for the discretion of ICOMOS on this matter for the future.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the OUV, fully supported the inscription, and congratulated the State Party. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to give special attention to ensuring visual integrity of the site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** noted the innovative attributes of the site and the OUV. The Delegation fully supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party.

The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the inscription of this engineering masterpiece on the World Heritage List. The Delegation echoed the point made by the Delegation of Croatia that this nomination should serve as an example because it was short and precise.

The Delegations of **Malaysia, Vietnam, Senegal** and **Qatar** recognized the OUV of the site, supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** considère que le rapport de l'ICOMOS reflète la qualité du dossier qui a été soumis par l'Etat partie. Elle félicite ce dernier et appuie l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial du pont de Forth dont elle considère la réalisation comme une étape importante dans l'histoire de la construction des grands ouvrages et une représentation du génie humain. La délégation de l'Algérie l'ICOMOS recommande la prise en considération dans les recommandations présentées dans le rapport de l'établissement d'un rapport sur la sélection des vues et des cônes de vision et d'une analyse de leur efficacité pour assurer la protection de ces vues et cônes de vision essentiels. La délégation de l'Algérie sait très bien que la question des zones de visibilité est très importante dans le classement de monuments. Elle demande à l'ICOMOS si cette recommandation qui est présentée dans le rapport ne constituerait pas à l'avenir une entrave à la protection du bien.

The Delegation of **Portugal** joined the previous speakers in congratulating the United Kingdom. The Delegation noted the OUV of the site, and further congratulated the State Party for the conservation of the site. The Delegation considered that the World Heritage List would be improved with the inscription of the Forth Bridge.

The **Vice-Chairperson** requested for ICOMOS to respond to the Committee's questions.

The representative of **ICOMOS** clarified the concept of a “de-facto” buffer zone. ICOMOS specified that the State Party had made a clear commitment to protect the views of the bridge. ICOMOS underlined that the immediate environment was large and therefore in order to decide what areas needed protection, the United Kingdom had established a designated protection zone for 20 km around the site. ICOMOS reported that the State Party had also selected nine main vista points to further analyze them, and explained that these were in the process of being mapped out and incorporated into local development plans. ICOMOS added that the deadline for this

was 31 Dec 2015. The Delegation highlighted that these sightlines needed to be taken into account and should favour the protection of the site. ICOMOS stated that that this type of protection was tantamount to the protection of a buffer zone.

La Délégation du **Liban** remercie l'ICOMOS de ses explications mais maintient que l'utilisation du terme « zone tampon de facto » est très délicat, flou et vague. Elle estime qu'il peut justifier beaucoup de dérives car il n'a encore jamais été utilisé dans le cadre de la Convention. Elle considère qu'il vaut mieux éviter d'utiliser ce type de terminologie car il peut aboutir à des mauvaises compréhensions et ensuite à des revendications quelque peu bizarres.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted the unanimous support for inscription and asked the Rapporteur if any amendments to the Draft Decision had been received.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Vice-Chairperson that no amendments had been received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.33** was adopted.

The **Vice Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the entire Committee and gave the floor to the State Party for a 2 minute intervention.

**Mr. Marco Biagi**, Minister of the Scottish Government, delivered the following speech:

*“Thank you chair and host. It is my honour to be here as Minister of the Scottish Government. Four years ago I was elected by the people of Edinburgh, who live in a World Heritage Site.*

*I know how much that UNESCO honour means to them, and so I know that I speak for all the people of Scotland, as well as the Scottish and UK Governments, when I offer the Chair, members of the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre and its advisory bodies, particularly ICOMOS, our deepest thanks.*

*We have a saying that a job can be 'like painting the Forth Bridge'. It means necessary work that goes on and on. This is the bridge's 125th anniversary, and through all those years the bridge has operated in its original purpose - a rail bridge.*

*It has been sustained by the work of uncountable numbers of people through generations. That heritage of labour has been continued by the efforts of the partnership of local and national organisations through the Forth Bridge Forum, and the vital contribution of the UK Government that brought us here today.*

*The Bridge was built when every corner of Scotland heard the sound of tools on coal, and ships, and steel.*

*Their echoes are heard today in this honour. Scotland didn't just build great works of engineering, our works of engineering built us, and are part of how we see ourselves.*

*Today many countries must be congratulated for their nominations, but also thanked for the recognition they are granting us, and the kind words.*

*Those who live along the River Forth know well the sight of the Bridge's great red girders against the backdrop of the Ochil Hills, spanning a national natural barrier never previously overcome by hand of man.*

*Making the Forth Bridge the sixth World Heritage site on Scotland is an honour that shows this is a great industrial treasure not just to the city, to Scotland or the United Kingdom, but the entire world.*

*It must be cherished, and we will discharge that responsibility with care.*

*Once again, thank you.”*

Property	<b>The Naumburg Cathedral and the Landscape of the Rivers Saale and Unstrut - Territories of Power in the High Middle Ages</b>
Id. N°	<b>1470</b>
State Party	<b>Germany</b>

[continuation]

The **Vice-Chairperson** thanked the Minister and returned to the discussion of the nomination of the Naumburg Cathedral. The Vice-Chairperson requested for the Rapporteur to present the revised draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended draft decision, which proposed that the nomination should be deferred.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.33** was adopted as amended.

Property	<b>San Antonio Missions</b>
Id. N°	<b>1466</b>
State Party	<b>United States of America</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification for this nomination had been received.

The representative of **ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the San Antonio Missions in the United States of America and recommended its inscription on the World Heritage List.

La délégation du **Liban** a noté la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site et a encouragé les États-Unis à continuer d'inscrire d'autres sites similaires.



The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the inscription and congratulated the State Party.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that this was a serial site that helped to understand European missionaries in the new world. The Delegation recognized the merit of the site's OUV but questioned the omission of criteria (iii), which could enhance protection. The Delegation also requested for the State Party to provide clarifications on the concerns expressed by indigenous communities regarding developments in the buffer zone.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** considère que le rapport de l'ICOMOS est clair et que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site a été très bien démontrée. Elle considère par ailleurs que le classement de ce type de bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial est important et félicite donc l'Etat partie pour cette proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **India** noted the interchange between indigenous people, missionaries and colonizers, agreed with the OUV of the site and supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** fully supported the nomination, emphasizing its OUV and the integrity of the missions at the site. The Delegation fully supported the recommendation of ICOMOS and congratulated the State Party for safeguarding such a vital feature of the World's Heritage.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated the State Party, ICOMOS and the authorities of the State of Texas for the serial nomination. The Delegation fully supported inscription.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported inscription of this serial site, which shared the values of the Baroque Churches of the Philippines. The Delegation congratulated the State Party for its successful inscription.

The Delegation of **Finland** fully supported the site's inscription, and congratulated the State Party on its excellent nomination.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** echoed the previous speakers in congratulating the State Party and supported the inscription. The Delegation noted that in the comparative analysis, ICOMOS had used the word "assumes" and the Delegation suggested that this word not be used.

The Delegations of **Croatia, Qatar** and **Vietnam** congratulated the USA and its experts for the nomination and fully supported its inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** acknowledged the OUV and authenticity of the site and expressed support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that the San Antonio Missions was a remarkable site and congratulated the State Party on putting up an important nomination. The Delegation thanked the Advisory Body for its thorough evaluation, and supported the

inscription of this property, especially the Mission Valero, which was known as the Alamo among Japanese people.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted the OUV, congratulated the USA and fully supported the inscription.

La délégation de **l'Algérie** est favorable à l'inscription du bien d'autant plus que le rapport fait ressortir que le site est bien défendu par des descendants des populations autochtones qui ont réussi à empêcher le développement envisagé dans le parc historique. Elle félicite l'Etat Partie pour cette inscription.

La délégation de la **Colombie** souligne le caractère exceptionnel des échanges dont témoigne le bien ainsi que la préservation des valeurs locales. Elle félicite l'Etat partie pour cette proposition et appuie l'inscription du bien.

The **Vice Chairperson** requested for the USA to respond to the questions raised by Portugal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** indicated that the City of San Antonio had carefully investigated the remains of the historic irrigation channels in the Hemisfair development area. It indicated that, though they lack sufficient integrity to be included within the boundary of the nominated site, they are in the buffer zone will be preserved and interpreted.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the USA for its clarification, supported the inscription, and congratulated the State Party.

The **Vice Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur if any amendments to the draft decision had been received.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendments to the draft decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.34** was adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party of the USA for a 2 minute intervention.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** gave the floor to their Ambassador to UNESCO, H.E. Mrs. Crystal Nix-Hines, who made the following statement:

*Merci, Madame la présidente. C'est un plaisir d'être ici pour la première fois. We are honored to receive this inscription, and thank ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee, as well as our German hosts. When I visited the San Antonio Missions, I was struck by their intricate craftsmanship combining Spanish and Native American architecture. But what really stood out was how these communities not only merged architectural styles but integrated diverse cultures, languages, and traditions as well. As one indigenous woman, María de Luz, said in a recent documentary: "I find myself drawn to the Missions by something I can't quite explain. These were my people. The Pajalache. The Aranama. The*

*Tamique. They put these stones in place...Their hands dug these aqueducts, built these walls. These were my people. The People of the Missions."*

*Thank you for allowing us to share this rich history with the world.  
I now pass the microphone to Judge Nelson Wolff, who was instrumental in this wonderful nomination together.*

Bexar County Judge Nelson Wolff made the following intervention:  
*On behalf of the citizens of Bexar County, Texas, I want to thank you for this great honor. Bexar County provided funding to restore the ecosystem of the San Antonio River and the farm fields of Mission San Juan and create portals to each of the Missions to enhance their connection to the river. We take great pride in the Missions and surrounding areas and are committed to their continued protection. Thank you again. I would now like to introduce the Mayor of San Antonio, Ivy Taylor.*

The Mayor of San Antonio Mr. Ivy Taylor made the following intervention:  
*On behalf of the City of San Antonio, we are very honored to become a part of the UNESCO family of World Heritage Sites. As we join this noble circle, we recognize the dedication and hard work of the many organizations and individuals who worked tirelessly on this nomination. We reaffirm our commitment as a community to protect the Missions' outstanding universal value. Through this inscription, we welcome the world to San Antonio to experience the richness of the Spanish Colonial Missions, as well as our vibrant, colorful, cultural city.*

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 5 July 2015

THIRTEENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany) and  
Her Excellency Ruchira Kamboj (India)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST  
OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL  
PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

C.3. ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1. New Nominations (*continuation*)

Property	Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining
Id. N°	1484
State Party	Japan

The **Chairperson** explained how the session would be conducted for the nomination of the Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining. The Chairperson stated that the Secretariat and ICOMOS would in turn be given the floor and thereafter, the Chairperson would explain the proceedings for the nomination.

The **Secretariat** stated that it had received a factual error notification on the evaluation of the Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation of the site.

The **Chairperson** announced that Japan and the Republic of Korea had found an understanding and expressed gratitude to both Japan and the Republic of Korea in this regard. The Chairperson requested for the Committee to respect the proceedings that were about to be laid out. The Chairperson outlined the following points:

1. There would be no debate on the nomination. Rather, the Committee would proceed directly to the decision.
2. The Draft Decision 39 COM 8B.14 would be adopted with one change.
3. The change would be to add a footnote to point 4(g).

4. The footnote would refer to a statement made by Japan, on which both Japan and Korea have agreed upon.
5. The Japanese statement had been provided in writing and distributed to the Committee.
6. Following the adoption of the decision, Japan would present the statement orally.
7. As the working languages of the World Heritage Committee are English and French, the Committee would have both the English and French statements.
8. For Japan and Korea, the English version would be the binding version, since the English version was agreed upon by Japan and the Republic of Korea. To that extent, Japan and the Republic of Korea have agreed that the French version of the Japanese statement would be a non-binding translation of the English original.
9. Japan's statement would only be presented in the summary records of the session in English.
10. Japan's statement could therefore be a part of the decision of the Committee. Germany, at Japan's request, had prepared the necessary proposed changes and proposed these to the Secretariat.
11. As the adoption process for the decision proceeded, the Chairperson would ask the Rapporteur to read the changes before the decision is adopted.
12. The German Delegation would briefly explain the proposed change.
13. The Chairperson would then give the Committee time to familiarize itself with Japan's written statement.
14. The Chairperson would then move to have a consensus adoption on the basis of the draft that had been proposed by the German delegation.
15. The Chairperson requested that all Committee members and States Parties refrain from any comments on the draft decision.
16. After the acceptance of the decision on inscription, Japan would deliver its statement.
17. The Chairperson would then proceed to give the floor to the Republic of Korea.
18. Following the statements by Japan and the Republic of Korea, the Chairperson would conclude by making a brief presidential statement.
19. The Chairperson expressed hope that all Committee members and States Parties would agree on the procedure.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to move to the adoption of the decision. The Chairperson enquired if the Rapporteur had received any amendments to the draft decision.

The **Rapporteur** stated that he received an amendment from the Delegation of Germany to add a footnote to paragraph 4(g) of the draft decision. The Rapporteur read out the footnote as follows:

*“The World Heritage Committee takes note of the statement made by Japan, as regards the interpretive strategy that allows an understanding of the full history of each site as referred to in paragraph 4.g), which is contained in the Summary Record of the session (document WHC-15/39.COM/INF.19).”*

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Germany to explain their amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Germany** explained that in order to facilitate the procedure explained by the Chairperson, an amendment to the draft decision proposed by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre was necessary. Therefore, the Delegation indicated that it had submitted an amendment to paragraph 4(g) in the form of a footnote. The Delegation stated that the footnote would add to interpretive strategy recommended by ICOMOS to the State Party. The Delegation requested that all Committee members accept the decision in line with Japan's statement.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to give the Committee some time to read Japan's statement.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.14** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated Japan on the inscription and proceeded to give Japan the floor.

The Delegation of **Japan** delivered the following statement:

*"Madame Chairperson,*

*Thank you for the opportunity to deliver this statement on behalf of the Government of Japan.*

*It is quite an honor for the Government of Japan that the "Outstanding Universal Value" of this property has been duly evaluated and that, with the support of all Members of the Committee, it has been inscribed on the World Heritage List by a consensus decision.*

*The Government of Japan respects the ICOMOS recommendation that was made from technical and expert perspectives. Especially, in developing the "interpretive strategy," Japan will sincerely respond to the recommendation that the strategy allows "an understanding of the full history of each site."*

*More specifically, Japan is prepared to take measures that allow an understanding that there were a large number of Koreans and others who were brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions in the 1940s at some of the sites, and that, during World War II, the Government of Japan also implemented its policy of requisition.*

*Japan is prepared to incorporate appropriate measures into the interpretive strategy to remember the victims such as the establishment of information center.*

*The Government of Japan expresses its deep appreciation to Chairperson Böhmer, all Members of the World Heritage Committee and everyone involved in the process for their understanding of the "Outstanding Universal Value" of the property, and for their kind cooperation towards its inscription."*

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Japan for its statement and proceeded to give the floor to the Delegation of the Republic of Korea.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** delivered the following statement:

*“Madame Chair,*

*The Government of the Republic of Korea takes with utmost seriousness the statement just made by the Government of Japan before this Committee, in which it stated that “there were a large number of Koreans and others who were brought against their will and forced to work under harsh conditions in the 1940s at some of the sites, and that it is prepared to incorporate appropriate measures into the interpretive strategy to remember the victims such as the establishment of information center.” The Government of the Republic of Korea has decided to join the Committee’s consensus decision on this matter, as it has full confidence in the authority of the Committee and trusts that the Government of Japan will implement in good faith the measures it has announced before this august body today.*

*Today’s decision was made possible because not only the Republic of Korea and Japan, but also all other Members of the Committee, including the Federal Republic of Germany as the Chair, worked together to uphold the spirit of the World Heritage Convention that World Heritage is for all the peoples of the world.*

*The Government of the Republic of Korea would like to draw the Committee’s attention to Paragraph 6 of the decision which recommends Japan “to consider inviting ICOMOS to offer advice on the implementation of [its] recommendations.” We also believe that this Committee will continue to follow up on the Japanese government’s full implementation of its measures and the recommendations until its 42nd session in 2018 when the Committee is scheduled to examine a progress report which Japan is requested to submit to the World Heritage Centre by December 1, 2017. Such an all-encompassing process will ensure an understanding of the full history of each site, as was recommended by ICOMOS and the Committee.*

*Today’s decision marks another important step toward remembering the pain and suffering of the victims, healing the painful wounds of history, and reaffirming that the historical truth of the unfortunate past should also be reflected in an objective manner.*

*In closing, I would like to express my deep appreciation to you, Madame Chair, for your leadership and all Members of the Committee for their cooperation and support. Thank you very much indeed.”*

The **Chairperson** expressed gratitude to the Republic of Korea and congratulated Japan for the inscription of this property. The Chairperson underlined that the inscription was a success not just for Japan, but for the World Heritage Committee as a whole, as it demonstrated the importance of trust. The Chairperson stated that trust was the most important currency and this had shown its value in the inscription that had just taken place. The Chairperson further stated that the Republic of Korea and Japan had found an understanding which made possible the World Heritage Committee decision that had just been adopted. The Chairperson expressed the view that this demonstrated the strength and spirit of the Convention to bring people back together even in difficult times. The Chairperson emphasized that in the World Heritage Committee, there were men and women from all corners of the world who

were working for what united rather than what divided. The Chairperson stressed that the Committee was fully committed to international understanding, the culture of living together and peace. The Chairperson stated that this inscription was an outstanding victory for diplomacy. The Chairperson underlined that this decision by the Committee pointed to the future because it laid out the foundation for friendship between Japan, the Republic of Korea and beyond. The Chairperson reiterated her gratitude to Japan and the Republic of Korea for their contributions and actions taken, as well as thanked all who had been involved in the process. The Chairperson concluded by stating that all could be pleased with the outcome.

#### C.4. EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

##### C.4.2. Extensions of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	<b>Gelati Monastery</b> (Significant Boundary Modification of “Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery”)
Id. N°	<b>710 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Georgia</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for the proposed boundary modification of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation for the significant boundary modification of Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery in Georgia and recommended referral.

Le **Liban** demande à l'ICOMOS une clarification sur l'analyse comparative concernant ce bien, qui semble avoir été conduite uniquement en relation avec des sites géorgiens. Une telle analyse est-elle suffisante pour établir la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

**ICOMOS** stated that the assessment of the Gelati Monastery was conducted in order to check if the Monastery on its own could satisfy criterion (iv) and if it could be an adequate representation of the style of architecture. ICOMOS pointed out that the comparative analysis referred to “greater Georgia” and not just the boundaries of Georgia, and referred to the specific architectural style concerned, which is present in this area.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** stated it was satisfied with the clarification provided by ICOMOS. The Delegation expressed the view that an error had been made at the time of the inscription in terms of comparative analysis.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that according the evaluation of ICOMOS, the overall condition of integrity and authenticity were sufficient and that the property also met the criterion (iv). The Delegation further noted that the State Party had undertaken the actions recommended by ICOMOS regarding the boundaries and therefore expressed support for the draft decision.



The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.35** was adopted.

Property	<b>Routes of Santiago in Northern Spain</b> (Extension of "Route of Santiago de Compostela")
Id. N°	<b>669 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that a factual error notification had been received for the proposed extension of the Routes of Santiago de Compostela: Camino Francés and Routes of Northern Spain.

**ICOMOS** presented its evaluation for the proposed extension of the Routes of Santiago de Compostela: Camino Francés and Routes of Northern Spain.

The **Rapporteur** informed that no amendments to the draft decision were received.

The Decision **39 COM 8B.36** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Spain** (Observer) thanked ICOMOS for its recommendation and recognized the contributions of all stakeholders who had contributed to this effort. The Delegation thanked the Committee for their acceptance of the boundary extension. The Delegation stated that Europe was characterized by this historic route and that this route was the common platform for cultural exchange. The Delegation noted that the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage list since 1999. The Delegation further noted the exceptional and significant art and architecture of the property and underlined that the route was meeting point of various cultures, languages, knowledge and experiences of people from all over the world. The Delegation concluding by reiterating its thanks to the Advisory Body and all who had supported the boundary extension, as well as to the pilgrims who walked the route.

#### **C.4.3. Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

Property	<b>Ephesus</b>
Id. N°	<b>1018 Rev</b>
State Party	<b>Turkey</b>

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for the nomination of Ephesus.

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of Ephesus.

Le **Liban** estime que l'exclusion de la composante 4 (la maison de la Vierge Marie) de l'inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial, telle que proposée par l'ICOMOS, n'est pas justifiée. La Délégation soutient que la valeur exceptionnelle universelle d'Ephèse n'est pas seulement justifiée par le fait que ce site fut l'un de plus important de l'antiquité, mais aussi eu vu dans l'importance majeure pour la chrétienté. La maison de Vierge Marie illustre cette importance ; il s'agit par ailleurs d'un lieu de pèlerinage exceptionnel qui justifie le critère (vi). En conclusion, l'élément 4 doit être intégré, et le critère (vi) doit être ajouté. Un amendement est présenté par la délégation à cet effet.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated the State Party for presenting this property for nomination. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to conduct more research on the property as it had an important role for human civilization. The Delegation noted that the property included the temple of Artemis, one of the Seven Wonders of the World, and a manifestation of diverse religious practices. The Delegation supported ICOMOS's recommendation.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated Turkey for continuing its efforts to nominate the property following the deferral recommendation in 2001. The Delegation disagreed with the exclusion of the house of Virgin Mary from the inscription because the Delegation was of the view that the connection between this component and the other sites of Ephesus was clear.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the inclusion of criterion (vi) in the inscription. The Delegation acknowledged the OUV of the property congratulated Turkey for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Philippines** recalled that the property had first been submitted by the State Party in 2001 and appreciated the hard work undertaken by the State Party with ICOMOS to bring it towards a successful outcome. The Delegation agreed that the property should be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Le **Sénégal** félicite la Turquie pour ce bien à la longue et riche histoire. Intégrité, protection adéquate valeur universelle exceptionnelle : l'ensemble des conditions nécessaires à l'inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial est réuni. La délégation se joint au Liban pour demander que l'élément 4 (la maison de la Vierge) fasse aussi partie du bien inscrit, en soulignant que Marie, ou Mariama, est vénérée aussi par l'Islam.

The Delegation of **India** noted that all the proposed criteria were met and congratulated Turkey for the nomination.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party for this exceptional serial nomination, which well-demonstrated the OUV of the site. The Delegation stated that the property was a testimony to the history of Christianity and fully supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged the OUV of the site and recognized the property as one of the wonders of the world and the capital of Asia Minor. The Delegation congratulated Turkey for the nomination of this property.

The Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the State Party and expressed appreciation for the hard work undertaken by the State Party since 2001. The Delegation requested that component 4 be included in the inscription as it represented an important part of the history of Ephesus.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party stated that this property added extraordinary value to the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** dit que par l'inscription de ce bien dans la Liste du Patrimoine mondial, une dette historique sera honorée. Elle souligne que la décision de différer cette nomination, il y a une dizaine d'années, a permis la réalisation d'une série de fouilles archéologiques qui ont permis d'assurer la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien. La délégation appuie aussi l'inclusion de la composante 4 dans le bien inscrit, et félicite la Turquie.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** congratulated Turkey for the nomination and remarked that the site was an exceptional testimony of Roman history.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully supported the inscription of the property and congratulated Turkey.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the inscription of the property. The Delegation acknowledged the serial components of the site. The Delegation stated that with regards to the components, the long historical life cycle of the site must be emphasized. The Delegation acknowledged that the property not only encompassed its ancient history, but was also an important site for the early Christian community and that the elements of Islamic influence should be acknowledged as well.

**ICOMOS** explained that the exclusion of component 4 was related to the fact that even in the case that component 4 could support the application of criteria (vi), this could not be applied to the entire series. ICOMOS stated that each of the elements of the component parts should contribute to the OUV through all of the criteria, and that for this reason, component 4 and criteria (vi) were excluded. However, ICOMOS acknowledged the valuable feedback from Committee members in this regard.

The **Rapporteur** explained the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.37** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Turkey** delivered a short statement and expressed its satisfaction and gratitude for the inscription of this site and commended the professionalism of the team in charge of the nomination, which included multiple layers of different civilizations across centuries. The Delegation affirmed Turkey's commitment to protect the immense and iconic site which belonged to all humanity.

## C.5. LATIN AMERICAN / THE CARIBBEAN

### C.5.1. New Nominations

Property	<b>Aqueduct of Padre Tembleque Hydraulic System</b>
Id. N°	<b>1425</b>
State Party	<b>Mexico</b>

ICOMOS presented the evaluation of the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutien l'inscription de ce bien et insiste sur la recommandation de l'ICOMOS de renforcer l'infrastructure sur place destiné aux touristes de respecter les normes.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** support la décision d'inscrire le bien sur la liste de Patrimoine Mondial grâce à ses valeurs extraordinaires. La Délégation félicite la preuve de respect et la tolérance envers la diversité culturelle des peuples autochtones et elle souligne la coordination performante entre les diverses institutions et municipalités envers la conservation du bien.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS for their efforts, and commended the nomination for being an outstanding example of hydraulic water architecture, which demonstrated the interchanges between Roman and Mesoamerican engineering techniques. The Delegation fully supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Germany** highlighted that the inscription of the Aqueduct of Padre Tembleque was an example of an engineering masterpiece of the Renaissance and would contribute to filling a gap on the List, just as The Forth Bridge (United Kingdom) inscribed earlier in the day represented an engineering masterpiece of the 19th century. The Delegation supported the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated State Party for putting forth the nomination. The Delegation highlighted that the hydraulic system was an outstanding example of water conduction in the Americas and its architectural structure and technological achievements spoke on behalf of its OUV. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Croatia** commended the nomination as a testimony to the Mexican effort to create a more balanced and representative World Heritage List as part of the Global Strategy. The Delegation acknowledged that the traditional management of the property for over 450 years, and the fact that it continued to be sustainable in the future, affirmed the excellent architecture and craftsmanship of the unique aqueduct. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'État Partie pour sa proposition du bien et elle soutien son inscription sur la liste de Patrimoine Mondial.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated Mexico for its nomination of an outstanding heritage canal. The Delegation endorsed the inscription of the site and commended both the State Party and the Advisory Bodies for this nomination, as a testament to what could be realized when all stakeholders work together.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** congratulated Mexico for its nomination of a unique hydraulic system with its interconnected Mesoamerican and European influences. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation congratulated **Mexico** for its nomination of an outstanding aqueduct that represented a perfect interchange of human values. The Delegation also emphasized that the evaluation process of the nomination was a testament to ICOMOS's efforts in initiating dialogue with the State Party, and expressed support for the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Peru** commended the aqueduct as a masterpiece of hydraulic works that was very important in the cultural history of the Latin America region and for mankind as a whole. The Delegation was of the view that the entire architecture and design of the aqueduct was a truly unique example of the mixture of two cultural traditions, the European tradition of Roman hydraulics and traditional Mesoamerican construction techniques. The Delegation underlined that the fact that the aqueduct had remained in operation, uninterrupted for 450 years, was thanks to local support that deployed ancestral means to ensure that the water could flow through irrigation canals to benefit people living in the area. The Delegation affirmed that the OUV was clearly demonstrated and that the site's inscription would enrich the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the Republic of **Philippines** congratulated the State Party for its nomination and commended the aqueduct not only as a masterpiece of engineering, but for serving its purpose till this very day. The Delegation stressed the important role that local communities play in the management of the aqueduct, evidenced in how the same communities who benefitted from these services have also kept it operating. The Delegation affirmed its trust in the local communities to ensure that water would continue to flow through relying on the same techniques.

La Délégation de **Qatar** félicite l'État Partie pour son travail professionnel en ce qui concerne la préparation du dossier et elle support l'inscription sur la liste de Patrimoine Mondial.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** note que l'Eau est une thématique de grande actualité et que ce projet montre la grande ingéniosité des hommes de capter cette sources vitales. La Délégation souligne que le bien proposé mérite l'inscription sur la liste de Patrimoine Mondial avec tous ces caractéristiques uniques et exceptionnelles.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** congratulated Mexico and commended the strong OUV of the site. The Delegation emphasized that the site was recognized as living heritage which was still in use by local communities. The Delegation expressed its hope that the system of conservation employed at the aqueduct be shared among State Parties

and stakeholders of similar properties all over the world. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** highlighted the importance of aqueducts in the development of human settlements and fully supported the recommendation to inscribe the site on the list. The Delegation also expressed satisfaction that the comparative study prepared by Mexico on the Aqueduct of Padre Tembleque was developed in Portugal based on Portuguese aqueducts previously inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Serbia** underlined that the physical manifestation of the hydraulic system had been well-preserved in various elements and was an authentic example of a hydraulic system. The Delegation stated that the combination of old wisdom and techniques with the new technology and capabilities of humankind, as this site represented, was needed to secure water for everybody, and would be important for the future. The Delegation expressed its support for the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported the site's inscription and congratulated Mexico for the nomination. The Delegation was of the view that with the definition of boundaries, criterion (v) could be satisfied.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** complimented the property as a masterpiece of the Renaissance and of industrial engineering. The Delegation also commended Mexico's close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies in developing this nomination and expressed its support for inscription.

**ICOMOS** stated that the main reason for the exclusion of criterion (v) was that the boundaries of the nominated property did not contain significant areas of the landscape nominated under criterion (v). ICOMOS informed that for criterion (v) to be applicable, the State Party would have to illustrate how the proposed landscape interacted with the hydraulic system in order for both elements to be seen as a full complex.

The **Vice-Chairperson** drew the Committee's attention to the change in name of the property to the Aqueduct of Padre Tembleque Hydraulic System.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.38** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Mexico** (Observer), on behalf of the Government of Mexico, thanked the Chairperson and the Government of Germany for organizing the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation acknowledged that while there were already examples of aqueducts in Spain and Portugal inscribed on the World Heritage List, as well as the Roman aqueducts in Italy, the aqueduct of Padre Tembleque was the first non-urban aqueduct to be placed on the List and remained operational today. The Delegation underlined that the construction of the aqueduct was a demonstration of knowledge on building with various materials using cultural traditions from Andalusia and Mesoamerica. The Delegation affirmed that this was a perfect testimony of the way of life of local communities. The Delegation expressed its commitment to World Heritage and UNESCO for the progression of the Convention and the protection of properties on the World Heritage List. The

Delegation acknowledged that inscription was a great responsibility that Mexico would pull together to fulfill, with the active participation and involvement of local communities. The Delegation also expressed that it was pleased with the inscription of the San Antonio Missions (United States of America).

The second representative of the Delegation of **Mexico** said that the site embodied both Mesoamerican traditions and European influences, and a strong example of indigenous culture that had evolved over decades. The Delegation commended the efforts of the National Institute of Anthropology and History in Mexico, the Ministry of Culture, Arts and Heritage, the State and Municipal Governments as well as local authorities in making this nomination possible. The Delegation underlined the 450-year history of the monument, the fact that it had been maintained by the local communities in an exceptional way as a unique piece of hydraulic architecture and its continued purpose as a living aqueduct. The Delegation also highlighted that the outstanding partnership with and participation of women had also contributed to the maintenance of the site, and took the opportunity to send a message of gender equality in water maintenance. The Delegation also emphasized the important role that local communities play and expressed gratitude to the Committee Members and the Advisory Bodies for the inscription of the site.

Property	<b>Fray Bentos Industrial Landscape</b>
Id. N°	<b>1464</b>
State Party	<b>Uruguay</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the evaluation of the site.

The Delegation of **Colombia** highlighted that this was the second World Heritage nomination for Uruguay and underlined that the nomination was in recognition of 20th century industrial values. The Delegation emphasized that the upstream process, in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, allowed the preparation of this nomination and encouraged Uruguay to share their experience with other States Parties. The Delegation affirmed the positive ability of Uruguay to protect its heritage and supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated Uruguay for its nomination of an industrial-cultural landscape. The Delegation was of the view that OUV had been clearly demonstrated and that the site was a testimony to how people and nature have joined together to create something favorable for the development of humankind, in terms of improving social and economic conditions. The Delegation agreed with the ICOMOS report to inscribe the property based on criteria (ii) and (iv). The Delegation highlighted that the cultural landscape was representative of an integrated industrial production with mechanization and the environment. Regarding ICOMOS's recommendations to ensure the management and protection of the property, especially in terms of keeping maximum legal protection for the buffer zone, the Delegation stressed that it was also important to work on these plans with the involvement of the community, especially the local businesses situated in Fray Bentos.

The Delegation of the Republic of **Philippines** congratulated Uruguay for its nomination as an outstanding ensemble representative of processes for meat sourcing, packing and dispatch in the 20th century. The Delegation underlined that these practices for meatpacking have impacted the world up to the present day. The Delegation also highlighted that the site represented the confluence of German technology, English economy and local practices. The Delegation welcomed the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Portugal** underlined that industrial sites was currently an underrepresented category on the World Heritage List and commended the State Party for presenting the nomination. The Delegation said that from the mid-18th century, the industrial economy had played an important role in the daily lives of the local population. The Delegation highlighted that the site still remained important in the present day to the local people, who still have social and cultural attachments to the site. The Delegation stressed the need to see the site as living heritage, as not just as a museum to visit. The Delegation also pointed out the cosmopolitan nature of the site, where workers came from many different origins. The Delegation highlighted the fact that technical and scientific contributions that the site made to the meat sourcing, packing and dispatch process were closely linked to 20th century European history. The Delegation welcomed the State Party's continued involvement of local communities in the new life of the site as a World Heritage property, expressed assurance that Uruguay would follow through with ICOMOS's recommendation and supported the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** noted that historical significance of the site as an outstanding example of early 20th century industrial production had met the conditions of authenticity and integrity, and justified OUV. The Delegation expressed its support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Japan** highlighted the contributions of the site to the meat sorting industry and its innovations in producing cured meat that made the long distance transport of meat possible. The Delegation expressed that the site had a huge impact on the world economy and supported inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** note que les installations du paysage industrielles du bien ont marqués leur temps. Elle souligne que le Liban est directement impliqué dans cette opération car les immigrants ont profité de ses installations futuristes. La Délégation félicite l'ICOMOS et les autorités du pays pour son travail.

The Delegation of **India** welcomed the addition of another industrial property to the List, as an evidence of the interchange of human values that had a great impact on the social, cultural and economic changes taking place in the 20th century.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** highlighted that the site included equipment and technology for the development of the meat processing industry that was a model for other parts of the world. The Delegation expressed confidence that OUV was demonstrated and supported inscription.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated Uruguay and stated that the nomination was a successful case of the Upstream Process. The Delegation noted



that the site was an outstanding example of industrial heritage, having given rise to the international exchange of technology and research for the meat processing industry. The Delegation acknowledged that the property was still being used in the present day, where descendants of former workers were still living in the residential area. The Delegation highlighted that this was a testimony to the living nature of the site, and how it had contributed to social and economic development over the years. The Delegation noted that sites with functions of adaptive reuse were never easy to protect, but recognized that the State Party had provided a timetable to address ICOMOS's recommendations. The Delegation supported inscription and also expressed its hope to see the State Party make considerable progress in the management of the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated Uruguay for their nomination as a successful example of the Upstream Process. The Delegation was of the view that the site presented all the necessary evidence to illustrate the global food production enterprise, and supported the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Germany** affirmed that Fray Bentos presented a unique example of industrial development in South America and the exchanges between many countries. The Delegation noted that Fray Bentos had a role to play in the export of canned meat, using a German technique, mainly to Europe during World War Two when meat was scarce. The Delegation endorsed the inscription of the site and congratulated the State Party.

The Delegation of **Serbia** recognized that Fray Bentos was an example of early-20th century industrial development that demonstrated the exchange of human values, resulting in changes in both South America and Europe. The Delegation noted that the comparative analysis was justified, all conditions for OUV were satisfied, legal protections were in place, and therefore supported the site's inscription. The Delegation also expressed confidence that the State Party would be fully committed to carry out ICOMOS's recommendations on the management plan, and noted that the State Party had also provided a timetable for implementation. The Delegation recognized that the nomination was a result of the cooperation between the State Party and ICOMOS from the upstream process, which demonstrated that dialogue at an early stage and continued communication was an important tool to ensure better protection of heritage.

La Délégation de **Viet Nam** félicite l'État Partie et soutient pleinement le projet de décision. La Délégation souligne qu'elle est très heureuse de partager la fierté parce que il n'y a beaucoup de pays en voie de développement qui peuvent présenter une telle nomination complète et professionnelle.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated both the State Party and the Advisory Body for their cooperation during the dialogue and consultation process, which led to a successful inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** commended Fray Bentos for being a symbol of technological progress, a reminder of economic success as well as having evidenced a strong relationship between the natural and human environment. The Delegation

fully supported ICOMOS's recommendation to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List, and congratulated the State Party.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souligne que le paysage industrielle du bien mérite pleinement son inscription sur la liste de Patrimoine Mondial. La Délégation élabore sur toutes les caractéristiques exceptionnelles du bien comme, entre autres, la représentation de l'échange entre le monde européen et américain. Elle note aussi que le site est pleinement intégré dans le paysage immédiat. La Délégation félicite l'État Partie pour cette présentation du bien et pour la parfaite collaboration avec les organisations consultatives.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne également le valeur exceptionnelle de ce bien qui montre, entre autres, la diversité culturelle et l'échange entre les civilisations. La Délégation félicite très fortement l'État Partie pour cette nomination.

La Délégation du **Qatar** joint les autres orateurs et exprime son soutien pour l'inscription de ce site.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated Uruguay for Fray Bentos being an important addition to the World Heritage List and fully supported its inscription.

**ICOMOS** highlighted that the positive result of Fray Bentos' inscription was attributed to the Upstream Process, and thanked the State Party for being part of the pilot project.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.39** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Uruguay** (Observer) thanked UNESCO, the GRULAC countries and all Committee Members for their support. The Delegation acknowledged that the successful nomination was due to the Upstream Process, which provided considerable encouragement and support in the preparation of the nomination. The Delegation also expressed gratitude to the local authorities, national Government, the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their support throughout the different stages of the nomination. The Delegation affirmed that heritage of Fray Bentos recounted the final stages of industrialization and that the site was important to humankind as it exported food products all over the world. The Delegation saluted the men and women who worked and lived there, as well as those who currently manage the companies, associations and schools that still operated there. The Delegation highlighted that the local community had shown great will to support this initiative and made human and material resources available in this regard. The Delegation underlined that Fray Bentos was looking steadfastly toward the future to meet the challenges of sustainable development in working towards a green economy and the use of clean energy, which would help to mitigate the effects of climate change. The Delegation affirmed that Fray Bentos was a symbol of collective memory in Uruguay and a site that the country was very proud of. The Delegation underlined that with the inscription, the site would not just be recognized in the food industry around the world, but also for its high cultural value as well. The Delegation expressed its hope that the successful inscription will help people to better understand their past and build a sound future.

The **representative from the Municipality of Rio Negro** underlined that the country had worked hard for the inscription to ensure the future of the living site. The representative affirmed the responsibility of Fray Bentos to continue in leading research and knowledge in this area, and to improve the quality of life for the local communities and all people.

*The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.*

EIGHTH DAY– MONDAY 6 July 2015

FOURTEENTH MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	<b>Lena Pillars Nature Park</b>
Id. N°	<b>1299 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Russian Federation</b>

IUCN presented its evaluation of the minor boundary modification of Lena Pillars Nature Park, Russian Federation.

The Draft Decision **39COM 8B.40** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its happiness on behalf of the people of Russia for the inclusion of Sinsky Plot to the property. The Delegation highlighted both the importance and vulnerability of the site that provided vital resources for the survival of the indigenous communities and warranted special attention. The Delegation assured the Committee that the Committee's decision would ensure the preservation of the property for future generations.

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 minor boundary modification of Darien National Park, Panama.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** requested for clarification on the decision for referral and the challenges faced by the State Party in addressing the issues.

**IUCN** explained that the challenge was having enough time to deal with legal process to move forward. IUCN elaborated that from its recent interaction with the responsible authorities, IUCN had suggested that the State Party consult with the World Heritage Centre to ensure that adequate maps were provided and that consultation with indigenous peoples have taken place.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.41** was adopted.

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

Property	<b>Abbey Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe</b>
Id. N°	<b>230 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>France</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Abbey Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe, France.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.42** was adopted.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura</b>
Id. N°	<b>91 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>Holy See / Italy</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Historic Centre of Rome, the Properties of the Holy See in that City Enjoying Extraterritorial Rights and San Paolo Fuori le Mura, Holy See / Italy.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.43** was adopted.

Property	<b>Historic Centre of Florence</b>
Id. N°	<b>174 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Historic Centre in Florence, Italy.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.44** was adopted.

Property	<b>Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto)</b>
Id. N°	<b>826 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Italy</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of Portovenere, Cinque Terre, and the Islands (Palmaria, Tino and Tinetto), Italy.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.45** was adopted.

Property	<b>Megalithic Temples of Malta</b>
Id. N°	<b>132 Ter</b>
State Party	<b>Malta</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Megalithic Temples of Malta, Malta.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.46** was adopted.

Property	<b>Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor</b>
Id. N°	<b>125 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Montenegro</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor, Montenegro.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.47** was adopted.

Property	<b>Old Town of Cáceres</b>
Id. N°	<b>384 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Old Town of Cáceres, Spain.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.48** was adopted.

Property	<b>Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct</b>
Id. N°	<b>311 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>Spain</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of boundaries of the Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct, Spain.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.49** adopted.

Property	<b>Heart of Neolithic Orkney</b>
Id. N°	<b>514 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>United Kingdom</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor boundary modification of the Heart of Neolithic Orkney, United Kingdom.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.50** adopted.

Property	<b>Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville</b>
Id. N°	<b>442 Bis</b>
State Party	<b>United States of America</b>

**ICOMOS** presented the minor modification of boundaries of Monticello and the University of Virginia in Charlottesville, United States of America.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.51** was adopted.

The **Secretariat** presented the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of the 12 properties that were originally recommended for referral or deferral, but were inscribed at the 38th session (Doha, 2014) and hence were only adopted provisionally by the Committee at that juncture. The SOUVs were for the following properties:

- Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru)
- The Grand Canal (China)
- Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey (Germany)
- Shahr-i Sokhta, (Islamic Republic of Iran)
- Erbil Citadel (Iraq)
- Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche (Mexico)
- Pyu Ancient Cities (Myanmar)
- Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir (Palestine)
- Historic Jeddah, the Gate to Makkah (Saudi Arabia)

Bursa and Cumalıkızık: the Birth of the Ottoman Empire (Turkey)  
Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape (Turkey)  
Monumental Earthworks of Poverty Point (United States of America)

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8B.52** was adopted.

## **ITEM 7 STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES** *(continuation)*

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

#### **Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710) - 39 COM 7A.40**

The **Vice-Chairperson** recalled the decision of the Committee to discuss the State of Conservation of the Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) following the examination of the major boundary modification of the property in 39 COM 8B.35.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.40** was adopted as amended.

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

#### **Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801 bis) – 39 COM 7A.4 REV**

The Delegation of **Germany** recalled that two meetings that had taken place between Germany, Poland, Senegal, Kenya, Ethiopia as well as IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to ensure that the OUV of the property was not affected by developments at the site. The Delegation elaborated that the meeting's main focus was the implementation of the Environment Impact Assessment to determine how the OUV would be affected. The Delegation affirmed that the States Parties of Ethiopia and Kenya would continue their efforts to ensure the protection of OUV in line with the Convention, through establishment of a joint ministerial commission. The Delegation thanked the Chief of the Africa Unit of the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for facilitating the discussions.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7B.4 REV** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** (Observer) thanked the State Party of Kenya, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for their cooperation and all other Committee Members who had engaged in consultation on this issue. The Delegation stated that they were committed to protecting heritage in their country through the preparation of a development strategy in this regard. The Delegation also affirmed Ethiopia and Kenya's cooperation to work together on the Environmental Impact Assessment and to present this report accordingly.



The Delegation of **Kenya** (Observer) thanked the State Party of Ethiopia, and also expressed its gratitude to the States Parties that had helped to preserve the OUV of the site as well as IUCN for their technical support.

### **Debate on Decision 39 COM 7: Global Overview of the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties**

The Delegation of **Poland** stated that State of Conservation directly impacted the credibility of the Convention and the World Heritage List. The Delegation affirmed the importance of Reactive Monitoring but acknowledged that such missions were not easy to conduct since it demanded deep knowledge of a particular site and its local situation. The Delegation highlighted the imperative of finding an operational solution to help countries in the protection of their heritage as well as to provide the Committee with a full insight on the monitoring process. The Delegation recognized the urgency and necessity to discuss the objectives of Reactive Monitoring and indicated that it had proposed amendments to the Operational Guidelines in this regard. The Delegation shared that its experience in the monitoring process had shown the importance of involving local communities in the protection of the site and their commitment to implement the recommendations of the Committee. The Delegation also stressed the importance of capacity-building concerning Environment and Heritage Impact Assessments starting from the level of property management.

The Delegation of **Finland** underlined four main issues arising from the debate on the State of Conservation. First, the Delegation highlighted the need for adequate management systems and plans to be in place. Second, the Delegation stressed the need for international cooperation to resolve the issue of poaching. Third, the Delegation pointed out the need to address the cumulative impacts on OUV in natural and cultural properties through Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments. Lastly, the Delegation also stressed the need for timely delivery of State of Conservation reports for better decision making in the Committee.

**IUCN** emphasized the importance of the Committee's decision for Reactive Monitoring as it was the decision that gave the mandate for the mission that followed and ensured that the issues described conform to what the Committee wished to investigate. IUCN affirmed that the focus on heritage, environmental and social impact assessment was crucial and that capacity-building was needed in this respect. IUCN agreed with the four points raised by the Delegation of Finland, particularly on the need for adequate management systems and plans to be in place as well as the timely delivery of State of Conservation reports by the States Parties to give the Advisory Bodies sufficient time to prepare their reports for the Committee. IUCN also noted the importance of species conservation in World Heritage areas and shared about the efforts of IUCN's Save Our Species (SOS) programme. IUCN shared that the SOS programme was a funding coordination programme that was working in a number of World Heritage sites and expressed its hope to move towards a more systematic window for species conservation needs to be identified with World Heritage sites. IUCN extended the offer to facilitate discussions between interested States Parties and the SOS programme for species conservation activities.

**ICOMOS** welcomed the merged report of key issues arising from State of Conservation reports and acknowledged the need to respect complexity in the

properties as well as to have more interdisciplinary approaches and management at the national level. ICOMOS noted the need for joint sustainable development to define how individual properties related to this issue. ICOMOS expressed the view that inappropriate development activities were the result of weak management systems, which was also related to the lack of coordination. ICOMOS stated that while Reactive Monitoring missions were useful, sustained dialogue between all stakeholders was also important. ICOMOS stressed that a property's inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not a punishment for the State Party, but rather an opportunity for support and collaboration to overcome the problems. ICOMOS also drew the Committee's attention to properties affected by conflicts and proposed the need for a policy framework to support the reconstruction of properties in post-conflict situations or in the aftermath of natural disasters. ICOMOS welcomed greater dialogue to support States Parties in this respect.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to the Draft Decision 39 COM 7.

The delegation of **Turkey** requested for the language used in the amendment of Finland.

The delegation of **Finland** agreed with Turkey's statement.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la proposition.

**The Assistant Director-General for Culture** proposed that the result of the last two workshops held by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre on this matter should be added to amendments.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, après l'intervention de l'ADG/CLT, précise qu'ils n'ont jamais vu les documents mentionnés. Ils n'ont pas été soumis à l'attention des membres du Comité. La Délégation se demande comment le Comité pourrait prendre une décision sans les connaître.

**The Assistant Director-General for Culture** noted that no document had been circulated yet about that seminar.

La Délégation du **Sénégal**, suite à la précision donnée par l'ADG/CLT, n'exprime plus de commentaires sur ce sujet.

The Delegation of **Philippines** said that it had no problems with the proposed amendments.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7** was adopted as amended.

The Vice-Chairperson announced that the Bureau had decided that Item 8C would be discussed at the following day's session.

## **ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

### **8D. CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE BOUNDARY**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/8D

*Decision:* **39 COM 8D**

The **Secretariat** presented the Draft Decision 39 COM 8D.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments had been received on this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8D** was adopted.

### **8E. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/8E.Rev

*Decision:* **39 COM 8E**

The **Secretariat** presented the Draft Decision 39 COM 8E.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments had been received on this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8E** was adopted.

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

### **9A. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE UPSTREAM PROCESSES**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/9A

*Decision:* **39 COM 9A**

The **Secretariat** presented the progress report on the Upstream Processes and the Draft Decision.

In the joint statement of the **Advisory Bodies** (ICOMOS and IUCN), they recalled the ten pilot projects of the Upstream Process which resulted in the successful inscription of properties on the World Heritage List. The Advisory Bodies shared that they have been invited by some States Parties for consultations on their Tentative Lists. The Advisory Bodies noted that moving forward, the main challenges would be to mainstream the Upstream Process such that it became part of the Convention,

and to ensure that adequate resources were available to all States Parties in this regard. The Advisory Bodies welcomed the recommendations from the Operational Guidelines working group recommendation to integrate the Upstream Process into the text of the Operational Guidelines but expressed concerns about the limited International Assistance available, which meant that the process could be only available to the States Parties that could financially support it.

The Advisory Bodies noted that it was the countries with many sites on the World Heritage List that also had greater access to financial resources for the Upstream Process. The Advisory Bodies shared that one possibility to bridge this gap was the utilization of Skype conferences with the States Parties in place of advisory missions. The Advisory Bodies noted that while this may entail no costs for the States Parties, there were limitations in the resources of the Advisory Bodies, which meant that they would not be able to give advice to all States Parties requesting for it. The Advisory Bodies highlighted that the Upstream Process had also offered guidance on the State of Conservation for properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List, as well as on issues of protection, management and the impact of development on the OUV, and therefore welcomed further dialogue with the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported the statement of Advisory Bodies and shared that it had benefitted from the Upstream Process for their successful inscription. The Delegation highlighted the benefits of the process and dialogue with Advisory Bodies in helping States Parties understand how to improve their nominations. The Delegation affirmed that the World Heritage Centre should continue to pursue this process.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed the view that the Upstream Process could also help States Parties to prepare their State of Conservation reports on time. The Delegation said that it would be interested to find out more about the successful case studies of properties that have benefited from this process. The Delegation underlined that this process could help sites that have the potential, but not necessarily the resources, to be inscribed in the list as well as provide the opportunity to address conservation issues on time. The Delegation also shared that it had collaborated with some States Parties in the Asia and the Pacific region to support their nominations and expressed its hope to help contribute financially to the implementation of the process in future.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** recalled that one of the pilot projects was a property that it had on the Tentative List and shared that the identification and definition of this property had taken place in consultation and dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and relevant stakeholders. The Delegation regretted that the mission to its site was not conducted earlier in order for the report to be prepared before the Committee session. The Delegation agreed with the statement of the Advisory Bodies and encouraged the Committee to help to promote the Upstream Process to ensure that it could be more beneficial for Less Developed Countries and countries that were currently underrepresented on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** regretted that only a few properties had benefitted from the Upstream Processes over the past two years. The Delegation proposed for a workshop to be organized as a side event at the 40th session and offered its help

and support to States Parties in need of assistance. The Delegation also offered more suggestions to the Thematic Programmes offered on the website of the World Heritage Centre, such as archaeological sites, industrial areas, group of monuments, rock art and pre-historic sites.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their work on the Upstream Process and remarked that advice should be given in the early stages of preparing Tentative Lists and nominations. The Delegation noted that the lack of funding could constraint the success of the process.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the institutionalization of the Upstream Process in the Operational Guidelines, but at the same time, the Delegation also noted the financial constraints for implementation. The Delegation noted that directing additional financing for the Upstream Process would further exacerbate the imbalance between the demand for funds and the availability of resources. The Delegation underlined that additional resources should be used in an effective manner, where a set of criteria could be established to select sites for the Upstream Process, prioritizing trans-boundary and mixed sites, as well as sites from Least Developed Countries. The Delegation emphasized that innovative solutions were needed and suggested that countries pay for advisory services for the upstream process as well as conservation purposes. The Delegation proposed that one solution could be that countries paying for advisory services for the Upstream Process could also provide an equal amount of voluntary contributions for International Assistance specifically for conservation and management. The Delegation was of the view that in this way, the share of funding going towards conservation purposes would not further diminish in relation to the funding going towards new nominations.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that the outcomes of six out of the ten pilot projects were still pending, and commended the successful cases. The Delegation proposed that the upstream process should continue to provide assistance to less developed countries.

La Délégation de **Colombie** souligne les résultats positifs constatés. Elle note que ce rapport illustre clairement les avancés faites grace à ce processus. La Délégation suggère que ce processus soit également appliqué aux Listes Indicatives.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** note que ce processus est intéressant. Cependant, elle souligne qu'il doit rester, pour l'instant, expérimental. Il faut prendre en compte que le coût éventuel lié à sa mise en œuvre pourrait créer une discrimination entre les pays. De ce fait, cette question relève de l'éthique de la Convention. Il est nécessaire de prendre tout le temps nécessaire pour bien analyser les résultats. Il faut surtout préserver la liberté des Etats Parties leur permettant d'avoir le choix de la demander ou pas.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** commended the efforts of the Advisory Bodies and shared from their own experience that the Upstream Process was very beneficial for States Parties. The Delegation agreed with Jamaica that the Upstream Process should now move from being experimental to operational. The Delegation also supported Senegal's statement that the Upstream Process should be a choice for

States Parties as they deem important and appropriate. The Delegation enquired on the possibility of having more experts for different types of dossiers, rather than just one expert who could only specialize in a certain type of dossier.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged the importance of the upstream process and its successful outcomes. The Delegation also supported the statements of the Delegations of Germany and Viet Nam.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked the Centre and ICOMOS for their participation in the Upstream Process for the Silk Roads serial nomination. The Delegation considered that the 4th meeting of the International Coordinating Committee for this project, with the participation of the 12 countries concerned, three observing countries and the Centre, could take place in September or October.

The Delegation of **Slovenia** (Observer) commended the instrumental role that the Advisory Bodies and the Centre have played in the Upstream Process and affirmed that this was a useful initiative for States Parties.

**ICCROM** drew the Committee's attention to the fact that the Upstream Process could be a tool for capacity-building. While the current focus of the initiative was on the nomination of a single site, it could be expanded to help the States Parties in the training of their experts. In the long term, this could help States Parties improve their nominations as well as the conservation and management of sites. ICCROM expressed its interest to work with more State Parties on this, especially regarding the potential use of the Upstream Processes in State of Conservation and Reactive Monitoring.

**The Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked all the delegations and Advisory Bodies for their comments and support. The Director highlighted the importance of ICCROM's comment on the contribution of the Upstream Process to capacity-building efforts not just for nominations, but conservation activities as well. The Director highlighted that the Upstream Process was not just limited to the ten pilot projects, but also to the Silk Roads project as indicated by the Delegation of Kazakhstan as well as the Qhapaq Nan roads system involving six countries, the latter of which was only possible thanks to extra-budgetary resources. The Director shared that extra-budgetary resources have also enabled courses to be organized to mentor focal points in the regions to review Tentative Lists, comment on draft nominations, prepare statements of OUV and to conduct a proper Comparative Analysis. The Director said that this had been done extensively in the Africa, Caribbean as well as in the Pacific region, particularly for Small Island Developing States.

The Director stated that with recommendations being mainstreamed in the Operational Guidelines, the Upstream Process has now gone from being experimental to operational. In response to the points raised by the Delegations of Senegal and Viet Nam, the Director underlined that this was purely an option that States Parties could make a choice on. The Director thanked the Delegation of Japan for their support in initiating this process since 2008 and also underlined that early interventions in the preparation of Tentative Lists was a crucial step to enhance credibility and to recognize the existence of OUV. The Director noted the comments

by the Republic of Philippines on early missions and thanked Turkey for its proposal to have a workshop as a side event at the 40th session. In response to the point raised by Turkey on expanding the information available on the website of the World Heritage Centre, the Director stated that this could be done to cover other categories of sites but shared that the information currently on the website was categorized on the basis of thematic programmes established by the Committee. The Director explained that a progress report on thematic programmes would be presented at the 40th session in 2016. Regarding financial resources, the Director considered that this should be seen in the overall framework of what the Committee had decided on for enhancing dialogue, transparency, communication, since the call for more advisory missions would require more financial resources.

**IUCN** acknowledged the concerns of the Republic of Philippines that the reporting for the Batanes site did take too long, and thus this pointed to the need for greater coordination on mixed site activities and capacity. IUCN also affirmed its commitment to work with the State Party of Slovenia on the Classic Karst whenever the State Party was prepared to do so in the future, as this had been identified as a gap on the World Heritage List. IUCN also noted that the ten pilot sites were just a small part of the upstream work conducted by the Advisory Bodies and considered that ICOMOS and IUCN should in the future, make visible reports on the kind of advice rendered for upstream support, to also assess the equity of support to States Parties that needed it the most.

IUCN opined that a problem laid with European-based organizations that naturally enable easy access for countries already well-established on the World Heritage List. IUCN expressed agreement with Finland's comments on setting priorities to focus on clearly identified gaps from studies undertaken and on the prioritization of special sites. IUCN acknowledged the broader context of financial constraints, where the budget for conservation and management had been halved over the past few years while the budget associated with new nominations had gone up over the same period of time. IUCN highlighted that this was in contrary with the need to prioritize conservation activities. IUCN noted that the Upstream Process could be seen more as a tool to engage in conservation more effectively rather than just reactively evaluating new nominations. IUCN agreed with the points raised by Viet Nam and said that in its view, the most effective intervention for Tentative Lists was in the form of workshop activities that could be focused both at the country-level as well as with neighboring countries centered on a particular theme. IUCN opined that this would reveal the greater potential for sites to be inscribed, such as transboundary and serial sites, which may not be so visible if workshops were just conducted at the national level.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 9A** was adopted.

## ITEM 10 PERIODIC REPORTS

### 10A. FINAL REPORT ON THE RESULTS OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR THE EUROPE REGION AND ACTION PLAN

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/10A

*Decisions:* 39 COM 10A.1  
39 COM 10A.2

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened Item 10A and noted that Item 9B would be skipped at this time.

The **Secretariat** introduced Item 10A on the Final Report of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for the Europe Region. The Secretariat explained that the Periodic Reporting exercise for the Europe region had a vast scope because of the large number of properties and also because it involved filling out the questionnaires as well as 269 cartographical information and 350 retrospective SOUVs. The Secretariat highlighted the key actors, which included National Focal Points, Site Managers, Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and the Periodic Reporting Expert Team for Europe. The Secretariat explained that technical support and guidance was offered to States Parties, through an online platform, development of a Handbook for Periodic Reporting, as well as a series of meetings. The Secretariat also highlighted that each event was also used as an opportunity for capacity building. The Secretariat thanked the donors who supported this Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting. The Secretariat announced that the States Parties submitted 99.8% of the questionnaires. The Secretariat shared that the response was largely positive, and that participants saw added value in going through the process. The Secretariat explained that the World Heritage Centre shared short summary reports for each State Party and the national datasets from the questionnaire for each State Party and each property. The Secretariat also drew the Committee's attention to the sub-regional capacity building studies carried out for each sub-region in Europe, available at <http://whc.unesco.org/en/events/1184>. The Secretariat introduced the group of experts who had liaised with the World Heritage Centre throughout the process: Mr Christopher Young, Ms Katri Lisitzin, Mr Pierre Galland, and Mr Ole S e Eriksen.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the experts to present the outcomes of the Periodic Reporting Exercise.

**Mr Christopher Young** thanked the Committee for the opportunity to report on Periodic Reporting as well as the State Parties and Site Managers for the data they provided. He informed the Committee that the full report was in Document 10A as well as on the website of the World Heritage Centre.

**Mr Ole S e Eriksen** presented the methodology used: data collection was undertaken through the online questionnaires, which provided quantitative and qualitative data. He explained that the data allowed for global, regional, sub-regional, national and site-level analyses. However, he indicated that the quantitative and qualitative data required different analytical approaches and noted that this was a



challenge with 424 World Heritage properties, which resulted in 660 columns of indicators, 66,358 rows of data and 1,913,256 cells of data. He emphasized that a systematic approach was not enough. He explained that the data was collected through a self-evaluation online tool and that in terms of data analysis, the questions of validity and reliability of the data had to be taken into account. He underscored that the Periodic Reporting questionnaire was designed to be as reliable and valid as possible; however, some feedback was received that the questionnaires were difficult to comprehend and respond to. He added that some thought Section II was not specific enough, and that transboundary issues were not sufficiently covered in Section II. He noted that efforts were made to use the Advisory Bodies' comments and regional and sub-regional reports as well as reactive monitoring reports, in line with the Committee's call for cross-referencing (Decision **29 COM 7B**). For the quantitative data, he explained that six datasets were created for Section I and Section II. All questions in the questionnaire were analyzed independently, and trends were identified through the quantitative data analysis. He explained that in the statistical analysis, graphs were created, showing the rather complex mass of data in a more comprehensive way. He noted for example that concerning factors affecting the properties, tourism was indicated as both the number one negative and positive factor. Finally, he stated that the unique datasets gathered from this exercise were beneficial, for example, with regards to the updating of management plans.

**Mr Christopher Young** presented the outcomes of Section I of the Periodic Reporting questionnaire, concerning the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* at the national level. He reported to the Committee that all countries in Europe had an inventory, although inventories for cultural sites were more complete and were used differently than those for natural sites. He pointed out that 90% of States Parties considered their legislation adequate; however, there was considerable room for improvement in giving cultural and natural heritage a life in the community. He added that the same was true for the integration of heritage conservation into larger-scale planning programs. This was reflected in the issues faced by States Parties when it came to the state of conservation of the properties. At all levels, he reported that governments remained a major source of funding and noted that EU funding was used in most European countries. He stated that although only 15% of States Parties said that funding was inadequate, all States Parties indicated that improved resources would increase efficiency. He further reported that all but four States Parties had Tentative Lists, and that all were regularly updated. He explained that the four that did not have Tentative Lists were small territories, and one already had its entire territory inscribed on the List. He noted that the perceived benefits of World Heritage include, in order of priority: enhanced honour/prestige, increased tourism/public use, strengthened protection, improved presentation, wider community appreciation and enhanced conservation. In terms of management, two out of three States Parties stated that they had adequate capacity, although he pointed out that different views emerged from the national and site-level. Regarding training, he noted that a wide range of activities was covered and that the greatest needs were community outreach, education, visitor management and risk preparedness. He also shared that less than 40% of States Parties had training strategies in place and that not all of them were fully implemented, while the remaining States Parties provided training on an ad-hoc basis. Lastly, he pointed out that awareness of World Heritage was highest among the tourism industry, decision-makers and civil servants, and that it was lowest among the general public, youth,

indigenous peoples and the private sector. He added that very few States Parties reported having effective strategies for public awareness.

**Ms Katri Lisitzin and Mr Pierre Galland** presented the Section II Report on cultural, natural and mixed sites, and specified that in many cases, the findings applied to all types of properties.

**Mr Galland** reiterated that the number of properties in the Europe region was very high, with 424 periodic reports received. Between the First to Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, the number of sites had doubled but the proportion has remained the same: culture represented 90 percent of the region's properties, while natural sites represented 9-10 percent and the number of mixed sites has remained the same. He noted that the questionnaires were filled in jointly by national Focal Points and Site Managers and added that this did not happen during the First Cycle. Numerous retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value were adopted by the Committee or were currently in the review process, many boundaries have been clarified and maps submitted, and management has improved in most cases. He shared that the results have been divided among sub-regions, but alerted that care must be undertaken when making statistical analysis among sub-regions, especially for natural sites, since the number was low in the Europe region (40 properties, for 375 cultural and 9 mixed properties). He further noted that many natural properties were located outside of the Europe biological region, for example, the South Pacific Islands, Canary Islands or Greenland. He noted that as there were few sub-regional differences, most of the Report presented to the Committee treated the region as a whole. Overall, he reported that the OUV of sites could be considered as maintained as less than 10 percent of cultural sites had their OUV impacted, and only in very few cases was OUV seriously impacted. For natural sites, he reported that the results of Periodic Reporting coincide with the outcomes of the IUCN Outlook, the main difference being that the IUCN Outlook was an external review process. When compared globally with other regions, he asserted that OUV could be considered as maintained at approximately the same level, at about 80%.

**Ms Lisitzin** reminded the States Parties that the data from the Periodic Reporting exercise was now out there and that it was up to the States Parties to make further use of it. She noted there was no general trend among sub-regions or types of properties regarding integrity and authenticity and that integrity was reported to be intact in the majority of properties. However, she noted that integrity was slightly more compromised in natural than mixed sites, which may be due to their size, and that authenticity in cultural properties were conserved in nearly all properties. She highlighted the lack of responses to the optional questions regarding attributes of OUV, and expressed the view that this may indicate a capacity-building need with regards to the definition of OUV for future work. She stated that many properties had clearly defined boundaries, which were in general adequate to maintain the OUV. She asserted that this was a positive development from the First Cycle. She explained that the situation was much more complex in buffer zones: 80% of cultural sites and half of mixed sites have a buffer zone. She noted that 16% of sites that did not have a buffer zone reported the need for one; however, the need for a buffer zone was lower for natural properties. She underscored that the function of a buffer zone was a major issue, that although they were generally seen to be positive, their management was difficult because they were under different legal and

management frameworks. She reported that there was a need for a national policy or national-level support to deal with the legislation and management of buffer zones and explained that many were meant to include the setting and landscape context. She added that the concept of buffer zones has evolved over time and that property boundaries and buffer zones were not well known among local communities. She underlined that efforts were needed to ensure they were updated and communicated as there was a lack of clarity on the function and role of the buffer zones.

She outlined that the factor groups affecting World Heritage properties were diverse and therefore it was difficult to identify clear trends. She underlined that the main groups include the following factors, which were similar in both cultural and natural sites: built environment; tourism/recreational activities; visitor activities; and climate change. She noted that within Periodic Reporting, more sharing of positive factors and experiences were needed. She underlined that the factors linked to social factors were perceived as both negative and positive. She noted that changes in lifestyle and knowledge systems as well as the deliberate destruction of cultural heritage were increasingly seen as a potential negative factor. She underlined that overall threats from outside of the property have been identified as major management concerns, i.e. beyond management authorities which meant that there would be an increasing need for coordination between local, regional and national authorities.

She shared that for cultural properties, the overall positive factors included interpretative visitor facilities, management activities, low impact research/ monitoring impacts of tourism/visitor recreation. She further shared that negative factors included the impact of tourism/visitor recreation, built environment/housing, effects arising from transportation infrastructure, and climate change.

**Mr Galland** presented the factors for natural properties. He specified that there was no limit to the number of factors that site managers were invited to identify. He indicated that for positive factors, it ranged from 0-33 and for negative factors, it ranged from 0-45, and these need to be taken into account for the analysis as well. He shared that the main positive factors included societal value, tourism (seen as both positive and negative), identity, social cohesion, and associated use (religious). He further shared that the negative factors included illegal activities (included as “other” factors), which was the leading negative factor. He reported that it was not possible to know if this referred just to trespassing or to large illegal logging or construction within the property. He underlined that tourism was also mentioned as a current negative factor, as well as climate change, including fire, waste, invasive terrestrial species, and temperature change. He added that a similar picture emerged for the potential negative factors affecting the property, with a bigger emphasis on climate-change related factors.

**Ms Lisitzin** presented the protective measures and noted that overall legislation was considered adequate in the majority of properties. However, she highlighted that the implementation of legislation and management measures was facing difficulties, as over half the properties reported that this could be improved through more adequate human and financial resources and political support. She added that changing legal systems and non-coordinates sectorial responses also had an impact on management effectiveness.

**M Galland** indique que concernant les plans de gestion, bien qu'il soit difficile de les comparer, d'immense progrès ont été accompli au niveau des systèmes et plans de gestion. Un plan de gestion est en place dans la majorité des cas, mais il y a une restriction concernant la mise en œuvre des actions liées aux plans de gestion. Il est souvent mentionné qu'il faut améliorer la coordination entre les communautés locales, les différents niveaux d'administrations locales et les acteurs extérieurs. La plupart des sites mentionnent qu'ils ont des ressources, mais qu'une augmentation et diversification des ressources serait souhaitable. La plupart des bénéfices viennent du tourisme local, qui affecte plutôt les sites culturels.

**Ms Lisitzin** pointed out that planned and effective education and awareness raising programmes linked to the properties' values was lacking in 40% of the cultural sites and in 25% of the natural sites. She explained to the Committee that initiatives for visitor appreciation and visitor management were difficult to analyse in the questionnaire but noted that the trends for visitor numbers were stable, with a slight increase over the past five years. She reported that visitor management was seen as both positive and negative. She highlighted that cooperation with the tourism industry was currently limited and that there was a need for a targeted World Heritage visitor strategy. She also underlined that the need for conducting a capacity and risk analysis were also noted in 'comments' section of the questionnaire form.

**M Galland** soulève la question des modalités de suivi et constate que si la moitié des biens indiquent avoir un programme de suivi exhaustif intégré, relativement peu de biens ont indiqué avoir des indicateurs et bases de référence en place pour le suivi. Il souligne également que le suivi fait partie des exigences de gestion pour tous les biens du patrimoine mondial, et souligne qu'il y a des besoins en matière de renforcement des capacités et de « coaching » dans la domaine du suivi.

**Ms Lisitzin** pointed out that capacity building for Site Managers was a high priority, and emphasized that less than half of cultural properties had a management and conservation programme that helped to develop local expertise, and only a third of the properties had a capacity-building development plan in place. She further noted that capacity-building needed to include targeted monitoring mechanisms, connecting research to World Heritage needs, and increasing professional capacity for community outreach, benefit-sharing and partnership-building mechanisms. She reminded the Committee that all the data that informed this presentation and the Periodic Report could be found on the World Heritage Centre website.

**Mr Young** presented the overall conclusions and noted that despite the amount of work involved, Periodic Reporting was seen as useful by Focal Points and Site Managers. He shared that the States Parties had requested that future questionnaires put more emphasis on the positive aspects, in order to have a better view of what worked well and what the problems were. He noted that decision makers outside the heritage world did not give enough importance to conservation. He highlighted that on the whole, cultural, natural and mixed properties faced similar challenges across Europe, with no major difference presented among sub-regions. He reported that a positive point for the majority of States Parties was that the state of conservation of properties was good and that OUV was maintained. However, he also pointed out that less than half of the properties in Europe had effective monitoring systems. He further stated that at all levels; work was needed on

education and community outreach, engagement and collaboration with stakeholders. He noted in conclusion that after two cycles of Periodic Reporting, one of the biggest benefits remained the collaboration at all levels, not just between the Centre and the States Parties, but also between different States Parties, who shared knowledge and experience through the exercise.

The **Secretariat** presented the Action Plan for the Europe region. The Secretariat explained that the Periodic Reporting exercise foresaw that each region of the world produced an Action Plan that targeted the main needs of the region and identified priority areas for the following years. For Europe, a first draft of the Action Plan was elaborated by the Focal Points during the Final Meeting on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, in December 2014 in Helsinki. The Secretariat recalled that at this stage, the Focal Points were presented with the preliminary analysis of the outcomes of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting, and as they worked in both thematic groups (according to the 5Cs) and in sub-regional groups, they created a first draft of the Action Plan that reflected their needs for the future of World Heritage.

The Secretariat pointed out that this first draft was consolidated by the World Heritage Centre and the Periodic Reporting Experts Group, and thereafter this revised version was again presented to the national Focal Points for comments. The Secretariat noted that the response was very positive, and the Centre received many interesting comments on the Action Plan, which were taken into account during the final revision. The Secretariat elaborated that at the end of this process, the Action Plan was consolidated as the “Helsinki Framework Action Plan”. The Secretariat explained that in an effort to make the Action Plan easy to use, the number of actions was limited to 34, and the Action Plan itself was subdivided into three Core Priority Areas: the Identification and Protection of OUV, Effective Management of World Heritage properties and Increased Awareness of the Convention.

The Secretariat further explained that to fit these large-scale priorities, nine themes were identified, ranging from the clear definition of OUV to credible and effective Tentative Lists and Nominations and the engagement of communities and young people with heritage. The Secretariat shared that each of these themes comprised one or more actions, and for each one, the Action Plan identified key partners who were the most likely to carry out the action (not an exhaustive list, and other partners were always welcome to collaborate on a given action), regional targets to be reached by the end of the Third Cycle of Periodic Reporting and quantifiable baselines, established on the basis of information provided through the Second Cycle of Periodic Report.

The Secretariat stated that these useful tools aimed to ensure that the Action Plan did not remain an abstract wish list, but a user-friendly list of concrete steps that could be monitored. The Secretariat underlined that the Action Plan was presented in an innovative format and rather than focus exclusively on region-wide priority needs, it also allowed the users to set sub-regional priorities among the actions identified by the Focal Points themselves. The Secretariat further elaborated that this approach also allowed for an easy appropriation of the Action Plan at national level: a State Party could download the Helsinki Framework Action Plan from the World Heritage Centre’s website, identify actions that were most relevant for its specific situation,

and utilise the actions, lead partners, monitoring indicators and regional targets to inform its policy- and decision-making processes at all levels.

The Secretariat also suggested that the Committee introduce a follow-up process for the Action Plan. The Secretariat proposed to set up a short biennial survey in order to ensure that the Action Plan became an important tool for the region. The Secretariat explained that the survey would allow each State Party to select the actions that have been deemed to be of high priority; and to provide, for those actions only, quantifiable information on the progress accomplished in the past two years. The Secretariat said that it should be an easy exercise, with minimal preparation gathering the necessary information on the most important aspects of the World Heritage at national level and the participation in initiatives at regional and sub-regional levels.

The Secretariat underlined that the results of this quantifiable survey would be especially useful to provide the World Heritage Committee with a result-based report on the implementation of the Action Plan for Europe. The Secretariat expressed hope that with the States Parties involved at all stages of the Action Plan, from the conception to the follow-up activities in-between the second and third cycles of Periodic Reporting, that there would be strong involvement and cooperation among the States Parties in the implementation of the Action Plan. The Secretariat finally noted that first steps for the implementation of the Action Plan have in fact already been undertaken, namely by the State Party of France that plans to organise the First Meeting of European Associations of Site Managers in October in Strasbourg.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that the Action Plan was presented in an innovative format, and gave the floor to the Committee for comments.

The Delegation of **Poland** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and the Experts for their work on the Periodic Reporting Exercise in Europe and North America and pointed out the crucial role of Periodic Reporting for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. Poland echoed a question from national site managers and requested for clarification regarding the monitoring of the progress accomplished with the Helsinki Framework Action Plan for Europe, presented in document 39 COM 10A point 4.1, particularly with regard to the "Regional Targets" expressed in numbers or percentage depending on the action. Finally, Poland underscored that all international efforts should be directed towards continuing the Periodic Reporting exercise, as it was a vector of international dialogue and supported the protection and management of the World Heritage properties through capacity building, which resulted in greater engagement of all stakeholders.

The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked the Secretariat for its guidance during the Periodic Reporting process and for the presentation. Turkey indicated that it found the Action Plan useful.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** exprime son appréciation pour le rapport présenté et félicite les experts pour leur travail remarquable. Le Sénégal constate que les biens naturels sont très peu représentés en Europe et, après avoir précisé qu'il est conscient des différences en matière de développement, exprime son souhait que

les expériences des différentes régions puissent être partagées pour le bénéfice de tous.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Expert Group for their successful work throughout the Second Periodic Reporting exercise. Germany added that the Periodic Reporting exercise was a fundamental instrument in strengthening the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat.

The **Secretariat** thanked the State Parties for all their statements commending the work of the World Heritage Centre, the Experts Group and the Advisory Bodies. The Secretariat responded to questions raised by Poland and Senegal, and briefly touched upon baseline indicators by drawing the attention of the Committee to the introduction section to the Action Plan, in the Periodic Report for Europe, where instructions towards the use of plan were provided. The Secretariat reminded the Committee that although major sub-regional priorities had already been defined, the Action Plan was structured in such a way that allowed sub-regions or national authorities to select the most relevant actions for their specific case. The Secretariat availed itself to further discussion and to provide guidance on these matters at future meetings.

The **Vice-Chairperson** suggested gave the floor to the Advisory Bodies.

The representative of **IUCN** welcomed the report and the involvement of the Site Managers.

The representative of **ICOMOS** delivered its statement on behalf of ICOMOS and ICCROM. The Advisory Bodies welcomed the completion of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting, which was an important process for the region of Europe and North America. The Advisory Bodies recalled that first periodic report was a fundamental step for building awareness of the World Heritage properties and their issues. The Advisory Bodies underlined that following a period of intense work on boundary clarification and the drafting of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, the second exercise had renewed attention on the conservation of sites, encouraged collective debates and networking at different levels - international, national and local - and has contributed to enhance the understanding of World Heritage concepts.

The Advisory Bodies highlighted that the work produced during this process demonstrated that the capacity of all parties had increased and that the process had facilitated exchanges among State Parties. The Advisory Bodies congratulated the States Parties of the Europe region for the work undertaken and for the achievement of the critically important retrospective Statements of OUV. The Advisory Bodies expressed the view that the achievements strengthened the implementation of the Convention in the region. The Advisory Bodies underlined that as a result of the intense work and exchanges, the report on this exercise was accompanied by a detailed Action Plan which would guide the region towards the third Periodic Reporting Cycle. The Advisory Bodies elaborated that the Action Plan identified three major spheres of activity: improving identification and protection of the OUV, reaching

effectiveness in management systems and augmenting the awareness of the World Heritage Convention.

The Advisory Bodies highlighted that specific objectives and activities were identified which called for the action from all parties and stated that the Advisory Bodies were ready to provide their assistance in implementing these actions. The Advisory Bodies welcomed the focus placed by States Parties on Tentative Lists, and on the need to address gaps in the thematic, geographic and cultural representation of the World Heritage List, as these would be important steps in the direction of achieving the objectives of the Global Strategy. In particular, the Advisory Bodies welcomed the proposal to update the gap analysis, if resources could be found. The Advisory Bodies also considered that the opportunity should be undertaken to update or to develop thematic studies, as an element of their 'upstream' activities. The Advisory Bodies recognized the emerging demand for capacity building and training for different target groups, from political decision makers, to Site Managers as well as communities, and acknowledged the need to engage them at early stages of all Convention processes.

The Advisory Bodies also welcomed the sub-regional capacity building strategies which have been developed and which would help to ensure that States Parties, Advisory Bodies, and other capacity building partners can work with States Parties towards a better implementation of the Convention at all levels. The Advisory Bodies expressed their readiness to work in a coordinated and integrated manner with State Parties in achieving the ambitious goals set out in this report, and note that there was significant potential to build further cooperation with the European Union and the Council of Europe on the above themes. The Advisory Bodies concurred with the priority given to these matters in the Periodic Report and its Action plan, and expressed their readiness to work in cooperation with State Parties, also through coordinated contributions from ICOMOS national Committees and international scientific Committees, IUCN sub-regional offices, and ICCROM's large network of professionals in the region.

The **Vice-Chairperson** asked if there any amendments to the draft decision were received.

The **Rapporteur** informed that no amendments to the draft decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10A.1** was adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to present Item 10A.2.

The **Secretariat** made the following presentation stated that following the adoption of the Periodic Report for North America, and in accordance with Decision **38 COM 10A**, the States Parties of Canada and the United States of America have submitted an Action Plan for North America. The Secretariat elaborated that this Action Plan was structured to speak to the Strategic Objectives of the Convention (also known as the 5Cs) and that the actions listed under the Five Result Areas were planned with an implementation timeframe of 5 years.



The **Vice-Chairperson** asked if there any amendments to the draft decision were received.

The **Rapporteur** informed that no amendments to the draft decision were received.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10A.2** was adopted.

*The meeting rose at 1 p.m.*

**EIGHTH DAY – MONDAY 6 July 2015**

**FIFFTHEENTH MEETING**

**3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS**

**ITEM 11 REVISION OF THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES***

*Document:* WHC-15/39.COM/11  
WHC-15/39.COM/11.Annex 1  
WHC-15/39.COM/11.Annex 2  
WHC-15/39.COM/11.Annex 3

*Decision:* **39 COM 11**

The **Chairperson** opened the session and invited the Committee to consider Item 11. The Chairperson invited the Chairperson of the *Operational Guidelines* Working Group to present the outcomes of the working group.

Le **Président du groupe de travail** sur la révision des Orientations présente les conclusions et les propositions de décision du Groupe. Il rappelle le mandat du Groupe concernant les révisions aux Orientations telles que présentées à l'Annexe 1 du document de travail 39 COM.11. Il rappelle également que le Comité a demandé au Groupe de travail de prendre en considération les conclusions du groupe de travail ad hoc telle comme présentées dans le document 13A et de prendre en charge les tâches confiés au groupe de travail sur les méthodes de travail du Comité, établi en conformité avec la décision 38 COM 9C concernant la recommandation sur l'évaluation du la Stratégie globale.

M. Tabet précise que compte tenu de l'ampleur de la tâche confiée par le Comité, le groupe s'est réuni à 6 reprises pendant la pause-déjeuner de 13h00 à 15h00 et à 4 reprises le matin de 8h à 9h. Il souligne qu'une réunion conjointe avec le groupe de travail sur le budget afin de traiter du nombre maximum des dossiers par Etat partie par an et du nombre maximal total des dossiers de nomination examiné chaque année a été conduite pendant une heure et demi.

Il souligne finalement que le groupe de travail s'est réuni pendant 16 heures et demi et que de 40 à 60 Etats parties ont participé dans les sessions du travail et que ses conclusions et recommandations sont présentées dans le document révisé qui a été distribué.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its appreciation for the excellent work of the Chairperson of the *Operational Guidelines* working group and its members. The Delegation also commended the work by the Budget working group and the inter-sessional *ad hoc* working group. The Delegation underlined that there were now a

couple of Draft Decisions proposed by all three working groups to the Committee. The Delegation suggested that a new inter-sessional *ad hoc* working group in order to identify well thought-through solutions on points where disagreement still persisted should be established. The Delegation commended the Draft Decision arising from the *ad hoc* working group and underlined that one of the that working group's recommendation was to enhance dialogue between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. Concerning Draft Decision 39 COM 13A, the Delegation wished to see its contributions reflected, along with the contributions of the Delegations of Germany and the Philippines, and expressed its support for this Draft Decision. On Draft Decision 39 COM 5E, the Delegation expressed support and stated that it could be flexible on this. Regarding Draft Decision 39 COM 11, the Delegation noted that there were certain areas that would require further discussions, especially concerning paragraphs 61 and 68.

Therefore, the Delegation suggested first to adopt all the suggestions of the *Operational Guidelines* working group where an agreement could be found and that all the points where more discussions were required could be remitted to a completely open inter-sessional working group. The Delegation elaborated that the proposals of this working group could be brought back to the next Committee session. The Delegation suggested that this working group could be chaired by the Delegation of Turkey.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the working group for the comprehensively revised working document. The Delegation agreed with the points raised by India and noted that the inclusion or exclusion of basic terminologies could impact certain State Parties significantly. Therefore, the Delegation expressed the view that more time would be required.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its gratitude and admiration to the *Operational Guidelines* working group and acknowledged the Chairperson's commitment. The Delegation also expressed appreciation for the work of the *ad hoc* working group. The Delegation expressed the view that the working group's recommendations had already borne fruit given that the Advisory Bodies had already started to implement some of the measures in terms of ensuring transparency. The Delegation expressed its hope that the efforts of the Advisory Bodies would continue. The Delegation of **Turkey** further stated that the remaining issues needed to be tackled with utmost care in the spirit of compromise and guided by the experience of the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation also favoured the continuation of the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group and stated that the *ad hoc* working group had proven to be an efficient body which should therefore be maintained.

The Delegation of Turkey endorsed the position of the Delegation of India to achieve a broader consensus. The Delegation agreed that paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines* required further discussions. The Delegation noted that if UNESCO remained at where it was at the present moment, it would be impossible to achieve the proposed recommendations within the frame of the current resources. The Delegation of Turkey recalled that during the prioritization exercise of the sectors of UNESCO, it became clear that if UNESCO had to introduce certain measures to restrain and diminish the operational capacities of one of its most prestigious and effective Conventions, the States Parties should have the right to come back and to

renew this. The Delegation of Turkey expressed the view that a non-restrained and non-diminished World Heritage Centre was needed. The Delegation further stated that the World Heritage Centre should be equipped with additional funds, institutions, expertise and manpower that would allow it to deliver what the Convention requires. The Delegation expressed its belief that the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group should be extended and that a reflection should take place on innovative approaches to create new funds in support of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the revision of the *Operational Guidelines* and noted that the *Operational Guidelines* working group had spent 16 hours of work to develop the revised Draft Decision. The Delegation thanked the Chairperson of the working group for the effective leadership rendered and stated that it would be happy to adopt the revised Draft Decision as proposed. The Delegation also thanked all those who had participated in the process. The Delegation informed the Committee that it had submitted an amendment to the revised Draft Decision 39 COM 11 to add a paragraph regarding management plans and management systems of nominated properties.

The Delegation of **Peru** congratulated the budget working group for its hard work. The Delegation fully agreed with the statement of the Delegation of India and noted that some issues discussed by the working group required a deeper analysis. The Delegation suggested renewing the terms of reference so that the *ad hoc* working group could continue inter-sessionally, in particular concerning paragraph 61. The Delegation of Peru expressed its hope to continue with the reflection process and pointed out that the renewed *ad hoc* working group should be thinking not just of the present, but also the future of the entire system of the conservation of natural and cultural heritage. The Delegation underlined that the system of the World Heritage Convention had been developed over the years, but the time had come to undertake a deeper analysis on its sustainability in the future. The Delegation highlighted that the List would soon contain around 1,040 properties, which would call into question if the three Advisory Bodies would be able to evaluate all these sites.

The Delegation also pointed out that over the last three years, the notion of Outstanding Universal Value had become subsumed with outstanding universal cultural value and therefore the Delegation questioned what that meant in operational terms. The Delegation of Peru further suggested obtaining advisory input from leading archaeological universities, research centres and other specialised institutions. The Delegation expressed the view that this measure would render the system more affordable as advice would be provided by universities such as Yale and Oxford, which would be able to contribute with their own resources. The Delegation also pointed to the concept of sustainable development which has been now completely interwoven with the approach to World Heritage. The Delegation therefore endorsed an inter-sessional working group as it would provide a platform to enable a continuation of these reflections.

The Delegation of **Japan** joined the previous Delegations to express its sincere appreciation for the work of the *Operational Guidelines* working group. The Delegation also thanked the Chairpersons of both the *Operational Guidelines* and Budget working group. The Delegation agreed with the points put forward by the

Delegation of India. The Delegation further outlined three issues which should be considered by the suggested inter-sessional working group. First, the Delegation highlighted that determining a potential cap to the annual number of nominations would require careful discussion. The Delegation was of the view that a cap would have a great impact on the visibility of the World Heritage Convention while, in terms of the cost effectiveness, only 140,000 US\$ would be saved. Therefore, the Delegation stated that a broader perspective would be needed. Second, the Delegation underlined that the future resource mobilisation strategy should be examined further. The Delegation recognised the importance of the World Heritage Fund for the Convention and encouraged the World Heritage Centre and the Committee to engage more actively with potential donors in the future. Lastly, the Delegation stated that with regards to the proposed amendment of Rule 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure, it was too early to revert to the previous format and stressed that there was still merit when a concerned State Party could express its view. However, the Delegation acknowledged that the current working in the text could be interpreted as being too flexible and hence considered that the text could be modified by limiting the intervention of the State Party to a clarification or an update on its nomination. The Delegation expressed the view that this could increase the efficiency of the Committee's proceedings without being too consuming.

La Délégation de **Sénégal** félicite le Président et souligne qu'il s'agit d'un large consensus sur presque toutes les questions. Elle remarque néanmoins qu'une réflexion plus approfondie est nécessaire conformément à ce que le Pérou a proposé. Elle insiste sur le fait que les organisations consultatives sont très efficaces, mais considère qu'elles sont atteint leur limite dans plusieurs domaines de spécialisation. Les universités sont à ses yeux des institutions qui pourraient apporter beaucoup en matière de réflexion prospective.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated the Chairpersons of the working groups and underlined that strengthening the dialogue was well-reflected in the proposed revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Delegation also thanked the representatives of ICOMOS and IUCN who allowed the working group to come to an agreement on all points. The Delegation expressed its belief that all the new amendments to the revised Draft Decision would benefit all States Parties. The Delegation supported the limiting the number of nominations per State Party to one per year in order to facilitate a representative World Heritage List. The Delegation supported extending the mandate of the ad hoc working group as it was of the view that the working group has been a very effective platform over the past year.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** commended the Chairperson of the *Operational Guidelines* working group and the Advisory Bodies as well as the *ad hoc* working group for presenting a revision of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Delegation stated that concerning paragraph 61, the issue should be remitted to an inter-sessional working group as the matter needed to be discussed in more detail.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its warmest thanks to the *Operational Guidelines* working group and especially to its Chairperson. The Delegation of Finland supported the revised Draft Decision as presented by the Chairperson of the *Operational Guidelines* working group so as not to undermine the hard work of the *Operational Guidelines* working group. The Delegation also underlined that an

overwhelming majority in the working group supported limiting the annual number of nominations submitted to the Committee to 25 per year to address the imbalance on the World Heritage List. The Delegation stated that it was open to have a discussion on the workload and resources available. The Delegation expressed the view that a strong message should be sent from this Committee session. The Delegation expressed its openness to continue participating in the working group, but also drew the Committee's attention to the fact that not every State Party had sufficient resources to participate in every working group.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** commended the excellent work of the *Operational Guidelines* working group and remarked that the revised Draft Decision represented an appropriate summary of this work. However, the Delegation noted that some paragraphs required further discussion and supported the proposal of the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed appreciation for the work of the *Operational Guidelines* working group. The Delegation emphasized that the *Operational Guidelines* were important in the implementation of the Convention and stated that the outcomes of these discussions would entail fundamental implications for the Convention. The Delegation remarked that as the world continues to change, the *Operational Guidelines* needed to be updated accordingly as well. The Delegation agreed with the Delegation of India that the points where consensus could be reached should be adopted. The Delegation underlined that regarding paragraph 61, it was not only an issue about the number of nominations but also the issue regarding prioritisation of nominations for examination. The Delegation stated that States Parties that have voluntarily refrained from having their nominations examined during their mandate as Committee members should have some priority in putting forward nominations at the end of their mandate. The Delegation agreed with the Delegation of Finland that this matter should not be postponed.

The Delegation of **Germany** fully supported the positions of the Delegations of Poland, the Philippines, Portugal and Finland. The Delegation considered that it could also go along with the proposal of the Delegations of India and Turkey regarding the limit of 25 nominations per year. The Delegation said that it was in favour of retaining paragraph 61 b) which stated that the States Parties could only submit one nomination per year. The Delegation also agreed with the revision of paragraph 61 c), especially with regards to States Parties that were applying for a Committee mandate in November 2015.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed thanks to the Chairperson of the *Operational Guidelines* working group. The Delegation stated that the working group had dealt with multiple issues in a short period of time to respond to the need to balance the World Heritage List, tackle its gaps and embrace the Global Strategy. The Delegation agreed with the point raised by the Delegation of Finland that it would be difficult to involve less wealthy States Parties in the process if they did not have sufficient resources to be fully involved in all the discussions. The Delegation agreed with the proposals put forth by the *Operational Guidelines* working group and considered that it could perhaps go with the proposal of one nomination per year per State Party. The Delegation stated that it would prefer to wait before introducing the cap of 25 nominations per year. The Delegation expressed its support for amending

Rule 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure. The Delegation also supported the views expressed by the Delegation of Poland concerning management plans.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** fait remarquer que les Etats parties sont obligés à respecter certaines limites dans la soumission des dossiers de candidature. Elle rappelle que son pays n'a pas présenté de site pendant la durée de son mandat. Elle se prononce en faveur d'une limitation à 25 et à 1 dossier par pays tout en rappelant que ce qui fonde la Convention du patrimoine mondial est le principe d'inscription des biens sur la Liste. Elle souhaite une clarification sur ce point de la part du Conseiller juridique.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** considère qu'en ce qui concerne le paragraphe 6, il est nécessaire d'effectuer une réflexion approfondie et s'exprimer en faveur de la proposition de l'Inde de continuer avec la discussion dans le cadre du Group ad hoc.

The Delegation of **Turkey** clarified that it had no problems with the limitations on the number of nominations as long as it did not clash with the overall aims and spirit of the Convention. The Delegation stated that there were States Parties with around a many sites on their tentative list that would take a long time to be nominated given the current speed of nominating sites. The Delegation underlined that an essential issue was the conservation and refurbishment of sites. The Delegation further underlined that in light of the long list of sites on the Tentative List, other measures needed to be implemented which would trigger the conservation of sites before a potential inscription. The Delegation pointed out that the proposed cap would only resolve in cost savings of around 100,000 US\$ and therefore stated that careful consideration was required on where a threshold should be established.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** presented a statement that covered three main points. First, the Delegation stated that it would not object to the conclusions of the working group as it believed that the working group has worked very hard to achieve its outcomes. However, the Delegation cited its experience of the on the Committee of the Intangible Heritage Convention, where a cap on the number of nominations implied a cap for each country. Second, the Delegation underlined that the 1972 Convention was firmly embedded in the hearts and minds of people and that any changes to the processes of the Convention should be carefully considered. The Delegation expressed the view that the current draft decision may not be ideal as there was no significant monetary impact and that it may also affect the visibility of the Convention. Third, the Delegation recalled the celebrations for the inscriptions of new sites that had taken place the day before and noted the pride of the stakeholders involved, recognising the workload and efforts that had been invested into the nominations. The Delegation acknowledged the long Tentative Lists and expressed its hesitation towards the sudden introduction of a cap, as it would have implications on groups of people that may not be a part of the present Committee session. The Delegation further stated that a comprehensive roadmap would be required. The Delegation stated that it was willing to go along with the changes proposed but encouraged accountability as there were high expectations placed on the Committee in this regard.

The Delegation of **Croatia** thanked the working groups and stated that it could agree with the proposal of one nomination per country. The Delegation highlighted that

there were also important conservation and management issues that need to be discussed and explored further. The Delegation opined that perhaps the time was not yet ripe for setting a cap to the overall number of nominations and that more time would be needed on this matter.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that it was important to reach a consensus on this issue. The Delegation foresaw that future discussions would be required and therefore supported the establishment of a working group. The Delegation proposed that regarding article 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*, point c) – ix) should be approved at this Session and that the other pending points could be postponed for further discussion.

The Delegation of **Philippines** supported the statement by the Delegation of Portugal.

The Delegation of **India** stated that this was a very tough debate as it was unclear as to direction where the consensus was going towards. The Delegation stated that there was no doubt that further discussions were needed as there remained many issues that required more time to resolve. The Delegation therefore reiterated its position to remit some of these matters to an inter-sessional working group which it saw as the most constructive solution.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal of the Delegation of the Philippines to keep at least paragraph 61 c) – ix) and proposed to keep c) – x) and c) – xi) as well.

The Delegation of **Serbia** applauded the hard work of the working groups and joined the Delegation of the Philippines in thanking IUCN and ICOMOS. The Delegation stated its support for the outcomes of the working groups but noted that since there was currently no consensus in the Committee; a new working group may be helpful in resolving some of these issues.

The Delegation of **Peru** highlighted that the present debates illustrated that the concerns from Committee members could not be delay with within the limited timeframe of the Committee session. The Delegation stressed that as the issues concerned the future and sustainability of the World Heritage Convention, more time was required for discussion and reflection. The Delegation reiterated its support for the idea that unresolved issues should be remitted to an inter-sessional working group, as proposed by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Finland** commented on the real costs of nominations and stated that there was a need to be very precise on this issue since. The Delegation of Finland stated that the cost of a nomination did not only entail the amount of 142,000 US\$ that was mentioned, but also the additional costs for the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation called for a comprehensive analysis of the real costs of a nomination and further requested for the World Heritage Centre to indicate the costs of the proposed open-ended working group.

The **Chairperson** remarked that that the Committee members had come to an agreement on a number of issues, but not complete consensus. The Chairperson



acknowledged the need for further discussion, in particular concerning nominations, but at the same time, stated that discussion should not be open on all issues, especially for issues where consensus had already been reached. The Delegation stated that if the Committee were to proceed with the proposal by the Delegation of India to convene an open-ended inter-sessional working group, this working group should only restrict its focus to specific points such as paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*. The Chairperson underlined that there was a need to reduce the number of nominations not only because of the financial situation, but also because the World Heritage List could not grow further without a limit. The Chairperson also expressed the view that more discussion was needed to ensure better mobilisation of resources. The Chairperson further underlined that the question of having a cap on the number of nominations needed to be taken in conjunction with the question on the mobilisation of resources. The Chairperson expressed the view that collectively, this could be a reasonable agenda for a working group. The Chairperson also noted the references that some Committee members had made to paragraph 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure and stated that the Committee's position on this had to be further clarified.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Germany.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested for a clarification on the prioritisation of the nominations in paragraph c).

The **Chairperson** sought the Committee's understanding to have a succinct debate.

The Delegation of **Portugal** clarified that paragraph 61 c) – ix) that had nothing to do with the budget or the cap on nominations, but with potential conflict of interest of Committee members. Therefore, the Delegation was of the view that this discussion should be taken separately from the matters currently at hand.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the suggested procedure. The Delegation expressed concern at restricting the focus of the working group as the issues to be discussed were inadvertently related to other issues as well. The Delegation stressed that an important issue for the working group to consider was the effective use of available resources.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** reiterated its view that to revisit paragraph 61 should be revisited through the establishment of a working group. The Delegation stressed that that paragraph 61 should be looked at in its entirety, taking into account the linkages between all the paragraphs.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with Jamaica's point to look at paragraph 61 in its entirety in order to arrive at an optimal solution. The Delegation reiterated that these outstanding matters should be remitted to a working group with a timeframe of one year.

The **Legal Advisor** sought to clarify if the question from the Delegation of Algeria was related to changing the cap for the number of nominations per State Party from 2

to 1 and the overall cap from 45 to 25 based on the concern it may be seen to be inconsistent with the Convention.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a posé la question de savoir si les Orientations pouvaient déroger aux deux principes généraux suivants: celui d'inscrire un bien et celui du mandat du Comité d'adopter l'inscription d'un bien.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that the current caps were fixed in the Operational Guidelines by the Committee 15 years ago at its 24th session. The Legal Advisor recalled that the Committee had decided at that juncture to limit the number of nominations per State Party to two and the annual limit on the number of nominations to be examined to 45. The Legal Advisor stated that therefore, it would simply be a case of changing the number that had already been determined to be capable of being fixed by the Convention. The Legal Advisor also acknowledged that the Convention had other responsibilities apart from inscription; such as the development of suitable management plans, the State of Conservation and protection of sites.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the working group was convened by Germany; hence all the related costs had been covered by Germany. The Director stated that staff time was involved but this did not generate additional costs.

The Delegation of **Finland** enquired on the budgetary implications of an open-ended working group.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated it would depend on the decision adopted and when the Committee eventually adopted the decision on the ad hoc working group, it would have to specify how the working group would meet. The Director informed that Secretariat would not be able to host such a working group at UNESCO premises as interpretation in two languages would have to be provided and this would be difficult if budgetary resources were not available.

The **Chairperson of the Operational Guidelines Working Group** thanked all States Parties who had participated in the meetings. He stated that 40 to 60 States Parties had participated in the working group meetings which lasted a total of 16.5 hours. The Chairperson underlined that two representatives from each region had participated in the ad hoc working group that was hosted by Germany. The Chairperson further underlined that if the Committee would like greater representation in the inter-sessional working group that was foreseen, this should be clearly specified in the decision. The Chairperson agreed with the points raised by the Delegation of Senegal on Peru that the issues of authenticity, integrity and OUV required a more in-depth debate, but acknowledged that this would have to be undertaken over several years. The Chairperson also underscored that the issue of reducing the number of nominations to be presented by each State Party per year had been discussed since the 1990s, not just for financial reasons but as matter of equity and the representativeness of the List. The Chairperson also recalled that the reason for the cap of two nominations a year for States Parties was to increase the number of the natural sites on the List. However, the Chairperson acknowledged that the gap between cultural and natural sites on the List has widened. The Chairperson added that the States Parties who have the capacity to present two sites per year are

those who already have the most number sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. The Chairperson stressed that regardless of the outcomes on the nominations, it should be a collective responsibility of States Parties in the interests of the Convention.

The **Chairperson** suggested that if an inter-sessional working group were to be convened, there should be adequate representation from the regional groups. The Chairperson proposed that the mandate of the working group should be devoted to paragraph 61, in order to have an in-depth discussion on the issues at hand.

The Delegation of **India** underlined that the substance of the working group should concentrate on paragraph 61 and some other issues could be identified as well. The Delegation of India stated that regarding the financial implications of convening an inter-sessional working group, the working group could use the existing mechanism of regional group meetings to meet, as this would not entail additional costs. The Delegation also proposed that these issues could be taken up during the General Conference in November for broader consultation, and eventually to the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that it may not be necessary to discuss these issues at the sidelines of the General Conference as the general Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention would also be meeting in November and this could be put forth as an agenda item where the results of regional group consultations could be taken to the General Assembly. The Director stated that it would not be recommended to discuss these issues at the Extraordinary session as that session would be convened only for the limited purpose of appointing the Vice-Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The Director reiterated that the General Assembly could thus be an appropriate platform for consultation on these issues.

The **Chairperson** recalled the main points discussed: that a working group would be established and take into account proposals made by the regional groups, where the working group would not be open-ended but rather, the members would be limited in number. The Chairperson further stated that that the platform of the General Assembly would be used as a broader platform for consultation. The Chairperson also underlined that it was important for the working group's mandate to focus on paragraph 61, and other urgent issues that may be identified. The Chairperson requested for India to present a concrete proposal to the Committee on the convening of an inter-sessional working group, for incorporation into the draft decision.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the points stated by the Chairperson and requested to hear from Turkey as they would be the Chairperson for the next World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recognized Germany's generous contributions for the ad hoc working group and stated that it would endeavor to deliver the same. The Delegation expressed its hope that the inter-sessional working group would be able to have extensive discussions to arrive at creative and effective solutions to the issues at hand.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the General Assembly of States Parties would provide the broader forum for consultation with all States Parties, but they would not be able to take a decision as these entailed changes to the Operational Guidelines that only the Committee could decide upon. The Director stated that the results of the working group could be taken to the General Assembly in November for consultation and that the recommendations could be finalized for presentation to the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee. The Director also clarified that regarding the availability of rooms at the UNESCO headquarters, if the Secretariat organizes such meetings, it was a requisite for interpretation in both language to be provided, which entailed additional costs.

The Delegation of **Turkey** requested for the Delegation of Germany to provide information on the expenses undertaken for the organization of the ad hoc working group.

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

La Délégation du **Sénégal** a estimé que l'Assemblée Générale des Etats parties constitue une bonne tribune, une opportunité à ne pas rater pour discuter de ces questions. Elle pense qu'il y a un problème d'éthique sur la question de la compensation. En effet, cette question soulève d'après elle le conflit d'intérêt, la prise de participation. Elle suggère de maintenir le fonctionnement actuel. Elle indique également que si des comités ad hoc doivent se mettre en place, des efforts seront fournis pour que la traduction soit assurée dans les deux langues.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** acknowledged Turkey's generosity in hosting and chairing the inter-sessional working group and supported the statements of India and Turkey.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** proposed to move to adopt the draft decision removing paragraph 61 as suggested by India. The Delegation also proposed an amendment to the draft decision to encourage States Parties to submit one nomination per year from 2017. The Delegation reiterated that its proposed amendment was just to encourage States Parties, taking into account the discussions that were taking place. The Delegation stressed that this did not entail any changes to the Operational Guidelines, but would reflect the sentiments of the house and be a constructive step forward to achieve better representation on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** a apporté son appui à la proposition de l'Inde afin que le groupe de travail ad hoc poursuive la réflexion sur ce point. Au sujet du point 5, elle considère que le maintien de l'article 22.7 tel qu'amendé en 2013 est important puis qu'il permet à l'Etat partie d'exposer son expérience dans le cadre d'une proposition d'inscription et de fournir des informations actualisées sur les mesures de gestion mises en place. Ce mécanisme a permis d'augmenter la confiance et le dialogue entre les Etats parties et le comité.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the proposal of India to establish an inter-sessional working group and also agreed with Turkey's proposal.

La Délégation du **Pérou** a apporté son appui à la proposition de l'Inde et demande que la question soit renvoyée à un groupe de travail intersession à composition non limitée.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** stated that if all delegations were in favour of removing paragraph 61 from the Draft Decision, it could agree to do so as well. The Delegation also suggested that the Draft Decision mention the working group and that the mandate of this working group should be limited to paragraph 61.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** a souscrit à la proposition de l'Inde et à l'acceptation généreuse de la Turquie pour la constitution du groupe de travail Ad hoc. Elle a souhaité avoir confirmation qu'il ne s'agit que de l'approfondissement de la disposition 61 et a voulu avoir des précisions sur la nature du groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the reexamination of paragraphs 61 and 69, and further supported the proposal made by the Philippines.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stated that it would go with the consensus. The Delegation expressed its thanks to Turkey and supported the proposal of the Philippines.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to move to a paragraph by paragraph adoption of the Draft Decision. The Chairperson adopted Paragraphs 1-3, and paragraph 4, with the removal of the reference to paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines, was adopted as well.

The **Rapporteur** read through paragraph 4bis.

The Delegation of **India** stated that it did not agree with paragraph 5 as it went against the spirit of the working group that was to be set up and the need for further consultation and discussion on the matter.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** requested for the language of the text to be clarified.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** made some clarifications to the text.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** proposed the addition of the "sustainability of the World Heritage Fund". The Delegation also suggested that a discussion on amendments to paragraph 61 should be included in 4ter.

The Delegation of **Finland** reiterated the need to have a very precise mandate for the working group as its scope appeared to be broadening. The Delegation thanked Viet Nam for its proposal.

The Delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the proposal of the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the proposal made by Finland

La Délégation du **Qatar** a proposé d'envisager qu'il ait un membre du Comité représentatif du groupe électoral et un autre représentant qui ne soit pas membre du Comité, de sorte que tous les Etats parties soient représentés pour plus de richesse dans les débats.

The Delegations of **Jamaica** and **Serbia** supported the proposal made by the Philippines

The Delegation of **Japan** agreed with Finland that the mandate of the working group should be kept precise.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souhaite qu'on arrive à un consensus et pense qu'il ne faudrait pas rendre le débat sur le paragraphe 61 exclusif.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** apporte son soutien à la proposition des philippines de donner la priorité au paragraphe 61. Elle estime que sera l'occasion de débattre d'autres questions qui n'ont pas fait l'objet de discussions

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stated that the mandate of the working group should be limited to paragraph 61.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** propose de se prononcer sur ce qui doit être modifié pour gagner du temps et être plus efficace.

The **Chairperson** stated that Algeria had made a sensible proposal.

The Delegation of **Poland** agreed with the Republic of Korea that the mandate of the working group should be limited to paragraph 61.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and **Croatia** agreed with Algeria.

The **Rapporteur** read through the remaining draft decisions.

The Chairperson noted that there were no further reservations on 4ter and proceeded to adopt 4ter and to move on to paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **India** stated that since the Committee had agreed to the working group and the mechanism of regional consultations, the issue should be discussed in its entirety and a decision made only when the discussions have concluded.

The **Chairperson** requested if Vietnam and Finland would still like to hold on to the wordings they had proposed given the statement from India, or if they could accept India's proposal.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** stated that it could go along with the consensus of the room.

The Delegation of **Finland** shared Viet Nam's views and hence accepted India's proposal.

The **Chairperson** sought the agreement of the Committee members to extend the afternoon session to finish the discussion of Item 11.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** souhaite avoir des éclaircissements sur le nombre de pays qui feraient partie du groupe. Elle estime qu'il est important que des pays observateurs fassent partie de ce groupe tout en soulignant qu'elle souhaite aller dans le sens du consensus.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Committee was now extending the mandate of the working group established in Doha to include two representatives from each electoral group as Turkey had clarified that any members of the electoral group were welcome to join the new working group even if they were not part of the working group established in Doha.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** exprime son accord avec la proposition d'élargir le groupe ad hoc et proposé de modifier 4 bis comme suit : décide de prolonger le mandat du groupe de travail ad hoc élargit à un représentant par groupe régional non membre du Comité pour approfondir les contenus des paragraphes sur lesquels il y aurait consensus.

The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of the decision paragraph by paragraph.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** souhaite apporter une modification au point 8: accueille aussi favorablement l'inclusion des paragraphes relatifs aux peuples autochtones et le patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Turkey** highlighted that Paragraph 10 should include mention of both Paragraph 61 and 68 of the Operational Guidelines.

Paragraphs 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments by Poland to Paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the formulation as they had said from the outset that the extended mandate of the working group should also take on sundry issues as necessary. However, the Delegation noted that some members felt that the Working Group should be more restrictive in its scope and hence said that it was self-contradictory that the changes introduced to Paragraph 12 in effect expanded the scope of the working group.

The Delegation of **Poland** clarified that the intention was not for the working group to review an additional paragraph of the Operational Guidelines but rather, the discussions in the following year could give provision to the Advisory Bodies in preparation for the next revision of the Operational Guidelines in four years' time.

The **Chairperson** requested for more clarity in the wording of the Draft Decision on this matter.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with Poland on the need for greater clarity on the distinction between management plans and systems as they are integral for the State of Conservation, and this was critical for preserving OUV.

Paragraphs 12 and 13 of the Draft Decision were adopted.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any Committee Members who objected to the mention of the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund that would be part of the work of the extended mandate of the ad-hoc working group. The Chairperson noted that there were no objections from the floor.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** souhaite faire remarquer, avant l'adoption de la Décision, que la proposition de l'Inde doit être bien reflétée dans le résumé des travaux de cette session car il est important que les Présidents de Groupes régionaux puissent consulter au sein de leurs propres groupes pour alimenter le débat. Il faut donc prendre note de la proposition de ces consultations régionales pour qu'elles aient lieu.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique penser avoir compris que les discussions seraient ouvertes au-delà du paragraphe 61 des Orientations pour aborder des questions qui seraient liées.

The **Chairperson** clarified that consensus had been reached on this matter and proceeded to adopt the entire Draft Decision.

The **Draft Decision 39 COM 11.REV** was adopted as amended.

## **FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

### **ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2014-2015 AND PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2016-2017**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/15

*Decisions:* **39 COM 15**

The **Chairperson of the Budget Working Group** said that she had the pleasure of introducing the Decision of the Budget Working Group. She recalled that the Budget Working Group was established as a standing consultative body to examine budgetary and financial issues on Item 15. The Working Group had started its work on 30 June 2015 (Tuesday) and concluded its work on 4 July 2015 (Saturday). She noted that almost 12 hours of debates had taken place, including a joint meeting with the Working Group on the Revision of the Operational Guidelines. She also recalled the Budget Working Group had 40 to 50 participants present at each of its meetings, representing 29 States Parties, of which 15 were Committee members. She thanked the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for her continuous efforts in convening the participants of the Budget Working Group. She also expressed her thanks to the Chief Financial Officer of UNESCO, the three Advisory Bodies – ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM – as well as the Secretariat for their useful



presentations and support. She noted that the task of the Budget Working Group was not easy; there were different issues to consider as the ad-hoc working group chaired by Germany was not able to come to a consensus on matters of finance. She announced that she was pleased to report back to the Committee on the main content of the debates and the draft decision 39 COM 15.REV. The presentation would comprise three parts: the current financial situation, the budget proposal for the World Heritage Fund for the biennium 2016-2017 and cost savings and efficiency measures and resource mobilization. She stated that with the inclusion of two alternatives to Paragraph 24 of the Draft Decision, the Budget Working group managed to reach consensus on the content of the Draft Decision.

Firstly, regarding the current financial situation, the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group shared that the main focus of the discussion was on strengthening the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. She elaborated that the financing of World Heritage activities had a decreasing trend since 2010. She underlined that the working group had expressed deep concern at the current financial situation of the World Heritage Fund, which hampered its ability to provide for activities related to the Convention, including International Assistance. She also stated that the Budget Working Group noted with concern the worsening trend in the World Heritage Fund in terms of resources dedicated to conservation and nominations. She indicated that the General Assembly and the World Heritage Committee had highlighted conservation as a top priority but the actual stance of budgeting did not reflect this prioritization. She noted that of the funding, 52% goes to nominations and 48% to conservation and therefore, the Draft Decision called for increasing the proportion of the World Heritage Fund dedicated to conservation. The Budget Working Group strongly called on Member States to pay their contributions on time and as early in the year as possible. The Budget Working Group also called upon States Parties to allocate voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund, especially to the sub-accounts of International Assistance and human capacities. The Budget Working Group emphasized the need to continue further resource mobilization, voluntary contributions, fundraising and public-private partnerships. She indicated that one delegation also called upon options to increase voluntary financial contributions by State Parties related to new nominations. The Chairperson of the Budget Working Group also shared that Member States showed great interest to be briefed about the budget throughout the year and indicated that the Draft Decision requested for the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with Advisory Bodies, to hold a budget briefing as part of the information session held prior to each Committee meeting. Regarding State of Conservation reports, the Budget Working Group requested the World Heritage Centre, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to explore options to extend the reporting cycle depending on the degree of urgency at the site. Regarding the Committee meeting cycle, the Draft Decision requested for an analysis to be prepared on the implications of transferring to a two-year meeting cycle of the Committee to allow for more time for evaluation and conservation activities to take place. With regards to current financial situation, the Budget Working Group had proposed to approve the budget adjustments within the World Heritage Fund to fund International Assistance requests. The Budget Working Group also accepted using operating reserves to cover ICOMOS's request for additional funding. She stated that in order to allow the execution of the Committee's decisions and to respond to emergency needs, the Budget Working Group proposed to grant authorization to the

Director-General for up to 20% of the initial budget, and up to a maximum amount of USD 250,000.

Secondly, on the budget proposal for the next two years, the Budget Working Group had approved the budget proposal of the World Heritage Fund for 2016-2017. According to the expenditure plan, this would be USD 5.1 million as shown in Annex 5 of Document 15.

Thirdly, on cost savings and efficiency measures and resource mobilization, the Budget Working Group had weighted the eight options in the Comparative Analysis that could contribute to the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. The Chairperson of the Budget Working Group noted that this analysis was prepared by the Secretariat as requested by the Committee members at the 38th session (Doha, 2014). She recalled that the eight options were based on three elements: the number of new nominations discussed at each Committee meeting, the number of State of Conservation reports and the frequency of Committee meetings. The Budget Working Group discussed solutions in terms of the addressing the division between funding directed to conservation and to nominations. The Chairperson of the Budget Working Group informed the Committee that the group had a discussion on how these measures would offer savings, efficiency and the reduction of the workload in order to strengthen financial sustainability and maintain the quality of World Heritage work. She indicated that two alternatives were present in the Draft Decision at Paragraph 24, and both propose to maintain the present yearly meeting cycle of the Committee. She also stated that the results of the Operational Guidelines Working Group would also have an impact on the alternatives. The Chair read out the first alternative, which entailed reducing the annual limit of the number of nominations from 45 to 25 and the number of State of Conservation reports from 150 to 120, with the final number of SOCs to be determined through consultation with Advisory Bodies, which would result in total cost savings of USD 218 076 (Option 3 of WHC-15/39.COM/15). The Chairperson stated that the second alternative noted that reducing the number of new nominations per State Party from two to one, with certain exemptions, would bring the total number of nominations examined to between 27 and 32 based on past trends, and result in some cost savings. The Chairperson underlined that the second alternative also proposed to adopt if necessary a reduction in the number of SOC reports examined annually from 150 to 120, which would result in cost savings of USD 74 696 (modified Option 2 of WHC-15/39.COM/15).

The Chairperson of the Budget Working Group thanked the host country of Germany for the professional facilities as well as support personnel and volunteers made available to the Budget Working Group. She also reiterated her thanks to the Committee, States Parties and observers, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for the excellent cooperation and good discussion. She proceeded to submit the Draft Decision for the Committee's adoption and discussion.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Budget Working Group for their extensive and excellent work and announced that the meeting would conclude with the introduction from the Budget Working Group and that the debate would resume the following morning.

*The meeting rose at 7.00 p.m.*

**NINTH DAY – TUESDAY 7 July 2015**

**SIXTHEENTH MEETING**

**9.30 a.m. – 2.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES**

**ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2014-2015 AND PREPARATION OF THE BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 2016-2017 (continuation)**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/15

*Decisions:* **39 COM 15**

The Delegation of **Germany** explained its amendment to the Draft Decision.

**The Rapporteur** read through the proposed amendment made by Germany.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 15 REV** was adopted.

The Chairperson thanked the Working Group as well as the members of the Committee. She invited the Committee to move to Item 5E.

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

**5E. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CAPACITY-BUILDING STRATEGY – FOLLOW-UP TO DECISION 38 COM 9C**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/5E

*Decisions:* **39 COM 5E**

The Delegation of **Japan** indicated that they had consulted with other members of the Committee on this matter and proposed an amendment to Rule 22.7 of the Rules of Procedure.

**The Chairperson** requested for the Legal Advisor to clarify the difference between Paragraphs 22.7 and 22.7.

The **Legal Advisor** explained the connection and contradiction between Paragraphs 22.7 and 22.7. The Legal Advisor explained that Rule 22.6 limited the possibility of

States Parties to speak on World Heritage properties only in response to specific questions whereas Rule 22.7 saw the possibility of States Parties being able to speak on World Heritage properties at the discretion of the Chairperson, but not necessarily just in response to specific questions posed. The Legal Advisor recalled the amendment of Japan to limit the possibility for States Parties to present their views just for inscription of properties on the World Heritage List, to provide clarifications and updates on the proposed site.

The **Chairperson** noted that even with the Japanese amendment, the existing contradiction between Rule 22.6 and 22.7 would not be completely resolved.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its support for the proposal made by Japan.

La délégation du **Sénégal** explique que le paragraphe ne doit pas se limiter aux inscriptions mais être étendu aux rapports sur l'état de conservation, car ces derniers ont suscité énormément de débats.

The **Chairperson** said that Senegal's proposal would reintroduce the contradiction to Rule 22.7.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that it supported the proposal by Japan.

La Délégation de **l'Algérie** indique trouver la proposition du Japon intéressante quand il s'agit d'avis à donner sur les biens à inscrire, mais elle souligne que l'Article 22.6 laisse la porte ouverte à l'état de conservation. Elle souligne qu'il faudrait une précision à l'article 22.7 indiquant « *après évaluation des Organisations consultatives du bien proposé à l'inscription par cet Etat* ».

The Delegation of **India** stated that it would continue to support the proposal by Japan but also drew the Committee's attention to Paragraph 183 of the Operational Guidelines. The Delegation stated its belief that the proposal put forth by Japan was a good compromise.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that it was not supportive of the proposal by Japan and expressed its preference for the original version of the text.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stated that it supported Japan's amendment.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its preference for the original version, but said that it could go along with the Japan's amendment for consensus.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its preference for the original version, but as some inconsistency still existed, the Delegation proposed to merge both the proposed amendment and the original text.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** supported for Japan's amendment.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed a modification to the language of the amendment proposed by Japan.

The **Chairperson** summed up the interventions, accepted the Japanese amendment, and invited to adopt the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 5E** was adopted as amended.

## **WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS**

### **ITEM 13 FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS**

#### **13A. WORKING METHODS OF THE EVALUATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS OF NOMINATION: REPORT OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/13A  
WHC-15/39.COM/INF.13A

*Decision:* **39 COM 13A**

The **Chairperson** requested for Committee Members to go through the Draft Decisions and asked the Rapporteur if any proposals for amendment had been received.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments as proposed by the Delegations of Germany, Philippines and Serbia.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee members to examine and adopt the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph, and thereafter proposed to concentrate on the amendments to Paragraphs 10 and 11.

The Delegation of **Turkey** proposed to review and shorten the amendments.

The Delegation of **India** stated that it was proud to associate its name with this Draft Decision, as this was the result of the cooperation and efforts of all Committee members.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** indique que le projet de décision est vaste et touche à de nombreuses questions qui méritent discussion. Elle souhaite donc discuter de tous les points de ce projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** reminded Senegal that the items being discussed at this juncture had been decided upon by the consultative bodies on the Operational Guidelines and Budget.

The Delegation of **Japan** stated that it was happy with the current text and made a query on paragraph 9 regarding the involvement of ICCROM.

**ICCROM** thanked the working group and said that no discussion had ever taken place between ICCROM and any State Party with regard to the ICCROM's role in the

evaluation process. ICCROM noted that the value it could add to this process should be specified. ICCROM stated that it did not want to add to the financial pressure on the Convention. ICCROM also noted that the draft decision only suggested studying the feasibility of ICCROM's involvement in the evaluation process. ICCROM expressed its willingness to continue working with State Parties, IUCN, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre in all the activities in the framework of the convention such as the State of Conservation, reactive monitoring, periodic reporting and capacity building.

The Delegation of **Germany** clarified that the paragraph on the feasibility of ICCROM's involvement in the evaluation process had arisen as an outcome of the ad-hoc working group and endorsed the Turkish amendment.

The **Chairperson** considered that paragraph 9 should be deleted.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** indique souhaiter discuter du paragraphe 9.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** endorsed the Draft Decision put forth by Germany, Philippines and Serbia.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** thanked the ad-hoc working group under the leadership of Germany and wished Turkey success in its leadership of the working group in the coming year. The Delegation expressed its support for the Draft Decision.

La délégation de l'**Algérie** appuie le projet d'amendement de la Turquie et de l'Allemagne concernant le point 10. Pour ce qui concerne le paragraphe 9, elle souligne que l'ICCROM fait partie des Organisations consultatives au même titre que les autres et que son expertise unique dans la reconstruction et la restauration des biens est essentielle notamment dans les situations actuelles de post-conflit ou de post catastrophe naturelles. Ainsi, l'ICCROM devrait être d'avantage impliquée dans le processus d'intervention sur les biens.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with the Turkish amendment to paragraph 10 and supported Algeria's involvement to further involve ICCROM as an Advisory Body in the evaluation process.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the decision proposed by the working group, as well as the Turkish amendment.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** soutien l'observation faite par l'Algérie.

The Delegation of **Croatia** thanked the working group and supported paragraph 10.

The **Chairperson** explained the amendments that had been proposed so far.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that there was a problem with paragraph 9 as there were still two different amendments.

The **Rapporteur** explained that one amendment was in favor of further studying ICCROM's role in the evaluation process, supported by Germany, Philippines, Serbia and Jamaica whereas the alternative proposal by Algeria and Portugal were in favor of involving ICCROM in the evaluation process at this juncture.

**ICCROM** thanked the delegations of Algeria and Portugal for their strong support but stated their preference to consider the feasibility of ICCROM's involvement, bearing in mind financial concerns.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** prend note des préoccupations financières exprimées par l'ICCROM mais insiste sur le fait que sa participation au processus d'évaluation doit être reconnue.

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

The Draft Decision **39 COM 13A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** thanked the ad-hoc working group for their hard work and wished Turkey success in its future Chairmanship of the working group.

**IUCN** thanked the ad-hoc working group and welcomed greater dialogue with the Advisory Bodies.

**ICOMOS** fully supported IUCN's statement and thanked the Chairperson as well as Germany for the strong collaboration over the past year.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the excellent co-operation and work with all stakeholders involved.

The **Chairperson** explained that the Delegation of Belgium had wanted to make a statement regarding Item 10B discussed the day before and invited the Delegation of Belgium to take the floor.

La Délégation de la **Belgique**, dans le cadre du plan d'action présenté hier, indique soutenir toutes les formes de synergies entre les Conventions et les institutions intergouvernementales. Elle rappelle que la Belgique a accueilli récemment la 6<sup>e</sup> Conférence du Conseil de l'Europe des Ministres du patrimoine culturel et qu'à cette occasion deux textes d'importance ont été adoptés : *l'Appel de Namur* qui condamne la destruction volontaire du patrimoine et le trafic illicite et la *Déclaration de Namur* appelant à une mise en œuvre de la stratégie pour le patrimoine en Europe pour le 21<sup>e</sup> siècle selon 4 axes prioritaires : la contribution du patrimoine à la qualité de la vie, la contribution du patrimoine à la prospérité de l'Europe, l'éducation et la formation tout au long de la vie et la gouvernance participative dans le domaine du patrimoine.

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

### **9B. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE REFLECTION ON PROCESSES FOR MIXED NOMINATIONS**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/9B

*Decision:* **39 COM 9B**

The **Deputy Director of the Division for Heritage** presented the item.

The **Advisory Bodies** (joint statement between ICOMOS and IUCN) supported the decision concerning possible modifications to the shared working methods regarding the evaluation of the nomination of mixed properties. The Advisory Bodies stated that coordination had improved and that State Parties were encouraged to consult the Advisory Bodies regarding the challenges they faced with mixed sites. The Advisory Bodies considered that the working methods could further be improved, such as through the possibility of introducing a new joint panel mechanism. However, the Advisory Bodies acknowledged that this would require additional resources and therefore this may only be introduced after the budget discussion for the next biennium. The Advisory Bodies further noted that a joint coordination group was formed between IUCN and ICOMOS to assure joint work on mixed sites and cultural landscapes. The Advisory Bodies also shared that they would work in close cooperation with ICCROM on capacity building. The Advisory Bodies stated that the result of the “Connecting Practice” workshop was available online. The Advisory Bodies reiterated their commitment to improving the processes and methods for the evaluation of mixed properties.

**IUCN** fully endorsed the joint statement.

The Delegation of **Germany** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their actions on mixed sites and proposed a minor amendment to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** shared that there were many challenges in putting up a mixed nominations and thanked ICUN and ICOMOS for their help and guidance for the Jamaican inscription. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Poland** welcomed the conclusions and encouraged IUCN and ICOMOS to implement them. The Delegation welcomed the “Connecting Practice” initiative of ICOMOS and IUCN.

The Delegation of **India** expressed its support for the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed that there was a minor amendment received from Germany and read it out.

Draft Decision **39 COM 9B** was adopted as amended.



## WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS

### ITEM 12      PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DRAFT POLICY GUIDELINES

*Documents:*      *WHC-15/39.COM/12*

*Decision:*      **39 COM 12**

The **Secretariat** introduced the item.

**ICCROM** recalled that it was asked to take the lead for the scoping study of the Policy Guidelines to be carried out with close collaboration between the World Heritage Centre and other Advisory Bodies. ICCROM thanked the State Party of Australia its generous contribution in providing funding for the scoping study. ICCROM noted that the study would take approximately three months. ICCROM shared that at the end of the following day's session, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre would have a meeting to discuss the purpose of the study, determine roles and responsibilities, necessary tasks to be carried out, the timeline and the format that the study would take. ICCROM explained that the study would be divided into two parts: first, the study would provide an overall framework for the policy guidelines with a brief look at the past policy development within the World Heritage Convention and the future role of the policy guidelines in the implementation of the Convention, specifically the relationship between the Policy Guidelines and the Operational Guidelines.

ICCROM elaborated that the second part of the study would look at the development of the policy guidelines, with reference to the structure of the draft policy on Sustainable Development. ICCROM explained that this section of the study would also extract the policy areas already contained in past Committee and General Assembly decisions and highlight existing policy gaps. ICCROM further explained that the study would make proposals for the necessary procedures to be developed, individual policies to be adopted as well as to ensure that there would be a procedure harmonise the Policy Guidelines with the Operational Guidelines. ICCROM indicated that it expected the scoping study to be presented at the 40th session of the Committee in 2016, with the agreement of the Committee that additional progress beyond the scoping study could be presented in 2017. ICCROM emphasized the effectiveness of studying the policy aspects first, before requesting the Operational Guidelines and Budget working group to draft the necessary language and ensure that funds are available to implement the policies that have been agreed upon.

The **Chairperson** opened the debate and invited Committee members to take the floor.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked Australia for providing financial support for this study. The Delegation emphasized the importance of ensuring the balanced representation between natural and cultural sites. The Delegation encouraged the role of civil society in the preparation work of the policy guidelines and for the state of conservation. The Delegation proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to reflect greater civil society participation.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked Australia for their funding of the development of the policy guidelines and informed that the Poland had also proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** drew the Committee's attention to the draft policy for the integration of sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention to avoid conflict among different nations with regard to cultural issues within the World Heritage Convention.

The Delegation of **Argentina** (Observer) stated that while both resources and time were limited, the other conventions should be looked into as well. The Delegation said that both new categories for inscription, particularly for industrial heritage, as well as new legal instruments, were needed. The Delegation underlined the importance of the Policy Guidelines to ensure the success of the Convention. The Delegation also requested for the issue of the mass destruction of sites to be discussed in future.

The Delegation of **Australia** (Observer) expressed that it was delighted to finance the policy guidelines study, which was an extremely important issue within the World Heritage Convention.

The **Rapporteur** read through the amendments proposed by Committee members to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 12** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** went through the Committee's agenda for the present session, and indicated that the item related to Jerusalem would be examined by the Committee at 13h, instead of 12h.

## **ITEM 13 FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS AND EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS**

### **13B. FEASIBILITY STUDY ON AN ADDITIONAL ORDINARY SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/13B

*Decision:* **39 COM 13B**

The **Secretariat** introduced the item.

The **Rapporteur** informed that no amendments had been made to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 13B** was adopted.

## FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

### ITEM 14 INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/14

*Decision:* **39 COM 14**

The **Chairperson** noted that that the difficult financial situation was evident during discussions of the World Heritage Committee over the past few days, especially taking into consideration the diagram that the World Heritage Centre presented that outlined the needs and distribution of financial means. The Chairperson thanked the World Heritage Centre for its report on the budgetary situation and requested States Parties to the Convention to keep the discrepancy between the financial resources and the needs and tasks in mind. The Chairperson concluded by encouraging States Parties to provide more extra-budgetary resources.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted with concern the limited funds available for International Assistance, especially the budget lines for conservation and management as well as the increasing imbalance in the World Heritage Fund with more funding going towards nominations instead of conservation purposes. The Delegation was of the view that this imbalance would hamper the credibility of the Convention and diminish the ability of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to assist States Parties in true need of support for their threatened sites. The Delegation acknowledged that that the Secretariat could render more support to States Parties in their preparation of International Assistance requests. The Delegation stated that out of its contribution of USD 200,000 directed towards conservation and management for natural and mixed sites, provided at the end of 2013, there was still USD 41,000 remaining, despite the evident great need on the ground. The Delegation expressed understanding and awareness towards the fact that there were hardly any natural heritage experts left in the regional units to support States Parties. The Delegation expressed its hope UNESCO would pay greater attention to this issue and ensure that natural heritage expertise in the World Heritage Centre was significantly strengthened. The Delegation called upon all States parties who were in the position to do so, to contribute to the World Heritage Fund, in particular to the budget line for conservation and management in order to show that conservation was truly at the heart of the Convention.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** drew the Committee's attention to the fact that it was a contributor to the International Assistance fund. The Delegation stated that the reason for their contribution back in 2013 was that considering the financial constraints for UNESCO, International Assistance should provide a crucial financial lifeline for global cultural activities. The Delegation expressed its support for the Draft Decision, especially paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **Germany** supported the intervention of Finland, especially the points concerning the lack of expertise on natural heritage in the Centre. The

Delegation underlined the necessity of having natural heritage experts for the future successful work of the Centre and the implementation of the Convention.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its concerns about the decreasing pool of finances available for International Assistance. The Delegation underlined that International Assistance was a fundamental part of the Committee's work and that it was the Convention's responsibility to assist States Parties in the conservation and preservation of properties. The Delegation suggested that since the mandate of the ad-hoc working group had been extended to look at such problems, perhaps some creative ideas could come out for discussion at the following year's committee session.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** se félicite des efforts importants qui sont faits pour l'Afrique mais souligne également qu'il y a encore beaucoup d'efforts à faire à cause du grand déséquilibre. L'essentiel des ressources va au niveau des consultations qui sont importantes, mais le Comité devrait rationaliser et les organisations consultatives gagneraient énormément en essayant de s'appuyer sur les expertises locales et leur savoir qui existent dans les pays.

**IUCN** noted the paradox between the drop in funding for International Assistance and the lack of implementation and utilization of available resources, as the Delegation of Finland had highlighted. IUCN supported the observation of the Delegation of Philippines that this would be a good issue for the ad-hoc working group to discuss and come back to the Committee with proposals. IUCN agreed with the points raised by the Delegation of Senegal and stated that the World Heritage Outlook was precisely intended as a means of engaging the whole range of IUCN local partners and NGO members to mobilize local action for conservation.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 14** was adopted.

## **ITEM 10 PERIODIC REPORTS**

### **10B. FOLLOW-UP OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR THE OTHER REGIONS AND GENERAL REFLECTION ON PERIODIC REPORTING**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM10B

*Decision:* **39 COM 10B.1** to **39 COM 10B.5**

#### **Follow-up Activities on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Asia-Pacific**

The **Secretariat** informed that in spite of budget constraints at UNESCO, several operational activities and training workshops had been organized since July 2014, using extra-budgetary resources or partner institutions such as Category 2 Centres under the auspices of UNESCO. The Secretariat underlined that in November 2013, the General Conference of UNESCO had 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. The

Secretariat informed that the Centre would organize an International Workshop on Disaster Risk Reduction and World Natural Heritage sites in the Asia and the Pacific Region from 24 to 28 August 2015 in order to identify and assess natural and man-made disaster risks at World Heritage properties in the Asia-Pacific region, to raise awareness about the need to integrate special concern for natural and mixed WH properties into natural disaster reduction policies and to develop an Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction in World Heritage management plans.

The Secretariat also informed the Committee about a Workshop on Planning for the Conservation and Development of the Historic Towns and Urban Areas in Suva, Fiji, from 27 July to 7 August 2015. The Secretariat shared that the activity was possible thanks to the financial support of the Netherlands Funds-In-Trust and in close consultation with the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITR-AP) in Shanghai, China. The Secretariat further shared that the workshop aimed to promote the UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (2011) and to develop a medium-term plan for the conservation of structures in poor condition and for the professional development of expertise in conservation for Levuka Historical Port Town. The Secretariat underlined that other regional or sub-regional training activities would also be organized by WHITR-AP, ICCROM and the International Centre on Space Technologies for Natural and Cultural Heritage (HIST) in China. The Secretariat shared that for instance, a training workshop would be organized for East Rennell, a natural heritage site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, to use satellite images and data for the preparation of the Desired State of Conservation for the property. The Secretariat stated that through a Framework Arrangement signed between the Cultural Heritage Administration of the Republic of Korea and the World Heritage Centre, technical assistance had been granted in support of the World Heritage Nomination process for various developing countries in Asia (notably in the Philippines and Maldives) as part of the upstream process. The Secretariat indicated that within the Agreement, the thematic initiative for Sustainable Development and Community Involvement (SDCI) had been launched to focus on the revitalization of traditional skills and knowledge which were associated with the conservation of the ancient monuments and sites in Bangladesh and Pakistan. 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 partner institutions such as UNESCO Category 2 Centres who had provided strong support to the follow-up activities in the Asia and the Pacific region.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10B.1** was adopted.

### **Follow-up Activities on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Africa**

The **Secretariat** presented the highlights of the follow-up activities for the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for the Africa region and for the implementation of the regional Action Plan for 2012-2017. The Secretariat recalled that the Action Plans had five main objectives, which included increasing the representation of African sites on the World Heritage List, increasing direct economic benefits to local communities, increasing disaster risk preparedness, finding a balance between conservation and development needs and protecting heritage in conflict and post conflict situations. The Secretariat shared that the last year of the “Implementation

Programme of the Second Periodic Report in Africa” had focused on cultural heritage and was financed by the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) and UNESCO. The Secretariat stated that this had resulted in two Nomination training workshops organized in Botswana and Burkina Faso, two entrepreneurship/business planning workshops organized in Senegal and Ghana and one field workshop carried-out in Zambia. The Secretariat further stated that two disaster risk preparedness workshops for Lusophone countries were organized in Mozambique and Cabo Verde, a workshop on Traditional Management Systems in Harare, Zimbabwe and a seminar on the future of the Nara Document in Africa as well as a seminar entitled “Experiences of World Heritage in Africa” were also organised.

The Secretariat indicated that in the framework of the “Africa Nature Programme,” financed by the Governments of Flanders (Belgium), Spain and the Netherlands and the MAVA Foundation and implemented in close cooperation with IUCN and AWHF, a series of practical training and field workshops to “Test the How-to Guides in Destination Management” were carried out at four Natural Heritage sites in Africa. The Secretariat also shared that World Heritage Centre had created a shared Africa Nature programme workspace within UNESTEAMS to ensure a lively forum for conservation stakeholders and site managers. The Secretariat also stated that the World Heritage Paper Series N°40: Engaging Local Communities in the Stewardship of World Heritage had also been published.

The Secretariat drew the Committee’s attention to the efforts of the UNESCO Bamako Office in Mali for successfully rehabilitating the mausoleums of Timbuktu, towards the objective of establishing mechanisms for heritage conservation, protection and management in pre-conflict, conflict and post-conflict situations. The Secretariat reminded States Parties to submit their National Action Plans for World Heritage, and encouraged them to establish National World Heritage Committees to help reinforce the implementation of the World Heritage Convention on a national level.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10B.2** was adopted.

### **Follow-up Activities on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for the Arab States**

Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente le programme régional pour les Etats arabes, élaboré sur la base les résultats du deuxième cycle des Rapports périodiques a été adopté à la 35e session du comité du patrimoine mondial à Paris en 2011. Ce programme est depuis mis en œuvre par le Centre du patrimoine mondial avec le soutien des bureaux régionaux de l’UNESCO à Bagdad et Erbil, à Beyrouth, au Caire, à Doha, à Tripoli, à Rabat et à Ramallah. Le Centre régional pour le patrimoine mondial dans les Etats arabes, un centre de catégorie 2 basé à Bahreïn, soutient le programme régional financièrement. Il participe aussi à la conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, au renforcement des capacités des professionnels syriens et irakiens, et fournit, en collaboration étroite avec l’UICN, un appui méthodique au patrimoine naturel si peu représenté dans la région. Comme l’examen de l’état de conservations des biens a montré, cette année a été très dure pour le patrimoine de la région arabe. Elle a été

marquée par des nouvelles de destruction quasi quotidiennes en Iraq, en Syrie, en Libye et au Yémen, et une fragilisation de la protection du patrimoine dans des pays post-révolution ou post-conflit, comme l’Egypte et la Tunisie mais aussi la Palestine ou le Liban. En Syrie, des activités de contrôle, d’évaluation et de réduction des risques ont été mises en œuvre, en mettant notamment l’accent sur les sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et ceux inclus sur la Liste indicative, dans le cadre du projet financé par l’Union européenne. Ce projet a servi de base aux initiatives similaires lancées en Iraq en Libye et au Yémen. Plusieurs activités et études techniques ont été mises en œuvre sur les questions des menaces et mesures de consolidation d’urgence, ainsi que celles de travaux de restauration et de réhabilitation urbaine. Le Centre a organisé une réunion d’experts au siège de l’UNESCO les 18 et 19 juin 2015 sur la question de la reconstruction post-conflit dans le contexte du Moyen-Orient, avec une session dédiée à l’Ancienne ville d’Alep. Cette réunion de réflexion a rassemblé un groupe pluridisciplinaire d’experts internationaux, qui connaissent bien le Moyen-Orient d’un point de vue urbain, archéologique, architectural et technique, politique, et social et les collègues de l’UNESCO des autres conventions. La réunion a permis de lancer une réflexion sur ce sujet et de jeter les bases d’une approche élaborée sur la reconstruction post-conflit au Moyen-Orient. Suite à la situation sans précédent dans la région arabe, le Centre a dû revoir les priorités et faire face à ces situations d’urgence. Malgré cette pression sans précédent, le Centre a continué à suivre de près tous les états parties, et souvent de façon proactive et de leur fournir le soutien technique nécessaire selon les priorités du programme régional. Ainsi, pour le renforcement des capacités, au moins 14 ateliers techniques et de formation ont été organisés, notamment sur les mesures d’urgence pour l’évaluation des dommages et la protection du patrimoine bâti, sur l’élaboration ou révision de Listes indicatives, et la préparation des dossiers d’inscription, sur l’application du mécanisme d’analyse comparative au niveau régional et sur l’application des mécanismes de rapport au Comité du patrimoine mondial. Le programme des Villes du patrimoine mondial apporte un soutien important à la conversation urbaine dans les États arabes, où les ensembles urbains historiques sont la catégorie la plus représentée. Une conférence sur la Recommandation et son rôle dans la sauvegarde du patrimoine urbain et architectural moderne dans le monde arabe se tiendra au mois de décembre 2015 au Koweït. Cette conférence mettra l’accent sur les moyens de renforcer la formation des architectes et urbanistes dans la région, avec la participation d’une douzaine d’universités et de nombreuses organisations non gouvernementales. L’Organisation arabe pour l’éducation, la culture et les sciences (ALECSO), qui a lancé un projet d’établissement d’un observatoire pour les villes historiques du monde arabe apporte un soutien important à cette initiative.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10B.3** was adopted.

### **Follow-up Activities on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting for Latin America and the Caribbean**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of two meetings that were in line with decision 38 COM 10B.4 encouraging the development of sub-regional action plans with a focus on the specific needs of each sub-region. The Secretariat shared that together with the UNESCO Offices in La Havana, Kingston and in Port au Prince and with the financial support of the Netherlands Funds-in-Trust, it organized a Sub-

Regional meeting on the Caribbean Action Plan for World Heritage (La Havana, 26-28 November 2014). The Secretariat stated that the outcome of this meeting was the adoption of the Caribbean Action Plan for World Heritage (2015-2019).

The Secretariat indicated that the second meeting organized in the framework of the follow-up of the second cycle of periodic reporting for the Latin America and Caribbean region was the sub-regional meeting for the elaboration of the World Heritage Action Plan for South America (2015-2020). The Secretariat informed the Committee that this meeting was held from 5 to 7 May 2015 in Cuzco, Peru, thanks to the financial support of the Government of Peru, and stated that this meeting was jointly organized by the World Heritage Centre and the Ministry of Culture of Peru with the support of the UNESCO Office in Lima. The Secretariat also informed the Committee that a sub-regional meeting for Central America was expected to be organized in the first half of 2016 and a progress report on the regional Action Plan and the sub-regional Action Plans would be presented at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2016.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10B.4** was adopted without discussion.

### **General Reflection on Periodic Reporting**

The **Secretariat** recalled that the Committee had launched the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting at its 32nd session in 2008. The Secretariat underlined that the working document addressed important elements such as the involvement of stakeholders such as the World Heritage Centre, the workload of States Parties and Advisory Bodies, and provided information on the feedback on the format of the questionnaire. The World Heritage Centre informed that it had collected the feedback of all regions for the Final Europe Meeting in Helsinki, Finland (February 2015). The Secretariat stated that the working document contained specific considerations with regard to Section I and Section II of the current questionnaire that concerned periodicity, reliability of data as well as coordination and funding of the 3rd cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise. The Secretariat concluded that the 2-year reflection period would allow the simplification and harmonization of the questionnaire and to strengthen comprehensive indicators and benchmarks

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the analysis undertaken by the World Heritage Centre and the decision of a 2-year reflection period to reflect on the data collected during the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in order to improve the process. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision and emphasized that the Periodic Reporting was a useful mechanism on the national and international level.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its support for the 2-year reflection period. The Delegation informed the Committee of the difficulties to report on serial World Heritage sites in the current Periodic Reporting format and stated that this was a problem that should be rectified. The Delegation concluded that the Periodic Reporting exercise provided the opportunity to streamline information on the conservation and protection of the World Heritage properties as well as the application of the World Heritage Convention.



**IUCN** expressed its gratitude for the collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the States Parties to the Convention. IUCN stressed that the Periodic Reporting exercise provided information on lessons learnt and that the relationship with category 2 institutes such as the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and Pacific Region (WHITR-AP) and the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH) in Bahrain were crucial. IUCN welcomed the Africa Nature capacity building program as a good example to align funding and programme activities of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in order to use limited resources efficiently. IUCN also underlined that the Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation (COMPACT) initiative should be adopted in many World Heritage properties. IUCN supported the two-year reflection period (June 2015-June 2017) that would allow the opportunity to define what the next cycle of Periodic Reporting should entail.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 10B.5** was adopted.

## **ITEM 16 OTHER BUSINESS**

*Documents: WHC-15/39.COM/INF.16*

The **World Heritage Committee** took note of this item.

The **Chairperson** informed that Item 17 on the election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 40th session (Istanbul, 2016) would be discussed during the morning session of 8 July.

## **ITEM 18 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 40TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Documents:* WHC-15/39.COM/18

*Decision:* **39 COM 18**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** briefly introduced the item and explained that the agenda included Item 5D on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes. The Director also explained that a new addition to the agenda – Item 11 on the Operational Guidelines – had been included as the working group had decided to continue the discussion on paragraph 61 and 68 of the Operational Guidelines during the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2016.

The Delegation of **Turkey** informed the Committee that in 2016, the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee would take place in Istanbul. The Delegation stated that the session would be organized by the Turkish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Culture and the Turkish National Commission to UNESCO and expressed that Istanbul was looking forward to hosting and welcoming the participants of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation expressed its hope to carry forward the ideals of UNESCO and to raise the profile of UNESCO to new heights. The Delegation informed the Committee that the session was planned to take place after the end of Ramadan on 8 July and that the name of the Chairperson would be announced in the near future.

The **Chairperson** expressed her deep gratitude to the Delegation to Turkey for its invitation and stated that Istanbul was a city with an interesting past, present and future and also a World Heritage property. The Chairperson thanked Turkey for its outstanding hospitality.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee would take place from 10 July until 20 July 2016. The Director of the World Heritage Centre also informed the Committee that these dates might be adjusted.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 18** was adopted.

## ITEM 7 STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

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

#### CULTURAL PROPERTIES

##### ARAB STATES

#### **Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev) - 39 COM 7A.27**

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that there was broad agreement that there should be no debate on this matter, and gave the floor to the Delegation of Qatar.

The Delegation **Qatar**, supported by the Delegations of **Senegal** and **Serbia**, requested that the Chairperson move to the closure of the debate, in line with Rule 32 of the Rules of Procedure. The Delegation proposed that the Committee proceed to move to a secret ballot vote on the Draft Decision that had been circulated in the room.

The **Chairperson** moved to adopt the idea of vote by a secret ballot. The Chairperson requested for the Secretariat to explain the procedure for a secret ballot.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the procedure for a secret ballot. Committee Members would be voting on the following question: "Are you in favour of Draft Decision 39 COM 7A.27 on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan)?" The Director of the Centre added that after voting by Committee Members was completed, the ballots would be counted under the supervision of the Legal Advisor and two Tellers.

The **Chairperson** named the Philippines and Serbia as Tellers.

#### **The Voting process was initiated. Counting of ballots**

The Chairperson announced the results of the vote:

**20** Committee members present.

**1** Committee member was absent.

**5** blank ballots.

No invalid ballots.

**15** Members voting (required majority: 8 votes)

**13 YES**

**2 NO**

The Draft Decision **39 COM 7A.27** was therefore adopted.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer States Parties of Israel, Jordan and Palestine to deliver a statement.

The Delegation of **Israel** thanked the Chairperson for the wonderful work and the organization of the Committee session. The Delegation expressed special thanks to those who tried to break the danger of adopting this Decision by consensus. The Delegation stated that UNESCO was once again being manipulated and abused by a small group of irresponsible states incited by Palestinians and extremist elements in the Board. The Delegation expressed the view that the Organization had today reached a new low in its history and a new record for being politicized, irresponsible, and for its persecution of Israel and Jewish history. This was also a new record for lies and incitement. The Delegation expressed that what the Committee was witnessing was a cynical and dangerous abuse of the organization by the same gang who had pushed aside the moderate and responsible ones. Consequently, they pushed the Organization into a dead end with no relevance to reality. The Delegation stated that the Palestinians and their collaborators had proceeded to turn the World Heritage Committee into a field court martial by presenting accusations against Israel which were totally based on lies, false facts and incitements and this should turn a red warning light to everyone. The Delegation remarked that Palestinians and their collaborators were introducing the rule of law and the justice similar to what was today witnessed with ISIS, where they accused and executed with no distinction between the prosecutors, the investigators, the judges and the executors. The Delegation stated that it was difficult to always know the complete truth but it was always very easy to recognize total lies. The Delegation expressed regret that in this mission, some members of the Committee failed. The Delegation stated that the draft resolution presented by the Palestinians was a paper with maximum lies and zero evidence and that its adoption in Germany was a disgrace to the Organization and to those who didn't fight against the draft resolution. The Delegation expressed that no people in the world could compete with the bond that the Jewish people have with Jerusalem and that the world and humanity should be thankful to the State of Israel for being the sovereign of Jerusalem and the Holy City, for taking care to protect the history and culture of this city, with no discrimination and for the benefit of all religions. The Delegation expressed the view that without Israel, the destiny of the holy sites in Israel and especially in the Holy City of Jerusalem would not be different from what was happening today in the Middle East. The Delegation remarked that there was one sun, one truth and one Jerusalem. As far as the truth was concerned, there were those who could produce their own, and this was what happened here today. The Delegation stated that the State of Israel despised the resolution that was adopted. The Delegation also added that as for the sun and as for Jerusalem, the Delegation promised that Jerusalem would stay united and under Israeli sovereignty. As for the sun, the day the Palestinians woke up and see two suns in the sky, would be the day where Jerusalem would be divided or would not be under the full sovereignty of Israel. The Delegation wished to end with a positive proposal; that the Palestinian draft resolution could be presented as a non-tangible World Heritage document for its contribution to the culture of lying. The Delegation stated that there was no need for the recommendations from ICOMOS since the draft resolution was unique and had a great OUV. The Delegation called on UNESCO to wake up and realize that the mistake they did in accepting Palestine as a member state in their organization as this would have much more severe consequences in the future.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its sincere appreciation for the support that led to the adoption of the resolution on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls as proposed by Jordan. The Delegation highlighted the following five points: Firstly, the Delegation stated that it represented the voice of moderation and responsibility, and had been playing the most balanced and conciliatory role in the troubled region. The Delegation emphasized that it had always advocated credibility, moderation, peace and supported stability in the region and beyond. The Delegation expressed its appreciation to the German delegation for its constructive role to reach a consensual resolution through extensive rounds of deliberations, which were opposed by some parties and as a result, consensus unfortunately did not materialize. Secondly, the Delegation underlined that the resolution was based on facts and scientific credible sources. The Delegation urged Israel, the occupying power, to stop the persistent violations and acts which have altered the status quo in the occupied old city of Jerusalem. Thirdly, the Delegation stressed that all elements pertaining to Israel's violations and unilateral acts were facts on the ground and that Jordan would be willing to provide concrete factual information on all these violations. The Delegation stated that it was of paramount importance to highlight that the Israeli report regarding the State of Conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls included many distorted claims. The Delegation cited an example where the report claimed that there was full cooperation and coordination between Jerusalem, the municipality and the Israeli Antiquities Authority, which the Delegation stated was not the case. Fourthly, the Delegation reaffirmed that the preservation of the heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem and its holy sites were among the top priorities of His Majesty King Abdullah II, the custodian of Jerusalem, Christian and Muslim holy sites. Fifthly, the Delegation expressed concern regarding the continued Israeli demolitions and removal of significant historic remains, which have changed the historic status quo and character of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls.

The Delegation of **Palestine** expressed its deepest gratitude to Germany, not only for the hosting of the Committee session but also for its diplomacy which did not spare any effort to reach a consensus at this session for the resolution of Jerusalem. The Delegation stated that it was unfortunate that the expected result was not met.

La Délégation de Palestine remercie tous les membres du Comité qui ont voté en faveur de la protection de Jérusalem, le patrimoine de l'humanité. Elle souligne que ce patrimoine se trouve en Palestine et qu'il est la capitale du pays, mais que ce bien n'appartient pas au peuple palestinien ou aux arabes, mais à l'humanité toute entière. De plus, la Délégation souhaite s'adresser à ceux qui se sont abstenus et regrette que leur comportement démontre que la protection du bien de Patrimoine Mondial n'a pas une priorité. Finalement, la Délégation s'adresse à ceux qui ont voté contre et regrette que ces membres du Comité transmettent par ce message le fait qu'ils n'accordent aucune importance à la protection du patrimoine mondial mais qu'ils expriment une position uniquement et clairement politique. Elle souhaite que ces Délégations soient plus objectives et qu'elles regardent la réalité sur le terrain. La Délégation souligne qu'il est temps que le Comité fasse face de ses responsabilités.

The Delegation expressed warm thanks to the Jordanian Alkaff and His Majesty the King of Jordan who have been actively managing and protecting the holy sites and the cultural heritage in Jerusalem. The Delegation urged all States Parties to join the efforts for the protection of World Heritage in Jerusalem. The Delegation stressed

that the efforts could not stop until the aim was reached. The Delegation concluded by emphasizing the importance of putting heritage first, as we owe this to our children.

The **Chairperson** informed that Agenda Item 7A was now closed, and proposed to move on the Agenda Item 8C.

## **ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

### **8C. UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

*Decisions:*     **39 COM 8C.1 to 39 COM 8C.3**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the 39th session (Bonn, 2015) inscribed **24 new properties** on the World Heritage List, of which there were zero natural properties, **23 cultural properties** and **1 mixed property**. The Committee also **approved the extension of 3 properties** already inscribed on the List. Among the newly inscribed properties there were **7 cultural landscapes**, and with these additions there were now 95 properties officially recognized as cultural landscapes, representing **9%** of the List.

Out of the **27 successful nominations** (24 new properties and 3 extended properties), 7 properties are situated on the territory of current Committee members. The Secretariat also indicated that following the debates on Item 8B, 6 nominations had been referred and 3 deferred. The Committee did not follow the Advisory Body recommendations as presented in the Draft Decision in 10 cases:

- **5** Referrals became Inscriptions
- **4** Deferrals became Referrals
- **0** Deferrals become Inscriptions
- **0** Deferrals became an approved extension
- **0** Non inscriptions became Referrals
- **1** Non inscription became a Deferral

There were now **1031 properties** inscribed on the World Heritage List, of which **802 are cultural**, **197 are natural** and **32 are mixed**. The breakdown of properties inscribed at the 39th session was as follows:

- Africa: **0** properties
- Arab region: **2** properties
- Asia-Pacific: **7** properties
- Europe/North America: **12** properties
- Latin America and the Caribbean: **3** properties

The Secretariat also informed that the both States Parties of Jamaica and Singapore had their first property inscribed on the World Heritage List.

For the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee at its 39th session decided to inscribe **3 properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger**: Hatra (Iraq), Old

City of Sana'a (Yemen) and the Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen). At the same time, 1 property, Los Katios National Park (Colombia), was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. According to these decisions, there are now 48 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 8C** was adopted.

*The meeting rose at 2.00 p.m.*

**TENTH DAY – WEDNESDAY 8 July 2015**

**SEVENTEENTH MEETING**

**10.00 a.m. – 11.30 a.m.**

**Chairperson: Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer (Germany)**

**ITEM 17 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSON AND  
RAPPORTEUR OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

The **Chairperson** opened the session and recalled the generous invitation of the Delegation of Turkey to host the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee in Istanbul.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its sincerest gratitude to the Federal Republic of Germany for hosting the 39th session in Bonn. The Delegation highlighted the unparalleled hospitality and generosity of the host country, and further stated that the closing ceremony represented the perfect organisation of the session. The Delegation noted that the city of Bonn embodied nature and history and delivered a wonderful experience. The Delegation affirmed the commitment of the Government of Turkey's invitation to host the next session of the World Heritage Committee in Istanbul. The Delegation explained that because of the recent Government elections in Turkey, it was not yet possible for the State Party to indicate who the Chairperson for the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee would be. The Delegation invited the current Chairperson to continue her duty until the new chairperson was named.

The Delegation reported that an interagency task force had been initiated, which comprised the responsible ministry, the national commission to UNESCO, the city council of Istanbul and other appropriate bodies and agencies. The Delegation reiterated its commitment to make the 40th session a success and to fulfil all responsibilities of the host country. The Delegation of **Turkey** announced that the Istanbul Conference Centre would be the venue for the 40th Session.

The **Chairperson** expressed confidence that the State Party of Turkey would be a great host and highlighted that city of Istanbul would be a great place to host the World Heritage Committee. The Chairperson noted the recent elections in Turkey and the process of establishing a new Government. The Chairperson stated that she would be delighted to continue her mandate until a new Chairperson was found.

The **Chairperson** moved on to the election of the next Vice-Chairpersons.

The Delegation of **India**, on behalf of the Asia-Pacific region, proposed the Philippines as Vice-Chairperson of the 40th session.

The proposal was adopted.



The Delegation of **Finland**, on behalf of Europe and North America region, proposed Poland as the Vice-Chairperson of the 40th session.

The proposal was adopted.

**La Délégation du Qatar**, de la part des Etats arabes, a proposé le Liban pour la Vice-Présidence de la 40eme session du Comité.

Cette proposition a été adoptée.

The Delegation of **Columbia**, on behalf of the Latin America and the Caribbean region, proposed the Peru as the Vice-Chairperson of the 40th Session.

The proposal was adopted.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Delegation of Senegal would end its mandate at the next General Assembly. Therefore, the Chairperson suggested that the Delegation of Senegal continue its mandate as Vice-Chairperson for the African region until a new Vice-Chairperson was elected at the General Assembly.

The proposal was adopted.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for his work.

The Delegation of **India** was pleased to propose **Ms Eugene Jo**, member of the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, as the new Rapporteur.

The proposal was adopted.

The **Chairperson** thanked her team as well as the Vice-Chairperson (India) for her excellent chairmanship. The Chairperson welcomed the screening of a short film by the Delegation of Turkey to introduce the city of Istanbul, the venue for the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Draft Decision **39 COM 17** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** requested if Committee members needed time to read through the Decisions report before proceeding with the item. The Chairperson noted that Committee members preferred to continue directly with Item 19.

## **ITEM 19 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS OF THE 39TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2015)**

*Documents:*        *WHC-15/39.COM/19*  
                          *WHC-15/39.COM/19.Annex 1*

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Item 19 and the Decisions Report presented. The Chairperson congratulated the Rapporteur and the World

Heritage Centre for compiling the Decision Report. The Chairperson also reminded the Committee that debate on the contents of the decisions should not be re-opened.

The **Rapporteur** thanked the Committee for the appointment and for the trust and responsibility. He also expressed thanks to the State Party of Germany for the great organisation of the Committee session, the Chairperson, the Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO, the German National Commission to UNESCO and the city of Bonn. The Rapporteur also expressed thanks to his own team and Delegation. The Rapporteur recalled the daily meetings in the evening with the Secretariat to finalise the Draft Decisions and thanked the Secretariat and its staff for their work.

The Rapporteur briefly explained the process of the adoption of the Decisions Report. The Rapporteur drew the Committee's attention to two points: first, Item 17 was currently not in the Decision Report since it had just been adopted. The Rapporteur stated that the second point concerned Item 11 where paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision contained a footnote providing a link to the *Operational Guidelines*. He concluded by inviting the Committee to comment on the report.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for his work during the past ten days. The Chairperson invited the Committee to point to editorial and factual errors in the Decisions Report and started with Part I of the Decisions Report.

**IUCN** noted a minor point in Decision 39 COM 7A.5 on page 15: Paragraph 11 should be shown in bold text.

The **Chairperson** thanked IUCN.

Part I of the Decision Report was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Part II of the Decision Report.

The Delegation of **Germany** remarked that for Decision 39 COM 7B.34, it had wished to retain the original paragraph 9.

The **Rapporteur** responded that the Delegation of Senegal has asked to delete that paragraph, and the decision was subsequently adopted.

**ICOMOS** noted that in Decision 39 COM 7B.60, the paragraph containing the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage in Danger List should be printed in bold.

Part II of the Decision Report was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Part III of the Decision Report.

**ICOMOS** drew the attention to paragraph 39 COM 8B.7 and pointed to a **slam** error in the brief synthesis of the Statement of OUV of the Blue and John Crow Mountains (Jamaica).

**ICOMOS** pointed to Decision 39 COM 8B.15 and stated that to its understanding, in recommendation 4, part c) should be deleted.

The **Rapporteur** replied that it was a factual error which would be removed.

The Delegation of **Poland** remarked that the second paragraph in Decision 39 COM 8B.18 should mention Decision 37 COM 8B.27.

The **Rapporteur** replied that this was a factual error which would be corrected and thanked the Committee for its understanding given the tight timeframe during which the Decisions Report was prepared.

The Delegation of **Germany** stated that the Decision 39 COM 8B.14 should include a footnote pointing to the document number of the Summary Record (INF.19).

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** suggested an editorial change to delete the bracketed word “Germany” in the same footnote and to mention the summary records in plural.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Secretariat will delete the word “Germany” in brackets and referred to the *Rules of Procedure*, rule 47, which speak of the “Summary Record” in singular.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** suggested that following the clarification of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, that the website of the World Heritage Centre should then consistently mention it as “Summary Record”.

Part III of the Decision Report was adopted.

The Decisions of the 39th Committee Session 2015 in Bonn, Germany were adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 19.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that it was his honour to express his heartfelt gratitude to the State Party of Germany for its hospitality and for the organisation of the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee, which had been conducted in an outstanding manner. The Director underlined that the organisation of the Session was a resounding success, given the fact that this Committee session saw the highest number of participants ever. The Director also acknowledged the work of the young team of always-smiling volunteers who have readily responded to all requests. On behalf of the Secretariat, the Director thanked the Committee for its decision-making and thanked the Advisory Bodies for their close cooperation. The Director also commended the excellent work of the Rapporteur. The Director drew the Committee’s attention to the team of interpreters and thanked each one of them for their exceptional work. The Director also expressed thanks to the technicians involved.

The Director commended the Chairperson’s leadership which has enabled consensus among the Committee members. The Director underscored that the Chairperson had navigated the Committee in a harmonious way to work through

difficult decisions. The Director expressed that for the Secretariat, it was an immense pleasure to work with the Chairperson and her team as well as with the team from the German National Commission to UNESCO and the Permanent Delegation of Germany to UNESCO with Ambassador Michael Worbs and expert Birgitta Ringbeck. The Director also expressed thanks to the Chairpersons of the Working Groups on Operational Guidelines and the Budget and stated that the decisions adopted reflect the quality and efficiency of their work.

The Director expressed his gratitude to the members of the Committee and underlined that the Secretariat will continue to improve its working methods and to increase transparency. The Director also thanked the Observer Delegations present and noted the high number of views in the live web stream, compared with the last Committee session in Doha. The Director also underlined that the Committee session was held in the backdrop of the unprecedented destruction of heritage and in this regard, the Director highlighted the adoption of the Bonn Declaration. The Director concluded by thanking all colleagues of the World Heritage Centre and also highlighted the efficient organisation of the newly established Conventions Common Services Unit. The Director also reiterated concerns over the increasing workload. The Director expressed gratitude to the Delegation of Turkey for being the hosts of the 40<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee in Istanbul.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the statement of the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Turkey** reported that the Turkish government had just designated a Chairperson for the 40th Committee Session 2016. The Delegation presented H.E. Ambassador Gürcan Türkoğlu as the new Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, who was currently serving as the Deputy President of the Turkish National Commission of UNESCO. The Delegation expressed its wish to bring multiple worlds closer together in the cultural “melting pot” of Istanbul and Turkey.

La **Délégation de la Turquie** a réitéré ses félicitations aux autorités allemandes, en particulier à la Commission Nationale, pour l'organisation de la 39e session, et a exprimé ses remerciements aux membres de l'équipe en charge de l'organisation pour avoir partagé leur expérience. Elle a exprimé ses remerciements aux membres du Comité d'avoir accepté l'invitation à Istanbul pour la 40e session, en leur souhaitant une session efficace et un temps agréable.

The proposal to elect H.E. Ambassador Gürcan Türkoğlu as the Chairperson of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Delegation of Turkey and expressed her gratitude to the Director of the World Heritage Centre. The Chairperson acknowledged that this was the Director's last Committee session in that capacity and expressed appreciation for his work. The Chairperson highlighted that the Director was a very experienced specialist in World Heritage, and that he managed to combine these skills with excellent organisation efforts and teamwork, which led to the success of the Committee session. The Chairperson wished the Director every success in going forward whether professionally or personally.

The **Chairperson** then declared the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

**Address by Irina Bokova,  
Director-General of UNESCO  
on the occasion of the opening of the 39th Session of the World Heritage  
Committee**

**Bonn, 28 June 2015**

Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer, 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,

First of all, I would like to ask Professor Böhmer to convey our deepest gratitude to Her Excellency Chancellor Angela Merkel for the powerful message we have just heard.

This is a strong message of commitment, a broad vision of culture as a tool to build peace and sustainable development, a perfect opening for this 39<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee.

For more than four decades, the World Heritage Committee has met every year, bringing together governments and experts, to set the pace for protecting the world's cultural and natural sites of universal outstanding value.

We have done so in times of peace, to celebrate the power of culture to foster dialogue and development, mutual understanding and tolerance.

We have done so in times of turbulence, when heritage is under attack and people are deprived from their fundamental rights and history.

Heritage is under attack today.

In Syria, in Iraq, in Libya, in Yemen, in Mali, we see the brutal and deliberate destruction of heritage on an unprecedented scale.

Mesopotamia, the cradle of human civilization, is being burnt to ashes.

Mosul, Nimrud, Hatra, Aleppo – all of them bear witness to the wealth of Islamic wisdom, to the dialogue of cultures in human history, and they being bombed and destroyed with jackhammers.

World Heritage sites are used for military purposes.

Illegal excavations and trafficking of cultural objects are depriving people of their identity, accelerating social disintegration, and contributing to the financing of terrorism.

All this is a call to action.

This calls on us to reaffirm our commitment to the principles and values upon which the World Convention was adopted, in 1972.

This is a reminder of our responsibility to always recall that the destruction of heritage is an integral part of humanitarian and security crises, and that its protection cannot be delinked from the protection of human lives.

It is our responsibility to bring Governments and experts together, to respond to the new threat of violent extremism and halt cultural cleansing.

It is especially fitting Germany is chairing the World Heritage Committee this year -- I wish to convey my deep thanks to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany for hosting and organizing this 39<sup>th</sup> session of the World Heritage Committee, most especially Her Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer for her leadership.

German experts and institutions are acting on their commitment and expertise to protect the cultural heritage of humanity, including in the Middle East -- from the Pergamon Museum to the German Archaeological Institute.

It is a German philosopher, Hans Jonas, who introduced into modern thought the idea of collective responsibility to future generations -- the idea that we should behave as "*guardians of the planet*".

Germany was among the first countries to ratify the World Heritage Convention, and this is the second time the Committee holds its annual session in Germany, after Berlin in 1995.

Last month in New York, at the initiative of Germany and Iraq, co-sponsored by more than 90 states, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution to mobilize States for "*the protection of the cultural heritage of Iraq*".

I believe this marks a turning point in international mobilization, which we must take forward together.

Tomorrow, we will launch *the Global Coalition for the Protection of Heritage* and the Chairs of all UNESCO Cultural Conventions will meet to join forces and coordinate actions...

We are building strong momentum -- we must build on this together.

Excellences, Mesdames et Messieurs,

Chacun mesure ici l'ampleur des enjeux auxquels nous faisons face.

Il ne s'agit pas seulement d'un enjeu culturel : c'est un impératif humanitaire et de sécurité, un combat collectif pour défendre une certaine vision du monde et de l'humanité.



Lorsque les extrémistes attaquent l'histoire et la mémoire des peuples, lorsque quiconque essaie de prendre la culture en otage, pour diviser l'humanité et diviser les peuples, c'est l'idée même du patrimoine mondial qui est visée, l'idée que l'on peut vivre en paix, dans le respect de la diversité et le dialogue des cultures.

En réponse, notre rôle est à la fois de protéger les sites, de stopper le trafic des biens culturels, et c'est aussi de faire valoir une autre vision de l'humanité, rassemblée autour des droits humains et d'un patrimoine commun.

La Convention pour le Patrimoine Mondial incarne l'une des plus hautes contributions de l'UNESCO au développement de la Communauté internationale - de son unité, de sa solidarité, et nous sommes heureux d'en célébrer les valeurs pour le 70<sup>ème</sup> anniversaire de notre Organisation.

Notre devoir est de défendre une vision de la culture et du patrimoine comme une force de paix, de dialogue, de rapprochement des peuples.

Comme moyen d'apaiser les mémoires blessées, de retrouver confiance dans son histoire, et l'énergie de se projeter dans l'avenir.

Comme force de créativité, d'innovation, de développement durable, à intégrer dans l'agenda des Nations Unies post 2015.

Notre devoir, c'est de renforcer la crédibilité de la Convention, d'accompagner les Etats bien au-delà de l'inscription, pour la sauvegarde des biens sur le très long terme, pour les générations futures.

Contre l'ignorance et la bêtise criminelle, nous devons répondre aussi par la culture, la connaissance, partager les savoirs et la sagesse millénaire islamique, partager le message de Palmyre, la Venise des Sables, comme un pont entre l'héritage gréco-romain, l'empire perse et la culture arabe de l'antiquité jusqu'à nos jours.

C'est le sens de la campagne que j'ai lancée en mars, à Bagdad, avec les étudiants de l'Université, sur les réseaux sociaux, #Unite4Heritage.

C'est le sens du travail inlassable de l'UNESCO, avec le Conseil de Sécurité, avec la Cour Pénale Internationale, avec l'ensemble de nos partenaires, dont la plupart sont ici, et que je salue.

Les textes existent, les mécanismes aussi, et nous devons les renforcer, élever le niveau d'engagement politique et c'est le sens de la coalition que nous lancerons demain.

Partout dans le monde, des jeunes se mobilisent pour la protection de leur patrimoine, pour sauver les forêts, les sites qui portent leur histoire, leur identité, qui sont pour eux des sources de résistance, de résilience, de cohésion, dont la sauvegarde est inséparable de la protection des vies humaines et dont la protection permet le développement des sociétés.

La semaine dernière, un gardien et deux policiers des patrouilles de protection du parc de la Garamba ont été tués de sang froids, par des braconniers.

Un policier lancé à la poursuite de trafiquants de biens culturels, à Denizli, en Turquie, a payé de sa vie son engagement à protéger le patrimoine culturel de son pays.

Au Mali, à Tombouctou, après deux ans d'efforts, les maçons de la ville viennent de terminer la reconstruction des mausolées détruits en 2012 et c'est la meilleure réponse qu'on peut imaginer contre l'ignorance et le fanatisme.

Dans quelques jours à Mostar, en Bosnie-Herzégovine, nous célébrerons les 10 ans de l'inscription du vieux Pont sur la liste du Patrimoine Mondial, et sa reconstruction par les habitants de la ville, sous l'égide de l'UNESCO.

C'est au nom de toutes ces sentinelles du patrimoine que nous sommes réunis aujourd'hui, pour sauvegarder notre patrimoine commun et le transmettre aux générations futures.

Merci pour eux.

**39th Session of the World Heritage Committee**

**Bonn, Germany**

**28 June 2015**

**Address by H.E. Dr Hao Ping**

**President of the General Conference Vice-Minister of Education of the People's Republic of China**

Excellency Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Foreign Minister of Germany  
Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee  
Madam Director-General  
Mr. Chairperson of the Executive Board  
Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee  
Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Good evening!

First of all, I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to the Government of Germany and the City of Bonn for their generous hospitality.

I'd also like to acknowledge the efforts of the international community to address the emergency situation of extensive damage to World Heritage in Nepal. High attention and concrete efforts have also been paid to World Heritage in conflict areas. We should also condemn the recent terrorist attacks in Tunisia, France and Kuwait.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The 1972 Convention entered into force, in order to protect natural landscape and historical sites, to preserve our memories and cultural identities, to pass on human wisdom and values to future generations. In the past 40 years, the Convention has served as a vital framework to unite international cooperation and demonstrated the power of culture in ensuring lasting peace and supporting sustainable development.

In the last 2 years, I had the chance to visit some natural and cultural heritage sites, and they all made me proud of the World Heritage List, UNESCO's flagship programme.

Today, the Convention remains fundamental, for many reasons, among which I would like to highlight the following points.

First of all, heritage is the legacy of history and the most significant embodiment of human creation, which lays down the foundation of development today. In this rapidly

changing world, one of humanity's essential challenges is the preservation of the past, which leads to a brighter and more equitable future.

Secondly, heritage is the best way to preserve and conserve cultural diversity. "Civilizations have come in different colors, and such diversity has made exchanges and mutual learning among civilizations relevant and valuable." It is important to preserve heritage to promote mutual understanding and respect.

Finally, heritage contributes powerfully to the construction and defense of peace in the minds of men and women. Today, in this interconnected world, all cultural heritages are humanity's common asset, and the humankind shares a common destiny. It is important to construct our common destiny and foster solidarity to ensure long-lasting peace.

Ladies and gentlemen,

Renewed efforts are needed ahead in the important year of 2015, when we are celebrating the 70 years' anniversary of UNESCO and commemorating the end of the Second World War. We must continue to stand together to protect our heritage.

First, we must continue to ensure that our efforts remain inclusive to make the implementation of the Convention benefit for all countries. I'm glad to see the reforms and a more equitable geographic and cultural representation in the Committee. We should also endeavor to improve our support to countries most in need to protect and manage their World Heritage sites.

Second, we must continue to underpin the role of education on the protection of World Heritage. Education is an essential means of safeguarding world heritage. The young generation is the heritage practitioner of the future. We must emphasize the role of education to make sure that the young people inherit the past and pass it on to future.

Last but not least, culture must be an integral part of the post- 2015 development agenda. We have seen how World Heritage has the potential to uplift communities, alleviate poverty as well as foster a culture of peace. In this way, we show how essential culture and heritage are for global sustainable development in the future.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have made good progress. In the current Committee Session, 37 new sites will be proposed to the list, which shows once again the strength of the Convention.

Finally, on behalf of the General Conference of UNESCO, I wish all of you a very fruitful Committee session.

**H.E. Ambassador Mohamed Amr  
Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO  
Permanent Delegate of the Arab Republic of Egypt to UNESCO  
Bonn, Germany  
28 June 2015**

Your Excellency Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Federal Foreign Minister of the Federal Republic of Germany,  
Your Excellency Professor Maria Böhmer, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee,  
Your Excellency, Mr Hao Ping, President of the General Conference of UNESCO  
Madam Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO,  
Distinguished Members of the World Heritage Committee,  
Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honour for me to be invited to attend the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee in my capacity as Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO.

At this time, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany and to you, Professor Böhmer the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, for hosting this event.

Let me also say that the great number of experts and political decision-makers who choose to attend this annual event affirms the importance of the 1972 Convention, and is a testament of the international community's commitment for the protection of World Heritage.

Dear Colleagues,

On the occasion of the 70th anniversary of UNESCO this year, we should also take the time to remember the accomplishments and ceaseless dedication undertaken by our Organization and all its Member States in preserving and safeguarding the world's cultural and natural heritage.

The World Heritage List is a great source of pride for all peoples and cultures around the world.

Such Heritage contributes to strengthening identity, ensuring sustainable development, alleviating poverty and promoting social inclusion and cohesion. Its protection, therefore, is not only important to the local communities where the heritage is found – but also to the global community as a whole – that is why we have created a WORLD Heritage List.

That is why it is of the utmost importance that we – ALL – collectively must protect it.

Over the years, the role of culture has been recognized as a driver for more equitable social, economic and environmental development. Especially in the face of numerous attacks against our educational and cultural institutions all over the world, UNESCO's responsibility to initiate change and action where it is most needed becomes more pertinent.

At the opening of the Executive Board session last April, I quoted British Prime Minister Clement Attlee, who spoke at the international conference convened for the purpose of founding UNESCO. Prime Minister Attlee said, "Today, the peoples of the world are islands shouting at each other over seas of misunderstanding 'Know thyself', said the old proverb. 'Know your neighbour', we say today. And the whole world is our neighbour."

These words, while having been said over 70 years ago, still resonate strongly with us today.

The idea of World Heritage – and its notions of universality and a shared humanity – is the bridge we need in order to know our neighbour.

Much like the symbolism of the reconstruction of the Old Bridge of Mostar, which dates back to the 16th Century and acted as a physical and symbolic link between various communities of the town, it is this kind of understanding and acceptance of the Other that is vitally important to the building of peace in the world today.

UNESCO is the only organization within the United Nations system that has a mandate specifically in the field of culture. This means that we have a special mission to assume international leadership for the promotion, preservation and protection of culture – most especially in times of conflict.

During the last session of the Executive Board in April, Members affirmed UNESCO's commitment to take the lead and drive global action in addressing threats to heritage.

At the opening of the last session of the Board, I said that the horrific and criminal attacks on world cultural heritage sites in Syria, Iraq, Libya, Mali and elsewhere are attacks on humanity as a whole.

I recalled the excellent work of the Director-General to raise international awareness and, ultimately, condemnation by the international community against such destruction and the United Nations Security Council's adoption of Resolution 2199 in February of this year.

In this regard; I would like to applaud her social media campaign "#Unite4Heritage". It aims to mobilize international, regional and local efforts to protect heritage. This campaign is an excellent way of bringing awareness for the need to protect cultural heritage, especially in

times of crises, to young people – who already know all too well, the dangers and suffering that violence and conflict bring.

It is my conviction that UNESCO – ideally through the World Heritage Committee – can offer real-impact solutions in such crisis situations where its expertise is so valuable.

The looting and illicit trafficking of cultural property are fast becoming disasters that require a strong, purposeful response, particularly given the situation in countries where there is armed conflict.

Tomorrow, our Director-General, Ms Irina Bokova, will launch a much-needed coalition for the protection of cultural heritage. We must all embrace this initiative, just as we have been doing with her.

Today, on behalf of the Executive Board, I wish to reaffirm our solid commitment to strengthen UNESCO's role in protecting heritage in conflict areas, and hope that you will all join in our collective efforts.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

In the coming days, your tasks will include the reviewing of the State of Conservation reports and the evaluation of new nominations to the World Heritage List, and other issues related to World Heritage that need to be addressed.

I urge you to do so with consideration to the safeguarding and the promotion of cultural diversity and to uphold collective will in the decision-making process.

In this regard, I would like to encourage you to collaborate constructively towards the elaboration of a final outcome declaration from this meeting that reinforces our work for the preservation, promotion and protection of cultural heritage.

Only in this way can we fulfil the responsibilities bestowed upon us by our founders, and to meet the challenges of the age we live in.

On behalf of all Members of the Executive Board of UNESCO, and from me personally, I would like to wish you a very successful and fruitful 39th session of the World Heritage Committee.

Thank you for your attention.

## **The Bonn Declaration on World Heritage**

On the occasion of its 39th session in Bonn/Germany

We, the members of the World Heritage Committee,

1. Emphasizing the need in the year of the 70th anniversary to revive the core values and principles forged by UNESCO since 1945,
2. Reaffirming that culture and education for justice, liberty and peace are indispensable to human dignity and the duty of all states,
3. Growingly concerned about the physical damages inflicted or occurred in prominent world heritage and other cultural sites in areas exposed to armed conflict and natural disasters and also alarmed by the looting and illicit trafficking of cultural properties and assets in those areas,
4. Conscious of our responsibility to safeguard World Heritage sites valued for their natural beauty, uniqueness and universality against, overexploitation, natural disasters, civilian unrest and/or armed conflicts,
5. Recalling UNESCO's seven culture conventions designed to complement and reinforce each other to safeguard and nurture human culture and creativity in all its forms,
6. Recalling that intentional attacks against buildings dedicated to religion, education, art, science or charitable purposes and historic monuments may amount to war crimes;
7. Bearing in mind the 2003 UNESCO Declaration concerning Intentional Destruction of Cultural Heritage and UNESCO Executive Board Decision 196EX/29 of 21 April 2015 on UNESCO's role and responsibilities in protecting culture in conflict areas as a humanitarian concern and safety issue;
8. Taking note of:
  - the Declaration of the Organization of the Islamic Cooperation (OIC) Group at UNESCO on Safeguarding of Iraqi, Syrian and Libyan Cultural Heritage supporting the aforementioned Executive Board Decision 196EX/29;
  - the Cairo Declaration by the Ministerial Conference of Middle East and Northern African States of 14 May 2015;
  - the European Parliament Resolution of 30 April 2015 on the destruction of cultural



sites perpetrated by ISIL/Daesh (2015/2649(RSP));

- Resolution 3.MSP 9 of the 3rd Meeting of States Parties to the UNESCO 1970 Convention (18-20 May 2015) following the report on the actions undertaken by the Secretariat to fight against illicit trafficking of cultural property in emergency situations;

9. Keeping in mind all relevant treaties, conventions, legal instruments and declarations, including the ones to strengthen emergency assistance in the field of natural disasters,

10. Recalling United Nations Security Council resolutions: including Resolution 1483 (2003), Resolution 2199 (2015) on threats to international peace and security caused by terrorist acts,

11. Also recalling United Nations General Assembly resolutions 69/281 on Saving the Cultural Heritage of Iraq adopted on 28 May 2015 and 69/280 on Strengthening Emergency Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction in Response to the Devastating Effects of the Earthquake in Nepal adopted on 15 May 2015, as well as other resolutions strengthening crime prevention and criminal justice responses to protect cultural properties,

12. Deeply shocked by repeated attacks, destructions and violence perpetrated by ISIL/Daesh and other extremist groups, aimed at destroying cultural diversity through deliberate targeting of individuals and communities on the basis of cultural, ethnic or religious background, as well as places of worship, memory and learning,

13. Also alarmed by the increasing number of threats to cultural heritage through illegal excavations, organized looting and trafficking of cultural objects, which seriously undermine irreplaceable cultural treasures, among them UNESCO World Heritage sites in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Mali, Syria and Yemen,

14. Calling attention to the enduring problems at natural world heritage sites in the Central African Republic, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo and Niger, which are likely to continue long after the end of hostilities,

15. Greatly concerned by the enormous damage caused to Nepal's cultural and natural heritage by the earthquake in 2015, and also remembering still continuing effects of the devastation caused by the earthquake in Haiti in 2010;

16. Convinced that UNESCO's culture Conventions provide the proper framework for national measures and international cooperation in protecting culture and heritage against all threats and challenges;

17. Condemn the barbaric assaults, violence and crimes committed in recent times by the so called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) also known as Daesh against the cultural heritage of Iraq, including the World Heritage site at Hatra, which recalls mindless destructions in Bamiyan, Timbuktu and elsewhere;

18. Deplore the exposure of and use of cultural heritage sites in military operations by the parties to various conflicts, including as shelter to protect combatants, to keep hostage local indigenous communities and by indiscriminate use of weapons and explosives, which resulted in widespread destruction of Aleppo, Crac de Chevaliers, Bosra and other significant sites;

19. Express deep concern about the World Heritage site of Palmyra, which also has been exposed to threat of destruction because of armed conflict;

20. Express utmost concern about the continuing hostilities in Yemen, which inflict damage to cultural sites and properties especially in the ancient city of Marib, the World Heritage Site of the Old City of Sana'a and the city of Aden;

21. Denounce the destruction and looting of cultural objects used as a tactic of war and as a source to fund terrorism;

22. Call upon all parties to armed conflicts to refrain from military use or targeting of cultural and natural heritage sites and monuments that constitute flagrant violation of international law and to comply with their obligations under international treaties such as the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its 1999 Protocol as well as relevant rules of customary international law, to refrain from any act of aggression against heritage sites;

23. Recommend that the Security Council analyzes the possibility of introducing a specific dimension of heritage protection in the mandates of peacekeeping missions where appropriate; delivering for instance complementary training modules focusing on the protection of cultural property both tangible and intangible, during and in the aftermath of armed conflicts; raising awareness of culture as a critical resource for the stability, social cohesion and reconstruction of societies affected by war;

24. Regret that Nepal's cultural and natural heritage which is inseparable part of world heritage suffered severe damage and losses during recent earthquakes and invite all States Parties to vigorously continue implementing Resolution 69/280 on Strengthening Emergency Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction in Response to the Devastating Effects of the Earthquake in Nepal adopted on 15 May 2015;

25. Remind States Parties to the World Heritage Convention of their obligation to safeguard cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value at the national

and international level and the growing need to raise sufficient funds to help UNESCO fulfill its mandate, and towards that end appeal them to fulfill their obligations in preserving natural and cultural heritage by responding more quickly and substantially to emergency situations, taking into consideration the requirements of bilateral or multilateral programs and forms of cooperation as well as the recently established UNESCO Heritage Emergency Fund;

26. Encourage States that have not yet ratified the World Heritage Convention and other cultural international legal instruments to do so;

27. Call upon States Parties to evaluate their implementation of pertinent legally binding and other instruments and to strengthen their national legislation and practice for the protection of cultural and natural heritage, also by introducing more effective measures to combat illicit trafficking and illegal trade of cultural properties;

28. Call upon States Parties and other interested parties, to strengthen their intergovernmental and law-enforcement cooperation on the protection and preservation of cultural heritage, as well as to reinforce active participation of all interested third parties - especially those active in the fields of art and culture - in measures to combat all forms and aspects of trafficking in cultural properties;

29. Welcome UNESCO's #Unite4Heritage campaign for countering the propaganda of hatred and addressing professional communities and individuals, in particular the young people, as well as the launching by the Director-General of UNESCO of a Global Coalition for the protection of culture aimed at rallying the international community and actors from the cultural, humanitarian, security and other relevant sectors around an agreed agenda for action for the protection of culture and the promotion of cultural pluralism;

30. Request UNESCO to enhance its international leadership in the operationalization and coordination of a comprehensive response to the protection of heritage in the event of armed conflict or natural disaster in agreement with the International InterAgency Humanitarian Coordination System;

31. Invite all States Parties to UNESCO Culture Conventions to join forces and share their expertise under the leadership of UNESCO, and to coordinate their bilateral and international emergency relief projects for achieving the maximum possible benefit;

32. Commit ourselves to promote the objectives of this declaration in order to strengthen the international protection of cultural and natural heritage and to actively contribute to the Global Coalition launched by the Director-General of UNESCO, recognizing that building peace tomorrow requires defending our common heritage of diversity and tolerance today.

**Address by Irina Bokova,  
Director-General of UNESCO  
on the occasion of the launch of the Global Coalition for the Protection of Cultural  
Heritage  
Bonn (Germany), 29 June 2015**

Excellency Mr Adel Shershah, Minister of Tourism and Heritage of Iraq,  
Professor Dr Maria Böhmer, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee,  
Mr Tim Morris, Executive Director of INTERPOL,  
Mr Gustavo Araoz, President of ICOMOS,  
Professor Dr Markus Hilgert, Director of the Pergamon Museum,

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The decision adopted a few minutes ago bears witness to the commitment of all Members of the World Heritage Committee -- a commitment we are determined to take forward together.

I believe this marks a decisive step in the mobilization of the international community against the destruction of cultural heritage, against the looting of antiquities and the persecution of minorities, which seeks to destroy Iraq's wealth of cultural diversity.

I see this as turning point in the fight against cultural cleansing in Iraq.

Never before in recent history have we seen such brutal and systematic destruction of cultural heritage, used as a tactic of war, to intimidate populations, to disseminate hatred.

This is a war crime -- as is the destruction of cultural heritage in Mali, Syria, and Afghanistan.

All of us, I believe, know these attacks are not just against specific communities or specific religions.

These are attacks against the very notion of civilized order, against the humanity we share, against the values that bind us together as a single human family.

This calls on us to review the means by which we seek to defeat violent extremism.

To this end, over the past months, UNESCO has spared no efforts in seeking to mobilize all partners to join forces.

We have convened experts to assess damages, to craft emergency responses, in close cooperation with networks and partners on the ground – I see many of them in this room today.

We have brought together law enforcement professionals and technical agencies, to curb the illicit trafficking of cultural objects, working with INTERPOL, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, customs services, museums -- to assist Member States in the implementation of Security Council Resolution 2199, which establishes a ban on the trade of cultural objects from Iraq and Syria.

We are working with armed forces, to share data and information, in line with the provisions of the 1954 Convention.

We have launched a global communication campaign, to craft a counter-narrative to the propaganda of hatred -- I am pleased to see the hashtag, #unite4heritage, is becoming the tagline for all those who wish to share information and join forces.

Today, we go a step further, building on all these initiatives.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Les gouvernements représentés au sein du Comité du Patrimoine Mondial représentent le cœur d'une coalition globale des Etats pour la protection du patrimoine.

La menace est globale et la réponse doit être globale.

Elle appelle une plus forte coordination des services nationaux, des échanges d'information entre états, le partage des bonnes pratiques, et rien ne remplace, sur ces sujets, l'action des gouvernements.

Elle appelle l'intégration de la culture dans les opérations des forces armées, dans la formation des soldats, dans le mandat des forces de maintien de la paix, dans la diplomatie qui est la seule réponse durable à cette crise.

L'exemple du Mali, le travail de la MINUSMA et la reconstruction des mausolées, représentent un espoir qu'il faut consolider.

Nous devons associer davantage les enjeux culturels, humanitaires et de sécurité, sur la base des résolutions adoptées par le Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO, l'Assemblée Générale des Nations Unies, le Parlement européen.

Nous devons également accroître les financements pour la protection et la mise à l'abri des objets culturels, la formation des professionnels, le renforcement des capacités nationales.

La réponse à ce défi ne peut pas être seulement militaire – elle est diplomatique, politique, culturelle, et l'ampleur du défi nous oblige à repenser l'action des Etats, sur le très long terme, pour la prévention et l'anticipation.

Avec cette coalition, portée aujourd'hui par l'Allemagne et l'Iraq, avec l'ensemble des membres du Comité du Patrimoine Mondial, nous allons renforcer le soutien des Etats pour la protection du patrimoine qui porte les fondements de l'existence humaine.

Je vous remercie.