



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

Organización  
de las Naciones Unidas  
para la Educación,  
la Ciencia y la Cultura

Организация  
Объединенных Наций по  
вопросам образования,  
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة  
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、  
科学及文化组织

**9 COM**

**CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/Report**  
**Paris, 6 April 2015**  
**Original: English**

**SECOND PROTOCOL TO THE HAGUE CONVENTION OF 1954  
FOR THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY  
IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT**

**COMMITTEE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CULTURAL PROPERTY  
IN THE EVENT OF ARMED CONFLICT**

**Ninth Meeting**  
**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris**  
**18-19 December 2014**

**FINAL REPORT**

## Item 1 of the provisional agenda - Opening of the meeting

1. The ninth meeting of the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (hereinafter, “the Committee”) established by the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (hereinafter, “the 1999 Second Protocol”) was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 18 and 19 December 2014. The meeting was attended by the twelve States Members of the Committee (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Cambodia, Croatia, Egypt, El Salvador, Georgia, Greece, Japan, Mali and the Netherlands). In addition, 32 States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol that were not Committee members, 23 High Contracting Parties to the Hague Convention of 1954 that were not party to the 1999 Second Protocol, seven other Member States of UNESCO, three intergovernmental organization, five non-governmental organizations and one expert attended as observers. The list of participants and the working and information documents of the meeting are available at the following web address:  
<http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/armed-conflict-and-heritage/the-committee/meetings-of-the-committee/>
2. **The Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr Alfredo Pérez de Armiñán, opened the meeting. In his address he recalled the sixtieth anniversary of the 1954 Hague Convention and the assessment by the international community of its relevance with a particular emphasis on the protection of cultural property in Iraq and Syria. He went on to highlight items to be considered by the Committee focusing on two specific items – protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, including occupation and the creation of a distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection. He concluded by referring to the staffing and financial situation of the secretariat of the Hague Convention and its two Protocols and invited Committee members and observers to provide the Secretariat support to sustain and for the implementation of the Second Protocol.
3. To introduce the celebration of the 70<sup>th</sup> anniversary of UNESCO, the Secretariat presented a slide show with highlights related to the Hague Convention and its Second Protocol, displaying photographs of cultural property listed in the International Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection under the Hague Convention and World Heritage cultural sites entered in the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection established by the Second Protocol.

## Item 2 of the provisional agenda – Election of the Bureau

4. Following the opening statement of the Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Benjamin Goes (Belgium), the outgoing Chairperson, thanked the Committee and the Secretariat for the work done and introduced the candidature of Ms Artemis Papatthanassiou (Greece) for the Chairperson of the Committee. He went on to propose to elect Ms Papatthanassiou by acclamation. Her candidature was supported by several **members of the Committee**. No other nominations were introduced, Ms Artemis Papatthanassiou was elected by acclamation.
5. Following her election, **the newly elected Chairperson** proceeded to the election of the four Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur. The Chairperson informed the Committee that the four Committee members - **Armenia, Cambodia, Egypt and Mali** - are candidates for the posts of four Vice-Chairpersons. In addition, Ms Rosa Moreira De Lemoine (**El Salvador**) was a candidate for the post of Rapporteur. There were no objections and consequently all the candidates were elected.

### Item 3 of the provisional agenda – adoption of the agenda

#### Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/1

6. The **Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the agenda, and gave the floor to **Ms Mechtild Rössler**, the Deputy Director of the Division for Heritage, for some introductory remarks. Ms Rössler recalled the previous practices of the Committee, in particular two issues – modification of the working documents prepared by the Secretariat during the Committee meetings and informal Bureau meetings with the participation of the Secretariat called by the Chairperson. She emphasized that the Secretariat requested legal advice on both issues. Referring to the modifications of the working documents prepared by the Secretariat by the Committee during its meetings, Ms Rössler quoted the legal advice stating that under the Second Protocol it is the Secretariat's responsibility to prepare the Committee's documentation. She also added that "it is the understanding that the contents of the documents remain within the responsibility of the Secretariat, and should not be amended by the Committee, unless, there are factual or typographical errors". Concerning the informal Bureau meetings, Ms Rössler quoted the legal advice stating that under Rule 15.1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee, Bureau's functions are solely limited to coordinating the work of the Committee and fixing the dates, hours and order of the meetings.
7. The Delegation of **Armenia** then took the floor and requested clarification regarding changes of the procedure and the work of the Committee. It stressed that if there are any changes of the procedure of the meetings of the Committee, they must be agreed by the Committee and put in practice from the next meeting of the Committee.
8. In her reply, **Ms Rössler** stated that this is not a new procedure but an alignment with the existing practice of other intergovernmental committees within the Culture Sector. Furthermore, she went on to say that the Committee has several other options such as to request the Secretariat to produce a new document or to amend a draft decision as appropriate.
9. Afterwards, the **Chairperson** and the **Secretariat** proposed several amendments to the provisional agenda and titles of some items. The **Committee** had no objection, and Decision **9.COM 1** was adopted as amended.

### Agenda item 4 – Report of the Secretariat on its activities

#### Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/2

10. Further to the written report (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/INF.2) made available to Committee members and observers through the Secretariat's website, the **Secretariat** provided an oral update on activities having taken place since September 2014. In that regard, the **Secretariat** referred, in particular, to the letter sent by Director-General to the countries involved in military actions in Syria and Iraq reminding them of their obligations under the 1954 Hague Convention, the Second Protocol or international customary law as appropriate. It also highlighted international events on the protection of Syrian and Iraqi cultural heritage such as a high-level meeting entitled "Heritage and Cultural Diversity at Risk in Iraq and Syria" (UNESCO Headquarters, 3 December 2014) and the International Symposium entitled "The Endangered Iraqi Heritage and How to Protect It?" (UNESCO Headquarters, 29 September 2014). Finally, the Secretariat briefly referred to the follow-up of decisions of the 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Committee.
11. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** then took the floor to emphasize its Government's commitment to the applicable rules of the Convention mentioned in the letter of the Director-General. Furthermore, it pointed out that there must be a mechanism within UNESCO allowing it to engage proactively with Parties to a conflict immediately after the outbreak of a conflict. The Delegation of the Netherlands also proposed to include a list of cultural

properties in letters sent by the Secretariat with regard to the protection of cultural heritage in conflict areas. Finally, the Delegation emphasized the desirability to cooperate with other partners, such as NATO, whenever appropriate.

12. In response to the issues raised by the Delegation of the Netherlands, the **Secretariat** referred to functions of the Emergency Preparedness and Response Unit within the Culture Sector which coordinates Culture Sector's actions in the field of emergencies. As to the need to incorporate geographical coordinates, the Secretariat stressed that the letters sent to the States concerned contained the geographical coordinates of Iraqi and Syrian World Heritage properties as well as sites on national tentative lists. Finally, with respect to the cooperation with other international organizations, the Secretariat referred to its participation in the November 2014 meeting organized by NATO that discussed, among other things, the preparation of inventories and their availability.
13. The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the draft Decision **9.COM 2** of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/2) as it stands.
14. The Delegation of **Armenia** took the floor and proposed to add the wording "thanks the Kingdom of Belgium for providing additional funds in the form of appropriation letters as well as" to the beginning of the fifth paragraph of the draft decision.
15. The Committee agreed with this proposal and Decision **9.COM 2** was adopted as amended.

## **Agenda item 5 – Protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, including occupation**

### **Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/3**

16. Following the introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/3) by the Secretariat, the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion of the draft Decision.
17. First, the Delegation of **Armenia** took the floor. It expressed its disagreement over the procedure not allowing the Committee members to modify the content of working documents prepared by the Secretariat and pointed out that the connection between the introductory part of the document and the draft Decision was not clear. In particular, the issue of dispatch of technical missions was not reflected in the draft Decision. The Delegation stated that the document also includes unnecessary repetitions, a large number of ambiguous statements, and interpretative footnotes. In conclusion, the Delegation proposed to prepare a new revised document reflecting its position as well.
18. The Delegation of **Belgium** then took the floor and proposed several paragraphs to the draft Decision to give a more active role to the Chairperson and more visibility to the Second Protocol.
19. The **Chairperson** then asked the Delegation of Armenia for wording of the draft Decision. The Delegation of **Armenia** proposed the following wording for paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 in the draft Decision:
  2. "Taking a note of document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/3, requests the Secretariat to produce a new updated document in consultation with the members of the Committee based on the outcome of the discussions held during the 9<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Committee;
  3. Reaffirms the importance of the mandate assigned to it under Article 27(1)(c) of the Second Protocol, particularly in the context of monitoring the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, including occupation, including dispatching of technical missions on ground with consent of all Parties to an armed conflict;

4. Encourages Parties to an armed conflict as well as other Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol to draw their attention to the state of cultural property affected by an armed conflict, including occupation, and to implement their obligations under the 1999 Second Protocol in good faith.”

20. The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** then took the floor. It expressed its satisfaction with the work of the Secretariat done within the available resources and proposed to study the other tools of monitoring as well. Moreover, the Delegation also expressed its support to the Belgian proposal on strengthening the role of the Chairperson.
21. In its intervention the Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the operative part was disconnected from the working document. It also provided its support concerning the legal advice which does not allow the Committee members to revise the texts of working documents and proposed that the paragraphs contained in the Belgian proposal concerning Syria and Iraq must be issued in the form of a separate statement of the Committee. In addition, the Delegation stressed that it preferred to keep the original version of paragraph 2 without the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Armenia.
22. The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the idea of revision of the working document and the Egyptian proposals.
23. The Delegation of **Cambodia** then took the floor and expressed its support to the Egyptian proposal to issue a separate statement. The Delegation of **Japan** concurred with this view.
24. Taking floor, the Delegation of **Armenia** stated that since the Committee members have not considered in-depth and commented on the working document, it was preferable to use the wording “taking note” rather than “examine” in paragraph 2. In response, the Delegation of **Egypt**, proposed to focus on substantive issues such as the approval of the operational and procedural arrangements regarding to the dispatch of technical missions on the ground. It then proposed the following paragraph 3 of the draft Decision:

“Approves the operational and procedural arrangements, related to the dispatch of technical missions on the ground contained in the document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/3;”

25. The Delegation of **Japan** took the floor and expressed its support for the Egyptian proposal. The Delegation of **Armenia** also supported the Egyptian proposal except for retaining the wording “having examined”. Moreover, the Delegation of Armenia suggested adding getting the consent of the Parties for the dispatch of technical missions in the proposed paragraph 3.
26. The Delegation of **Austria**, an Observer State, took the floor and stated that in the document there is an unnecessary confusion between the terms “consent” and “negotiated agreement”, “armed conflict” and “occupation”. Moreover, the Delegation stated that prior agreement of the Parties cannot be a condition to receive assistance from the Fund. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its disagreement with the comments made by Austria.
27. Afterwards, the **Chairperson** suggested to proceed to a paragraph-by-paragraph examination of the draft Decision. The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed to add the following wording to the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph of the draft Decision:

“and requesting the Secretariat to produce an editorial revision of the document;”

28. Moreover, the Egyptian Delegation suggested the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the draft decision as following:

“Approves the operational and procedural arrangements, related to the despatch of technical missions on the ground contained in the document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/3, which include, the consent of all States Parties to an armed conflict as a *sine qua non* condition;”

29. The Delegation of **Armenia** suggested deleting the word “States” in the proposed paragraph 3 in order to align it with the whole document. In addition, the Delegation of **Belgium** proposed to add wording about ensuring the security of the mission. Taking into

account the opinions expressed during the discussion, the Delegation of **Egypt** proposed paragraph three as follows:

“Approves the operational and procedural arrangements, related to the dispatch of technical missions on the ground contained in the document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/3, which include, for the purpose of ensuring the security of the mission, the consent of all concerned Parties to an armed conflict as a *sine qua non* condition;”

30. The Delegation of **Armenia**, proposed to add the words “inter alia” after the wording “which include” in paragraph 3 and also asked whether the wording “Parties to an armed conflict” is understood as the State Parties to the Second Protocol. In response, the **Secretariat** stated that “Parties to an armed conflict” with an uppercase “P” means States Parties to the Second Protocol. The Delegation of **Armenia** then suggested to use the wording “parties” with a lowercase to cover parties to an armed conflict that are not party to the Second Protocol as well. The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the Armenian proposal. The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** referred to the working document which uses “parties” with capital “P” and expressed its disagreement with the proposal to use the word “parties” with a lowercase. The Delegation of **Georgia** supported the position of the Azerbaijani Delegation. The Delegation of **Cambodia** stated that due to the security of the missions, it would be better to use “parties” with lower case.
31. The **Chairperson** proposed to go along with the prevailing view among Committee members which was to use “parties” with lower case “P”. She then proceeded to a paragraph-by-paragraph adoption. Paragraphs 1-5 were adopted as amended.
32. The **Chairperson** suggested to discuss paragraph 6, proposed by the Bureau:
 

“encourages the Chairperson, in consultation with the Bureau, to make public statements on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict together with UNESCO and other statutory bodies under Cultural Conventions and/or the International Committee of the Blue Shield”.
33. The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** suggested to delete the words “in consultation with the Bureau” and to add the words “including occupation” after the words “armed conflict”. The Delegation of **Japan** stressed the importance of consulting members of the Committee before making public statements. The Delegation of **Greece** underscored the challenge to consult members of the Committee in cases of urgency. The Delegation of **Armenia** expressed its support to the Japanese position with regard to consultations of members of the Committee and proposed the following amendment to the paragraph:
 

“...to make public statements together with UNESCO and/or other statutory bodies under Cultural Conventions and/or the International Committee of the Blue Shield on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, including occupation”.
34. The Delegation of **El Salvador** endorsed the proposal. The **Secretariat** proposed to replace the word “under” by the words “established by”.
35. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Legal Advisor. The **Legal Advisor** emphasized that the Rules of Procedure do not foresee the consultation of the Bureau by correspondence and suggested that Committee members modify the Rules of Procedure at the next meeting accordingly. The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** supported the wording “in consultation with the members of the Committee”. The Delegation of **Georgia** endorsed Azerbaijan’s position. The Delegation of **Armenia** suggested to add the words “as well as” before the words “together”.
36. The **Chairperson** stressed that the prevailing view on paragraph 6 is as following:
 

“encourages the Chairperson, in consultation with members of the Committee, to make public statements on behalf of the Committee as well as together with UNESCO and/or other statutory bodies established by Cultural Conventions and/or

the International Committee of the Blue Shield on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, including occupation;”

37. Subsequently, this paragraph was adopted as amended.
38. The **Chairperson** continued the discussion of paragraph 7 and proposed the following formulation:

“Invites the Chairperson, in collaboration with the Bureau to exercise his/her functions by, as appropriate, making use of the knowledge and experience of the previous Chairpersons of the Committee;”
39. The Delegation of **Cambodia** supported this proposal and proposed to replace the word “Chairpersons” with the word “Chairperson”. As a consequence, this paragraph was adopted as amended.
40. Following its adoption, the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** proposed the following new paragraph as paragraph 8:

“Encourages the Chairperson pursuant to the Article 36(2) of the Second Protocol to engage in negotiations with the representatives of the Parties to the conflict with a view to discuss the terms of reference of technical missions to be sent to the occupied territories, or other measures deemed appropriate”
41. The **Chairperson** suggested replacing the verb “engage” with the verb “invite” and to delete the words “with a view”. The **Representative of the Director-General** explained that without inviting a Party to a conflict the Chairperson cannot act alone and moreover, due to the wording of the Article 36(2) of the Second Protocol it would be better to use “to meet and discuss” instead of “to discuss”. The Delegation of **Belgium** stressed that without inviting a Party to a conflict, taking such action may lead to some confusion about the role of the Chairperson.

*[At this point, considering the time constraints, the **Chairperson** adjourned the discussion of the agenda item 5 and resumed the discussion after the agenda item 6]*
42. During further discussion, and considering the disagreement among the members of the Committee on reference to Article 36(2) of the Second Protocol, the **Committee** decided to delete the reference to the concrete provision, and to use general wording. Thus, paragraph 8 was adopted as amended.
43. Afterwards, the **Chairperson** proceeded to the discussion of paragraphs 9 and 10. The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed to make the words “where cultural property is at risk” more precise by adding “in the context of an armed conflict, including occupation”. With regard to paragraph 10, the **Committee** decided to add the words “National Advisory Committees foreseen by Resolution II of the 1954 Hague Convention”. As a consequence, paragraphs 9 and 10 were adopted as amended.
44. Taking into account consensus on the whole text of Decision **9.COM 3**, it was adopted as amended.

#### **Agenda item 6 – Studies on the evaluation of the criteria of Article 10, subparagraphs (a) and (b) of the Second Protocol**

##### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/6**

45. The **Chairperson** invited the representative of the ICOMOS to present the document. The **Representative of the ICOMOS** provided a brief summary of the studies undertaken by ICOMOS.
46. The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed to the discussion of the draft Decision. The Delegation of **Japan** asked the view of the Secretariat on the study. The **Secretariat** pointed

out that it was still considering the study and that it worked closely with the World Heritage Centre with regard to the clarification of the relationship between elements of the notions of "highest importance for humanity" and that of "the outstanding universal value". The Secretariat also added that further consideration might result in amendments to the Guidelines for the Implementation of the Second Protocol.

47. The **Chairperson** then proceeded to the adoption of the draft decision paragraph-by-paragraph. Paragraphs 1-4 of the draft Decision **9.COM 6** were adopted as drafted. The Chairperson proposed the following text for adoption as a new paragraph 5 which reflected amendments proposed by Mali:
- “Requests the Secretariat to further continue its work, in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross and in consultation with States Parties, on developing methodologies to analyze the criterion of Article 10 (a), (b) and (c) of the 1999 Second Protocol;”
48. The **Secretariat** proposed to use the words “members of the Committee” rather than the words “the States Parties”. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its disagreement with the Secretariat’s proposal since the outcome will affect all States Parties. It also suggested using the words “three criteria” instead of “the criterion”. The Delegation of **Belgium** asked to insert a reference to co-operation with the International Committee of the Blue Shield and to delete the reference to the paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). The Delegation of **the Netherlands** supported Belgian proposal. During the discussion the **Committee** also stressed that the results of the Secretariat’s evaluation must be presented prior to the tenth Meeting of the Committee. Thus, paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.
49. The **Chairperson** then proceeded to the discussion of paragraph 6 of the draft Decision. The **Committee** stressed that since the Guidelines for the Implementation of the Second Protocol might be amended, it would be desirable to present the draft amendments at the tenth Meeting of the Committee. Paragraph 6 of the draft Decision and Decision **9.COM 6** as a whole were adopted as amended.

## **Agenda item 7 – Creation of a distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection and establishment of the modalities of its use**

### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/4/REV2**

50. The **Chairperson** opened the general discussion of the item and asked the Secretariat to introduce the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/4/REV2).
51. Recalling informal consultations of the Bureau, the Delegation of **Belgium** noted that the Bureau members expressed their preference for Proposals No. 3 and No. 6 (B) in Annex I of the document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/4/REV2). In addition, the Delegation informed the Committee of its informal consultation with the military, which expressed its preference for Proposal No. 3. Several **Committee members** raised questions regarding the content of the working document to which the **Secretariat** provided clarifications.
52. The **Chairperson** then proposed the discussion of draft Decision **9.COM 4**. The Delegations of **El Salvador, Japan, Egypt, Cambodia, Azerbaijan** and **Georgia** expressed their explicit support to Proposal No. 3 and proposed to include this proposal in paragraph 3 of the draft Decision **9.COM 4**. Furthermore, the Delegation of **Cambodia** proposed to replace “considers” with “approves” in paragraph 3. The Committee members did not support the Cambodian proposal noting that the approval of the emblem will be included in the provisional agenda of the sixth Meeting of the Parties in 2015. In addition, several members of the Committee proposed linguistic adjustments to the “Draft amendments to the Guidelines for the implementation of the 1999 Second Protocol” (Annex 2).
53. Then the **Committee** discussed a new paragraph 6 proposed by the Bureau. The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** noted the very limited human resources of the Secretariat, which may hinder



the work of the Secretariat when processing requests of Parties for the granting of enhanced protection to cultural property. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** suggested to add the proposal of the Bureau to the separate statement which the Committee intended to adopt at the end of its meeting. The Netherlands' proposal was endorsed by other members of the Committee.

54. Decision **9.COM 4** was therefore adopted as amended.

### **Agenda item 8 – Cultural property and its immediate surroundings**

#### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/5**

55. After the **Secretariat's** introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/5), the **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee to express their views.

56. Furthermore, the **Secretariat** pointed out that it would be linguistically more appropriate to replace the word "joint" with the word "contained" in paragraph 2 of the draft Decision **9.COM 5**. The Committee did not express any objection to the draft decision and Decision **9.COM 5** was adopted as amended.

### **Agenda item 9 – Development of synergies with other relevant UNESCO normative instruments and programmes and strengthening partnerships**

#### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/7**

57. Following the introduction by the Secretariat of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/7), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion.

58. The Delegation of **Cambodia** asked the Secretariat to provide information on the International Discussion Platform on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. The **Secretariat** stressed that the Platform is a coordination unit intended to involve stakeholders dealing with the protection of cultural property, such as the International Committee of the Blue Shield.

59. During the discussion, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** suggested to add the words "for the protection of cultural property" after the words "strengthening partnerships" for further clarification of the paragraph 4 of the draft decision. The Delegation of **Egypt** made a proposal to enlarge the scope of the development of synergies to other relevant international humanitarian law instruments under the same paragraph. Other members of the Committee supported the Egyptian proposal.

60. The Delegation of **Belgium** proposed to add a new paragraph to the draft Decision on inviting the Director-General to organize - at least once a year - a consultation meeting of the Chairpersons of the Statutory Bodies established by Culture Conventions, in order to discuss possible opportunities to develop synergies among those Conventions. The **Committee** endorsed this proposal.

61. The Committee adopted the Decision **9.COM 7** as amended.

### **Agenda item 10 – Proposal to Strengthen Synergies between the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and the 1972 World Heritage Convention**

#### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/13**

62. After the introduction by the Delegation of **Belgium** of document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/13, the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion.

63. **Ms Mechtild Rössler**, the Deputy Director of the Division for Heritage, took the floor and informed the Committee that the World Heritage Committee discussed at its 37<sup>th</sup> session possible synergies between the Second Protocol and the World Heritage Convention and took a decision (37 COM 12.II) regarding the Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Moreover, Ms Rössler informed the Committee members that as an outcome of consultations among the Chairperson of this Committee, representatives of the relevant Secretariats and the Director of the World Heritage Centre it was considered more appropriate to include the issue of synergies in the forthcoming reflection on the Periodic Reporting rather than to amend the nomination format of the Operational Guidelines (Annex 3) for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention due, among other things, to the different nature of the two instruments. In addition, Ms Rössler stressed that since a nomination to the World Heritage List does not guarantee inscription, it would be premature to process such properties to the consideration for the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection. She added that not all types of properties could be considered (excluding large scale, serial cultural sites as well as natural access) and that changes to the completeness check part of the Operational Guidelines may have further inspirations. In response, the Delegation of **Belgium** pointed out that the decision of the Committee does not impose an obligation for States Parties to both instruments and therefore, it will be up to States to decide on this issue. Moreover, the Delegation stated that it will facilitate the work of States Parties if they decide to opt for simultaneous nomination because they will not be obliged to prepare two different nomination files.
64. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** thanked the Delegation of Belgium for the document and stated that the Decision of the Committee providing a recommendation to the World Heritage Committee will raise awareness of risks of armed conflicts to cultural properties.
65. During the discussion, the Delegation of **Japan** asked what would happen if the World Heritage Committee rejects a nomination for the World Heritage List. The Delegation of **Belgium** replied that there could be two outcomes – nominations on an emergency basis in case of armed conflict and ordinary nominations. In the case of the ordinary procedure, the Committee would wait for the decision of the World Heritage Committee. In case the World Heritage Committee decided not to include a property on the World Heritage List, the Committee would have to examine the nomination files in accordance with Article 10 of the Second Protocol. In an emergency situation, the Committee would proceed to the examination without a decision by the World Heritage Committee.
66. The **Chairperson** then requested the view of the Committee members on the annexes of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/13). The Delegation of **Japan** proposed to adopt the draft decision without amending the annexes upon the understanding that the Chairperson would submit the decision and possible comments made by Committee members within the thirty days, to the established Working Group on Operational Guidelines. The **Secretariat** noted that due to the upcoming holidays it will not be possible to include all comments in thirty days but agreed to include all observations to the final report of the Secretariat.
67. The Chairperson proceeded to the examination of the draft Decision 9.COM 13.
68. During the discussions, the Delegation of **Japan** suggested to replace to word “subscribing” by the word “appreciating” in paragraph 3. The Delegations of **El Salvador** and **Egypt** supported the Japanese proposal. In addition, the Delegation of **Japan** proposed to insert the words “including written comments received from the members of the Committee” after the word “decision” in paragraph 4. **Ms Mechtild Rössler**, the Deputy Director of the Division for Heritage, replied that it would be more appropriate to include electronic links to comments of the Committee members that can be uploaded to the website of the 1954 Convention rather than to insert all comments into the document.
69. During the general discussion of the draft Decision, **the Committee members** agreed to use less specific wording for requesting the Director-General to transmit all relevant documentation to the upcoming session of the World Heritage Committee. Moreover, the

Committee decided also to include the proposal of the Bureau requesting the Director-General to propose the World Heritage Committee to consider developing synergies between the sections I and II of Periodic Reports and the national reports required by the 1954 Hague Convention and its Second Protocol.

70. The Decision **9.COM 13** was adopted as amended.

### **Agenda item 11 – Methods to enhance awareness-raising efforts of the Second Protocol to the 1954 Hague Convention**

#### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/14**

71. Following the introduction by the Delegation of **Egypt** of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/14), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion and examination of the draft decision **9.COM 14**.

72. The Delegation of **Japan** proposed not to use the term “including primary education” under subparagraph “c” of the draft Decision **9.COM 14.5**. **Several members of the Committee** proposed to replace the words “educational curricula” with the words “educational systems” because a number of countries do not have national educational curricula. In addition, **the members of the Committee** stated that it was the first time that the Committee adopted a decision on awareness-raising issues.

73. The Decision **9.COM 14** was adopted as amended.

### **Agenda item 12 – Fundraising strategy**

#### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/8**

74. Following the Secretariat’s introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/8), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion.

75. The **outgoing Chairperson, Mr Goes**, informed the members of the Committee of the recent developments concerning fundraising and referred to his meeting with the Qatari authorities related to a financial contribution to the UNESCO for risk emergency response. He stressed that the Memorandum between UNESCO and the State of Qatar enables the Secretariat to finance certain activities and suggested that the Chairperson provide a follow-up by a letter. Afterwards, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** expressed its concern over the small number of contributions to the Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and proposed to divide paragraph 3 of draft Decision **9.COM 8** into two parts, to highlight these issues.

76. Subsequently, the Decision **9.COM 8** was adopted as amended.

### **Agenda item 13 – Creation of a Special Account for human resources of the Secretariat of the 1954 Hague Convention and its two Protocols**

#### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/9**

77. After the Secretariat’s introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/9), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion.

78. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** referred to the creation of extrabudgetary accounts for different conventions and mentioned the possibility of creating one single account and to permit the Director-General to decide on the allocation of funds received on the basis of needs. In response, the **Secretariat** explained that the reason behind the establishment of the special account for the human resources was to enable those States unable to contribute

large amounts to make financial contributions according to their means. The Secretariat also added that this practice was implemented in various other statutory bodies, as could be confirmed by BFM present in the room.

79. During the general discussion, **several members of the Committee** proposed to replace the words “decides in favour of” with “welcomes” in paragraph 3 and to use “encourages” rather than “invites” in paragraph 4.
80. As a consequence, Decision **9.COM 9** was adopted as amended.

#### **Agenda item 14 – Modification of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee (election and composition of the Committee’s Bureau)**

##### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/10**

81. Following the Secretariat’s introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/10), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion and stated that since the Bureau expressed its preference for Proposal No. 2 providing for the election of the Bureau for a two-year term at the beginning of each ordinary session of the Committee, it would be more appropriate if the members of the Committee would present their views on this proposal.
82. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** pointed out that the main issue was to allow for the rotation of the Bureau members while ensuring its continuity. It added that if the Committee decided to elect its Bureau for two years, then the continuity would not be ensured. Thus, it would be more suitable to elect the Bureau for one year with the possibility of re-election to ensure both rotation of its members and continuity. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its preference for a two-year term of office of the Bureau while also noting that the eligibility of all members of the Committee for the election to the Bureau must be taken into account.
83. During the discussion, **several members of the Committee**, including **El Salvador, The Netherlands, Egypt, and Japan**, proposed to keep the current Rules of Procedure in force to maintain both continuity and rotation of Bureau members. The Committee members were in favour of maintaining the *status quo*.
84. Thus, Decision **9.COM 10** was adopted as amended.

#### **Agenda item 15 – Follow-up to the Audit of the Working Methods of Cultural Conventions and to the Evaluation of UNESCO’s Standard-Setting Work of the Culture Sector**

##### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/11/REV**

85. Following the Secretariat’s introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/11/REV), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion and proposed the adoption of the draft Decision **9.COM 11**.
86. To focus on the key results of the implementation of the recommendation contained in the IOS audit, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** proposed to insert the words “about the key results” after the words “updated information” in paragraph 4. The proposal was supported by the other members of the Committee.
87. As a consequence, Decision **9.COM 11** was adopted as amended.

## **Agenda item 16 – National Reports**

### **Document CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/12**

88. Following the Secretariat's introduction of the working document (CLT-14/9.COM/CONF.203/12), the **Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
89. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** asked about the starting date of electronic reporting. The **Secretariat** replied that electronic reporting would start from the next reporting cycle beginning in 2016.
90. The Decision **9.COM 12** was adopted as amended.

## **Agenda item 17 – Miscellaneous**

91. The **Chairperson** opened the general discussion and asked the Committee members to discuss the statement concerning Syria and Iraq of the Committee and to raise any other matters.
92. The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed to use term "statement" as a title. The **Legal Advisor** explained that the Rules of Procedure of the Committee do not prohibit the Committee from issuing statements. The Delegation of the **Syrian Arab Republic**, as an Observer, proposed to use the verb "invites" rather than the verb "calls upon" in paragraph 4 of the statement. The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its disagreement with the Syrian proposal. During the discussion, the Delegation of **Armenia** proposed the wording "condemns the repeated deliberate attacks" in the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the Statement. This proposal received support by **members of the Committee**. After several linguistic amendments the Statement of the Committee was adopted as amended.
93. The Delegation of **Belgium** noted that it was the first time that the Committee adopted such statement.
94. No more observations were expressed by the participants.

## **Agenda item 18 – Closure of the meeting**

95. The **Chairperson** thanked Committee members for their valuable contributions. She also thanked the Bureau, the Committee, UNESCO Member States, observers and the UNESCO Secretariat, and declared the ninth ordinary Meeting of the Committee closed.