

Distribution limited

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

CONVENTION ON THE PROTECTION OF THE UNDERWATER CULTURAL HERITAGE

MEETING OF STATES PARTIES

Third session

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters

This document contains the draft summary record of the second session of the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (Paris, UNESCO Headquarters, 1/2 December 2009). The States Parties may submit comments by email to u.guerin@unesco.org and/or in hard copy to the Secretariat of the Convention.

Item 4 of the Provisional Agenda:

Adoption of the Summary Record of the Second Session of the Meeting of States Parties

Decision required : paragraph 3

1. The second session of the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage took place at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, on 1 and 2 December 2009.
2. According to Rule 26.4 of the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting, the Secretariat shall prepare a summary record of each session of the Meeting for approval at the opening of the next session.
3. The Meeting of States Parties, at its third session, may therefore consider the annexed draft summary record, as prepared by the Secretariat, and may wish to adopt the following resolution:

DRAFT RESOLUTION 4 / MSP 3

The Meeting of States Parties, at its third session,

1. *Having examined the draft summary record of the second session of the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage set out in the Annex of document UCH/11/3.MSP/220/4;*
2. *Adopts the record as contained therein.*

Annex

Summary Record of the Second Session of the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage

The second session of the Meeting of States Parties (hereinafter “**the Meeting**”) to the Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage (hereinafter “**the Convention**”) took place at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris, on 1 and 2 December 2009. The Meeting was attended by participants from 22 States Parties to the Convention, including H. E. Mr Charlemagne, Minister of Culture of Saint Lucia. It was furthermore attended by observers from 44 States not party to the Convention and the Holy See, representatives of 1 intergovernmental committee (the IOC) and 16 non-governmental organizations. UNESCO’s Section of Museums and Cultural Objects provided the Secretariat. A copy of the list of participants is available upon request from the Secretariat.

I. Opening Ceremony of the Second Session of the Meeting of States Parties

(Item 1 of the Agenda, no document provided)

The session opened on Tuesday, 1 December 2009 at 10 a.m. with a video message by **Ms Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO**. In her address, she greeted the participants of the Meeting and commended the States Parties on the tremendous progress made since the entry into force of the Convention on 2 January 2009. She recalled that the first session of the Meeting of States Parties in March 2009 adopted its Rules of Procedure, established a Scientific and Technical Advisory Body and adopted its Statutes. She underlined that the States Parties convened the second session less than a year after the first, in order to undertake the crucial task of elaborating operational guidelines. She expressed UNESCO’s satisfaction that the Convention along with its Annex were now widely recognized as the foremost international reference for the protection of submerged archaeological sites and will serve to curtail the growing illicit trade by looters and guide the development of underwater archaeology worldwide. To ensure the widest possible implementation of this instrument, the Director-General called upon all States worldwide to take the necessary steps to ratify, and noted that it had become increasingly clear that the world’s cultural heritage in all its forms constitutes an irreplaceable asset.

Mrs Eleonora Mitrofanova, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO, acknowledged the importance of the Convention as an instrument to safeguard cultural heritage. She reaffirmed UNESCO Executive Board’s dedication to pursuing UNESCO’s achievements in the important sphere of standard-setting and stressed that the Convention was unique as it provided the first international framework for the protection of submerged archaeological sites. She considered it

therefore essential that Governments firmly committed to the protection of the underwater cultural heritage and ensured that the Convention lived up to its noble objectives.

II. Election of a Chairperson, the Vice-Chairpersons and a Rapporteur of the Meeting

(Item 2 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/2)

Ms Françoise Rivière, Assistant Director-General for Culture, representative of the Director-General, addressed Agenda Item 2, the **election of the Bureau**, recalling that the Bureau to be elected would remain in office until the next session of the Meeting of States Parties.

Ms Rivière also gave a brief explanation of the role of the **Rapporteur**, stressing that no oral report would be prepared, as was the case in other meetings of States Parties. She explained that the Rapporteur's role would be to certify that the decisions reported were in conformity with what had been actually decided by the Meeting.

Mr Jasen Mesić (Croatia) as Chairperson of the Meeting, the **Islamic Republic of Iran, Lebanon and Spain as Vice-Chairpersons** and **Ms Beatriz Hernández Narváez (Mexico) as Rapporteur** were proposed. The representative of the Director-General noted that there was consensus, and the Meeting unanimously appointed the bureau by acclamation and adopted **Resolution 2 /MSP 2**.

Mr Mesić thanked the delegations for their confidence and trust. He reminded them that, in accordance with Article 27 of the Convention, only those States that had ratified the Convention at least 3 months before the Meeting, i.e. before 1 September 2009, can be considered States Parties. He also reminded the delegates that the consent of the Chairperson had to be obtained whenever an observer wished to address the Meeting and that amendments to resolutions or documents could only be proposed by States Parties.

III. Adoption of the Agenda of the Second Session of the Meeting of States Parties

(Item 3 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/3)

The representative of the Director-General introduced Agenda Item 3 and presented the related documents prepared by the Secretariat.

Spain requested that in the future a point should be added to the agenda concerning the admission of observer **NGOs** to the session by decision of the Meeting. This was accepted by consensus by the States Parties present. The Agenda of the Meeting was then adopted unanimously by **Resolution 3 / MSP 2**.

IV. Adoption of the Summary Record of the first ordinary session of the Meeting of States Parties

(Item 4 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/4)

The Chairperson proposed to the States Parties to approve the draft Summary Record of the first ordinary session of the Meeting of States Parties held in March 2009. This record had been made available well in advance of the session by the Secretariat in document *UCH/09/2.MSP/220/4*, and the States Parties were asked for their comments. As of the opening of the second session, no comments have been received.

Saint Lucia took the floor stating that it would vote for the adoption of the summary record, as distributed, but considered it nevertheless necessary that in future a **more extended and detailed report** be prepared. Saint Lucia stressed that this record constituted the only publicly available institutional memory of the sessions held by the States Parties. The record of the first session was therefore too abstract and too short. In addition Saint Lucia observed that the outline format caused the record to be unbalanced, as the attached observer statements were given more room than the observations made by States Parties during the Meeting. Portugal took the floor to support this statement, along with the delegations of Mexico and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Lebanon took the floor concerning the explanation given by the Secretariat on the role of the Rapporteur, insisting that an oral report should be adopted by the Meeting at the end of its session in accordance with the established tradition. The Chairperson pointed out that the absence of the oral report was consistent with the procedures of the Meetings of States Parties for the other conventions of the Culture Sector. Furthermore, an oral report was not foreseen in the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting. The Rules call for a written summary record, which could more faithfully reflect the positions of States Parties. The proposal to not prepare an oral report was therefore accepted, and the summary record, as presented by the Secretariat, was adopted without amendment by **Resolution 4 / MSP 2**.

V. Discussion of the Draft Operational Guidelines

(Item 5 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/5)

The **Chairperson** proposed to begin examining the Draft Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the Convention. He thanked the Secretariat, which, in a very short period of time, prepared the draft presented to the States Parties on the basis of the responses to a questionnaire, as decided by the Meeting in its first session. He reminded the delegates present that a summary of the answers of States Parties to this questionnaire was available from the Secretariat. He also observed that no revised version of the Secretariat draft had been received from States Parties at the opening of the Meeting.

The Chairperson proposed that the Meeting, before starting a chapter-by-chapter discussion of the draft, undertake a debate on the general structure of the Guidelines.

The delegate of Spain took the floor and expressed preference for a preliminary general discussion on the draft submitted by the Secretariat, followed by a point-by-point debate. He acknowledged the importance of this point of the agenda and asked the Secretariat to explain how this draft was elaborated. Mexico supported the Spanish position and the floor was given to the Secretariat.

V.a. Explanation of the Secretariat Draft of the Operational Guidelines:

The representative of the Director-General explained that the draft took into account the results of the questionnaire, to which eleven States Parties had responded. The **key aspects of the draft of the Guidelines** were as follows:

1. the implementation of the State cooperation mechanism;
2. the creation of a Fund and the regulation of financial aspects of the cooperation mechanism; and
3. the functioning of the Advisory Body and its cooperation with NGOs.

The draft Guidelines as prepared intended also to improve the understanding of the Convention and to raise awareness among the general public about underwater heritage and the importance of its preservation.

The representative of the Director-General presented in details the content of the draft Guidelines (document *UCH/09/2.MSP/220/5*):

- **CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION**, briefly explaining the Convention, its territorial application, its content and objectives, as well as its organs, in non-legal terms, to make it easily understandable for non-specialists.
- **CHAPTER II – THE STATE COOPERATION MECHANISM**, encompassing the reporting under the Convention and the mode of transmission of reports and declarations as well as their formatting. It contains details on the appointment of Coordinating States and the operational protection of underwater cultural heritage. This chapter was singled out as the most important on which the States Parties' opinion was required.
- **CHAPTER III – FINANCING**, providing the terms for the **creation of an Underwater Cultural Heritage Fund** in the form of a special account as well as regulations on the **financing of the implementation of the State cooperation mechanism**.
- **CHAPTER IV**, concerning partners in the implementation of the Convention.

- **CHAPTER V**, concerning the cooperation of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body (hereinafter "**the Advisory Body**") with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and criteria for the accreditation of NGOs, by the Meeting of States Parties as foreseen in the Statutes of the Advisory Body (Article 1 e))
- **CHAPTER VI**, concerning cooperation, information-sharing, raising public awareness, and training.

The Representative of the Director-General furthermore drew attention to the forms, attached to the draft, distributed only for preliminary information, and containing the **outline of a possible UNESCO Reporting Database**. This database could serve for the transmission of reports from one State Party to the other States Parties via UNESCO in the Exclusive Economic Zone and the Area. The forms were provided to offer insight into the possible format and function of such a database.

The Chairperson proposed that the Meeting discuss this general structure of the document before opening a Section-by-Section discussion.

V.b. Discussion on the General Structure of the Operational Guidelines:

Mexico asked the Secretariat **if any external organ, such as ICOMOS, had been consulted** in the process of the elaboration of the draft Operational Guidelines. The Representative of the Director-General informed that States Parties had requested the Secretariat, in the first session of the Meeting, to consult them by questionnaire and then to elaborate a first draft. This had been done accordingly and in the very short delay of seven month for the distribution of the questionnaire, the drafting and translation of the text. The Representative of the Director-General also informed that eleven countries had replied to the questionnaire.

Portugal stated that the **Secretariat draft of the Guidelines was a considerable step ahead** and that it was now of course necessary to examine, as usual, this draft technically and scientifically and with the help of the Advisory Body, to be created by the present session of the Meeting of States Parties.

Saint Lucia expressed the view that the structure of the draft Operational Guidelines was acceptable, but remained of course subject to modification during the discussion of the content of the Guidelines. It considered furthermore that the **creation of a working group consisting of States Parties** would be advisable to revise the draft. It also stressed that the Advisory Body was in charge of questions concerning the Rules, contained in the Annex of the Convention. The **drafting of the Guidelines** was, however, a **responsibility of the Meeting of States Parties**.

Ecuador thanked the Secretariat for the draft provided. It stressed that it had no particular comment on the index of the draft, but would prefer a clearer distinction be made in the text when reference was made to the Convention text. Supporting the statement of Saint Lucia, Ecuador underlined that the draft Guidelines should be discussed by the Meeting of States Parties and not

by the Advisory Body, whose responsibilities did not include such a task. Ecuador recalled Article 23 of the Rules of Procedure and supported the creation of a working group or other subsidiary organ to the Meeting of States Parties to consider the draft.

Spain supported the statements made by Ecuador and Saint Lucia.

Mexico stated that it would be in favour of the inclusion of a **separate chapter on the protection of underwater heritage** to the proposed draft Guidelines preferably before the current Chapter III on financing. This proposal was supported by Grenada and Saint Lucia. Mexico also inquired about the original language of the Secretariat draft, calling attention to some translation inaccuracies in the Spanish version. It also suggested that the experts of the Advisory Body, which were attending the Meeting, make comments on the draft. The Secretariat replied that the draft had been prepared originally in **English**, and recalled the lack of time for its preparation, which prevented the Secretariat from ensuring a comprehensive verification of the five translated versions.

Grenada suggested that a **chapter-by-chapter** discussion of the draft would be necessary before the work could be given to a subsidiary body. Regarding protection, Grenada shared the concerns expressed by Mexico and emphasized, although mentioned in the introduction of the guidelines, that the draft only developed an international cooperation mechanism, while nothing was included in terms of setting principles for protecting underwater cultural heritage or practical guidelines for dealing with such heritage.

Saint Lucia stressed that the **objective of the Operational Guidelines** was to facilitate the understanding and implementation of the Convention for stakeholders and warned that the drafting of Guidelines should not lead to a re-writing of the Convention. Much care should therefore be taken to avoid enlarging the scope of the Convention, re-writing or interpreting it. Saint Lucia supported the chapter-by-chapter examination and suggested that such an exercise could reveal that some parts of the Convention were so well written that it would be dangerous to explain them in the Operational Guidelines.

The floor was then given to **observers**:

The delegation of the United States considered that the Guidelines should provide information and technical assistance to Parties seeking to cooperate and consult in protecting underwater cultural heritage. A main focus should be the State cooperation and consultation mechanism, including the elaboration of aspects such as protective mechanisms. The delegation of the United States estimated that the current draft of the guidelines only addressed this important issue in a few pages so that it could be expanded concerning the implementation of the Rules of the Annex. It also stated that guidance would be beneficial in regard to scientific and technical standards for research, recovery, conservation and curation. The Guidelines should not try to rewrite or interpret the Convention or other treaties such as UNCLOS. For the most part, the US delegate considered that the draft provided by the Secretariat did not intend to do so but she stated that there were instances of legal interpretation. The delegate also considered that in footnote 1 the

use of the term “sovereignty rights” and the omission of the reference to the binding nature of customary international law were confusing. The United States also estimated that the Guidelines should not merely re-state provisions of the Convention. They would be most useful for the Parties if they provided more information that enabled them to successfully implement the Convention’s provisions. A mere re-statement of the Convention, could however introduce uncertainty and a lack of legal clarity in the scope and meaning of the Convention when there would be an inconsistency, however slight, between the provisions of the Convention and the terms of the Guidelines. Finally, the United States estimated that the Guidelines should focus on their intended purpose and audience. [*The full text of the statement of the United States is available from the Secretariat*].

Italy announced that it had adopted a law authorizing the **ratification** of the Convention in October 2009. It thanked the Secretariat for the work that had been done since the first Meeting and considered that the Operational Guidelines should be an instrument providing concrete and specific rules to allow the application of the Convention, in particular concerning the mechanism of cooperation and consultation of States (articles 8 to 13) and the designation of Coordinating States in the Area. The draft included certain explanations of the Convention that could be omitted. The text should be limited to facilitating the implementation of those parts of the Convention that require explanation. Italy considered that it would be helpful if the Meeting could identify such parts and entrust a drafting committee with the task of revising the draft and allow the next session of the Meeting of States Parties to adopt the Operational Guidelines.

Argentina announced the upcoming **ratification** of the Convention by its Government.

Thijs Maarleveld, president of ICUCH, stated that ICUCH would be very interested in providing its expertise in the elaboration of a chapter on protection of underwater heritage proposed by Mexico and Grenada. It was important to provide information on a normal protection system, rather than only focus on exceptions, which, of course, also had to be dealt with.

Greece stated that the Operational Guidelines had to be compatible with UNCLOS. Special attention should be given to ~~the~~ coastal State jurisdiction over the contiguous zone and the rights of Coastal States with regard to maritime scientific research. The forms attached for information purposes to the draft Operational Guidelines and the criteria for verifiable links should be examined in greater detail, in particular concerning the identification of very ancient remains.

Spain, State Party to the Convention, underlined the importance of the declarations made by the observers, especially those made by countries that are either in the ratification process or considering becoming Parties to the Convention. It stressed that it was essential that more States become Parties to the Convention as this would guarantee the success of its implementation.

Saint Kitts and Nevis, Observer, took the opportunity to announce that they would deposit the instrument of **ratification** the day after the present Meeting. They stressed the economic relevance of the Convention for their territory, as Saint Kitts and Nevis was among the States with the largest number of sites in the Caribbean, boosting the tourist interest of the islands.

Closing this discussion point for the day, the Chairperson called upon the States Parties to consult with each other concerning the establishment of a working group and to indicate in writing their wish to participate. He suggested that the second day of the Meeting be dedicated to a chapter-by-chapter discussion, with a view to collecting general views of the States Parties that could guide the work of the working group in their revision of the draft Operational Guidelines provided by the Secretariat.

VI. Creation of a Fund

(Item 8 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/8)

The Chairperson introduced Agenda Item 8, which concerned the creation of a special account to contain the **Fund for the Underwater Cultural Heritage**. He reminded the Meeting that the draft Operational Guidelines proposed in Chapter III, Sections 12 and 13, provisions that deal with the **use** of such a Fund. He asked the Secretariat to explain Agenda Item 8 and the related draft resolution.

The Representative of the Director-General took the floor to inform the Meeting that the Convention did not specifically provide for the establishment of a fund as possible means of financial support to the activities related to the protection of the underwater cultural heritage. According to Article 3 (g) of the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting of State Parties, one of its responsibilities was however “to seek means for raising funds and to take the necessary measures to this end”. The creation of a Special Account had therefore been proposed by the Secretariat, in order to finance the functioning of the Convention and its State Cooperation Mechanism, international cooperation projects in relation to the scope of the Convention, the building of capacity in States Parties and the enhancement of the protection of the underwater cultural heritage.

This Special Account should allow for the collection of funds from different sources, not only voluntary contributions from State Parties, but, for instance, funds appropriated for this purpose by the General Conference of UNESCO, contributions from other States, as well as from organizations and programmes within the United Nations system or from private entities.

The Representative of the Director-General explained that such a special account would be established in accordance with Article 6.6 of the Financial Regulations of UNESCO. To that end, and pursuant to Article 6.7 of the Financial Regulations of UNESCO, a special draft of Financial Regulations on the management of the Fund had been proposed by the Secretariat in conformity with the standard text for the Financial Regulations of Special Accounts, as adopted by the Executive Board at its 161st session and following similar regulations already established for other UNESCO conventions.

Saint Lucia proposed that the Director-General should call upon States to contribute to the Fund and inquired on the amount of **support costs** to be paid. The Secretariat informed that in

pursuance of Administrative Circular No. 2280 of UNESCO, a support cost rate of 10% was currently applicable to voluntary contributions to all the Special Accounts of UNESCO.

Spain declared its support for the creation of the Special Account and expressed its readiness to **contribute**. The Chairperson thanked the Spanish delegation for its generous offer.

Grenada supported the proposal to create a Fund and recalled that developing States should be eligible for financial assistance, as already regulated concerning their participation in the Advisory Body Meetings. Ukraine requested also the inclusion of States in transition among the States that will receive assistance. Romania requested that the Meeting should consider how to use the funds to be received by the Fund.

In the light of the discussions, the Meeting requested the Director-General of UNESCO by **Resolution 8 / MSP 2** to establish the "Underwater Cultural Heritage Fund" to be managed as a Special Account in accordance with Article 6.6 of the Financial Regulations of UNESCO and decided that its resources would be used on the basis of the Operational Guidelines to be adopted by the Meeting at its future sessions. It also approved the Financial Regulations for this Fund, as annexed to the document *UCH/09/2.MSP/8*.

VII. Election of the Members of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body

(Item 7 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/7)

Before proceeding to the election of the members of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body the Chairperson recalled that the Meeting had, in its first session and by Resolution 5/MSP 1, established this Advisory Body according to Article 23.4 of the Convention. In the same resolution, the Meeting of States Parties had adopted the Statutes of this body. He asked the Secretariat to inform the Meeting on the candidatures received.

The Representative of the Director-General recalled that, in accordance with Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure of the Meeting of States Parties, a State Party could nominate an expert for election to represent it in the Advisory Body. According to Rule 22 of the Rules of Procedure, the election should be conducted with regard to the principle of equitable geographical distribution and the desirability of a gender balance as well as a balance of domains of expertise. Experts should furthermore have a scientific, professional and ethical background at the national and/or international level adequate to the task, in conformity with the objective and purpose of the Convention. She stated that the invitation letters to the second session of the Meeting had requested each State Party to nominate a candidate for elections. **Eleven candidatures** were received by the Secretariat, and the provisional list of candidates and the background information required had been made available in document *UCH/09/2.MSP/220/INF.4*. A list by electoral group of current States Parties to the Convention appears in the Annex of document *UCH/09/2.MSP/220/7*. She noted that in accordance with Article 2 (a) of its Statutes, the Advisory Body should be composed of twelve members, while only eleven candidates had been

nominated. The candidatures were not equally distributed within the electoral groups. Electoral groups V (a) and V (b) did not propose any candidates.

Spain took the floor to suggest that the Meeting partially **suspend its Rules of Procedure** for this election by electing all candidates for a term of only two years. Saint Lucia suggested that, in the future, greater care should be taken to avoid a **conflict of interest** between the elected members of the bureau of the meeting and the candidates standing for election to the Advisory Body.

Spain's proposal found consensus among States Parties, and the Meeting decided by **Resolution 7/MSP 2** to suspend, in this case, Article 23 of the Rules of its Procedure. It elected the following 11 candidates to the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention for a **two-year term**:

- Francisco Alves (Portugal)
- Milton Eric Branford (Saint Lucia)
- Pilar Luna Erreguerena (Mexico)
- Andrej Gaspari (Slovenia)
- Hugo Eliecer Bonilla Mendoza (Panama)
- Jasen Mesic (Croatia)
- Kalin Stoynev Porozhnov (Bulgaria)
- Carmen García Rivera (Spain)
- Hossein Tofighian (Islamic Republic of Iran)
- Serhiy Oleksandrovykh Voronov (Ukraine)
- Vladas Zulkus (Lithuania)

VIII. Accreditation of NGOs for cooperation with the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body

(Item 6 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/6)

The Chairperson proposed to start the discussion of Item 6 of the agenda, concerning the accreditation of non-governmental organizations. According to Article 1 (e) of the Statutes of the Advisory Body, it "shall consult and collaborate with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) having activities related to the scope of the Convention, namely ICUCH, as well as other competent NGOs accredited by the Meeting of States Parties".

He noted that no **criteria for the accreditation** of such NGOs had yet been established. Potential accreditation criteria had, however, been detailed in the draft Operational Guidelines proposed by the Secretariat under Item 5 of the Agenda. The Secretariat had furthermore

received eight applications for accreditation by relevant NGOs as outlined in the Annex of *UCH/09/2.MSP/220/6*. He reminded the Meeting that **background material** on the NGOs that applied had been made available in *UCH/09/2.MSP/220/Inf.3*.

The Secretariat pointed out that one of the organizations mentioned was in fact not an NGO, but an international series of conferences, **IKUWA**, which had obtained the patronage of UNESCO, as its steering committee organized the largest conference on underwater cultural heritage.

The Chairperson recalled that no possibility had been included in the Statutes, which would allow the Advisory Body to **consult with intergovernmental organizations**. As, however, several intergovernmental organizations had activities related to the 2001 Convention, (e.g. the United Nations and its Secretariat of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the International Seabed Authority and the International Maritime Organization) it might be advisable to include the possibility of consulting such organizations by amending Article 1 (e) of the Statutes of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body.

Romania stated that the Advisory Body needed to cooperate with the experts in the field and non-governmental organizations. It also expressed the opinion that it is in the best interests of the States Parties to increase public awareness about the protection of underwater cultural heritage and that NGOs could be valuable cooperation partners in this undertaking.

Ecuador requested more information on the NGOs that applied for accreditation and was reminded that this information had been made available in the Information Document 3 by the Secretariat, although the Secretariat could not guarantee the accuracy or completeness of the information provided. The Secretariat stressed that this information document carried a **disclaimer** indicating that the information had been received from the NGOs concerned and had not undergone any verification.

Portugal stated that not all NGOs that applied were necessarily NGOs that should be accredited and that while some were very well known and reputed, others might not be known to the Meeting or the Advisory Body. It was therefore difficult to give an opinion at this time concerning the question of accreditation. Spain supported this, stating that criteria for accreditation would have to be established.

Saint Lucia underlined that there needed to be criteria for the accreditation of NGOs, but these **should not be too elitist** and should not exclude NGOs from the South. Spain agreed, adding that there needed to be certain criteria of excellence and competence.

The Chairperson thanked the States Parties and gave the floor to the **observers**.

France stated that it was preparing **ratification** and that it considered it necessary that the NGOs that applied for accreditation undergo a certain degree of monitoring to avoid that the reputation of UNESCO or its logo be exploited and that the “the fox was let in the henhouse”.

This concern was taken up by several States Parties and in view of the discussions, the Meeting decided by **Resolution 6 / MSP 2** not to accredit any NGO for consultation under Article 1 (e) of the Statutes of the Advisory Body, until criteria for accreditation are adopted in the Operational Guidelines. It invited the Advisory Body to give its opinion to the Meeting regarding the background of the NGOs that applied for accreditation in the current session.

The issue of a possible cooperation with IGOs was postponed to be decided in a future session since, at the present time, there was no immediate need for this issue to be regulated in the Statutes. This issue was therefore not reflected in the resolution finally adopted.

IX. First session of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body

(Item 9 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/9)

The Representative of the Director-General introduced Item 9 of the Agenda explaining that according to Article 4 (a) of the statutes of the Advisory Body “The Director-General shall convene a session of the Advisory Body once a year. In special circumstances, he/she may convene another session if funds are available. The Director-General shall establish the agenda for the sessions of the Advisory Body after consultation with the Chairpersons of the Meeting of States Parties and the Advisory Body.”

Spain expressed its support for the newly established Advisory Body and its members, **inviting the Body** to hold its first session in Cartagena, Spain, in the newly renovated National Museum of Underwater Archaeology and National Centre of Underwater Archaeology in Cartagena (**ARQUA**). All costs incurred in addition to those that were to be covered if the meeting had taken place in Paris, would be covered by Spain, including travel costs for the members of the Advisory Body that could otherwise not attend the meeting. Spain expressed the opinion that no decision could be taken at present concerning the agenda of this meeting.

Ms Ángeles Pérez Bonet, representative of ARQUA, took the floor to explain that **ARQUA** is a new and modern museum focusing entirely on the research, study, restoration and exposition of underwater cultural heritage. She was pleased to extend their invitation to the first session of the Advisory Body. The Chairperson thanked Ms Pérez Bonet for this generous invitation on behalf of the Meeting.

Saint Lucia thanked Spain for its invitation, accepting it as far as Saint Lucia was concerned, underlining however that since some observers might not be able to travel to Spain, it should be the only meeting to be held outside of UNESCO Headquarters in Paris.

By **Resolution 9/MSP2**, the Meeting unanimously requested the Director-General to convene the first session of the Scientific and Technical Advisory Body to the Meeting of States Parties in Cartagena, Spain, in the second quarter of 2010.

X. Additional Items – Map on Underwater Cultural Heritage

(Additional item, no working document provided)

Saint Lucia inquired about the communication sent by the Secretariat to the States Parties regarding the creation of a map on underwater cultural heritage. The delegate indicated concern for the security of submerged archaeological sites.

The Secretariat explained that several operational and informational activities were undertaken to raise public awareness about the need to protect underwater cultural heritage. It had been noted that the public largely ignored the historical importance and wide range of such heritage. The awareness-raising activities included designing a new website, in eight languages (Eng/Fr/S/Ar/Ru/Ch/It/Pt), which could also include a **map illustrating several underwater cultural heritage sites**. Thus in the above-mentioned letter, the Secretariat proposed that States forward the Secretariat information on important underwater cultural heritage sites in their territory to be included in such a map. It was stressed that the intention of the Secretariat was neither to include all existing underwater sites, nor to give their exact GPS location, as the Secretariat was of course aware of the related security issues. The map was intended to give a general overview and provide information on no more than two sites per country.

No resolution was taken on this issue by the States Parties. A general understanding emerged, however, that the project would not be pursued until contrary indication by the States Parties.

XI. Discussion of the Operational Guidelines

(Continuation of Item 5 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/5)

XI.a. Setting up of a Working Group

The morning of the second day of the Meeting began with an **informal meeting** of the States Parties to discuss the **establishment of a working group**. It was decided that this group should begin its work by electronically exchanging comments on the **Secretariat's draft of the Operational Guidelines**, circulated to all its participants. The group would then meet in Paris to revise the new draft.

Spain suggested that the Secretariat serve as Secretariat of the working group and that it should be clear that the working group should only exist for the duration of the drafting process.

On the question of opening the working group to observers, Spain suggested that the sessions be closed, while Saint Lucia, supported by several other delegations, asked that the Meeting be open to observers and that therefore all UNESCO Member States be invited by the Secretariat. Consensus was reached on the latter suggestion. Discussion ensued on whether ICUCH should be invited to participate in the working group as observer. Portugal expressed its strong support for the inclusion of ICUCH in the working group. It was supported by Mexico. Saint Lucia stated that it was the task of the States Parties and not of NGOs to draft the Operational Guidelines to

the Convention, even when this concerned ICUCH. Saint Lucia's proposal was supported by Nigeria and accepted by all States in a spirit of consensus and cooperation.

It was then agreed that the meetings of the working group should be conducted in **English and French**, while the **draft to be worked upon should be the original Secretariat draft in English** to facilitate the proceedings.

Lebanon requested a translation of the working draft in Arabic. Several delegations intervened however calling attention to the time and budget that such a translation would require.

During the discussion of the time schedule for the working group, the Secretariat drew attention to the issue that all working documents to be provided to the Meeting of States Parties had to be translated in six languages and that a certain time would be required for this.

XI.b. The Operational Guidelines: General Remarks

Continuing the **official session of the Meeting**, the Chairperson suggested that the resolution on the working group and its members should be taken at the end of the Meeting of States Parties and that the States Parties should first provide their general remarks on the Secretariat draft of the Operational Guidelines to guide the working group.

Nigeria, which had only been able to join the Meeting on the second day, took the floor and asked whether it would still be possible to include Nigeria in the **Scientific and Technical Advisory Body**. The Chairperson regretted that no candidature of a Nigerian expert had been provided to the Meeting for potential election prior to the Meeting and that the election had already taken place. However, he encouraged strongly future candidatures from the African States that are party to the Convention.

The Chairperson then asked for **General Remarks on the Draft Operational Guidelines**.

Spain suggested that the basis of the work should be the Secretariat draft. The nature of the document should be similar to the Operational Guidelines drafted for the 2003 and 2005 Conventions.

Spain, Portugal, and Saint Lucia stated that the Guidelines should **not interpret the Convention**, but facilitate its implementation. Ireland suggested including a clear statement of this nature. Jamaica expressed its support for these statements.

Portugal stated that the Operational Guidelines should not contain explanations. The "**Frequently Asked Questions**" document, prepared by the Secretariat, was more appropriate for that purpose. The delegate called for the preservation of the types of '**constructive ambiguities**', that arose during the elaboration of the Convention text and which should not be confused with a lack of clarity.

XI.c. Layout:

Lebanon asked that the document be presented in two columns: the articles of the Convention, in their entirety, appearing on the left, and guidelines proper on the right, as already partially done in the draft with a reference to the number of the pertinent article on the left

XI.d. Additional Chapters to be included in the Draft Guidelines:

Referring to the Secretariat's draft, Mexico requested that after the chapter on operational protection a new chapter be added to **explain protection measures** for underwater cultural heritage, the dissemination of knowledge, the awareness-raising about the Convention, cooperation, and the development of ethical standards. Grenada supported this request and suggested enriching the Guidelines with the information on protection contained in the **web page** created by the Secretariat for UNESCO's portal. Grenada also proposed to include **guidelines on the Annex** of the Convention.

Romania suggested that the working group could also collect information on national laws and draft a **model law** for the use of the States Parties.

Lebanon proposed expanding the existing Chapter entitled "Operational Protection" rather than creating a new chapter on protection

Ukraine requested that the protection of **heritage from the two world wars** be taken into consideration.

Italy, as observer, called attention to the importance of **Article 6** of the Convention, which encourages States Parties to enter into **bilateral, regional or other multilateral agreements** or develop existing ones, for the preservation of underwater cultural heritage, and which should be reflected in the Operational Guidelines. Such agreements could concern protected zones.

XI.e. Chapter-by-Chapter Discussion of the Draft Guidelines:

ON CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION

A.1. Application of the Convention

Mexico requested that after the reference to lakes and rivers, **cenotes** (flooded caves) should also be mentioned and that it should be made clear that this is a non-exhaustive list (using for example "as for instance").

Greece suggested mentioning **Article 28** on the left-hand column next to draft paragraph A.1.

Ireland explained that the term "**wetland**" in paragraph a.) was inappropriate, as it would be too broad, and that it should be replaced by 'territory periodically submerged by water'.

Footnote 1

Further to the remarks made by the USA and Greece on the previous day, Ireland requested to either delete this footnote or to quote the whole text of the relevant provisions of UNCLOS.

A.2. Content of the Convention

Spain suggested the inclusion of a paragraph d.) clearly stating what the Convention did not regulate – in particular referring to the **non-regulation of ownership issues** and the fact that the Convention does not change UNCLOS.

Grenada suggested elaborating on protection measures in the introductory part.

A.3. The State Cooperation Mechanism

Saint Lucia suggested that this section should be simplified while stressing some problems with the text contained in A.3 a), and b). Saint Lucia also pointed out that paragraph A.3 c) needed to be re-drafted due to the fact that the text was inconsistent with Article 9 1 b. ii) of the Convention.

Lebanon asked for an explanation of the reasons for the regulations on reporting contained in Article 9 paragraph 2 of the Convention.

Mexico, Grenada, Romania, Saint Lucia, and Spain expressed their conviction concerning the establishment of the **Reporting Database**, as proposed in A.3 d) of the draft Operational Guidelines, that profound consideration should be given to security issues and the need for encrypting. Spain was in favour on the establishment of an agile information sharing system although considering that it should not be regulated within the Guidelines. Portugal expressed its preference of a more general approach in order to provide and share information, taking into consideration how sensible archaeological information could be. On the other hand, Saint Lucia expressed that the database should not operate as a replacement for the reporting mechanism to the coastal State in the EEZ, in accordance with Article 9 of the Convention, so that language in this subparagraph should be consistent with what was contained in Chapter II, 3.1.

Ireland stated that it considered this database a necessary tool for the implementation of the Convention. ~~Greece stressed that there was a contradiction between the proposed database and article 9.3 of the Convention.~~

B. States Parties to the Convention

China asked for clarification on the following questions: could a State Party choose exclusively amicable solutions of disputes under Article 25 of the Convention and would declarations made concerning dispute resolution in ratifying UNCLOS also apply when a country ratified the 2001 Convention. The Secretariat informed that it was available for assistance concerning this kind of questions, even when the Secretariat could of course not interpret the Convention, and would contact the Chinese delegation accordingly.

C.1. Declarations

Saint Lucia mentioned a problem of interpretation of Article 9.1 of the Convention regarding the reference to coastal States in subparagraph b) and suggested to delete this point.

C.3. Reservations

Saint Lucia asked for the deletion of the phrase 'in principle' from the first part of the Section.

ON CHAPTER II – THE STATE COOPERATION MECHANISM

Subchapter II.1. - Reports, notifications and declarations of interest

Section 3. Mode of Transmission of Reports and Declarations

Spain, supported by Grenada and Mexico, again expressed concerns for the **security of the UNESCO Reporting Database** suggested by the Secretariat. Spain also expressed its desire to leave the discussion of a possible database for the future and not to include it in the Guidelines for the moment.

Lebanon asked for an explanation of the choices given by the Convention in its Article 9.

Greece expressed concern for undermining the preservation of the **jurisdiction of Coastal States** and for the **security of the Reporting Database**.

Ireland stated that the distinction between the exceptions regulated by the Convention and the standard situation should be explained.

Saint Lucia, on paragraph 2, reiterated its observations made under Chapter I Part c 1.b regarding reporting and the coastal States.

Section 4. Formatting of Reports and Declarations of Interest

Saint Lucia suggested revisiting the way in which communications should be done between States. While the draft refers to a form, Saint Lucia underlined that it was their

understanding that communications are done with Diplomatic notes in order to be consistent with the formal mode of transmission.

Section 5. Contact Point

ICUCH stated that it was most important to understand the crucial role of the competent authorities under the Convention and that the Operational Guidelines should elaborate on this. A different title should accordingly be given to this Section.

Subchapter II.2. – Selection of the coordinating state and state consultations

Section 6. Appointment of a Coordinating State for Underwater Cultural Heritage located in the EEZ or on the Continental Shelf

Saint Lucia, supporting Lebanon, asked that this part of the draft should be clearer, considering that the way in which it was drafted, did not enough stress the role of the coastal State as Coordinating State. Saint Lucia suggested redrafting this paragraph in the spirit and the tone of Article 10.3 b.) of the Convention.

Lebanon suggested using another wording in paragraph c.) than ‘readiness and capacity of a State’. It also asked to use another word than ‘*coordonateur*’ in the French version.

Greece emphasized that the coastal State would normally be the Coordinating State and this should be reflected in the Guidelines~~asked for the replacement of the term ‘Coordinating State’ with ‘Coastal State’.~~

Section 7. Consultation Procedure concerning Underwater Cultural Heritage located in the EEZ or on the Continental Shelf

Saint Lucia requested that this part of the draft Operational Guidelines be carefully redrafted to be more **consistent with the text of Articles 9.5 and 10.3** of the Convention.

Subchapter II.3. – The operational protection of underwater cultural heritage

Section 9. Immediate Danger to Underwater Cultural Heritage

Saint Lucia asked for the deletion of the sentence “This does not exclude the responsibility to intervene of the other States Parties and assistance can be requested from the other States Parties by the Coordinating State.” in Section 9.1 a.).

Mexico suggested a redrafting of the above sentence, as follows: “This does not exclude the possibility for other States Parties with a verifiable cultural, historical and archaeological link to the underwater cultural heritage under discussion to participate in its protection, nor the possibility of the Coordinating State seeking assistance from other States Parties”.

Mexico also suggested in Section 9.1 b.) to include after “practicable measures” the words “in a coordinated way”.

Saint Lucia and Lebanon raised concerns on the concept of “immediate danger” contained in 9.2 and asked for further reflection on this subject.

Lebanon asked for a redrafting of Section 9.2.

Section 11. The Implementation of Measures and the Issuing of Authorizations

Saint Lucia stressed that this Section was re-writing the articles of the Convention to the prejudice of the Coastal State and suggested a complete re-draft.

ON CHAPTER III – FINANCING

Section 12. The Underwater Cultural Heritage Fund

Nigeria proposed to include a provision to promote ratification of the Convention, particularly of African countries not yet State Party, adding in paragraph 2 c.) “not only the building of capacity in States Parties, but also in States not yet Party to the Convention.”

Spain supported the proposal of Nigeria in terms of assisting non State Parties, if decided by the Meeting of the Parties, but stressed that priority should be given to activities taking place in States Parties to the Convention.

Grenada stated not to be in favour of including the Nigerian proposal within the Guidelines, suggested however to invite non States Parties to regional workshops intended to build capacities in the framework of the Convention.

Section 13. Financial Assistance

Ukraine requested that **States in transition** should be granted financial assistance under Section 13 paragraph 2.

ON CHAPTER IV -PARTNERS

Section 15. Partners in the Implementation Process of the Convention

Spain proposed to limit the definition of partners to those identified in the Convention and proposed in particular the deletion of paragraph d.) “private parties working in conformity with and in relation to the scope of the Convention.”

Portugal referred to the lack of clarity contained in paragraph c.) when it refers to NGOs having activities related to the scope of the Convention.

Saint Lucia stressed the importance of identifying the partners in the Guidelines by emphasizing that there is a difference between the NGOs accredited to participate in the meetings of the organs of the Convention, for consultation purposes, and those partners (NGOs and others) in the field who would assist in the implementation of the Convention without necessarily requiring an accreditation.

The Nautical Archaeology Society expressed its interest in cooperation and suggested extending this part of the Operational Guidelines to partnerships related to training, education and research.

Section 16. Partners in the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage at the National Level

Portugal proposed the deletion of paragraph b.), which suggested the participation of partners in inventorying underwater heritage.

France questioned the relevance of this Section considering that it made reference to what should be done at the national level and considered that these partnerships should not be regulated in the Operational Guidelines. Ireland, on the other hand, expressed its conviction that this Section should be retained given its importance.

Grenada reminded that one of the purposes of the Guidelines was to suggest good practices, included those concerning partnerships and other means of collaboration.

Jamaica considered that the relation with the competent authorities and other partners should be included in the Guidelines and also proposed to transfer paragraphs a.), b.) and c.) to the chapter on operational protection.

ON CHAPTER V - COOPERATION OF THE ADVISORY BODY WITH NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Mexico stated that there are three levels of NGOs participation: i) NGOs working in the field; ii) NGOs which may want to be accredited for consultation to the Advisory Body and iii) NGOs accredited for participation in the Meeting of States Parties. The selection of the latter two had not been addressed neither in the first nor in the second session of the Meeting of the States Parties, so **criteria** were needed in this regard.

Spain, which supported Mexico, mentioned the need to avoid the conflict of interests that may arise if NGOs are accredited in these different levels. Spain also requested the Secretariat to timely inform before the beginning of each Meeting of States Parties, on the NGOs wishing to participate in its sessions.

Lebanon stated that it would not be necessary to include these criteria in the Operational Guidelines, as they would be better **placed in the Rules of Procedure** of the Meeting. Furthermore it would be advisable to give consideration to an **equal geographical**

repartition of the NGOs accredited. Lebanon also stressed the role of the Secretariat in the selection and control of the NGO applying for accreditation.

The Secretariat explained that the issue of admittance of NGOs to the Meeting of States Parties, as observers, had to be separated from the issue of accreditation for cooperation with the Advisory Body. The representative of the Secretariat acknowledged that in the agenda of the Meeting of States Parties the item referring to the admittance of observers to the Meeting had been omitted.

Grenada called attention to UNESCO's basic texts which contain regulations on the acceptance of observers and relations with NGOs. Saint Lucia, supporting Grenada, expressed preference for the inclusion of this issue in the Guidelines and called for a serious investigation of applying NGOs by the Meeting, without blocking a too large number of them from obtaining accreditation. It was suggested that the Advisory Body give an opinion on the applying NGOs.

France stressed that this chapter was very important and needed profound consideration and vigilance to prevent giving accreditation to NGOs that do not deserve it.

ICUCH stated that there are organisations which can indeed give advice on the implementation and promotion of the Convention. Nevertheless, ICUCH reiterated the importance to verify, when setting the criteria for accreditation, the ethical background of the NGOs applying.

The Society for Historical archaeology (SHA), representing a wide range of archaeologists, highlighted their international in scope in the study and protection cultural resources through education, knowledge exchange, professional development, and the maintenance of high ethical standards. Both SHA and the closely affiliated Advisory Council on Underwater Archaeology (ACUA), confirmed that they remain available to assist, in cooperation with ICUCH, as called upon by the States Parties and UNESCO.

ON CHAPTER VI - COOPERATION, INFORMATION-SHARING, RAISING OF PUBLIC AWARENESS, TRAINING

Section 20. Cooperation and Information-Sharing

Mexico stated that it would be necessary to elaborate on the issue of the promotion of the Convention and awareness-raising among the public. The present chapter should be limited to this issue. In that sense, it was suggested to transfer the paragraph regarding cooperation among States to the proposed chapter on protection.

Portugal drew attention to the difference between raising public awareness and information sharing between States, on the one hand, and the inventory of heritage, on the other. The latter had to be considered with care, but was very important.

Lebanon supported Portugal's statement and added that information sharing should only take place between States and not with the public.

Libya stated the importance of building capacities for local experts.

Romania stressed again the need to ensure the security of the proposed database.

Section 21. Public Awareness

Italy stressed that it was important to promote underwater heritage public-access projects. It also stated that when the Convention or the Operational Guidelines referred to 'commercialization' (as stated in Chapter I, part B. paragraph b.c.), treasure-hunting was meant, and not the enhancement of heritage by tourism or public access.

Section 22. Training

On paragraph 2. c.) the Nautical Archaeology Society, UK (NAS) proposed the strengthening of specialized national institutions while considering the development of partnerships with other bodies or sharing national training schemes. NAS also emphasized the need to ensure the good quality of training which should be in line with the principles of the Convention. Last, it made reference to the need to consider different levels of training taking into account the different levels of competence associated with underwater cultural heritage.

Section 23. Mobilization of national and international support in favour of the Convention

Lebanon drew attention to the role of the Secretariat to promote the Convention rather than States Parties, as stated in the draft Guidelines.

ON THE PROPOSED NEW CHAPTER REGARDING PROTECTION

The Chairperson announced that, in accordance with the discussion on the Guidelines, the working group may wish to consider placing a new chapter on operational protection as chapter II, III or even V.

Mexico reiterated its proposal to transform the subchapter on operational protection in an independent chapter and include those items already mentioned in the general debate on the guidelines, i.e. indications concerning the operational protection of underwater cultural heritage. Regarding the first outline of forms for the database, attached for information only and as annex to the draft of the Operational Guidelines, Mexico mentioned controversial aspects on form 1 such as GPS location of underwater sites.

Grenada pointed out that the means and ways of information sharing and the use and confidentiality of the database is essential for protection while it also reiterated that

UNESCO's website contained already much information on *in situ* protection, the establishment of inventories, site supervision, and long-term protection, etc.

Romania suggested that the working group could gather information on national laws related with the protection of cultural heritage and, to harmonize them, elaborate a model law. In light of this, the Secretariat made reference to the UNESCO Database of National Cultural Heritage Laws (www.unesco.org/culture/natlaws) and the possibility to include a subsection with specific reference to underwater cultural heritage laws. Spain, on the other hand, was of the view that the exercise proposed by Romania could lead to a complete re-drafting of the Convention. Spain emphasized the need to agree on basic principles of protection based on what is already contained in the Convention taking into account the deep differences that may be found in national legislations.

Greece proposed to re-draft of the form number 1, attached for information purposes only to the draft of the Guidelines, so that it could be in conformity with Article 9 of the Convention.

Ireland reiterated that the proposed new chapter on operational protection should give practical guidance to States Parties in order to implement the dispositions contained in the Convention, particularly those in Articles 2, 7 and 15. Ireland further stated that, while recognizing the need to secure information included in a possible database, access to it is extremely important to raise awareness and promote the principles of the Convention.

ICUCH mentioned that the Convention already contains quite a few issues that can be dealt with under the general heading of protection referring to the "Rules".

ICUCH also called upon the States Parties to seriously consider that information-sharing is the basis for cooperation while emphasizing that a lot of information may be disclosed without threatening national security.

XII. Members of the working group:

Following discussion of the draft Guidelines, the **Chairperson** read the names of the States Parties that had indicated in writing their interest to participate in the **working group**:

- Bulgaria
- Cambodia
- Croatia
- Ecuador
- Grenada
- the Islamic Republic of Iran
- Lebanon

- Mexico
- Nigeria
- Portugal
- Romania,
- Saint Lucia
- Spain
- Ukraine

The Chairperson also indicated that the delegations of Albania, Argentina, Egypt, France Germany, Greece, India, Ireland, Italy, the Philippines, the Netherlands, Russia and the USA have expressed their wish to be admitted as observers to the meeting of the working group.

The Meeting of States Parties invited the working group in its **Resolution 5 / MSP 2** to revise the Secretariat draft of the Operational Guidelines taking into account the observations made during the first and the second session of the Meeting. It also decided that the group would work in English and French. It requested the working group to first proceed in its work by means of electronic exchange and then to meet in a first session in 2010 at UNESCO Headquarters. It decided that the meetings of the working group would be open to observers.

The Meeting of States Parties requested the working group to submit the results of its work for consultation to the States Parties through the Secretariat four months before the third Meeting of States Parties and to submit a consolidated draft two months before the third Meeting of States Parties.

XIII. Date and venue of the third session of the Meeting of States Parties

(Item 10 of the Agenda, Document UCH/09/2.MSP/220/10)

The Meeting of States Parties discussed the dates and the place of its third session (the final item on its agenda). Following a short discussion, it was decided that it should be an ordinary session to take place in 2011 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris.

XIV. Closure of the Meeting

(Item 11 of the Agenda, no document)

The Chairperson then declared the Meeting closed. He thanked the States Parties and the observers for their work and greeted the achievements of the second session of the Meeting of States Parties, which were widely applauded by the delegations present.

