



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

40 COM

WHC/16/40.COM.INF.19

Original: English/French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Fortieth session

**Istanbul, Turkey
10-17 July 2016**

**UNESCO Headquarters, Paris, France
24-26 October 2016**

**SUMMARY RECORDS
RÉSUMÉ DES INTERVENTIONS**

This Document contains in **Part I** the Summary Records of the debates held in Istanbul (10-17 July 2016) and in **Part II** the Summary Records of the debates held at UNESCO Headquarters (24-26 October 2016).

Ce Document contient, dans la **Partie I**, le résumé des débats ayant eu lieu à Istanbul (10-17 juillet 2016) et, dans la **Partie II**, le résumé des débats ayant eu lieu au siège de l'UNESCO à Paris (24-26 octobre 2016).

PART I

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE DEBATES HELD
IN ISTANBUL**

(10-17 JULY 2016)

**ITEMS EXAMINED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE IN ISTANBUL
(10-17 July 2016)**

OPENING SESSION

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

REPORTS

4. Report of the Rapporteur of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee (Bonn, 2015)
5. Reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies
 - 5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions
 - 5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies
 - 5C. *World Heritage Convention* and Sustainable Development
 - 5D. Report on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes
6. Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy and Progress Report on the World Heritage-related category 2 centres

EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

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

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

8. Establishment of the World Heritage List and of the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List*

WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS

11. Revision of the *Operational Guidelines***
13. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods
 - 13A. Working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination: Report of the ad-hoc working group**

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

15. Presentation of the Final Accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2014-2015 and Implementation of the World Heritage Fund under the Biennium 2016-2017**

CLOSING SESSION

17. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee (2017)*

* Partial examination (continued at the Paris session, see Part II).

** Working Groups established – outcomes examined at the Paris continuation session (see Part II).

SUNDAY, 10 JULY 2016

OPENING OF THE SESSION

6.30 p.m – 8.30 p.m

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/INF.2

The Opening Ceremony of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee was organized at the Istanbul Congress Centre (Istanbul, Turkey) on Sunday 10 July 2016. The **21 Members** of the World Heritage Committee were present:

Angola, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Croatia, Cuba, Finland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe.

The following 117 States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

Afghanistan; Albania; Algeria; Andorra; Antigua and Barbuda; Argentina; Armenia; Australia; Austria; Bahrain; Bangladesh; Belgium; Benin; Bolivia (Plurinational State of); Bosnia and Herzegovina; Botswana; Brazil; Bulgaria; Cambodia; Cameroon; Canada; Chad; Chile; China; Colombia; Congo; Costa Rica; Côte d'Ivoire; Cyprus; Czech Republic; Czechia; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Denmark; Dominican Republic; Ecuador; Egypt; El Salvador; Eritrea; Estonia; Ethiopia; France; Georgia; Germany; Ghana; Greece; Grenada; Guatemala; Haiti; Holy See; Honduras; Hungary; Iceland; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Japan; Jordan; Kenya; Kyrgyzstan; Latvia; Lithuania; Madagascar; Malaysia; Mali; Marshall Islands; Mauritania; Mexico; Micronesia (Federated States of); Mongolia; Montenegro; Morocco; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Netherlands; Niger; Nigeria; Norway; Oman; Pakistan; Palestine; Panama; Romania; Russian Federation; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Seychelles; Singapore; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; South Sudan; Spain; Sri Lanka; Sudan; Sweden; Switzerland; Syrian Arab Republic; Thailand; the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Togo; Trinidad and Tobago; Turkmenistan; Uganda; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Uruguay; Uzbekistan; Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of); Zambia.

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

The Opening Ceremony of the 40th session was held on **Sunday 10 July 2016**. Speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

- H.E. Numan Kurtulmuş, Deputy Prime Minister of Turkey
- H.E. Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO
- H.E. Nabi Avcı, Minister of Culture and Tourism of Turkey
- Lord Mayor Mr Kadir Topbaş, Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality
- H.E. Stanley Mutumba Simataa, President of the General Conference of UNESCO
- H.E. Lale Ülker, Ambassador, Chairperson of the 40th session of UNESCO World Heritage Committee
- H.E. Michael Worbs, Ambassador, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO
- Professor Öcal Oğuz, President of Turkish National Commission for UNESCO

During the ceremony, the Director-general of UNESCO proceeded with the designation of musicologist and master of ney, Mr Kudsi Ergüner, as UNESCO Artist for Peace.

During the Opening ceremony, the outcomes of the **Youth Forum** “At the Crossroads of Multi-Layered Heritage”, which was held from 26 June to 11 July and gathered youth representatives from 35 countries, were also presented.

A cultural performance and a reception followed.

FIRST DAY – Monday, 11 JULY 2016

FIRST MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 2. ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.2

Decision: **40 COM 2**

The **Chairperson** welcomed the attendees to Istanbul wishing everyone a successful meeting and opened Item 2 of the agenda.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 2** was adopted.

ITEM 3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

3A. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

3B. ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/3A.Rev
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.3A.Rev.3
WHC/16/40.COM/3B.Rev.2

Decisions: **40 COM 3A**
40 COM 3B

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre, Mrs Mechtild Rössler, to present the Provisional Agenda and Timetable of the session, contained respectively in Documents WHC/16/40.COM/3A.Rev and WHC/16/40.COM/3B.Rev.2. She also proposed a small change in the timetable concerning the adoption of the Istanbul Declaration, suggesting that it be held immediately after the adoption of the Agenda and Timetable.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that two changes were made to the original Provisional Agenda of the 40th session after its adoption by the Committee at its 39th session (Bonn, 2015): Item 9B regarding mixed nominations was removed, as a report on this matter was only requested for 2017, and an Item 13B on governance was proposed for inscription on the Agenda, at the request of the Open-Ended Working Group on Governance, Procedures and Methods of Work of

the Governing Bodies of UNESCO, established by the General Conference of UNESCO.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** also indicated that, during the first Bureau meeting held on 10 July, two members of the Bureau requested that the following state of conservation reports be opened for discussion, in addition to those already included in Document INF.7.Rev: Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria), Venice and its Lagoon (Italy), Ancient City of Tauric Chersonese and its Chora (Ukraine). She further indicated that the Bureau suggested that Items 11, 15, and 13A be examined together in the afternoon of 18 July.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** briefly presented Document WHC/16/40.COM/3B.Rev.2 which contains the Timetable of the session, including the Bureau meetings. She also indicated that the *Istanbul Declaration on the protection of World Heritage*, prepared at the initiative of the Chairperson, would be presented to the Committee immediately after the examination of Items 3A and 3B.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments to the Agenda or Timetable had been received.

The Draft Decisions **40 COM 3A** and **40 COM 3B** were adopted and Item 3 was closed.

The **Chairperson** informed the room that due to time constraints, Rule 22.2 of the *Rules of Procedure*, by which interventions are limited to 3 minutes for Committee Members and 2 minutes for observers, would be applied. The Chairperson also invited NGOs to coordinate amongst themselves regarding statements on the same issues. The Chairperson also reminded the room that official statements and declarations should be delivered to the Secretariat as soon as possible for integration in the proceedings. The Chairperson informed the room that amendments to Draft Decisions would need to be submitted to the Secretariat either in writing or by email to the Rapporteur and that said amendments should be delivered in a timely manner, so as to allow the Secretariat to translate them into French or English. The Chairperson thanked the Delegates for their cooperation on the implementation of these working procedures.

Chairperson's Initiative: Adoption of the Istanbul Declaration at the occasion of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee

The **Chairperson** presented the *Istanbul Declaration on the Protection of World Heritage* Stressing the urgent need to join forces towards the preservation and safeguarding of the world's common heritage, she indicated that she took the initiative to propose this text to the Committee, and that it should be seen as a message to the international community, testifying of the common responsibility to protect heritage for the next generations. She recalled that this text was prepared in consultation with all Committee members prior to the session, to ensure its smooth endorsement.

The *Istanbul Declaration on the Protection of World Heritage* was unanimously adopted.

The text of the *Istanbul Declaration* can be found in **Annex I** (in English and French).

ITEM 4. REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 39th SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (BONN, 2015)

No document

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 4 of the Agenda and indicated that Mr Hicham Cheaib, the Rapporteur of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee, expressed his regrets not to be able to attend the 40th session. The Chairperson indicated that Mr Cheaib had recorded his report.

In his report, the **Rapporteur of the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee** indicated the number of Delegates present at the 39th session, the number of decisions that were adopted and the number of sites inscribed as well as the number of State of conservation reports examined. He indicated that two working groups had met several times during the session to prepare Draft Decisions on the Budget and the *Operational Guidelines*. He also highlighted the positive aspects of the previous year's session, and notably the Chairperson's initiative to adopt the Bonn Declaration regarding World Heritage in conflict and the launch by the Director-General of UNESCO of the Global Coalition «Unite4Heritage » to foster the protection of World Heritage under threat. The Rapporteur expressed his gratitude for all the assistance provided during the 39th session and conveyed his good wishes to the Rapporteur of the 40th session.

ITEM 15. PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2014-2015 AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND UNDER THE BIENNIUM 2016-2017
[Constitution of consultative body]

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/15

Decision: **40 COM 15**

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee established, by Decision **35 COM 12B**, Paragraph 13, a standing Consultative Body for review of the Committee's biennial budget, in conformity with Article 20 of the *Rules of Procedure*. She also recalled that this Consultative Body was open to all States parties, including States Parties that are not members of the Committee, and that the Advisory Bodies would have the possibility to attend this working group as Observers.

The **Chairperson** also indicated that the Committee would have to establish a Working Group on the *Operational Guidelines*. In this regard, and to avoid heavy agendas and overlapping of meetings of these two working groups, the Chairperson suggested that the Committee reduce the length of each of these working groups to three days, instead of being held for the entire duration of the session. She therefore proposed that the Budget Working Group meet from 12 to 14 July, from 2 to 3 pm.

No objection was made to this proposal.

The **Chairperson** also recalled that, as per Rule 20.2 of the *Rules of Procedure*, it is of the responsibility of the group to elect its Chairperson. However, she expressed her understanding that some consultations had already taken place in this regard, and requested to know if a Delegation would like to make a proposal.

The Delegation of **Poland**, supported by the Delegation of **Burkina Faso**, proposed **Professor Elizabeth K. Kiondo** (Tanzania) as Chair of the Budget working group.

This proposal was unanimously supported.

Professor Kiondo thanked all members for their confidence and urged all members to attend this Working Group.

ITEM 11. REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES [Constitution of consultative body]

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/11

Decision: 40 COM 11

The **Chairperson** recalled that, by Decision **39 COM 11** in 2015, the Committee decided, on an exceptional basis, to re-examine Paragraphs 61 and 68 as well as Annex 2A at its 40th session in 2016, and that this matter was closely linked to the work of the Ad-Hoc Working Group which met throughout the year. Therefore, she indicated that it was proposed that a working group be established as a consultative body, in conformity with Article 20.1 of the *Rules of Procedure*, and be open to all interested States parties, including States Parties that are not members of the Committee. She recalled that the Advisory Bodies will have the possibility to attend this working group as Observers and that the group will report back to the Committee at its plenary session. The Chairperson also proposed, as for the Budget group, to reduce the duration of this working group to 3 days, and that it meet from Friday 15 to Sunday 17 July from 2 to 3 pm.

No objection was recorded.

The **Chairperson** also recalled that, as per Rule 20.2 of the *Rules of Procedure*, it is of the responsibility of the Working Group to elect its Chairperson. However, she indicated that she understood some consultations had already taken place in this regard, and opened the floor for proposals from the Delegations.

The Delegation of **Finland** proposed **Mr Jad Tabet** from Lebanon as Chair of the Working Group. This proposal was unanimously supported.

Mr Jad Tabet thanked all Committee Members for their confidence.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the logistical arrangements with regard to the time and venue for the meetings of the Working Group.

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

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

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/5A

Decision: **40 COM 5A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced Item 5A and presented the structure of the Report. She announced that the post of Deputy Director of the Division for Heritage was currently under recruitment, and that the appointee would cover all Heritage Conventions that fall within the purview of the Division for Heritage other than the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*.

Concerning the structure and composition of the World Heritage Centre, she underlined that the number of posts – financed through regular and extra-budgetary funding sources – had decreased over the last years, while the number of properties on the World Heritage list (1031 properties) and the tasks of the World Heritage Centre have been constantly increasing. She noted that the Centre was facing a situation that is no longer sustainable. In this regard, she thanked China, Finland, Germany, Japan, the Republic of Korea and Turkey for their support to the Centre, mainly via secondment of staff.

The Director indicated that the activities of the World Heritage Centre were in line with the Medium-Term Strategy (2014-2021) and the Approved Programme and Budget for 2014-2017 (37 C/5 and 38 C/5), and that the Secretariat's report provided concrete examples to illustrate how the World Heritage Centre works with the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and many other stakeholders to identify, protect, monitor and sustainably manage World Heritage.

She also indicated that South Sudan had recently become the 192nd State Party to ratify the Convention and called on all remaining countries to ratify this Convention to make it fully universal.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre also indicated that the second part of the report summarised the Secretariat's activities on the basis of the six performance indicators established to achieve the goal of protecting properties on the World Heritage List. In this regard, she provided specific information and key outcomes on Statutory meetings of Governing Bodies held in 2015, i.e. the 39th session of the World Heritage Committee (June/July 2015), the 20th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and the 11th Extraordinary Session of the Committee (November 2015).

She welcomed the nine new Committee members elected during the 20th General Assembly (Angola, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Indonesia, Kuwait, Tunisia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe) and thanked the other States Parties whose term of office as Committee members had come to an end (Algeria, Colombia, Germany, India, Japan, Malaysia, Qatar, Senegal and Serbia) for their commitment and to the work of the Committee

She underlined that Capacity-building activities were implemented in all regions and gave specific examples, notably in the regions of Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Latin America and the Caribbean.

Concerning Nominations, the Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled that, after the 39th session of the Committee, the World Heritage List reached 1031 properties, of which 802 are cultural, 197 natural and 32 mixed. She recalled also that a total of 180 States Parties have submitted a Tentative List. She indicated that the Centre provides support to States Parties in the process of updating their Tentative Lists and in the elaboration of best practices for the preparation of nominations.

Referring to Sustainable Development, she recalled that the General Assembly adopted, at its 20th session, the “Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the *World Heritage Convention*” (Resolution **20 GA 13**).

Concerning conservation, thematic priorities and awareness raising, the Director indicated that, during the 40th session, the Committee would examine 156 reports on the state of conservation (SOC) of World Heritage properties, including 48 related to properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Director indicated that 100,000 copies of the 2014-2015 World Heritage Map had been produced in collaboration with National Geographic and with the support of Turkey, who also financed a Special Issue of the quarterly magazine ‘World Heritage’ dedicated to Turkey.

The Director recalled that Gender Equality is one of the Global Priorities of UNESCO, and that the Centre takes it closely into account, notably by ensuring male/female parity when examining nominations and for the different roles in the preservation of World Heritage properties.

She underlined that the “Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk reduction 2015-2030”, which was adopted in March 2015 by the United Nations General Assembly, includes references to culture and heritage. It recognises the essential relationship between different aspects of culture, resilience, and disaster risk reduction and builds on a number of earlier efforts, such as the 2007 “UNESCO Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction at World Heritage properties” and numerous UNESCO-led capacity-building initiatives. In this regard, she recalled that the Centre has provided technical and financial support to the authorities of countries affected by major disasters to enable the assessment of the damage, the identification of priority recovery needs and the implementation of urgent safeguarding measures.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre indicated that the Culture Conventions Liaison Group (CCLG) reinforced efforts to create synergies among the six UNESCO Culture Conventions. In this regard, she recalled the meeting of the Chairpersons of these six Conventions, which took place during the 39th session of the Committee, along with the meeting organised in December 2015 to discuss the destruction of cultural heritage in armed conflict. She also indicated that a review of the Convention Common Services (CCS) was forthcoming and would assess the workload and the functioning of the unit. She also indicated that the Centre participated in the meeting of the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG) in February 2016, in an effort to reinforce cooperation and synergies between the biodiversity-related conventions and programmes. She further underlined that synergies are also enhanced through the PR reflection process. Finally, she indicated that the World Heritage Centre the

Centre and the Secretariats of the MAB and the Geoparks Programme were very active on the occasion of the COP21.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** commended the work of the Secretariat despite the current challenging financial situation of UNESCO and took note of the number of posts funded via the regular budget and using extrabudgetary funds. The Delegation further noted that various expert meetings were held throughout the year and contributed to the work of the Committee. The Delegation suggested establishing a mechanism whereby Committee members can provide inputs/views and also be fully appraised on the results of these meetings. Furthermore, the Delegation suggested that Committee members be more involved in the selection/preparation of capacity-building programs and, if given opportunities to contribute, to provide assistance. With a view to strengthening governance, the Delegation recommended that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies develop interactive orientation sessions for new Committee members, covering the practical implementation of the Convention, its *Operational Guidelines* and its *Rules of Procedure* as well as case studies on complex nominations and best practices. Given the overlaps between natural World Heritage sites, biosphere reserves and geoparks, the Delegation encouraged the World Heritage Centre to work with IUCN and the UNESCO Science sector to help develop guidelines for State Parties to promote coherence and clarity. Furthermore, the Delegation suggested that Partnerships be utilised for activities in favor of a representative and balanced World Heritage List. The Delegation indicated that it submitted amendments to the Draft Decision under this item.

In order to better cope with the constraints faced by the Secretariat, the Delegation of **Turkey** suggested exploring an adjustment of the staff structure of the Secretariat. It suggested developing an organigram of the current structure of the Centre, to better understand the lack of human resources. It underlined that new thematic areas are being included into the mandate of the Secretariat, which requires additional work and capacities. The Delegation underlined that the Government of Turkey has already provided the Secretariat with seconded experts and will continue to do so. The Delegation recognized the importance of the upstream process, which is a valuable tool in assisting State Parties, and welcomed the Secretariat's efforts to improve this process, in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. Furthermore, the Delegation requested that best practices pertaining to nominations, management, and Heritage Impact Assessment be made available on the World Heritage Centre's website.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** welcomed the comprehensive report and congratulated the Secretariat for the excellent work accomplished despite the financial constraints. The Delegation noted that, despite this difficult situation, the Secretariat continues to prioritize UNESCO's two global priorities: Gender Equality and Africa. The Delegation welcomed the adoption of the Sustainable Development Policy by the 20th General Assembly of State Parties and encouraged the Secretariat to continue activities related to the Sustainable Development policy in Africa and Small Islands Developing States (SIDS).

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the work of the World Heritage Centre and the quality of the report, but expressed concerns regarding the current financial constraints. The Delegation also expressed its commitment to assist in amplifying the voice of SIDS in the implementation of the Convention.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed satisfaction with the work and efforts of the Centre aiming at developing synergies between the Conventions. It underlined the work of the Centre in support to the implementation of the "Sendai Framework for

Disaster Risk Reduction” and its efforts to reinforce UNESCO’s action in the protection of cultural heritage in event of armed conflict. With regards to nominations, the Delegation welcomed the support given to the Africa region through the Upstream Process. However, it noted that one quarter of all nominations last year were from Committee members. The Delegation also expressed its concern that the Committee increasingly disregards the Advisory Bodies’ recommendations, noting that this undermines the credibility of the Convention. The Delegation noted with concern the current situation regarding human resources at the World Heritage Centre, underlining the lack of natural heritage experts. The Delegation encouraged all parties to interact with civil society, emphasizing that it is an indispensable partner for the implementation of the Convention.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour la qualité du travail fourni en dépit de la situation budgétaire défavorable. La Délégation note avec inquiétude le manque de ressources humaines au Centre.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** underlined the efforts deployed for capacity building in the Africa region. It noted however that this region remains disadvantaged in terms of the results of the Upstream initiative, as evidenced by the few inscriptions achieved so far despite commendable efforts from the World Heritage Centre and the African World Heritage Fund. The Delegation appealed to the Advisory Bodies to come up with innovative approaches to make this process more sustainable.

The Delegation of **Portugal** praised the Centre for streamlining its activities under serious constraints, which have not yet been properly addressed. The Delegation noted that significant human and financial resources continue to be expended in organizing statutory meetings, and that the evaluation of increasing complex nomination also requires a huge amount of time and massive funds, leaving fewer resources for the conservation of World Heritage properties and capacity-building activities. The Delegation noted that, as such, the current situation is neither sustainable nor acceptable. The Delegation commended the World Heritage Centre for its efforts and thanked all the relevant stakeholders for their continued support, while noting that a situation where an increasing number of activities can only be implemented by resorting to voluntary contributions is a matter of utmost concern. The Delegation welcomed the reinforcement of synergies among the six cultural Conventions and indicated that it looked forward to the reviewing process for the Culture Conventions Liaison Group, later in 2016.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** félicite la nouvelle Directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial et se félicite de la qualité du rapport du centre sur ses activités. Elle rappelle que le 5 mai de chaque année a été proclamé *Journée du Patrimoine Africain* et se félicite également de cette initiative. La Délégation salue les efforts déployés pour développer les synergies entre les différentes Conventions de l’UNESCO et invite le Centre à poursuivre ses efforts pour le renforcement des capacités dans les pays africains.

La Délégation de **l’Angola** félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial de son action, notamment concernant le soutien accordé au continent africain afin d’améliorer la qualité de ses propositions d’inscription. La Délégation invite aussi le Centre à poursuivre ses efforts pour améliorer les synergies entre les différentes Conventions.

The Delegation of **Poland** congratulated the Chairperson and reiterated the commitment of its government to support her in the best way possible. It also congratulated the Centre for its hard work. The Delegation also expressed its

appreciation for the agreement reached during the last session of the Committee concerning the property 'Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution' and underlined that the compromise found after intensive discussions, led in the spirit of cooperation, should serve as an important example in dealing with nominations and should inspire all countries.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** expressed appreciation for the work of the World Heritage Centre and expressed the wish that more capacity-building support can be provided to developing countries.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** thanked Turkey for the organisation of the Committee and expressed its sympathy and solidarity with the country after the recent events. As a new member of the Committee, Azerbaijan expressed its commitment to the Convention and thanked the Secretariat for its efforts. It recalled the two global priorities, Africa and Gender Equality, and acknowledged with satisfaction that both were covered thoroughly in the Secretariat's report. Azerbaijan commended the capacity-building activities carried out by the Secretariat to train Site Managers, especially for conservation and tourism strategies. Nonetheless, Azerbaijan noted that capacity building should also be extended to those regions where heritage is threatened by armed conflict. The Delegation welcomed the inclusion of Sustainable Development into the process of heritage preservation and drew attention to the important ongoing process of definition of the scope and structure of such work. It further expressed its strong belief in working with the Secretariat and the Committee to achieve good results. Azerbaijan commended the Secretariat's work, despite lack of resources, and highlighted that the goal of the 1972 Convention is not only inscriptions, but also improving conservation. Finally, Azerbaijan expressed its support to reinforcing synergies between Conventions, which it considers especially important to achieve positive outcomes, and highlighted the work already achieved by the Culture Conventions Liaison Group.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** remercie le Centre ainsi que les autorités Turques pour l'excellente organisation de la session et se joint aux autres Délégations en félicitant la Directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le travail important réalisé par le Centre et notamment pour le soutien – tant technique que financier – apporté à la Tunisie dans le cadre de la préparation du dossier d'inscription de Djerba. Compte tenu des difficultés financières actuelles auxquelles fait face le Centre, la Délégation en appelle à tous les États parties ainsi qu'aux partenaires afin de renforcer financièrement le Centre pour qu'il soit en mesure d'apporter toute l'aide nécessaire aux pays africains et arabes dans le cadre de la préparation des dossiers d'inscription. La Délégation indique sa satisfaction d'avoir contribué aux ateliers de formation organisés par le centre et l'ICCROM pour les pays en conflit.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite les autorités turques pour l'organisation de la 40e session et souligne l'importance et la symbolique de tenir cette session à Istanbul, frappée récemment par des attaques terroristes. La Délégation félicite également le Centre pour son travail méticuleux et les efforts déployés alors que la crise budgétaire est importante. La Délégation espère que les travaux du Comité permettront de trouver une solution durable à cette crise.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** conveyed its deep appreciation to the Director of World Heritage Centre for the quality of the report. The Delegation expressed its opinion that the Centre must collaborate with the States Parties on all steps of implementation of the Convention, from identification to conservation and presentation. In this respect, the Delegation recalled the meaningful agreement reached during the 39th session regarding the inscription of the property 'Sites of

Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution' on the World Heritage List, at the occasion of which the Committee recommended that Japan prepare an interpretive strategy for a presentation which allows an understanding of the full history of the site, as the result of intense discussions in the spirit of perseverance and cooperation. The Delegation indicated that it believes an inscription is merely a starting point, and that it is incumbent on the Committee members to ensure the monitoring of the implementation of the Committee's decisions. To reflect the historical truth and the heritage of the unfortunate past in an objective manner, all Committee members should work together to set an example for the future, fully recognizing that setting such a precedent would be instrumental in advancing the World Heritage system as a whole. The Delegation further indicated that, in collaboration with many experts, it has gathered information on interpretive strategies, and that it is organising a Side Event on World Heritage and Interpretation, which will be held on 13 July, and that a subsequent International Seminar will be held in November 2016 in Seoul (Republic of Korea). The Delegation also indicated that it hopes Japan will take concrete actions in implementing the Committee's decisions and integrate the outcomes of these consultations without delay.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** expressed its support to World Heritage Centre and UNESCO on the fight against the destruction of cultural heritage and its solidarity with people of Turkey and the Arab countries for the loss of lives.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** expressed its thanks to Turkey for its hospitality. Concerning the property 'Sites of Japan's Meiji Industrial Revolution', the Delegation indicated that Japan respects all recommendations of the Committee and that a progress report would be submitted by December 2017, as requested by the Committee. Japan reaffirmed its commitment to prepare an interpretive strategy, as requested by the Committee, and indicated that it is gathering information to appropriately draft this interpretive strategy, in collaboration with national and international experts.

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of World Heritage Centre to reply to the questions raised by the Committee members.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** emphasized that there is a mismatch between the available resources and the aspirations of the Convention and the Committee, considering the 1,031 properties currently on the World Heritage List and the number of incoming nominations. In response to questions raised by the States Parties, she indicated that the optimum number of staff depends entirely on the Committee's decisions. On the topic of resources, she stated that partnerships with other organisations and the private sector have produced results by supporting under-represented regions, but that extra-budgetary funding remains focused on specific activities. The Director further noted that significant progress was made with synergies, as highlighted by the States Parties, notably with other conventions, including the biodiversity conventions. Concerning the web page, and particularly the sharing of best practices, the Director indicated that the work was underway, but emphasized that World Heritage Centre carries out research on best practices when asked by a State Party, and stands ready to do so at any time. Finally, the Director thanked the States Parties for their financial contributions to the World Heritage Fund and indicated that several other questions, notably those on the Upstream Processes, would be addressed in detail under other items.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 5A** was adopted as amended.

5B. REPORTS OF THE ADVISORY BODIES

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/5B

Decision: **40 COM 5B**

The **Chairperson** invited the representatives of each Advisory Body to make their presentation.

ICOMOS proceeded with the presentation of its report.

L'**ICCROM** félicite le Centre du patrimoine pour son travail remarquable dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre de la Convention, notamment compte tenu des circonstances budgétaires et de la surcharge de travail de plus en plus importante, particulièrement dans le cadre de la préservation des biens situés dans des pays en conflit. L'**ICCROM** présente ses condoléances à la Turquie à la suite des attaques terroristes ayant récemment eu lieu sur son territoire et félicite les autorités pour l'organisation de la 40e session dans ces tristes circonstances. L'**ICCROM** souligne l'importance de sa collaboration avec l'UNESCO – sa maison mère – depuis 60 ans et sa volonté d'être active non seulement dans le cadre de la Convention de 1972, mais aussi dans le cadre des autres Conventions culturelles et autres instruments normatifs de l'Organisation. Dans ce cadre, l'**ICCROM** indique qu'aucun autre accord formel, à part celui conclu dans le cadre des dispositions de la Convention du patrimoine mondial, n'existe entre l'UNESCO et l'**ICCROM** et que cela mériterait d'être reconsidéré afin de renforcer les liens de l'**ICCROM** avec l'UNESCO pour une coopération plus efficace.

In addition to its work on the Convention, ICCROM indicated that it has established a programme to better conserve cultural properties at large. ICCROM also noted that in 2015, it was invited for the first time to attend the ICOMOS Nomination Panel as a non-voting member. It also participated in SOC Meetings, Reactive Monitoring missions, Advisory Mission, and more. ICCROM emphasized its role with regard to capacity building related to World Heritage, as part of which it collaborates with the other Advisory Bodies, especially with the implementation of capacity-building programmes, with support of Switzerland. ICCROM also highlighted Norway's international 'World Heritage Leadership' programme. Finally, ICCROM evoked the scoping study it carried out for the revision of the Policy Guidelines, realised thanks to support from Australia, and which will be further discussed under Item 13.

IUCN thanked Turkey for its hospitality and expressed its solidarity with the Turkish people. IUCN reaffirmed its strong commitment towards the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. Stressing the need to tackle the issues at hand; IUCN indicated that the World Conservation Congress was the opportunity to move agreement into action towards reaching the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). IUCN noted that over the last 50 years, the *World Heritage Convention* has protected what are now 8% of the global nature reserves, which is exceptional, and that the protection of World Heritage and its conservation are constitutive elements of nature conservation. IUCN expressed its concerns over the fact that the world is currently losing species at 1,000 times the natural extinction rate, which is very worrying. IUCN further emphasized that the core of the Convention's credibility was in its performance, and that global ability to deliver on the SDGs and other international commitments closely depends on the primary ability to preserve sites designated as the most precious and universal heritage. Finally, the representative of IUCN invited the attendees to join the World Conservation Congress to be held in Hawaii in September 2016, where over 30 events will be dedicated to World Heritage.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the statement made by IUCN and called to intensify the joint efforts to improve dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre, with a view to better implementing of the Convention. The Delegation took note in this regard of the improvement of the dialogue with ICOMOS for the revision of evaluation process for nominations.

The Delegation of **Turkey** voiced some concerns expressed by several States Parties regarding the fact that the increased dialogue with ICOMOS still has room for improvement. It indicated that these concerns were not to be taken as criticism but as an expression of expectations, i.e that the greater involvement of States Parties during the evaluation process could be further improved and that this may be taken up via an amendment to the *Operational Guidelines*. The Delegation of Turkey indicated that upstream advice was also a crucial element which requires more collaboration.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** emphasized that reports should be transparent and comprehensive and should be based on the data obtained by States Parties.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the level of collaboration with and amongst the Advisory Bodies, especially with regard to capacity building, and recognised the essential role of ICOMOS for under-represented countries. The Delegation supported the presentation of IUCN, notably on the topics of communities and indigenous peoples, as well as the capacity-building efforts for SIDS.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** remercie les Organisations consultatives de leur rapport et se félicite du dialogue engagé entre elles et les États parties. Elle note que la transparence augmente, notamment dans le cadre du processus d'évaluation des dossiers d'inscriptions ainsi que dans le cadre de l'état de conservation des sites, et encourage les Organisations consultatives à poursuivre ce processus. Elle indique dans ce cadre soutenir la proposition turque. La Délégation se félicite de la coopération du Viet Nam avec l'IUCN et l'ICOMOS dans le cadre du Processus en amont.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their concise reports and for improving their working methods. It emphasized that this strengthened cooperation is especially relevant for difficult nomination dossiers and conservation issues. The Delegation further emphasized that this cooperation must benefit States Parties in need, as a matter of priority. The Delegation called upon all the Advisory Bodies to continue the dialogue and address the specific needs of each State Party in the nomination process, to avoid excessive standardisation, which will only lead to frustration. Portugal further noted that the Upstream Process will be a vector of increased interaction between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties, and that it can help address the current imbalance of the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Poland** raised concerns about the fact that the World Heritage system is going through constant adaptation, is currently overloaded, and that it may be losing its operational capacity. The Delegation thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their professionalism and commitment, and emphasized that the quality of the Committee's work is directly proportional to the work of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies and their relation with the Committee Members. Finally, the Delegation asked for clarifications regarding the involvement of ICCROM in the nomination process.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their expertise and their role in strengthening the credibility of the Convention. It highlighted that the January 2016 Interim Report represents a great progress for the States Parties, and

would wish to see this practice taken further. In this regard, the Republic of Korea asked the ICOMOS Secretariat how it foresees the future of this process.

The Delegation of the Philippines thanked the Advisory Bodies for their reports and valuable support to the Convention. In response to ICCROM's presentation, the Philippines highlighted that capacity-building activities must be enhanced to reach regional organisations such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and that more scholarships should be provided to heritage professionals from developing countries. In response to ICOMOS's presentation, the Philippines expressed their appreciation for the improved dialogue and asked for ICOMOS's preliminary assessment of this dialogue, especially with regard to complex nominations, and whether a longer cycle for serial transnational nominations could be considered. The Philippines also indicated that they look forward to gap report. Finally, in response to IUCN's presentation, the Philippines expressed their interest in studies of potential sites in the High Seas, and emphasized the need for greater cooperation for mixed sites.

ICOMOS thanked the States Parties for their comments and suggestions. ICOMOS agreed with Turkey that the new structure and format for dialogue must be further improved, and that the lessons learnt after the last panel would be taken into consideration for the future. On the question of flexibility, ICOMOS clarified that final decisions are made by March, and that there is no time between the various panels to organise new missions or review revised dossiers. Nonetheless, ICOMOS tries to identify these cases where two months of work would be enough to address the issues when making its recommendations, but in most other cases, ICOMOS considers that more time-consuming work is needed. Concerning the Upstream Processes, ICOMOS reminded the Committee that a specific item on that matter is inscribed on the Agenda of the current session. ICOMOS reaffirmed that it will make sure to improve methods and format to further enhance dialogue in the future.

ICCROM underlined that the core of its mission was training and that efforts will be made to provide more scholarships for professionals from LDCs.

IUCN indicated that it very much welcomes the newly developed Upstream Process and the resulting upstream dialogue, and emphasized that the Advisory Bodies' independence is a key pillar of the Convention. It highlighted the time pressures faced and recalled its proposal to have a two-year cycle for the Committee meetings, which would allow for a more in-depth process and grant more time for evaluations. Concerning capacity building, IUCN indicated that it looks forward to and appreciates its activities developed with Norway and hopes for an approval of the programme. Finally, IUCN expressed that it looks forward to working with ICCROM on capacity building for management.

The **Chairperson** moved to the examination of the Draft Decision and invited the Rapporteur to inform the Committee of any amendments received.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 5B** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1 pm.

FIRST DAY – Monday, 11 JULY 2016

SECOND MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

5C. THE WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/5C

Decision: **40 COM 5C**

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que ce document, requis par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de sa 39e session (Bonn, 2015) et par la 20e Assemblée générale des États parties (UNESCO, 2015), décrit les progrès accomplis quant à la diffusion et à la mise en œuvre de la Politique pour l'intégration d'une perspective de développement durable dans les processus de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Le Secrétariat souligne que l'adoption de cette politique constitue une innovation dans l'histoire de la *Convention*, permettant de l'inscrire dans des cadres politiques plus larges en matière de développement durable, tant au niveau de l'UNESCO qu'à celui des Nations Unies. Le Secrétariat donne également en exemple certaines activités sur le terrain se rapportant aux dimensions principales du développement durable. Enfin, le Secrétariat souligne que les enjeux principaux pour le futur proche seront d'une part l'intégration des objectifs de la Convention dans le développement des indicateurs pour les Objectifs du développement durable (ODD) au niveau des Nations unies et, d'autre part, le développement de mesures concrètes pour l'application de cette politique aux processus de la *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture complemented the Secretariat's presentation by underlining that everything UNESCO does must refer back to the overarching strategy framework that is the UN's 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. He emphasized that culture is present in many goals and targets and that Sustainable Development concerns many Conventions, notably the 1972 Convention, and that UNESCO has already aligned these Conventions several years ago in that regard. In terms of concrete actions, he pointed out that the definition of indicators is ongoing, in collaboration with the UNESCO Institute for Statistics in Montreal, as is the development of tools within the Conventions. Finally, he noted that UNESCO is also promoting cultural policies that are coherent with this strategic framework, and that the Organization would present, at the forthcoming Habitat III Conference, a global report on the role of culture for sustainable urban development.

ICCROM read a joint statement by the Advisory Bodies, on behalf of IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM.

The **Advisory Bodies** indicated that they recognise the fundamental importance of integrating the conservation of the world's cultural and natural heritage into Sustainable Development objectives and into wider Sustainable Development Goals.

In this regard, they warmly welcomed the new Sustainable Development Policy Document adopted by the General Assembly of State Parties and acknowledged with satisfaction that the Policy was adopted at the same time as the UN adopted its 2030 Agenda, and that the Sustainable Development prove that the heritage community shares similar aspirations with the wider global community. The Advisory Bodies also noted that the policy framework had been developed not only around the familiar dimensions of Sustainable Development (environmental sustainability, in its natural and cultural dimensions, inclusive social development and inclusive economic development), but also around peace and security, which they consider very timely.

The Advisory Bodies noted that the policy framework has been developed under three overarching principles: human rights, equity and sustainability through long-term perspectives. They noted with much satisfaction that the policy document has recognized the interlinkages between biological diversity and local cultures forming socio-ecological systems. In particular, they noted that the policy recognises that Sustainable Development policies should apply to all heritage, and not just World Heritage, and encouraged aligning Draft Decision **40 COM 5C** with the language in Paragraph 3 of the working document WHC/16/40.COM/5C and with Paragraph 4 of the Policy Document.

IUCN noted that it continues to be fully supportive of the *Convention's* important steps to integrate Sustainable Development into the management of World Heritage properties.

ICOMOS addressed the integration of cultural heritage into the wider development agenda since the 1980s, culminating in the 2011 ICOMOS Scientific Symposium on Heritage as Driver of Development. It pointed out that the Symposium's final declaration builds upon the recognition that cultural diversity should be seen as driver for Sustainable Development and recognises that heritage, as a repository of historical, cultural and social memory preserved through its authenticity, integrity and 'sense of place', forms a crucial aspect of the human development process, in which culture plays an essential role and provides for economic growth and ownership of development processes.

ICCROM welcomed the reference made in the Policy Document to capacity building as a means to enable implementation, which it considers the most important aspect. It noted that ICCROM introduced Sustainable Development into its capacity-building activities as early as 1995, with a view to promoting the importance of the 'people' factor and the wellbeing of the society as much as that of heritage. Since then, ICCROM has carried out a number of activities and training courses, including a stand-alone course module on promoting Sustainable Development. ICCROM pointed out that the lessons learnt from these exercises have emphasised that there is a daunting task ahead to change the mind-set of a new generation of heritage practitioners, so as to be able to translate the policy into practice by building capacities of practitioners, policy makers communities and networks, with the help of the Advisory Bodies.

The Chairperson opened the floor for comments.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed all progress made to implement the Sustainable Development Policy and invited UNESCO to continue its work making the SDGs functional for cultural and natural heritage. The Delegation considered that the contribution of the *World Heritage Convention* to the SDGs goes beyond the policy papers on Sustainable Development, and also believes that all stakeholders

should discuss the implementation of the Sustainable Development Policy, notably with civil society.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** commended the Centre, the Assistant Director-General for Culture and the Advisory Bodies for their presentations and suggested that, in due time, the Centre develop and implement, in collaboration with the State Parties, a strategy which will facilitate the process for State Parties to develop an action plan on Sustainable Development. The Delegation indicated that an amendment to the Draft Decision was submitted in this spirit.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** stated that it represented not only the State Party, but also Group 77, as its Chair. The Delegation expressed its support of the Ngorongoro Declaration and commended the Centre for its work with the State Parties to the *Convention*. It further indicated that it supports plans to build capacities for Member States and commended the Secretariat for the work undertaken in that regard, notably concerning the work on communities and indigenous peoples, which are key issues for Group 77.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial de son suivi de l'état de conservation des biens et propose un changement au Paragraphe 7 pour renforcer la contrainte relative au respect absolu des limites d'un bien du patrimoine mondial et de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the work of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies and underlined that a set of clearly defined guidelines, prepared by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, would be very useful to integrate Sustainable Development strategies into UNESCO's policies. The Delegation considered that it is important to increase capacities at local level for those who have to implement the policies and underlined the need for written amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* in order to ensure that Sustainable Development strategies are clarified, and indicated that it may have specific proposals, notably for Paragraph 77 of *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the World Heritage Centre for presenting the results of the consultation process and stressed that all stakeholders must be a part of the process. The Delegation also praised the Centre for mainstreaming the principles of Sustainable Development through capacity building and emphasized that World Heritage should be a platform for new approaches to Sustainable Development, and the Delegation stated that it wishes to be at the forefront of this process. The Delegation further expressed its belief that mainstreaming approaches should necessarily occur at a national level in a coordinated, comprehensive and ideally unified common perspective.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recognised that local communities now play a central role in Sustainable Development, and therefore it welcomed the World Heritage and Sustainable Development programme, which it considered a timely initiative. The Delegation expressed particular interest for the implementation of the SDGs through the Cities Programme.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed its belief that an adoption of the Sustainable Development Policy within the *World Heritage Convention* at the General Assembly in 2015 was a timely and important step, and indicated that it had already begun implementing this item. The Delegation further pointed out that it had established the International Centre for the Rapprochement of Cultures, a UNESCO Chair on Sustainable Development.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** remercie le Centre et les Organisations consultatives pour le travail accompli et souligne les liens étroits entre la *Convention* et le développement durable en général, telles les inégalités et la croissance économique. Elle propose que l'on parle de mise en œuvre des Objectifs pour le Développement Durable au Paragraphe 7 du projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observers who requested to speak.

Mr Max Ooft of the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and the Association of Indigenous Village Leaders in Suriname (VIDS) indicated that people in Suriname are experiencing the implications of an inscription on the World Heritage List, both negative and positive, and are consistently asking to be more effectively involved in the processes of the *World Heritage Convention*. VIDS and the IWGIA welcomed the adoption of the Sustainable Development Policy, which notes that recognizing the rights and fully involving indigenous peoples, in line with international standards, is at the heart of sustainable development. He encouraged the Committee to implement the necessary changes to the *Operational Guidelines* to translate the principles of the Policy into actual operational procedures and pointed out that the effectiveness of the policy in ensuring respect for indigenous peoples will depend on the adoption of specific procedures that not only encourage, but require States Parties to comply with international standards regarding the rights of indigenous peoples. Mr Ooft further emphasized that the 2015 additions to the *Operational Guidelines* concerning indigenous peoples are an important first step, but that more concrete action is needed, namely robust procedures ensuring that the rights of indigenous peoples under international law are respected in all World Heritage processes, and that indigenous peoples are fully and effectively involved in the nomination, management and monitoring of World Heritage sites, including all relevant activities of the Advisory Bodies. Obtaining indigenous peoples' free, prior and informed consent before sites are inscribed on the World Heritage List is a contemporary international standard and must be a mandatory requirement for States, and not only something that States Parties are encouraged to do. Mr Ooft further indicated that he considered the current lack of access to information and lack of transparency of the nomination process incompatible with human rights standards, as well as with Sustainable Development principles and the standards proclaimed by the United Nations, and requested that all nomination documents be made publically available once they are received by UNESCO, so that affected indigenous peoples and the general public can review them.

In a statement, the NGO **World Heritage Watch** indicated that representatives of civil society and indigenous peoples had attended the conference "Civil Society, the UNESCO World Heritage and Sustainable Development" organized by World Heritage Watch, KMKD and Anadolu Kültür on 8-9 July 2016, and appreciated the opportunity to address the Committee, and expressed their thanks to the Government of Turkey. The NGO evoked Target 11.4 of the SDGs and pointed out that it is of particular relevance to World Heritage, and that it is pleased to see that World Heritage has finally become part of the formal global development agenda. It noted however that the indicator proposed by the IAEG-SDG for Target 11.4 and adopted by the UN Statistical Commission focuses exclusively on the amount of expenditure on heritage. The NGO expressed concern that such an indicator is extremely vulnerable to manipulation and misinterpretation, refers to an input instead of a result, and critically lacks both validity and reliability. It expressed its opinion that this indicator alone is altogether inappropriate to measure progress on achieving Target 11.4., and that the considerable and laudable efforts to have the world's natural and cultural heritage included in the SDGs would not result in improved outcomes for World Heritage. The NGO urged the Committee to make determined

efforts, through the Centre and with the support of the Advisory Bodies, civil society experts and stakeholders, to propose additional indicators for Target 11.4 for adoption by the UN ECOSOC and the UN General Assembly, and for use in the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*, as long as the SDG process has not adapted its indicators framework. Finally, the NGO indicated that the civil society organizations and indigenous peoples connected through the network of World Heritage Watch offered their cooperation and assistance in formulating appropriate indicators.

Ms Noëlle Kümpel of the Zoological Society of London made a statement on behalf of the **World Conservation Society, the World Wildlife Fund and the Zoological Society of London** and began by extending these organisations' thanks to the Turkish government for its hospitality. She emphasized that these organisations provide technical input and mobilise tens of millions of dollars every year to support States Parties in the implementation of the *Convention* on the ground. She indicated that, via their field and policy programmes and in the context of the *World Heritage Convention*, these organisations embrace the integration of Sustainable Development into the management of World Heritage sites. However, she stressed the need to avoid compromising the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties in the pursuit of sustainable development and proposed an amendment to Paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

Le **Secrétariat** remercie les nombreux intervenants et souligne que les principes du développement durable seront intégrés dans les instruments normatifs de l'UNESCO et dans le programme prévu dans le prochain C/5, comme l'a souligné le Sous-Directeur général pour la Culture. En réponse à l'intervention de la Finlande, il précise que l'Objectif 11 est intégré car les Nations Unies ont désigné l'UNESCO comme Organisation partie prenante, ce qui n'est pas le cas pour les Objectifs 14 et 15, qui pourraient cependant être intégrés dans son travail sur le développement durable. Le Secrétariat rappelle que, lors de la 39e session du Comité, le groupe de travail sur les *Orientations* avait intégré les notions de « peuples autochtones » et de « communautés locales ». Il précise que le Centre du patrimoine mondial travaille pour mettre en adéquation les *Orientations* avec la politique du développement durable et que le Groupe de travail ad-hoc établi à ce sujet pourrait également se pencher sur cette question. Par ailleurs, en réponse à l'intervention du Portugal, le Secrétariat précise que, compte tenu de la tâche très importante que constitue l'intégration du développement durable aux niveaux national et international, il faudrait commencer par intégrer ce principe dans les politiques nationales.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that several amendments had been received, some in writing (Finland, United Republic of Tanzania, Jamaica) and several orally during the debate. The Rapporteur then presented the proposed amendments.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** précise qu'elle aimerait effectuer un changement mineur au Paragraphe 6 et s'aligne sur la suggestion de la Finlande.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to review the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph and read Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 6bis.

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to these paragraphs.

The **Rapporteur** read Paragraph 7 revised according to the proposal from Angola.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested the Secretariat to clarify what exactly the phrase "in full respect of the boundaries" refers to.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** stressed that in some cases, developers are not fully aware of the boundaries of World Heritage.

La Délégation du **Portugal** exprime un doute quant à la notion de « temps utile ».

The Delegation of the **Philippines** explained that, since the Committee already invited the Centre to develop the strategy, it considered it would be more appropriate to leave out “in due time”. The Delegation also asked that the Committee examine the Strategy before endorsing it.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if there was any objection to Paragraph 7 as it stood, taking into account the intervention of the Philippines.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** clarified its proposal.

The **Chairperson** asked United Republic of Tanzania whether the amended proposal would be acceptable.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** confirmed that it would be acceptable.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there was any objection to Paragraph 7 as it stood. As there was none, the Chairperson declared that Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended and invited the Committee to review the remainder of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 5C** was adopted as amended.

5D. REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE THEMATIC PROGRAMMES

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/5D

Decision: **40 COM 5D**

The **Chairperson** invited The Director of the World Heritage Centre to present Item 5D.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced Item 5D and stressed that the World Heritage Centre can no longer provide any funding for the thematic programmes unless extra-budgetary funding is provided. She listed the programmes that require extra-budgetary funding sources, such as the Cities Programme, the World Heritage Forest Programme, the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme (WHEAP), the Small Island Developing States Programme, the World Heritage Marine Programme, the Human Evolution: Adaptations, Dispersals and Social Developments (HEADS) Programme, the Astronomy and World Heritage Thematic Initiative, and the Initiative on Heritage of Religious Interest.

She recalled that, in 2014, it was proposed to phase out the World Heritage Forest Programme, as no extra-budgetary resources have been proposed for the programme itself, although individual projects were funded. Concerning the World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme, she emphasized that 10% of World Heritage properties are earthen structures and face increasing threats. She conveyed the proposal of the World Heritage Centre to transfer the programme to the *Centre*

de recherche et d'application en terre (CRATerre), the main programme partner, with institutional support and guidance from the Centre. Finally, the Director of the World Heritage Centre highlighted that the Sustainable Tourism Programme had raised over US\$ 3 million from private donors.

The Delegation of **Finland** indicated that it considers the Thematic Programmes a very useful tool to improve the balance of the List, and hence regrets that some programmes had to be closed, although the Delegation understands the reasons behind this decision. The Delegation also proposed to undertake an evaluation of the entire Thematic Programmes before deciding on their future.

The Delegation of the Philippines noted that closing various thematic programmes without extra-budgetary funding is regrettable, and therefore proposes to increase the contribution of the States Parties to the World Heritage Fund from 1% to 2%. It also indicated that a thematic programme on climate change would be useful.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its concern at the phasing out of the World Heritage Forest Programme and its support for forests and climate change.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** salue l'ensemble des activités décrites dans le document, qu'elle considère très utiles aux États parties, et remercie le Centre pour sa recherche de fonds afin de poursuivre la mise en œuvre de ces programmes thématiques. La Délégation précise également que le défi sécuritaire auquel doivent faire face les biens du patrimoine mondial devrait être étudié soit de façon transversale, soit par le biais d'un programme spécifique.

The Delegation of **Turkey** indicated that it is in favour of continuing the Thematic Programmes, and also considers that it is important to carry out a gap analysis.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** indicated that it considers the Thematic Programmes relevant, especially for SIDS.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its support to the World Heritage Centre as it makes the difficult decision of phasing out some of the Thematic Programmes. The Delegation asked that the Centre continue participating in these Programmes, as it has played a crucial role so far. The Delegation expressed its special support to the Initiative on Heritage of Religious Interest and expressed its wish to provide input using Korea's experience.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed regret as to the phasing out of the World Heritage Forest Programme, and hence asked the Secretariat whether it would be possible to find partners to implement projects on this and other topics.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** informed the members of the Committee that it was an instigator of the Human Evolution: Adaptations, Dispersals and Social Developments Programme, which has been successful since its adoption in 2009, and recalled that one of the programme's strategic goals is to strengthen the bond between cultural and natural sites.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** stated that the implementation of the World Heritage Programmes is crucial and that funding must be found for their further implementation. It announced that a meeting on SIDS would be held in Baku.

La Délégation du **Liban** insiste sur le fait que, compte tenu du manque de ressources financières, c'est aux États parties intéressés par certains programmes de trouver des fonds pour la mise en œuvre de ces programmes.

La Délégation du **Mexique** (Observateur) souhaite tout d'abord remercier la Turquie de son accueil chaleureux. Elle souhaite par ailleurs attirer l'attention sur la collaboration du Bureau de l'UNESCO à Mexico dans la mise en œuvre du programme AIDS au Mexique et mentionne l'organisation de deux réunions en 2013 et 2015 dont le sujet principal était « le premier peuplement du continent américain ». Le Mexique souligne que ces réunions ont eu un impact sur le travail quotidien de l'Institut national d'anthropologie et d'histoire, ainsi que sur le dossier de proposition d'inscription que le Mexique soumettra l'année prochaine. La Délégation considère enfin que cette discussion sur les programmes thématiques est très importante.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded the questions raised by the Committee. In response to the question from the Delegation of Finland, the Director confirmed that the proposed evaluation can be done but would require an estimated financial contribution of around US\$ 30,000–50,000. Regarding the question of procedure raised by The Delegation of the Philippines, the Director clarified that increasing the contribution of the States Parties to the World Heritage Fund was proposed in the past only in cases involving recognized organizations who held a Memorandum of Understanding with UNESCO. Regarding the requests to keep the World Heritage Forest Programme, the Director clarified that the programme had achieved its initial targets, and that the closure of the Programme does not lead to any further programmes on forest. While the Centre has received 5 million Euros for specific projects in Central Africa, this funding is not for the programme in general. The Director also expressed her concerns regarding the lack of proper expertise in the field of natural heritage, while informing the Committee that extra-budgetary funds had been secured for the Programme Specialists for the Sustainable Tourism and Marine Programmes.

Concerning a possible programme on Climate Change, the Director recalled the policy on Climate Change adopted by the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly in November 2015 and reported to the Committee that the Secretariat worked closely with Advisory Bodies in the preparation of COP 21. As for the questions on links between natural and cultural heritage, the Director confirmed that the reflection will continue, in cooperation with all Advisory Bodies. Concerning the question of security at World Heritage properties raised by Burkina Faso, the Director clarified that this would be further discussed on a case by case basis under Items 7A and 7B. Finally, the Director took note of the suggestions of Lebanon.

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed amendments to Paragraphs 3, 4, 6, 7 and 10 of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to review the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 5D** was adopted as amended.

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

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/6

Decision: **40 COM 6**

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the World Heritage Capacity building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage-related Category 2 Centres.

IUCN commended the efforts of UNESCO Category 2 Centres for the support to the effectively implementation to the *World Heritage Convention*. The Advisory Bodies considered the Category 2 Centres as a forward-looking approach in strengthening the preparation of nomination and enhancing the State of Conservation of World Heritage Sites, through joint efforts between the Category 2 Centres, World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It also expressed its appreciation on the capacity-building activities of the Category 2 Centres. It also recalled the successful cooperation with the Category 2 Centres in Africa and Arab Region and reaffirmed its commitment to work with Category 2 Centres to strengthen the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* as an international conservation tool.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** remercie Centre ICCROM IUCN de leurs rapports. Apprécie les activités développées dans le Stratégie pour mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial pour le renforcement des capacités. Regrette le manque de chiffre de montrant la participation des États en développement dans ce processus. Souligne que les activités des Centre de Catégorie 2 contribuent activement au renforcement de la coopération entre les pays dans ces régions pour atteindre les objectifs stratégiques pertinents de l'UNESCO et de la Convention de 1972. Rappelle que cela a été le cas pour le Viet Nam.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for their work and underlined the importance of the Capacity-building strategy, by referring to several activities in the Arab regions. It noted the activities have not only contributed to safeguarding the heritage but also encouraged dialogue and promoted understanding.

The Delegation of **Poland** recognized the great importance of the Capacity-building activities and the significance for all heritage protection and proposed a World Heritage Resources Manual on integrity be developed by Advisory Bodies in order to help the State Parties to overcome the difficulties faced during the nomination dossier preparation as well as the review of State of Conservation Report.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** commended the report prepared by World Heritage Centre work and noted that the success of Capacity-building activities as indicated in the report and further recommended an impact analysis to be conducted in order to evaluate the impacts of the Capacity-building activities and lessons gained be further streamlined into subsequent strategies .

La Délégation de **Tunisie** remercie le Centre d'encourager chaque région à renforcer les capacités pour sauvegarder le patrimoine mondial. Rappelle l'importance du renforcement des conditions de sauvegarde et de protection du patrimoine mondial. Souligne les difficultés que crée un éventuel chevauchement entre les différents Organismes. La Tunisie est un pays du Maghreb, où il y a le Fond Africain pour le patrimoine mondial, le Centre Arabe pour le patrimoine mondial et l'ALEXO.

The Delegation of the Philippines attached great importance to the Capacity-building and thanked the State Parties, especially Finland and Norway, for their continued contribution on the Capacity-building programme and proposed more scholarships for practitioners and experts to be provided to undeveloped countries and under presented countries be prioritized. The Delegation also stressed that trainings in management systems and plans should be enhanced and asked the Advisory Bodies to provide online training materials in order to reach a larger audience and track the progress more effectively. It further suggested an indicator on total numbers of participants from developing countries, segregated by gender and location be included in the future report under this item, the Delegation joined the proposal from the Delegation of Tanzania on the strategic impact analysis of the Capacity-building programme.

ICOMOS responded positively on the request to develop a scheme for measuring impact of capacity-building programmes and creating indicators as well as the suggestion for a manual or an extra part of the current manual on integrity. It agreed with the Delegation of Tunisia that a clear strategy is needed to avoid overlap, to plan better and have a good structure.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision with amendments to Paragraph 7.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 6** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 13A. FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS: OUTCOMES OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/13A

Decision: **40 COM 13A**

The **Chairperson** recalled Decision **38 COM 13** (Doha, 2014), by which the World Heritage Committee established an ad-hoc Working Group to examine issues related to working methods of the evaluation and decision-making process of nomination and to formulate its recommendations thereon. The outcomes of this Working Group were presented to the 39th session of the Committee last year, which, by Decision **39 COM 13A**, extended the mandate of the ad-hoc Working Group to further discuss and make recommendations on Paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines* as well as on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund.

The Chairperson invited **H.E. Mr Hüseyin Avni Botsalı** from the Delegation of Turkey to present the outcomes of the Working Group to the Committee.

The **Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group, H.E. Mr Botsalı**, indicated that the Government of Turkey had announced yesterday, through H.E. the Minister of Culture and Tourism, that it would double its annual contribution as a voluntary gesture. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group expressed his hope that the City of Istanbul would look into supporting projects, meetings and programmes, as this administration bears responsibility for one of the most significant World Heritage properties. Mr Botsalı also expressed his hope that all States Parties will consider following suit, especially since the Director of the World Heritage Centre gave alarming news in a recent session, indicating that it may not be possible to sustain current pace within the next one or two years. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working

Group urged the States Parties to go beyond rhetoric and take concrete actions, so that the *Convention* does not become defunct, and appealed to both Committee Members and States Parties in that regard.

The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group indicated that the Working Group finalised its deliberations as of 1 June 2016 and reminded the Committee that the Working Group's mandate had mostly been fulfilled in 2015 in Bonn, and that the amendments to the *Operational Guidelines* were already in force, as per the Committee's decision. He pointed out that the remaining task is considering means of making the World Heritage Fund more sustainable, reaching out to fresh sources, and introducing measures that would result in tangible savings, so that the priorities of the Convention can be actually be fulfilled. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group recalled that 12 meetings were held between September 2015 and June 2016, and that, in order to improve the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, the Working Group revised Paragraph 61 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group expressed his thanks to all members of the Working Group for their endurance and patience and for their contributions, as well as the non-member States Parties who took the time to attend the meetings and communicated with the Working Group, keeping the deliberations as rich and broad as possible. He further expressed his thanks to the World Heritage Centre, which spared no efforts to help the Working Group by providing background info, sharing their experience, analyses and data. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group further noted that some of the sessions were open-ended meetings, open to all States Parties, and highlighted that such practices are a means of broadening consensus and common understanding. He pointed out that the Working Group was meant to be as inclusive as possible, with a focus on realistic and achievable proposals.

The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group explained the Group's working procedures and recalled the published Itemised Memorandum before addressing each item. He highlighted that the Group collaborated extensively on a number of proposals, which are reflected in the working documents of the Committee, and notably the following:

Possibility of an Additional Protocol: The Working Group recommended that the Committee explore whether there is a consensus on the need for a new protocol to achieve sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group emphasized that the Legal Affairs department had been consulted and informed the Working Group that the Convention does not foresee a specific procedure for a new legal instrument, and that Legal Affairs would need to further investigate, if relevant, the most appropriate path to follow.

Secretariat Proposal to Increase the States Parties' Voluntary Assessed Contributions: The Working Group reached a general consensus over the fact this proposal was an agreeable formula, and that there was a need to ensure predictable and sustainable influx of resources to the World Heritage Fund. The Group recommended that the Committee endorse as viable the Options 1, 4 and 5 of the Resolution **19GA/8**, as well as the proposal made in Document WHC/15/20.GA/8. The Working Group further recommended that the Committee encourage States Parties to voluntarily implement these proposals and increase their contributions to the World Heritage Fund.

Revision of the Fundraising Strategy: After a comprehensive briefing by the Secretariat, the Working Group recommends revising the Partnerships Strategy by including new tools and ensuring better use of existing tools, through the possible engagement of a professional fundraiser, the better use of social media, online

licensing, grants, corporate donations, crowdsourcing, better partnerships with the private sector, tourism sector, a better use of the World Heritage logo, etc. Some members of the Working Group pointed out that cooperation with Category 2 Centres could be developed and that those Centres could raise funds for their own activities.

Introduction of Annual Fees for World Heritage properties: The Working Group recommended that the Committee initiate a consultation process and request the Secretariat to send out a survey to States Parties, with a view of seeing whether local authorities would be amenable to paying annual fees, and to present a report to the next session of the Committee. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working noted that some reservations and legal obstacles have already been evoked by some States Parties.

ICOMOS Proposal to Institute a Forum of Donors; Vision for the Fundraising Strategy; Twinning Strategies: The Working Group considered this proposal innovative and recommended that the Committee further take it into consideration. The Working Group proposed that Side Events to the annual Committee sessions be organised, where States Parties in need would be able to submit their requests and projects to other States Parties with greater resources as well as other interested donors and sponsors. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group pointed out that this could fill a major gap in system and help address state of conservation issues while broadening regional and international cooperation, but that reservations had also been expressed regarding private sector donors, which would need to be addressed. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group emphasized that International Assistance is one of the Convention's most important tools, and underlined the need to find more resources for it, possibly by institutionalising Upstream Process. The Chair also indicated that the twinning concept for financing nominations was integrated into the Forum of Donors concept.

Possible Measures to Expedite the Payment of Assessed Contributions and Arrears: The Working Group expressed the opinion that States Parties with prolonged arrears should be encouraged to pay their dues, and recalls Resolution **20.GA/8**, noting that this point is included in the Provisional Agenda of 21st General Assembly of the States Parties to the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, which will be held in November 2017. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group pointed out that issue was discussed during two full sessions, and that nearly all group members reach the conclusion that States Parties have the prerogative to benefit from the services under the *Convention*, and that the only penalising measure would be the deprivation from the right of election to Committee membership. He pointed out that the Working Group decided to develop positive language, rather than trying to penalise countries, and indicated that since this critical issue is overarching and concerns all States Parties, it should remain within the mandate of the General Assembly.

Duration and Frequency of Committee Meetings, Preparatory Meetings in Paris: The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group indicated that these proposals were dropped during review, and that Working Group members recognised the flagship role of the *Convention* within the UNESCO system, and considered that more funds needed to be allocated from the Regular Budget to the World Heritage Fund. The Working Group therefore recommended that the Committee renew its appeal to the Executive Board and the General Conference to allocate more resources from the Regular Budget to the implementation of the *Convention*, especially in view of the new 39C/5.

Paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines: The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group indicated that this was discussed during more than 3 sessions and that, despite some reservations, the Working Group supported the new nominations cap and agreed that, to ensure a better evaluation and more focus on conservation,

limitations should be applied at least on a temporary basis. A compromise was reached on 35 nominations and the Working Group recommended that this be implemented on a trial basis, to start for nominations submitted as of 1 February 2018, for a period of 4 years. The Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group pointed out that there would be no differentiation between SPs and that no priority would be given to nominations arising for Upstream Process. The Working Group noted the importance of setting criteria to measure the impacts of these reductions on nominations, and proposed that an item be added to the Provisional Agenda of the 45th session of the Committee to that end.

Finally, the Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group highlighted the request made by the Working Group the Committee to extend its mandate for one more year, enable the Working Group to carry out more deliberations on the Protocol, the Forum of Donors, the Partnership Strategy and the Budget. He also pointed out that the Working Group recommended extending tenure to include the all Members of the Committee as well as 2 non-Committee representatives from each regional group, and that 2 open-ended sessions should be open to all States Parties, in an effort to build a broad consensus and receive innovative views from outside of the Committee.

H.E. Mr Botsali expressed his hope that these recommendations would bring some relief to the World Heritage Fund and that, with increasing voluntary contributions, the prospects of making the Fund sustainable would improve.

The **Chairperson** thanked the members of the Working Group for their hard work and, recalling that several questions discussed in the Ah-Hoc Working Group are related to the *Operational Guidelines* and the Budget, suggested that these questions be also discussed during the relevant Working Groups, allowing for the preparation and adoption of an agreed decision on Monday 18 July, as foreseen in the timetable.

The meeting rose at 6.30 pm.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 12 JULY 2016

THIRD MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 7. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/7

Decision: 40 COM 7

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Item 7 and suggested that this item remain open, in order to take into account the debates held under Agenda Items 7A and 7B. The Draft Decision **40 COM 7** would therefore be adopted once the examination of Item 7A and 7B is completed.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee about the four additional State of Conservation reports (SOCs) being opened at the request of Committee members, leading to a total number of 26 SOC's opened for discussion under Item 7A and 31 SOC's under Item 7B this year. The Secretariat presented the snapshot of the factors impacting the OUV of properties and proposed the explanatory notes on how Reactive Monitoring missions should be organized as well as on the Desired state of conservation for the removal of properties (DSOCR) from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN highlighted the impact of climate change on the World Heritage properties. IUCN noted the importance and the relevance of the Paris Agreement adopted by the 21st Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in December 2015, and the new policy on Sustainable Development adopted in November 2015 by the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*. IUCN further noted with concern that amongst threats from industrial activities, an increasing number of natural properties continue to face potential threats from major dam projects. It highlighted the need for rigorous assessments of potential impacts from dams on the OUV of World Heritage properties located upstream or downstream within the same river basin, and invited the Committee to consider adopting a position that the construction of dams with large reservoirs within the boundaries of World Heritage properties is incompatible with their World Heritage status. It further expressed its wishes to emphasize that Environmental Impact Assessments and Heritage Impact Assessments should be undertaken not only for projects with likely direct impacts on OUV, but also for projects that could have indirect or cumulative impacts on OUV.

ICOMOS and **ICCROM** highlighted the challenges associated with reconstruction, in response to the destruction of the World Heritage by both military actions and natural disasters, and recalled the meetings held on the topic of Reconstruction in the past year. It pointed out the shifting global attitude towards reconstruction, its definition and implementation, and the questions surrounding the development of guidance documents, and further recommended that the Committee consider the

proposal made in Draft Decision **40 COM 7** to support the drafting of a new guidance to reflect the multiple challenges that surround reconstruction.

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

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked the Centre for the overview it provided of the Reactive Monitoring process and its difficulties, as well as the threats faced by World Heritage properties. The Delegation highlighted that, while natural sites represented only 19% of the List, they account nearly 40% of the List of World Heritage in Danger, and 1/3 of all natural properties are subject to Reactive Monitoring process. The Delegation considered that this calls for increased attention by UNESCO and the World Heritage Centre, and suggested increasing the number of experts for natural sites in the Secretariat. The Delegation further pointed out that biodiversity and healthy ecosystems are crucial to mitigate major threats such as climate change, and requested the States Parties to do their utmost to retain, restore and enhance the biodiversity at the World Heritage sites. Finally, the Delegation noted with alarm that many sites have management issues, and that this number increases, and stated that properties should not be inscribed without a proper management system in place. The Delegation encouraged enhancing cooperation with NGOs on the co-management of properties and further emphasized the importance of a comprehensive and implemented management system.

La Délégation du **Pérou** remercie les autorités turques pour l'organisation de cette 40ème session et, faisant référence aux activités liées à la préservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, soutient l'intervention de la Finlande. S'appuyant sur les Paragraphes 39 et 40 des *Orientations*, qui concernent les acteurs impliqués dans les processus de protection, la Délégation observe que les États ont un rôle à jouer en matière de principes éthiques pour la protection du patrimoine naturel et culturel. Avec le Chili et la Bolivie, le Pérou propose un texte relatif aux principes éthiques que toutes les parties prenantes devraient respecter, afin qu'il soit discuté sous l'Item 7 lors des prochaines sessions du Comité

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite revenir sur le point lié à la reconstruction mentionné par l'ICOMOS et souligne que cette question prend une importance croissante. La Délégation rappelle l'histoire de la reconstruction, du lendemain de la seconde guerre mondiale, moment de la naissance de l'UNESCO, à la reconstruction de l'ex-URSS, dans les années 90, et suite à la guerre au Liban. La Délégation note également qu'une série de réunions d'experts concernant différents aspects de la reconstruction est proposée.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted with regrets the main factors negatively effecting the conservation of the World Heritage properties and called upon States Parties to take basic actions such as the ratification and implementation of international instruments. The Delegation recognised the positive initiatives linked to reconstruction and congratulated the States Parties for the progress achieved, in particular in post-conflict countries.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked the Centre and Advisory Bodies for their reports. Referring to the exhibition opened on 30 June 2016 on the reconstruction work in Warsaw after the World War II, the Delegation stressed the urgency of reconstruction for World Heritage properties and emphasized that an exchange of information and good practices was urgently needed. The Delegation also offered to organize a major international conference on this subject, to provide further guidelines to the Committee.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed its appreciation to the Centre for its report and recommended that, during the examination of SOCs, the Advisory Bodies increase transparency and dialogue with the States Parties concerned, which could cultivate common understanding and lead to common solutions and realistic recommendations. The Delegation also drew attention to the DSOCR and corrective measures, which should be prepared in a timely and consultative manner and streamlined as much as possible, in order to facilitate their implementation by the States Parties concerned and lead to the timely removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation further recommended that options should be explored to formulate the DSOCR before a property is inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in line with Paragraphs 183-189 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Finally, the Delegation raised the issue of HIAs and EIAs, noting that while the latter is standard for many SP, HIAs are not as popular, and suggested a new mechanism, to be spearheaded by the Centre, to integrate HIAs within the legal frameworks for all the States Parties, as part of a capacity-building effort.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Delegation of Poland for its offer to hold a conference on reconstruction in countries in a post-war or post-catastrophe phase. This shall allow countries across the world to benefit from Poland's experience after World War II.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** recognized the efforts of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and asked that the Committee be more comprehensive, when examining the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, regarding the balance between conservation and development. The Delegation further indicated that it shares IUCN's concern on the effects of Climate Change on World Heritage properties, and agreed with Peru regarding the role of non-State actors.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** stated the growing number of sites under threat, as highlighted under this item, makes the case for a more robust system of conservation, protection and capacity building. The Delegation considers that the World Heritage system is losing fortitude to face present and future challenges and respond effectively to these urgent threats, and expressed the need to revisit the founding principles of the Convention and re-tool the Committee, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, in order to strategically position the *Convention* as an instrument for peace and Sustainable Development, as outlined in the Policy Document on the SDGs. The Delegation agreed with IUCN that Climate Change is a crucial factor, and that the Committee should engage it strategically, as mentioned by the Delegation of Indonesia. It also agreed with the Delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania on capacity building for EIAs and HIAs and joined the proposal of the Delegation of Finland to put more emphasis on capacity building for management and Management Plans. The Delegation also noted that the majority of the properties on the Danger List are natural properties from Africa and conflict countries and reiterated placing a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should result in an improved protection and not be seen as a sanction. It further suggested that the Committee re-examine properties that have been on the the List of World Heritage in Danger for a long time, to ensure that they can be removed in due time.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat for its work and took note of the great concerns linked to the increasing number of factors that affect World Heritage properties. The Delegation underlined the need for a consultative process with all stakeholders, particularly to reflect on the issue on reconstruction, and thanked the Polish government for its generous offer.

La Délégation du **Koweït** souhaite s'associer à la proposition polonaise, et indique que le Koweït a également des expériences à partager à cet égard.

The **Secretariat** thanked all Committee members for the constructive debates, recalled the meetings about reconstruction on Aleppo held in July 2015 and the reflection meetings with ICOMOS, and warmly welcomed the offer extended by the Delegation of Poland. Regarding the expertise on natural sites, the Secretariat appealed to all States Parties for the opening of secondments until fixed-term posts can be secured. The Secretariat also informed the Committee that a side event to reflect on HIAs will be held in the evening of 12 July 2016. It also recognised the importance of dialogue between the States Parties, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to ensure transparency in the SOC process and for the removal of properties from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and reiterated that the latter was not created as a sanction mechanism. Finally, the Secretariat agreed with the Delegation of Indonesia concerning the need for a comprehensive approach on Sustainable Development.

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

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

Documents *WHC/16/40.COM/7A*
 WHC/16/40.COM/7A.Add
 WHC/16/40.COM/7A.Add.2

Decisions: **40 COM 7A.1 to 40 COM 7A.50**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile) (C 1178bis)

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to provide clarifications on the Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.2** on Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile), which was not proposed to be opened for discussion.

The **Secretariat** provided clarifications on the correct name of the university involved in the implementation of the activities in the report, which is the "University Arturo Prat".

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.2** was adopted.

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

City of Potosi (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C 420) - 40 COM 7A.1

Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135) 40 COM 7A.3

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366) - 40 COM 7A.4

Coro and its Port (Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of) (C658) - 40 COM 7A.5

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

AFRICA

Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119rev) – 40 COM 7A.6

Le **Secrétariat** informe le Comité que l'État partie du Mali n'a pas été en mesure de fournir un rapport SOC en raison de la fragilité de la situation sécuritaire à Tombouctou, qui n'a pas permis la mission conjointe de suivi réactif UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM demandée par le Comité à sa précédente session afin d'évaluer l'état général de conservation du bien. Cependant, d'autres éléments ont pu être fournis par le Bureau de l'UNESCO au Mali et une mission d'évaluation de l'état de conservation du bien a pu avoir lieu à Bamako sur la base de rapports des missions techniques, des études et rapports d'activités réalisés, ainsi que des constats et témoignages des gestionnaires des sites. Cette réunion a permis d'élaborer des mesures correctives et d'engager la préparation de l'État de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril (DSOCR). Le Secrétariat a également appelé la communauté internationale à offrir son soutien à l'État partie pour le renforcement des mesures de conservation et de gestion.

ICOMOS applauded for the State Party for its work on reconstruction and enquired whether the records of this work would be submitted to the Centre, as an essential reference tool for future generations. It welcomed the corrective measures defined, supported their approval and expressed its willingness to offer support in this process.

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

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its regrets that the State Party failed to submit the SOC report, thanked the UNESCO Office in Mali for gathering the information for the review of the Committee, and found the information encouraging, congratulating the State party on the reconstruction and the conservation work undertaken. The Delegation noted that the involvement of local communities would ensure a sustainable protection of the sites, indicated that it was in support of the Draft Decision, and encouraged Mali to continue its efforts.

The Delegation of **Portugal** began by congratulating the Chairperson and the Government of Turkey for the organisation of the Committee session, and also

congratulated the Director of the World Heritage Centre on her appointment. The Delegation strongly commended the positive measures that were taken by State Party and UNESCO under adverse conditions. The Delegation also commended the reconstruction work carried out which, with the instrumental help from UNESCO, fully respects traditional practices with and was undertaken with the full participation of local communities.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** agreed with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the clear identification of the threats and commended the establishment of clear guidelines. The Delegation noted that a lot of restoration work had already been undertaken, and invited a reflection on why the State Party was unable to present a state of conservation report. It proposed that, in line with the Article 6 of the *Convention*, the Committee call upon the international community to support Mali, so that the work can continue, and recommended that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies help the State Party come up with strategies and resources.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** prend note de la présentation faite par le Secrétariat et félicite le Mali pour tous ses efforts entrepris pour la reconstruction du site de Tombouctou. Néanmoins, elle constate que le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien n'a pu être soumis pour des raisons sécuritaires et invite le Mali à poursuivre ses efforts pour la soumission de ce rapport.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** commended the concrete results of the reconstruction respecting traditional techniques, congratulated Mali for the consecration ceremony of Timbuktu in February 2016, and expressed its sincere hope that the entire heritage is placed under a consolidated management plan for future conservation and asked that the DSOCR be established to streamline decisions in that regard.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the State Party's work on construction and appreciated the funding support. The Delegation regretted that no SOC report has been provided since 2013, and noted that the quality of the reconstruction work and the level of protection of the property's authenticity need to be closely assessed by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation further appreciated the participation of the Advisory Bodies in the meeting held at the UNESCO Office in Bamako, which may provide an solution to compensate for the Reactive Monitoring mission which could not be carried out due to security issues.

La Délégation de **l'Angola** soutient les interventions précédentes et toutes les parties prenantes pour les efforts qu'elles ont fournis dans ce processus, notamment les maçons. Elle demande au Secrétariat et aux Organisations consultatives de soutenir l'État partie du Mali afin que ce processus de reconstruction s'achève et que le bien soit prochainement retiré de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** joined the congratulations to the State Party for the efforts to reconstruct the mausoleums and emphasized the need for a thorough documentation of indigenous technical knowledge and heritage. The Delegation appealed to the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to ensure that digital means of documentation are used to preserve indigenous technical knowledge for future use.

La Délégation du **Pérou** se rallie aux interventions précédentes et félicite toutes les parties prenantes pour leurs efforts. La Délégation indique que 3 leçons sont à retenir, à savoir la capacité de l'État partie à reconstruire dans le cadre d'une

reconstruction durable; la nature indispensable de la mission des Organisations consultatives pour la mise en place d'un système de gestion durable; et le fait qu'un effort collectif peut déboucher sur des résultats et ainsi servir de modèle.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** highlighted the importance of congratulating and encouraging the State Party for its achievements and agreed with Peru that this could be used as an exemplary case.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** extend its congratulations to Mali for the positive developments at the property and expressed its understanding for the coordination challenges that led to the non-submission of a SOC report. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to follow the recommendations formulated in the Draft Decision, notably the submission of a reconstruction strategy and the need to invite a joint Reactive Monitoring mission once the security situation allows it. The Delegation also encouraged the international community to provide further support to the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment to Paragraph 4 proposed by the Delegation of Jamaica.

ICOMOS clarified that one of its representatives attended the meeting at the UNESCO Office in Bamako, which served as a good alternative in the absence of on-site missions, and commended the suggestion from the Delegation of Zimbabwe for the digital documentation of indigenous technical knowledge and indicated that it welcomes initiatives to pursue this process.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) exprime sa gratitude pour toute l'attention accordée à son pays, et plus particulièrement au site de Tombouctou. Elle présente ses regrets qu'un rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien ne soit pas parvenu au Comité, et souligne le soutien apporté par le Bureau de l'UNESCO à Bamako. La Délégation indique que des rapports d'avancement ont soumis à ce Bureau ainsi qu'à la mission de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS, et que ceux-ci ont été pris en compte dans la rédaction du document de travail du Comité, et déplore qu'une mission n'ait pu avoir lieu en raison des aspects sécuritaires. La Délégation indique enfin que la reconstruction a permis aux communautés locales de s'approprier les mausolées et de les considérer comme leur patrimoine culturel, au-delà de la notion de patrimoine culturel, mais note avec inquiétude que le travail fourni à ce jour peut être détruit à tout moment, car aucun plan de sécurité du site n'a été mis en place.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** responded to the proposal of joint Reactive Monitoring mission would require security clearance and suggested that further discussions be held between the Secretariat, the site manager and team from the UNESCO Office in Bamako.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.6** was adopted as amended.

Tomb of the Askia (Mali) (C 1139) – 40 COM 7A.7

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'État partie n'a pas été en mesure de soumettre un rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien. Toutefois, plusieurs rapports techniques ont pu être collectés auprès du Bureau de l'UNESCO à Bamako suite aux nombreuses missions menées sur le terrain. La situation sécuritaire à Gao n'a pas permis à l'État partie d'inviter la mission conjointe de suivi réactif

UNESCO/ICOMOS/ICCROM demandée par le Comité. De même, le Secrétariat exprime son inquiétude quant au fait que le bien demeure soumis à des menaces réelles au niveau de ses composantes architecturales et du mécanisme de conservation et de gestion, et demande à l'État partie d'accélérer la mise en œuvre du projet de réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel à Gao. Une réunion d'évaluation de l'état de conservation du bien a eu lieu à Bamako et a permis d'élaborer des mesures correctives et d'engager la préparation de l'État de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril (DSOCR). Le Centre du Patrimoine mondial invite la communauté internationale à offrir son soutien à l'État partie pour le renforcement des mesures de conservation et de gestion. Le Secrétariat indique que le projet de décision a été modifié pour accommoder cet appel.

As for Timbuktu, **ICOMOS** acknowledged the positive developments yet regretted that the information on the Tomb of the Askia was cause for concern due to the lack of conservation for the tomb and its associated buildings and the weak management structures and plans. ICOMOS indicated that it considers the dialogue with the property of the utmost importance, in the absence of a mission due to the security issues, in order to discuss the implementation of corrective measures. ICOMOS underlined that it is ready and willing to explore all ways for this dialogue to happen in the difficult circumstances.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** presented the amendment proposed by the Advisory Bodies and the Centre on Paragraph 8.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.7** was adopted as amended.

Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022) – 40 COM 7A.8

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation of the property and indicated that the item was opened for discussion at the suggestion of the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to highlight concerns about the lack of progress with the development of the Master Plan, which was requested in the corrective measures in 2012.

ICOMOS recalled that the property was destroyed in April 2010 and that, at its 34th session (Brasília, 2010), the Committee was very supportive of the reconstruction, the process being considered in line with the OUV of the property, i.e. ongoing traditional building practices. ICOMOS further indicated that in the past 6 years, much work had been undertaken to define a reconstruction strategy and develop a revised timeline for the remaining reconstruction work, and that despite a lengthy process, the way forward appeared clear. ICOMOS emphasized that the reconstruction work should only be carried out alongside an agreed Master Plan, and expressed its concerns about the absence of such a plan for the property to guide the conservation of the traditional structures or its management arrangements. This was brought sharply into focus by various proposals through the solar panels and the electricity stations, particularly for firefighting equipment, which currently includes oil tanks that may put the property at high risk, and fire engineers are currently reviewing the proposals for alternatives. ICOMOS indicated that the Draft Decision draws attention to the urgent need for an overall coordinated approach to the various needs and initiatives at the property through the development of a Master Plan, the development of which should be undertaken as an emergency, and expressed its readiness to support the development of said Master Plan.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted the existence of a timeline for the reconstruction and suggests a similar time constraint to be present for the Master Plan, to ensure progress.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the site faces several limitations apart from the damage caused by the fire. Recognizing the commitment of the State Party, the Delegation requested that the site be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger as soon as the reconstruction is finalised, as it considers that regular state of conservation issues should be dealt with through the normal state of conservation process, to avoid keeping properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger for a longer period of time.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** commended the progress achieved for the conservation of the tombs and acknowledged that maintaining a balance between respecting authenticity and incorporating risk mitigation facilities was a difficult task.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** commended the efforts made by the State Party and expressed its continuous support to the State Party and the stakeholders involved. The Delegation showcased its support through the introduction of different schemes, including assistance with the reconstruction and the arrangement of future missions in order to prevent further delay in the reconstruction.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the State Party's postponement of development projects until the completion of the Master Plan. The Delegation expressed concerns that the reconstruction began without a Master Plan amended by the Advisory Bodies and therefore requested the State Party to clarify the timeframe for the actualization of the Master Plan and to revise the implementation of the reconstruction accordingly.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed distress over the damage done to the site and lamented the delays with the reconstruction. The Delegation noted the involvement of the local community and inquired about the possibility of commencing the reconstruction using traditional techniques until a Master Plan is prepared.

The Observer Delegation of **Uganda** commended the efforts made toward the reconstruction of the site and expressed thanks to the funders of the project. The Delegation noted the need for a Master Plan to ensure a holistic approach for the reconstruction and to prevent any other fire hazards in the future. The Delegation reminded the session that the site is an active spiritual centre where certain rituals are regularly carried out, which results in delays with the consultative mechanisms.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.8** was adopted.

ARAB STATES

Biens irakiens

Le **Secrétariat** souligne que depuis la 39e session du Comité s'est écoulée une année noire pour le patrimoine irakien, suite aux destructions délibérées. L'État partie continue d'affirmer que les groupes armés sont toujours sur le site d'Assour, appelle au respect des Conventions 1954 et 1970, et lance également un appel aux États membres pour financer la sauvegarde du patrimoine irakien.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** regrette la situation du patrimoine mondial en Irak et l'incapacité du Comité à pouvoir documenter ce patrimoine disparu. Elle en appelle aux autorités internationales, aux communautés locales et à la société civile pour sauver les archives et pour restaurer ces monuments.

The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** emphasizes the ongoing losses of the two Iraqi sites under the military operations of Daesh. The Delegation extends its gratitude to the large number of local and international aid provided in different forms. The Delegation indicates that despite the challenges faced by the State Party in accessing and securing the site, it has already started working on a Management Plan for the post-liberation period and is working on documenting the sites from several angles, in preparation for the future emergency restoration plans. The Delegation indicates that it stands firmly against illicit trafficking and asks the international community to combat such practice. Finally, the Delegation sends a plea for financial and moral support for their State Party.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed by the Secretariat.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.10** adopted as amended.

Hatra (Iraq) (C 277rev) – 40 COM 7A.11

Le **Secrétariat** présente le bien en indiquant que des groupes armés ont attaqué le site avec bulldozers et marteaux piqueurs, et qu'il est difficile d'obtenir des informations dans ces conditions.

The Delegation of **Portugal** extended its praise to the Iraqi people for their resilience and courageous efforts to rebuild their country. The Delegation regretted the damage caused to the Iraqi heritage, but also the constant loss of life in the country. The Delegation noted the constraints on site and expressed the opinion that until these conditions radically change, little can be done to protect the site and assess the damage.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to the Draft Decision, aligned with wording used in previous sessions.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.11** adopted as amended.

Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev) – 40 COM 7A.12

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'état de conservation du bien, en soulignant que des opérations militaires se déroulent sur place. De ce fait, la restauration est à l'arrêt et aucune documentation n'est possible.

L'ICOMOS souligne l'absence totale de protection et de gestion à cause de la situation préoccupante. Chacun doit être conscient de la situation même si les Organisations ne peuvent apporter une aide pour le moment.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** noted the systematic and deliberate destruction of Arab heritage by Daesh. The Delegation asserts the importance of the Iraqi heritage and the need for technical, financial and moral support to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Peru** regretted the attacks on the cultural heritage in Iraq and Syria and stresses that this is a focal preoccupation of the committee. The Delegation noted the exceptional character and the situation of real emergency that surround these sites. The Delegation requested a public declaration that would speak for the Committee's strong condemnation of this destruction. The Delegation wished to send a message and to raise awareness and highlighted the need for cooperation to safeguard and protect the heritage of the people in Iraq and Syria.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the severity of the humanitarian situation and its readiness to contribute to the cultural recovery of the area. The Delegation stressed the unfeasibility of restoration work without prior recuperation of a sustainable and peaceful life in the region. The Delegation underlined the need for coordination between various UNESCO agendas and conventions and encouraged thematic initiatives on cultural restoration.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** expressed its sympathy and solidarity with the Iraqi people and condemned the deliberate destruction of Iraqi heritage. The Delegation recommended that the State Party work with the secretariat of the 1954 Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of an Armed Conflict and its Second Protocol. Despite realizing that under the circumstances, substantial outcomes were hard to obtain, the Delegation stressed that at the very least the destruction of the Iraqi heritage could receive additional visibility.

The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** thanked all involved parties for their solidarity and continuous support of the protection of the Iraqi heritage and culture. The Delegation informed the Committee that the site has been freed from the control of Daesh and that it was in the process of removing slogans and all traces of vandalism from the site. The Delegation further indicated that an agreement has been signed with UNESCO, and that the research and restoration work has already started with the help of local experts. The Delegation wished that the site be removed from the World Heritage List in Danger in the following year, once the planned restoration works have taken place.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** supported the suggestion made by the Delegation of Azerbaijan to work with the 1954 Convention and its Second Protocol. She suggested that the fund under this Convention can be beneficial in such situations.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed same amendments were made in the Draft Decision as for previous Iraqi sites.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** enquired about the possibility of applying the amendment regarding the use of the provisions of the 1954 Convention and its two protocols for the previous decisions. The Delegation regretted not having mentioned this resolution for the previous decisions.

The **Chairperson** informed the Delegation of Azerbaijan that the previous decisions are closed and not up for revisions.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.12** adopted as amended.

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

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the examination of the state of conservation report on the old city of Jerusalem and its walls was suspended, and that this item would be reconsidered once the consultations taking place between the concerned parties regarding this property reach a consensus.

Ancient City of Aleppo (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 21)

Decision: **40 COM 7A.16**

The **Secretariat** presented the state of conservation report on the site and pointed to the report on the six Syrian sites currently on the World Heritage List of Danger. The Secretariat emphasized that Aleppo is still facing irreversible, extensive damages and that the difficulties in accessing the sites made it difficult to ascertain the extent of the damages. It pointed out that the World Heritage Centre organized a technical mission in June 2015 to address the reconstruction issue in the post-conflicts Middle-East, and that part of the meeting was dedicated to the Ancient City of Aleppo. In June 2016, an international meeting was held in Berlin concerning the reconstruction. Pointing out the urgency of reconstruction in Aleppo, the Secretariat emphasized that future action would require close collaboration with humanitarian stakeholders and other stakeholders such as the local authorities, the municipality, Syrian and International experts, local communities and the international community. It further pointed out that concrete measures to prepare for the post-conflict phase would lay the foundation for the coming steps.

L'**ICOMOS** regrette la destruction et souligne les besoins nécessaires et urgents. Il indique également que des solutions à long terme, non seulement techniques mais également à une échelle plus globale, seront nécessaires.

The Delegation of **Portugal** reacted to a previous request by the Chairperson to shorten interventions by stating that its future intervention will concentrate on the sum of all Syrian sites instead of individual ones.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendment was received for this item.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.16** was adopted.

Ancient City of Bosra (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 22) – 40 COM 7A.17

Le **Secrétariat** déplore que l'accord avec la société civile ait été rompu en 2015.

L'**ICOMOS** déplore que l'accord n'ait pas pu être prolongé et indique que tant que la situation sécuritaire ne s'est pas améliorée, aucun plan ne pourra être mis en œuvre.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** constate que les dossiers des sites en Irak et en Syrie se répètent et que les blessures sont profondes. La Délégation souhaite une session spéciale concernant ces sites soumis aux conflits armés et souligne qu'il ne s'agit pas la même méthode d'approche que l'étude de l'état de conservation.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** requested the Delegation of Tunisia to clarify its intervention, notably whether the Delegation had requested a special extraordinary session of the Committee or an evening session.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** regrette qu'une session spéciale n'ait pas été pensée concernant ces sites soumis aux conflits armés, comparés à des sites mal gérés.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** enquired once more about the type of session the Delegation of Tunisia wished to see devoted to the endangered Iraqi sites. She pointed out the rarity of extraordinary sessions of the Committee and stressed that under this year's Item 7, the vulnerability of heritage in times of conflict was clearly highlighted. She reminded the Committee that a number of Side Events had been organised to address heritage under threat, including Iraq's heritage.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient la demande de la Tunisie concernant l'état de conservation de biens situés dans des pays en conflit armé, lesquels auraient dû être discutés séparément.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendments had been received for this item.

Decision **40 COM 7A.17** was adopted.

Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20bis) – 40 COM 7A.18

Le **Secrétariat** déclare que le site est plus ou moins préservé et qu'une mission s'y est rendue fin avril 2016. Il indique que les dommages sont modérés à l'intérieur du bien, mais qu'un incendie a ravagé le site, et notamment le quartier inscrit, fin avril 2016, malgré les mesures préventives. Le Secrétariat indique qu'une reconstruction rapide est souhaitée pour que le site commercial puisse reprendre vie.

L'**ICOMOS** ajoute qu'il s'agit d'une ville antique exposée à des menaces, et qu'il faut éviter de prendre des décisions trop hâtives. Il souligne néanmoins qu'une mission de suivi réactif est nécessaire.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendments had been received for this item.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.18** was adopted.

Ancient villages of Northern Syria (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1348) – 40 COM 7A.19

Le **Secrétariat** souligne que le site de St Siméon a subi des dommages dus au conflit armé ainsi et l'installation que des populations.

L'**ICOMOS** se dit perturbé par les rapports illustrant les dégâts et estime que les efforts des communautés locales devraient être reconnus.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendment had been received for this item.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.19** was adopted.

Crac des chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 1229) - 40 COM 7A.20

Le **Secrétariat** déclare que le Site Dalah El Din est indemne, mais que le Crac des chevaliers est endommagé. Il souligne également que la DGAM a lancé un travail de documentation sur ce site.

L'**ICOMOS** soutient les activités de restauration d'urgence et propose une mission conjointe de suivi réactif.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendment had been received for this item.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.20** was adopted

Site of Palmyra (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 23) – 40 COM 7A.21

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que Palmyre est la plus grande et la plus spectaculaire victime des destructions en 2015. Il rappelle également que le 25 avril 2016, une mission d'évaluation rapide a été envoyée à Palmyre sous la direction de la Directrice de la Division du patrimoine, suite à la décision du Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO.

L'**ICOMOS** déplore la destruction intentionnelle de Palmyre ainsi que la destruction des monuments en 2015 et s'annonce favorable à des mesures d'urgence en coopération avec les communautés locale. Il souligne qu'il faut agir rapidement, étant donné que ce bien est considéré comme une « icône », et qu'il est donc urgent de travailler sur le terrain avec la communauté internationale.

La Délégation du **Portugal** souligne que la réhabilitation de Palmyre est un signe d'espoir et de détermination de notre part, et qu'un engagement avec Palmyre est un « non » à la destruction et aux conflits. La Délégation rappelle qu'un expert portugais a participé à la réunion de Berlin qui a approuvé des recommandations importantes, et qu'un compromis doit être trouvé avec travaux d'urgence.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** déplore la destruction de ce patrimoine « icône » et insiste sur le fait qu'il est important de réfléchir à la méthode selon laquelle la reconstruction aura lieu. Elle souligne qu'il ne faut pas aller vite et qu'il faut avoir de la documentation avant d'agir.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its concerns over the threats facing the cultural properties in Syria and expressed its deep condolences over the tragic loss of life due to the conflict. The Delegation commands all the efforts taking place in protecting Syria's cultural heritage and monitoring it closely. It recommended that systematic documentation of all damage incurred be pursued whenever the situation allows. The Delegation supported the removal of the properties from the List World Heritage in Danger as soon as the situation allows.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) déplore la situation tragique de tous les sites syriens et la souffrance causée, et souligne qu'il ne faut pas oublier la responsabilité de Daesh et du régime syrien de Damas. La Délégation se dit mobilisée et indique que le Président de la République française a demandé un rapport au Président du Louvre sur le patrimoine un conflit. La Délégation rappelle qu'un appui financier est nécessaire pour la numérisation de la documentation et

souligne également que #Unite4heritage est une belle formule pour avancer sur ce sujet très sensible.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** explained its active role in researching and discussing ways of preserving cultural heritage in conflict areas where access is not possible. The Delegation stressed the importance of preparing exhaustive inventories in times of peace. The Delegation considered that 3D data is fundamental in the development of recovery plans and the establishment of optimal approaches to restoration.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** notified the Delegation of Tunisia about the first damage assessment mission carried in Syria despite the security situation. She thanked all the Delegations that offered assistance and requested that the UNESCO Office in Beirut receive the existing 3D scans and documentation.

Le **Secrétariat** estime qu'il faudra une coordination pour rassembler une documentation suffisante pour mettre en place des initiatives futures.

L'**ICOMOS** souligne qu'il faut être prudent dans l'approche, en sachant que l'accès au bien est difficile, et souligne le rôle important que doit jouer la communauté internationale en tant qu'alliée.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendment had been received for this item.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.21** was adopted.

General Decision on the World Heritage properties of the Syrian Arab Republic

Le **Secrétariat** constate que depuis 2011 fait rage un conflit dévastateur pour la population et le patrimoine, et que les sites qui ne sont pas encore sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sont également très endommagés. Elle rappelle la réunion de Berlin sur la Syrie, où des décisions importantes ont été prises.

L'**ICOMOS** rappelle que tout a été dit sur les activités militaires, et que parmi les aspects positifs, l'on compte l'engagement du Directeur des Antiquités et des Musées de Syrie, qui envoie un rapport tous les mois, ainsi que les communautés locales qui apportent des informations. L'**ICOMOS** rappelle aussi l'importance de la réunion de Berlin et estime qu'après la mission en Syrie, il faut maintenant estimer les priorités. L'**ICOMOS** souligne que la reconstruction est un défi immense pour le patrimoine des villes et soulève une question clé : comment agir pour que la reconstruction puisse être un catalyseur pour le développement économique, social et patrimonial.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** commends UNESCO's and the World Heritage Centre's efforts in safeguarding the Syrian heritage, despite financial limitations and the difficult security situation. The Delegation reminded the Committee that the neighbouring countries are taking a bigger load due to the migration crisis and encouraged the reinforcement of the UNESCO Beirut Regional Office , especially in the field of Education.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its deep concern over the irreplaceable loss that impacted part of the world's collective memory, embodied in the endangered Syrian cultural heritage. The Delegation stressed the need for a holistic approach to the recovery processes and conservation practices in post conflict situations. The

Delegation reiterated its readiness to provide technical support and cooperation in the fight against the illicit trafficking of cultural heritage.

La Délégation du **Portugal** remercie l'ICOMOS pour la mise en place d'une feuille de route pour la reconstruction et salue l'action de l'UNESCO, mais estime néanmoins que tant que la paix ne sera pas de retour, on ne pourra pas agir.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** recalled the different decisions and declarations that are aimed at safeguarding the heritage in Syria. The Delegation commended the efforts to safeguard the heritage of Syria despite the limited access. The Delegation extended its full support in preventing the illegal trafficking of heritage and for restoring the damage inflicted to these sites. The Delegation believed in the indispensability of a heritage database for the planning and the execution of restoration projects.

La Délégation de la **France** (Obsevateur) indique qu'elle aurait demandé des recommandations si elle avait été membre du Comité. Elle estime que les autorités publiques syriennes n'auraient pas dû être remerciées et ne souhaite pas que des contacts soient établis avec une autorité qui martyrise son pays.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that no amendment had been received for this item.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.22** was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1pm.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 12 JULY 2016

FOURTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 7. EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continuation)

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

Documents *WHC/16/40.COM/7A*
 WHC/16/40.COM/7A.Add
 WHC/16/40.COM/7A.Add.2

Decisions: **40 COM 7A.1 to 40 COM 7A.50**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611) – 40 COM 7A.23

Le **Secrétariat** présente les biens situés au Yémen et rappelle que le conflit, qui a éclaté en 2015, a déjà eu des effets négatifs sur son peuple et causé des dégâts irréversibles pour son patrimoine. Il rappelle également qu'en juillet 2015, l'UNESCO a organisé une réunion d'experts qui a élaboré un Plan d'action d'urgence pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel du Yémen, comprenant des actions à court, moyen et long termes, pouvant être en partie réalisées par l'État partie avec un soutien technique à distance de l'UNESCO et des Organisations consultatives. Le Secrétariat indique toutefois que ce plan d'action n'a pas pu être mis en œuvre car il n'a pas encore bénéficié de soutien financier. Le Secrétariat indique également que l'État partie qu'en plus de la détérioration persistante du patrimoine bâti et le délabrement général, le bien continue d'être affecté par des troubles politiques et socio-économiques ainsi que par le conflit armé. Il souligne que l'État partie a indiqué que le soutien international continue d'être essentiel pour la protection du patrimoine yéménite et pour rendre possible la préparation d'un plan de mesures de conservation et de protection post-conflit.

ICOMOS acknowledged that conflicts in Yemen currently prevent both the effective management and any physical conservation works, despite the commitment of the Ministry of Culture. It explained that no progress was possible regarding the National Strategy for the Preservation of the Historic Sites and Monuments 2016-2020

because of the security situation, but underlined that the strategy with its Action Plan needed to be followed through. ICOMOS stressed the need to work with the local communities at the site and the need to receive the continuing support of the international community. A joint ICOMOS/World Heritage Centre Reactive Monitoring mission was proposed.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendment to the Draft Decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.23** was adopted.

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) – 40 COM 7A.24

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'État partie rapporte que le bien demeure en butte aux désordres socio-économiques, sécuritaires et politiques, mais surtout au conflit armé et que, de juin à septembre 2015, le conflit armé a causé la destruction du quartier de Maqshamat al Qasimi et des dommages sérieux au quartier al-Folihi, entraînant la destruction complète de huit bâtiments et en affectant 100 autres situés à l'intérieur du bien. Le Secrétariat indique également que malgré le manque de fonds, l'Organisation générale pour la préservation des villes historiques du Yémen (GOPHCY), en coordination avec le Bureau de l'UNESCO à Doha, a mené des études techniques et documenté les dommages sur le site. Le GOPHCY a également participé à des ateliers de formation conjoints UNESCO/ICCROM à Amman, au Caire et à Tunis sur le renforcement des capacités. Enfin, le Secrétariat précise que le GOPHCY a consulté le Centre au sujet de la reconstruction des bâtiments historiques détruits dans le quartier d'al-Qasimi, sous la forte pression des habitants qui ont perdu leurs domiciles. Néanmoins, et malgré l'assistance technique et financière fournie par le Centre et le Bureau de l'UNESCO à Doha, le projet de reconstruction des immeubles d'habitation détruits a dû être arrêté faute de moyens financiers. Il conclut en rappelant qu'il est important que la communauté internationale se mobilise pour soutenir le Yémen dans la sauvegarde de son patrimoine.

ICOMOS stated that the repair and reconstruction of damaged buildings is vital to the recovery of the cultural heritage values as well as the socio-economic aspects. It called upon the international community to support the property and stated the importance of ensuring the stability of reconstructions and to avoid a negative impact from hasty decision-making. ICOMOS further highlighted the need for expert advice at the property and supported the preparation of the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the Property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR) as soon as it is feasible. ICOMOS also welcomed the proposed joint Reactive Monitoring mission.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendment to the Draft Decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.24** was adopted.

Old Walled City of Shibam (Yemen) (C 192) – 40 COM 7A.25

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'État partie rapporte que, outre les menaces persistantes résultant de la pluie et des inondations, le bien continue d'être affecté par des

troubles politiques et socio-économiques, de même que par le conflit armé qui a éclaté en 2015. Il précise qu'une voiture a explosé près du mur d'enceinte de la ville, causant d'importants dommages aux édifices historiques, et que les efforts du GOPHCY et de la population de Shibam, qui œuvrent pour la protection de leur patrimoine dans des circonstances extrêmement difficiles, sont louables. Le Secrétariat indique enfin que le contexte sécuritaire empêche tout financement par des donateurs ou tout soutien administratif mais que les autorités locales, démunies, sollicitent une aide financière d'urgence.

ICOMOS acknowledged the ongoing efforts of GOPHCY and highlighted the importance of international support. It stressed the importance of developing a DSOCR based on a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to guide conservation at the site and prepare it for a possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party for the efforts made to protect its heritage despite the country's difficult security situation and commended the preparation of State of Conservation reports, damage assessments and first aid interventions in cooperation with local authorities and communities. It expressed its hope that a Reactive Monitoring mission would soon be able to assist in the development of corrective measures to facilitate the site's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendment to the Draft Decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.25** was adopted.

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

Abu Mena (Egypt)(C90) – 40 COM 7A.9

Birthplace of Jesus: Church of the Nativity and the Pilgrimage Route, Bethlehem (Palestine) (C 1433) – 40 COM 7A. 14

Palestine: Land of Olives and Vines – Cultural Landscape of Southern Jerusalem, Battir (Palestine) (C 1492) – 40 COM 7A. 15

All the Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

ASIA AND PACIFIC

Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 rev) – 40 COM 7A.26

The **Secretariat** presented the State of Conservation Report of the property and informed the Committee of an International Symposium involving all stakeholders to discuss the issue of possible reconstruction works at the property. In view of the additional information received, the Draft Decision has been amended to reflect the

International Symposium and to allow its outcomes to be considered by the Committee at its next session.

ICOMOS provided further explanations regarding the state of conservation of the property.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle que le site de Bamiyan est emblématique pour la Convention, puisque ce drame a été vécu par tous et qu'il préfigurait en un certain sens les drames futurs au Mali, en Syrie et en Iraq. La Délégation souligne que la question qui se pose actuellement est celle de la reconstruction des statues, et qu'il ne faut pas engager de reconstruction sans que les populations locales ne soient intégrées dans ce processus.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** noted its concern regarding the security of the site as well as the lack of implementation of the Management Plans, the risk of collapse of the niches and the irreversible deterioration of paintings. The Delegation commended the State Party for the adoption of the Management Plan and its integration into the city's Master Plan as well as the general progress made. The Delegation requested the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and stakeholders to work on an approval for the reconstruction of the Buddha niches.

The Delegation of **Portugal** joined the appreciation expressed by the United Republic of Tanzania and agreed with ICOMOS that further information is needed regarding measures to control development pressures. The Delegation requested the provision of expert advice to the State Party with regard to the development of a project plan regarding the Buddha niches and welcomed the Symposium, which is to take place later this year. It agreed with Lebanon that the implication of local populations is decisive for the success of the project.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** appreciated the updated reports and the developments of restoration projects. The Delegation informed the Committee that the Bamiyan Culture Centre is currently supported by the Korean Government in an effort to develop capacity building. It expressed its hopes regarding the development of a comprehensive Master Plan via the symposium and the Culture Centre.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcomed the progress made with the state of conservation of the property and stated that corrective measures needed to be consistently implemented. It encouraged the State Party to continue promoting the project and appreciated the resources provided by some States Parties. The Delegation expressed that issues such as the conservation of the Buddha niches, archaeological sites and paintings as well as Heritage Impact Assessments remain current. It confirmed that it would encourage Turkey's national authorities to make assistance available.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** also commended the State Party and indicated that it has supported the property for more than 10 years with more than US\$ 7,000,000. The Delegation informed the Committee that its cooperation currently focuses on the reconstruction of the Eastern Buddha niche, capacity building, and the symposium. It agreed that the proposed reconstruction needs to be carefully assessed, based on an appropriate reconstruction philosophy with regard to the property's OUV and that this requires a consultation of all stakeholders including local communities, to be reviewed by the Advisory Bodies and the Committee.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.26** was adopted as amended.

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev) – 40 COM 7A.27

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.27** was adopted without discussion.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708) – 40 COM 7A.29

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegations of Kazakhstan, Poland and the United Republic of Tanzania to present their justification for requesting to open the discussion on the Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia).

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** reminded the Committee of the decision **39 COM 7A.41**. The Delegation reported that its experts had studied the current situation of the property and arrived at the conclusion that the requested land use plan is now in place and that a relevant memorandum was signed by the Georgian Prime Minister. It stressed that plans to build a new museum had been cancelled and were being reviewed according to the ICOMOS recommendations. It furthermore highlighted the efforts made to develop improved legal frameworks and management systems. The Delegation proposed to remove the site from the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its satisfaction with the improvements made by the State Party since 2009 and also recalled Decision **39 COM 7A.41**. The Delegation supported the recommendations of the State of Conservation report. It asked for clarification regarding the World Heritage Centre technical assistance missions in reference to reactive monitoring. It regretted that the report did not refer to the implementation of corrective measures since its inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger and asked the Secretariat and ICOMOS about the State Party's progress with regard to the desired State of Conservation.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** commended the efforts of the State Party with regard to the ICOMOS recommendations. The Delegation supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Kazakhstan. It mentioned the importance of the State Party's cooperation with local communities and young generations and concluded that it could not find weaknesses with regard to the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** reminded the Committee that the List of World Heritage in Danger means to alert States Parties that measures must be taken to better manage a site and that this also applies to the property in discussion. The Delegation recalled last year's discussion and expressed its surprise with regard to Kazakhstan's proposal. It stressed that a distinction needs to be made between the discussions of a possible removal from the World Heritage List in Danger and discussions with regard to striking out recommendations suggested in the State of Conservation report. It asked ICOMOS to explain what such a proposal entails in practice and what their evaluation of the present state of affairs is.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** supported the property's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime qu'il est possible de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, sans pour autant oublier les recommandations du Comité, qui permettent de garantir la conservation du site à long terme, et sollicite à cet égard l'avis de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Koweït** considère que les efforts entrepris par l'État partie entre 2009 et 2016 montrent qu'il a pris en compte les préoccupations et les demandes de mesures correctives du Comité et, qu'à ce titre, le bien peut être retiré de la Liste en péril.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'État partie de ses efforts pour répondre aux recommandations du Comité et relève nombre de points positifs présentés dans le rapport du Secrétariat. Le représentant de la Tunisie considère qu'en dehors de la question de l'Église qu'il faudrait inclure dans la zone tampon, le bien peut être retiré de la Liste en péril.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** salue les efforts de l'État partie depuis 2009 pour mettre en place un mécanisme de gestion du bien et propose son retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation du **Pérou** reconnaît les efforts réalisés par l'État partie pour régler les problèmes de vulnérabilité du bien ainsi que les progrès réalisés. Néanmoins, elle pense que le Comité doit maintenir son exigence afin que l'État partie assure la viabilité du bien.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** once more recalled Decision **39 COM 7A.41**. The Delegation highlighted the exceptional progress made by the State Party and considered that a withdrawal could give more room to it to implement the recommendations.

The Delegation of **Turkey** indicated that it was unsatisfied with the efforts made by the State Party and recalled the conditions of last year's decision with regard to a possible removal from the World Heritage List in Danger. To be in line with Portugal, Lebanon and Peru, the Delegation recommended the removal of the site from the World Heritage List in Danger with certain recommendations to be conserved.

The Delegation of **Finland** seconded the statements of Portugal and Lebanon. It stated that it perceived the discussed amendment as a deleted Draft Decision rather than an amendment.

La Délégation du **Liban** précise qu'en dehors de la question de la zone tampon, il reste encore, selon les rapports des Organisations consultatives, quelques points à résoudre. Elle cite différents problèmes évoqués et non réglés, que mentionne également l'État partie. Il faudrait formuler plusieurs demandes qui garantissent que le bien ne revienne pas sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril dans quelques années.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** appreciated the progress made regarding the implementation of Decision **39 COM 7A.41**. It stressed the State Party's strong commitment which has successfully raised awareness regarding the *World Heritage Convention* amongst local communities and authorities. The Delegation claimed that the achievements of the State Party have to be seen as a

model of excellence and best practice. It agreed on the property's removal from the World Heritage List in Danger, while supporting the continuation of safeguarding measures.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party. The Delegation supported the interventions made by the Committee Members that spoke before and asked ICOMOS to present the proposed recommendations.

Le **Secrétariat** apporte quelques informations complémentaires et précise que l'État partie a fourni des cartes et des éléments supplémentaires demandés dans les mesures correctives, relatifs à la mise en œuvre du schéma directeur. Le Secrétariat indique que les deux dernières missions portaient sur le plan d'occupation des sols et le schéma directeur ainsi que sur le nouveau projet de musée.

ICOMOS clarified that the desired State of Conservation approved by the Committee in collaboration with the State Party included four elements, namely the boundaries and buffer zone, an Urban Master Plan including a Land Use Plan, a Management Plan, and plans for the long term conservation of monuments and archaeological sites. The Representative of ICOMOS informed the Committee that twenty-two corrective measures would have to be achieved to fulfil the desired state of conservation. It acknowledged the existence of an Urban Land Use Master Plan but regretted that it has not been finalized and its impact cannot yet be foreseen. It stated that the Historical Culture Base Plan is to be approved by the end of 2016. With regard to the buffer zone, it explained that the suggested boundaries need to be analysed with regard to development areas and the protection of the buffer zone. It agreed that excellent work has been undertaken regarding the conservation of the property, but reminded the Committee that no explicit plans are in place and that the approval of the Management Plan and a management system is still awaited. ICOMOS expressed that it understands the State Party's desire to be removed from the World Heritage List in Danger but stated that the desired State of Conservation has not been reached despite the State Party's commitment.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed that it is not against removing the site from the World Heritage List in Danger as long as it is ensured that mechanisms are in place to maintain its desired State of Conservation in the future. It stated that in spite of different approaches everyone has the same intentions with regard to the property and therefore suggested a drafting exercise to keep Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (with a little alteration) and 7 of the amendment, but to conserve the recommendations. It asked ICOMOS which recommendations should be kept to make the drafted suggestion.

La Délégation de **Cuba** souhaite tout d'abord remercier la Turquie de son accueil et l'Espagne d'avoir permis aux hispanophones de pouvoir s'exprimer en espagnol. En ce qui concerne le site, elle considère qu'il faut féliciter les progrès de l'État partie tout en maintenant les recommandations pour éviter que le bien ne retombe dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stressed that its proposal is not accidental. The Delegation once again underlined the recent activities by the State Party presented before. It stated that ICOMOS must have outdated information regarding the finalization of an urban master plan. The Delegation proclaimed that the achieved work justifies the removal of the item with regard to the borders of the site. It reminded the Committee of the revision of the museum plans with regard to the ICOMOS recommendations. It expressed its understanding of the importance of continuous monitoring and requested the State Party to submit a report on the State

of Conservation for examination at the 41st session of the Committee. The Delegation encouraged the Committee to acknowledge the work of the State Party.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** agreed with the Delegation of Portugal to revise the Draft Decision with regard to the recommendations that need to be kept.

The Delegation of **Poland** seconded the interventions by the Delegations of Philippines and Portugal.

ICOMOS explained the most important recommendations and questioned whether it should be generally discussed which of the recommendations of the desired State of Conservation still need to be achieved. ICOMOS proposed that with regard to decision 5 recommendations a, b, c, d, and e be maintained whereas f (museum) and g be taken out. It suggested that Item 6 (buffer zone) be kept. It addressed the critique by Kazakhstan reaffirming that ICOMOS is not aware of finalization or approval of the Management Plan. ICOMOS suggested revising the wording of the Draft Decision to address the points raised and to add a point regarding the long-term conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed to draft along the lines of ICOMOS' statement on the base of Kazakhstan's amendment.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the proposal of Portugal and proposed to go through its own amendment Item by Item.

The Delegation of **Portugal** proposed to combine three existing proposals by convening again the next morning on a revised version based on the amendment presented by the Delegation of Kazakhstan plus the ICOMOS additions.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** seconded the proposal by Portugal.

The **Chairperson** summarized that she sees a consensus on the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger but that it needs to be further reflected on the recommendations. She asked ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to prepare a new Draft Decision based on the negotiations. She declared that the debate on this report remained open.

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (C 1150) – 40 COM 7A.31

The **Secretariat** presented its report.

ICOMOS provided further explanations on the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** addressed the State Party's claim that the Committee has misunderstood an agreement regarding further development that was reached during the Advisory Mission. The Delegation asked the State Party to clarify what it means by saying that focusing on the planning process is more effective than revising the vision of Liverpool Waters.

The Delegation of **Poland** recalled that the development concerns present upon inscription have not lost their relevancy over the past 12 years. The Delegation explained that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger explicitly because of the Liverpool Waters major development project. It considered

that no progress has been made by the State Party who has not respected the Committee's request to develop a desired State of Conservation and a related time table. It expressed concerns that the Committee will have to come back to discussions regarding the deletion of the site from the World Heritage List in the future. The Delegation proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision and sent it to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Portugal** reminded the Committee of the discussions in Bonn and agreed to Poland and Lebanon. The Delegation said it was worried about the apparent lack of commitment of the State Party. It referred to an event in April to showcase the 34 story Liverpool Waters skyscraper project which the Delegation sees as proof that the Draft Decision is discussion is not based on misinterpretations. The Delegation agreed that the State Party should address the issues raised by the Delegation of Lebanon. It agreed that a deletion from the World Heritage List cannot be ruled out.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the Committee has been asking the State Party to develop the Desired SOC (DSOC) since the inscription on the Danger List in 2012, but it seems this is still work in progress. The State Party proposes to develop the DSOC and plans to adopt it before 2018. The DSOC is not only a tool defining the necessary circumstances for removal from the Danger List, but also a tool for the Committee to facilitate its decision-making. Timely submission of this document should be an urgent and crucial task for the State Party. Approval of the local plan and management plan should be defined within the corrective measures accordingly.

La Délégation du **Pérou** souligne que la situation est devenue critique quant au maintien de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle et constate que des membres du Comité envisagent le retrait du site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation demande à l'État Partie de fournir au Comité plus d'informations quant à la situation et l'impact du projet d'aménagement sur la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party of the United Kingdom for their reaction.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that it responds positively to the proposed way forward and will submit the DSOCR by 1/12/16. There may be a gap between the expectations by the Committee and what can be achieved by the State Party, but after fruitful discussions with ICOMOS , UK will do what they can to bridge the gap and ensure that the planning tools that are in development are put in place to support the DSOCR report. The reminded the Committee that the report on the state of conservation, requested by the 39th session of the Committee, had been submitted by December 2016. The State Party recalled that it did submit the DSOCR in April 2014, which responded to the planning process raised by the Lebanese Delegation. The State Party expressed its disappointment that the request for moratorium is still being extended from beyond the central docks area of Liverpool waters to the whole World Heritage site. Liverpool needs to continue with contextual, well thought out new development that respects the OUV, to drive economic growth and sustain historic buildings. HIA was done, and, according to Historic England, demonstrates there will be no significant adverse effect. The State Party further stated that the majority of the 29 sites in UK are models of good practice, and expressed regret that because of the planning process in the UK, they will not be able to respond positively to the request from the Committee to place a moratorium on the development, because it is a legal requirement that a local authority must decide on applications that are submitted to it. However, the DSOCR will be

processed with enthusiasm in order to secure the removal of Liverpool from the Danger List as soon as practicable.

ICOMOS, in answering the questions raised by Lebanon with respect to the planning process, stated that this was indeed the heart of the matter. The Committee in Bonn said that a first step was an agreed DSOCR adopted by Dec 2016. The State Party had earlier suggested that DSOCR would need to be informed by their planning framework. ICOMOS' view was that the DSOCR must be framed in terms of the retention of the OUV. Retaining OUV is the touchstone by which the planning framework and guidelines should be developed. If planning consent issued is larger the State Party can further address how to manage. In responding to Portugal, ABs shared the concern that it is entirely inappropriate to deal with a one-off planning consent. The tower announced in April, is in fact one of the applications that came to the Centre only a few days ago and was for a 34-storey tower development adjacent to the Princess docks in the buffer zone outside the core area of the property. The outline planning consent provides for 50-storey high-rise in this location and some of the suggestions in the impact assessment is that 34-storey is therefore an improvement. ICOMOS stressed that the impact on the setting and values of the place is the benchmark and not whether it is 50 storeys. They were pleased with the response of the State Party and acknowledged that the arrangement between the powers of the national government and the local authority has created a problem because the planning consent is in place. There is no obligation for the WH Committee to solve that problem; it would be inappropriate to have any of the detailed planning consents for large 30+ storey size. It would furthermore be inappropriate to consider such developments until after DSOCR has been prepared and agreed. ICOMOS acknowledged that there is at local level a legal requirement to address the proposals, but there are other ways than a purely legalistic way. There is need for discussions between English Heritage, Liverpool city council and developer Peel Holding. It is open to Peel holdings to put developments on hold until the due process is complete, and the DSOCR has been adopted and then it should be clear to Peel Holdings and the State Party what is required to solve the problem and then they can chose to solve the problem or not to. That is the appropriate process.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment received from Poland.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.31** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Poland to explain their request to open the state of conservation report on Medieval Monuments in Kosovo for discussion.

The Delegation of **Poland** requested to open the debate on Medieval Monuments in Kosovo, and at the same time to adjourn the debate until the next ordinary session, as conditions are not yet met to discuss the issue.

The Delegation of **Turkey** seconded the proposal by Poland.

The **Rapporteur** addressed the request from Poland and indicated that the new proposed Draft Decision was shown on the screens, which indicated that the Committee decided to adjourn discussion until its next ordinary session.

The **Chairperson** indicated that it was so decided.

Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) – 40.COM 7A.29

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.29** was adopted without discussion.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

The **Chairperson** indicated that, for the region of Latin America and the Caribbean, no natural property inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger was proposed for discussion.

The **Secretariat** read out the list of properties for which it is proposed to adopt the Draft Decisions without discussion:

Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764) – 40.COM 7A.32

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196) – 40.COM 7A.33

The Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

AFRICA

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire/Guinea) (N 155bis) – 40 COM 7A.36

Le **Secrétariat** présente les informations fournies dans le document de travail.

L'**UICN** note que d'importantes menaces sur l'intégrité du bien n'ont pas été abordées par l'État partie dans son rapport, à savoir l'avancée du front agricole et l'exploitation forestière en Côte d'Ivoire et le statut actuel des projets miniers en Guinée. Pour la composante ivoirienne, l'inquiétude liée au manque d'information sur la gestion des pressions anthropiques serait liée au projet de redéfinition des limites qui ne serait pas en phase avec les recommandations de la mission de suivi réactif de 2013. Plus d'informations sur le décret de redéfinition des limites sont nécessaires afin de confirmer que les limites ne sont pas redéfinies en vue d'exclure les zones dégradées. Pour la composante guinéenne, il est recommandé que le Comité réitère sa demande à l'État partie afin d'assurer que l'étude d'impact environnemental et social (EIES) de la compagnie minière West Africa Exploration suive les normes internationales, et demande que les États parties du bien s'associent au PNUD et au Fonds pour l'environnement mondial (FEM) pour élaborer la deuxième phase du projet. L'organisation consultative demande finalement que le bien soit maintenu sur la liste en péril.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that the site was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1992. It highlighted that the factors affecting the OUV haven't changed much, mining was the important issue and it is still there. It commended the efforts made by State Party, notably the participatory management practices undertaken with UNDPNGF funding. It noted that Guinea had not submitted a report on the conditions at the property. The Decision seemed appropriate

especially if it will help that situation does not deteriorate. The message to the State Party is positive, and should not be taken as discouraging.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.36** was adopted.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137) – 40 COM 7A.38

Le **Secrétariat** présente les informations fournies dans le document de travail.

L'**UICN** rapporte la baisse dramatique de gorilles dans le périmètre du bien et souligne qu'une action urgente est nécessaire pour contrer la disparition de l'espèce et les menaces liées à la chasse pour le commerce de brousse. L'Organisation consultative demande aussi à l'État partie d'annuler les permis d'exploitation minière et de prendre des mesures énergiques pour lutter contre le braconnage des singes. Elle demande finalement le maintien du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Republic of Tanzania** commended the report for the detailed information provided; however it noted that most of details in the report on problems affecting the site are overridden by issues of insecurity. The Delegation therefore suggested putting security issues in the focus and emphasized that, when speaking about poaching, the issue of insecurity cannot be forgotten. It also highlighted that this is valid for all sites where civil unrest has been present for many years.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.38** was adopted.

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

Le **Secrétariat** présente les informations fournies dans le document de travail.

L'**UICN** souligne que l'État partie a fait des efforts louables, l'opération Bonobo et la création du corridor écologique présentent des résultats positifs pour maintenir l'intégrité du bien sur le long terme. L'Organisation consultative prie l'État Partie d'envisager de nouvelles options pour connecter également la partie sud du bien par un corridor et de développer une stratégie sur les zones de résidence pour établir un dialogue avec les communautés. Elle rappelle les recommandations de la mission de suivi réactif, notamment que l'exploitation pétrolière est incompatible avec la protection du bien.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.40** was adopted.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) – 40 COM 7A.41

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** reported that it was not ready to start the discussion and requested that it be postponed.

The **Chairperson** agreed to the request.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9) – 40 COM 7A.43

The **Secretariat** presented the information provided in the working document.

IUCN stated that the State Party had reported significant progress with most of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee at its 34th session. However more should be done to address the financial sustainability of alternative livelihood programmes and of the grazing pressure reduction strategy. It is also recommended that the Committee ask the State Party to expedite the realignment to roads to avoid impacts and to complete the international assistance project to prepare a proposal for a significant boundary modification to harmonize boundaries with the extended national park. It is recommended that the Committee request that the State Party invite an IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to assess the progress towards achieving DSOC of the property towards removal from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party for addressing the threats to the OUV. Simian is very special, and it is important that the property has maintained OUV. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to maintain the ecosystem, further implement the grazing pressure reduction strategy, and recalled that the development of alternative livelihoods for local communities is necessary to ensure long term protection. Finland would be interested to provide some financial support to NGOs to allow developing sustainable livelihoods for people near the site. Finland hoped that the State Party will fulfil all the conditions so that the property can be removed from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** agreed with Finland's comments and extended its congratulations to the State Party, in particular as grazing had been reduced by 70%. The park is the habitat for major mammal species, therefore better inventories are needed, given the lack of data due to absence of patrol or surveys, and the statistics need to be updated. Projects addressing the welfare of populations should be encouraged.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.43** was adopted.

Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257) – 40.COM 7A.44

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'information fournie dans le document de travail.

L'**UICN**, conjointement avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial, salue la volonté politique manifeste de l'État partie d'assainir le trafic illicite de bois précieux et recommande que le Comité demande à l'État partie d'élaborer et de mettre en œuvre

un plan pour acquérir des ressources suffisantes en vue de mettre en œuvre la stratégie de saisie des stocks de bois précieux illégaux. Il exprime son inquiétude que, malgré les efforts consentis, la quantité de bois de rose illégalement exploité dans les composantes du bien n'est toujours pas connue, et que la situation demeure alarmante avec moins de 10% des rondins déclarés sur les stocks ayant été saisis. L'Organisation consultative recommande que le comité demande à l'État partie une mise en œuvre totale du plan d'action de la CITES et de clarifier la nature et la destination des produits à livrer par l'usine de traitement du bois saisi pour évaluer son impact sur la demande des bois précieux à l'avenir et l'impact potentiel sur la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Il est recommandé que le bien soit maintenu sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its delight that the State Party is committed to eliminate illegal logging, and stressed the crucial importance of the participation of local communities. However it noted that illegal logging and trafficking still occurred, thus effective actions are still needed. The lemurs endemic to the site are classified as the world's most endangered mammals. Some plant species are not any more able to spread due to the disappearance of the lemurs. Species conservation is crucial to ensure a healthy ecosystem. The Delegation pointed out that illegal wood logging and trafficking are not only a problem for the State where it takes place, but also a responsibility for the countries involved in illegal trade. It called upon the common responsibility and all States Parties to solve this issue as a matter of great urgency. It thanked WWF and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation for their support toward preserving Madagascar's rainforests.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Madagascar.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) confirme que le Gouvernement Malgache accorde une importance majeure à la préservation du capital naturel de Madagascar reflétée par sa représentation à cette session du Comité. La Délégation souligne qu'ils ont bénéficié de divers fonds pour la lutte contre exploitation illicite du bois de rose et d'ébène, pour la réduction du taux de défrichement et le braconnage et spécifie que le pays a renouvelé son engagement auprès du CITES sur l'interdiction d'exploiter le bois précieux, notamment le bois de rose et d'ébène et de nombreux efforts ont été entrepris par l'État Malgache. Elle remercie les pays et organisations internationales qui les ont appuyé dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations de la CITES lors de sa 66ème session de son comité permanent. La Delegation mentionne la volonté politique du Gouvernement Malgache et l'engagement du président de la République de Madagascar qui a été marqué par des avancées, à savoir avec l'adoption d'une loi pour la lutte contre le trafic de bois de rose et d'ébène et la répression des infractions relatives, l'adoption au conseil des ministres du décret d'application de la loi, la ratification de la Convention internationale sur les bois tropicaux, l'inventaire, la sécurisation et l'audit des stocks des bois saisis . Il reste néanmoins encore beaucoup à faire ; les moyens étant limités, la Délégation appelle à l'appui et à la collaboration de tous dans cette lutte.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.44** was adopted.

The Observer **Wildlife Conservation Society** supported the decision adopted by the Committee, as it should ensure that crucial attention will be given to improving the management of the property. Look forward to the operationalization of the Special tribunal provided for in the legislation passed in December 2015, to the

implementation of tools to enable law enforcement officials to identify precious wood species and further progress towards the implementation of Madagascar's CITES action plan. It commended the efforts of the State Party to remove site from Danger List.

Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573) – 40 COM 7A.45

Le **Secrétariat** présente les informations fournies dans le document de travail.

L'**UICN** souligne les importants efforts réalisés pour la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives actualisées par la 39^{ème} session du Comité (Bonn, 2015), et considère que l'État partie mérite un soutien fort de la communauté internationale de fait de la situation post-conflit de la région où se trouve le bien. Toutefois des efforts considérables sont encore nécessaires pour mettre en place des organes de gestion fonctionnels dotés de moyens techniques et financiers et pourvus d'un personnel adéquat. La persistance de l'orpaillage demeure une menace importante car une grande partie du bois en provenance du bien est acheminé vers les sites d'orpaillage. L'Organisation consultative recommande que le Comité demande à l'État partie l'accélération du recrutement d'agents forestiers ressources forestière afin d'assurer une mise en œuvre efficace du programme d'urgence et de surveillance et de contrôler l'exploitation des ressources naturelles et la réalisation du document de gestion forestière. Des résultats positifs ont été démontrés lors des missions de suivi écologique (décembre 2015) avec la présence accrue d'espèces (gazelles, mouflons), mais l'information reste insuffisante pour évaluer le statut de la faune sur l'ensemble du bien et un programme quinquennal de suivi de l'état de conservation des espèces clés et de leur habitat devrait être mis en œuvre. Il est recommandé que le bien soit maintenu sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril.

La Délégation du **Niger** (Observateur) rappelle que le site est un exemple de co-gestion où les populations locales se sont organisées en comités de gestion et sont devenues un réseau d'informateurs locaux qui assurent la surveillance des ressources naturelles et se consultent régulièrement pour améliorer la protection du bien. Les initiatives locales sont renforcées par l'élaboration d'outils de gestion et par la politique du Gouvernement qui soutient ces populations pour les activités prioritaires (surveillance et suivi écologique et éducation environnementale). Certes des insuffisances subsistent, notamment l'assistance financière pour permettre le suivi des reliques d'autruches à cou rouge et le suivi rapproché des Adax. Elle souligne que des efforts ont été accomplis, notamment la loi de programmation récente a permis d'affecter trente agents à la réserve Air Ténéré.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendment had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.45** was adopted.

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153) – 40 COM 7A.46

At the request of the Chairperson, the Delegation of **Republic of Tanzania** explained the reasons for which it had requested to open the discussion on the state of conservation of Niokolo Koba in Senegal: Since 2012 Senegal consolidated investment budget for furnishings and equipment for the Park in addition to its annual operating budget. All tracks in the Park were opened in 2015 which led to 35

poachers being arrested, ecological monitoring has been guaranteed and strengthened, cleaning of ponds had been done. The Environmental and Social Impact of the mining project at Maco followed all processes before validation. The Delegation requested complementary information from the State Party.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** (Observateur) remercie tous les acteurs qui ont aidé à progressivement sortir le bien de la liste en danger et informe le Comité de la création d'une association d'élus locaux pour la gestion du bien et demande que ces réalisations positives soient intégrées à la décision pour que les efforts du Sénégal soient reconnus, d'où l'ouverture de cette discussion.

The **Secretariat** and **IUCN** jointly stated that in spite of the clarification by Tanzania and Senegal, the reasons for opening the discussion were not yet entirely clear. If there were any amendments proposed to the Draft Decision IUCN would provide its response at that point.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souligne l'importance de la demande de l'État partie qui prépare la sortie de la liste en péril sans le demander et souligne les efforts réalisés. L'État partie doit pouvoir fournir plus d'information pour que le document d'État de conservation soit plus positif l'année prochaine.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** souligne également les efforts déployés par l'État partie depuis 2012 pour prendre en compte les recommandations du Comité, et demande d'autoriser l'État partie de soumettre au Comité un rapport actualisé sur la mise en œuvre des recommandations.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) salue le travail exemplaire de dialogue entre UICN et l'État partie.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments proposed by Tanzania to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** asked to hear IUCN's views regarding the amendments.

IUCN referred to the amendment in Paragraph 4. It had no problem to welcome efforts of the State Party with realization of EIA for the Maco project. It acknowledged that process has been exemplary. The original paragraph included question on current status on the project, this question remains and should not be ignored. In Paragraph 5: first amendment on chimpanzee habitat corresponds to IUCN view. OUV remains fragile even if recent surveys have shown that populations of various species appear stable or increasing but more information is needed on trends going upwards. Consider this premature to make a definitive statement on the trend. Regarding Paragraph 6: while Paragraph 4 recognized that the EIA for the Maco project concluded that there will be an impact on chimpanzee habitat outside property, IUCN sees this as impact on OUV. Any impacts to OUV cannot be compensated by mitigation in the area concerned. These amendments are not considered beneficial. Paragraph 8 amend is agreeable. Regarding submission of an environmental and social impact assessment it is fine as it is in accordance with IUCN advice note on WH. Regarding environmental assessment which includes a number of principles to be respected, as long as EA is in line with the advice note this is acceptable. Concerning the amendment of Paragraph 9, IUCN had no issue with it. Changes problematic for IUCN were the loss of the question regarding status of the project at Maco, and changes implying that changes and loss of OUV could be compensated.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked IUCN for the clarifications and suggested establishing a drafting group, as the amendments were too complicated to be solved on the spot.

The Delegation of **Turkey** seconded Finland's proposal.

The **Chairperson** agreed to establish a drafting group with representatives of Tanzania and IUCN to work on this and provide the text by the next morning.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) - 40.COM 7A.41 (continuation)

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Tanzania to explain its request to open the state of conservation report on Virunga National Park

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** informed the Committee that, during the recent Arusha conference on African heritage as Vehicle for Sustainable Development, it was noted that tremendous progress had been made to enhance management models based on public-private partnerships for this site leading to improving the state of conservation of Virunga. The State Party was requesting that an IUCN mission be sent to Virunga at the expense of the State Party. It was not requesting removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger, but rather recognition for progress made. It asked that the State Party be invited to inform on progress made.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** (Observateur) remercie la Délégation de Tanzanie de cette opportunité de présenter les efforts menés et souligne que le partenariat public/privé a amélioré les conditions de gestion du bien et que la croissance du nombre de gorilles de montagne et hippopotames a pu être observée. La menace d'exploitation pétrolière a pu être stoppée et la société d'exploitation évacuée du parc. Le site est classé 19e sur des listes de lieux à visiter à travers le monde et est un site pilote qui a su concilier développement et conservation. La Délégation demande que les efforts soient notés, sans que le site soit retiré de la Liste du patrimoine en péril et qu'une mission soit organisée pour constater les efforts réalisés. Elle propose de fournir un rapport d'état de conservation révisé.

Le **Secrétariat** constate que la demande d'ouverture de la discussion est inédite et l'accueille favorablement. Il félicite les efforts de l'État Partie dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives, et notamment pour sa proposition d'organiser une mission. Il demande à l'UICN de voir si le calendrier de la mission est envisageable. Il considère que les actions sont positives et souhaite encourager l'État partie à progresser dans ce sens.

L'**UICN** appuie la demande d'une mission pour constater les progrès accomplis, mais attend plus de détail sur le calendrier de la mission pour pouvoir la confirmer.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the State Party for the efforts made in improving the situation at this site, and urged the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to welcome the invitation of State Party to visit the Park.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that it would have been very happy if the State Party had suggested the removal from the Danger List, but it appreciated what had been achieved, as based on IUCN, WHC and State Party reports, progress was

impressive although not yet ideal. It commended the efforts of the State Party especially on how ecosystem services could be offered to neighbouring population and release pressure on biodiversity and ecosystem. We should concentrate on park protection and surrounding area protection beyond the buffer zone, people need to get access to ecosystem services and natural resources, in order to release pressure on park.

The **Secretariat** requested clarification whether the Democratic Republic of the Congo would like to invite the mission as an Advisory Mission or a joint WHC/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** requested more time to submit amendments to the Draft Decision by the next morning.

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of properties for which the adoption of Draft Decisions is proposed without discussion under this Item:

Manovo Gounda St. Floris National Park (Central African Republic) – 40 COM 7A.34

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) – 40 COM 7A.35

Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) – 40 COM 7A.37

Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) – 40 COM 7A.39

General Decision on the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) – 40 COM 7A.42

Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) – 40 COM 7A.47

The Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

ASIA-PACIFIC

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of properties for which the adoption of Draft Decisions is proposed without discussion under this Item:

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) – 40 COM 7A.48

East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N 854) – 40 COM 7A.49

The Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The **Chairperson** indicated that no natural properties from the region Europe and North America were proposed for discussion under this Item.

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

The **Secretariat** read out the list of properties for which the adoption of Draft Decisions is proposed without discussion under this Item:

Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76) – 40 COM 7A.50

The Draft Decision listed above was adopted without discussion.

The meeting rose at 6.30pm.

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 13 July 2016

FIFTH MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 7. EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continuation)

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

Documents *WHC/16/40.COM/7B*
WHC/16/40.COM/7B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/7B.Add.2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.7 Rev

Decisions: **40 COM 7B.1 to 40 COM 7B.106**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System (Argentina / Bolivia (Plurinational State of) / Chile / Colombia / Ecuador / Peru) (C 1459) - 40 COM 7B.1

The **Secretariat** presented its review of the state of conservation of the property and highlighted the significant progress made by the States Parties in the implementation of the Committee's recommendations. It informed the Committee that the World Heritage Centre, in close coordination with the six national secretariats, elaborated a comprehensive project to support the participative management structure of Qhapaq Ñan. This programme is financed by UNESCO/Japan Funds-in-Trust for World Heritage to reinforce management capacities, and the launch of activities is planned in 2016. The Secretariat thanked the Japanese Government for its support to this initiative.

ICOMOS explained the purpose of the opening is to allow a greater understanding of the complexity of the management of the serial sites. Recalling the three areas requested by the committee for further work: international technical cooperation; monitoring systems; and finalizing the management and conservation work, ICOMOS commented the achievements made by the six State parties. ICOMOS commended the example cooperation showed during the nomination process has been sustained after the inscription to strengthen the management systems and allowed for a much greater collaboration in sharing the expertise between site managers. It also highlighted the considerable resources needed.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the six state parties for the tremendous progress made in addressing the key management issues of the property which clearly demonstrated the strength in partnership. It is not only the partnerships among the countries that deserved to be highlighted, but more important, the partnerships in the UNESCO network, such as the partnership between World Heritage Centre and the JFIT that continue to ensure the efforts of safeguarding world heritage. It recognized the notable progress made by the State parties in two years in addressing the recommendations made by the committee; it joined the Advisory Bodies to encourage the State Parties to remain focus and resolute in completing key elements and congratulated again the State Parties for the progress had been made.

Le représentant de la Délégation du **Pérou**, s'exprimant également en sa qualité de représentant du Secrétariat *pro-tempore* du Comité établi pour le système de gestion de Qhapaq Nan, souhaite souligner que l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial est une nouveauté pour les biens en série transnationaux et qu'il en est de même pour l'établissement de son système de gestion, car ce dernier est de caractère multinational, tant dans sa structure que dans ses activités de préservation et de conservation. La Délégation indique que le Comité de gestion a établi un comité international constitué de deux sous-comités, l'un technique, formé par les responsables du secteur culturel et du projet Qhapaq Nan de chaque pays membre et l'autre de gestion, constitué des Ambassadeurs des États membres de l'UNESCO. La Délégation du Pérou précise également que le Comité international est responsable de la mise en œuvre de toutes les actions liées au plan de gestion, tant au niveau national que multinational. Il indique que ce dernier doit également coopérer avec des organismes exécutifs aux niveaux régional et national et qu'il doit élaborer et adopter les politiques conjointes pour le maintien de la VUE du bien et prendre en compte les Critères établis dans le plan de conservation. La Délégation du Pérou souligne que les États membres ont présenté un rapport au Secrétariat et que l'étape actuelle est très importante car il s'agit de l'élaboration et de la mise en œuvre des plans nationaux. Elle remercie le gouvernement du Japon pour son soutien financier important dans le cadre du fonds-en-dépôt de 450 .000 dollars EU, qui permet d'améliorer les capacités nationales et de mettre en œuvre les plans nationaux. Les six pays membres ont évalué l'analyse et les conclusions présentées par le Centre, l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM et souhaitent exprimer leur satisfaction pour le caractère positif de cette analyse. Enfin, le représentant de la Délégation du Pérou se dit satisfait du projet de décision et exprime son souhait de le voir adopté par le Comité par consensus.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated the six State Parties for its achievements and recalled the addition of criteria VI in order to recognize the intangible heritage elements of the property which played a role of exchange of cultural reference and identity for local community; it had been strengthened through the close cooperation between the countries, highlighted the cooperation is the key management issues. The Delegation was sure that the cooperation would carry on and encouraged the State parties to keep up the good work.

The Delegation of **Finland** recalled the nomination in Doha especially the long list of recommendations in the decision for state parties to report back on the 40th session of committee, congratulated the state parties' success in respond to the requests, although there's no enough time to fulfil all the requirements, suggested the committee to request another SOC to be reviewed at the 42nd session in order to carefully review the 10 sites included in the nominations which were against the recommendations of the advisory bodies and have remained unsolved issues. It

underlined the effective and fruitful cooperation was an inspiration for all of the countries.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite les États parties concernés pour la création de cette structure de gestion participative impliquant les communautés locales.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** stated the progress and cooperation made by the state parties were commendable; it expressed the wishes of the extension of the buffer zone to include landscape features would be implemented in the near future, as it would have significant effect in finalizing the management plan.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the collaborative measures took by the State Parties, noted the valuable experiences for similar transnational serial nominations with multiple state parties. It further encouraged the State Parties to share the organizational and technical experience towards this progress in a transparent way.

The Delegation of **Japan** joined the congratulations to the State Parties on its achievement, including the redefinition of the boundary of the buffer zone, expressed its pleasure to support through the new UNESCO/JFIT partnership to reinforce management capacity at international and local levels. It wished the cooperation to be continued and expressed its firm commitment to support the effort through UNESCO.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.1** was adopted as amended.

City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) – 40 COM 7B.5

The **Secretariat** presented the revised Draft Decision proposed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in light of the following additional information.

ICOMOS acknowledged the considerable progress achieved by the State Party with the adoption of the metropolitan plan for development and territorial management 2015-2025 and encouraged the related updating on the management plan for the property on the HIA and consideration of the UNESCO's recommendation on historical urban landscapes. ICOMOS underlined the property might be at risk from a proposed subway station at the San Francisco Square, in view of the potential impact of this proposal, suggested the HIA methodology should be applied to all potential alternative locations so that the subway project can be implemented without affect the OUV of this property. ICOMOS expressed its support for the amended decision and an Advisory Mission was suggested.

La Délégation du **Pérou** reconnaît que la construction de transports en commun souterrains, tels le métro, s'accompagne de risques pour la conservation et la gestion des biens mais souligne que, dans le cas de Quito, l'État partie a montré sa volonté de prendre en compte les risques et qu'il s'est engagé en faveur de la protection de la VUE du bien. La Délégation exprime son désir qu'une mission consultative soit envoyée sur le terrain pour prendre toute la mesure de la situation afin qu'il n'y ait pas de répercussion sur la VUE du bien. La Délégation conclut en soutenant le texte de la décision, tel qu'amendé.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party for its efforts to preserve the site, urban centres are not easy to manage as living spaces, it was pleased to see

the municipality had approved the metropolitan plan for development and territorial management 2015-2025, agreed to the proposed commission in order to take a holistic approach on the development of urban centres, and to examine the successful model of UNESCO's urban landscape, it further encourage the Advisory bodies and the state party to ungently agree on a timeframe for the follow up on mission recommendations.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its full support to the decision, and joined the opinion of Peru that this was a good example that the state party was able to conciliate heritage conservation and social and economic development. Commended the State Party for its commitment, hoped the management plan would be soon operational.

La Délégation du **Mexique** (Observateur) remercie la Présidente et les Membres du Comité de lui permettre de prendre la parole et insiste sur le fait que Quito est le premier centre historique latino-américain à avoir été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle précise qu'il est un très bon exemple de travail conjoint entre pouvoirs publics nationaux et internationaux pour la conservation du bien. Le représentant de la Délégation souligne la participation efficace du Bureau de l'UNESCO de Quito et de l'ICOMOS, ainsi que la Région de Barcelone. Le représentant du Mexique souhaite également féliciter l'Équateur car Quito est un très bon exemple de conservation d'un centre historique en Amérique latine.

The **Rapporteur** announced that no further amendment had been submitted to the revised text provided by the Secretariat.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.5** was adopted as amended.

Precolumbian chiefdom settlements with stone spheres of the Diquís (Costa Rica) (C 1453) – 40 COM 7B.3

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to provide a clarification on the property of Precolumbian Chiefdom Settlements with Stone Spheres of the Diquís (Costa Rica) which was not proposed to be opened for discussion.

The **Secretariat** presented an amendment to Paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.3** was adopted as amended.

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

Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia, Plurinational State of) (C 567rev) – 40 COM 7B. 2

Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526) – 40 COM 7B.4

National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haïti) (C 180) – 40 COM 7B.6

Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico) (C 416) – 40 COM 7B.7

Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) – 40 COM 7B.8

Historic Inner City of Paramaribo (Suriname) (C 940rev) – 40 COM 7B.9

The Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

La Délégation du **Pérou** reprend la parole souhaitant informer le Comité de la situation difficile qui prévaut dans le Centre historique de Cuzco, la capitale antique des Incas. Elle indique que les habitants de Cuzco se sentent blessés par différents projets spéculatifs qui ont des répercussions sur la VUE du bien. Le représentant du Pérou précise que l'hôtel Four Seasons a obtenu un permis de construire de façon illégale et qu'il a construit un bâtiment de sept étages et trois parkings souterrains dans la ville historique, ce qui a provoqué d'importants dégâts sur la VUE du bien, son intégrité et son authenticité. Le Gouvernement municipal de Cuzco, conformément à ses obligations vis-à-vis de la Convention et de sa politique de conservation a annulé ces permis de construire et a mis fin à la poursuite de ces travaux. Cependant, l'entreprise Sheraton, faisant peu de cas des dispositions prises par la Municipalité a décidé de la poursuivre en justice, sans pour autant assumer ses responsabilités. Le représentant du Pérou indique que l'ICOMOS s'est prononcé sur cette situation très préoccupante, concluant que la construction était en situation d'illégalité d'une part et, d'autre part, a pu prouver d'un point de vue technique qu'elle aurait des répercussions sur la VUE du bien. L'ICOMOS a donc demandé la destruction de l'immeuble au-dessus du 2^{ème} étage. La Délégation du Pérou remercie le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS d'avoir fait bénéficier les autorités locales de leurs avis et expérience technique, aboutissant ainsi à un travail de concert. Elle appelle le Comité à soutenir Cuzco pour faire face à cette situation difficile qui confronte la Municipalité de Cuzco à ces défis. La Délégation du Pérou indique que cette dernière doit également faire face à l'invasion des véhicules et que, conformément à l'esprit du Qhapaq Ñan qui passait par Cuzco, elle cherche à rendre piétonnier le centre historique de Cuzco. Le représentant de la Délégation du Pérou conclut en demandant au Centre d'envoyer très rapidement une mission à Cuzco.

The **Secretariat** recalled the Rule 22.6 of the *Rules of Procedure*, which states that "States Parties shall not speak to World Heritage properties in their own territories, except at the explicit invitation of the Chairperson".

AFRICA

Lower Valley of the Omo (Ethiopia) (C 17)-40 COM 7B.11

The **Secretariat** presented its review of the state of conservation of the property and the Draft Decision.

ICOMOS reviewed the OUV of this property and expressed its deep concern regarding the sugar project due to the lack of details information, recalled in 2013 the Committee regretted that the State Party had not replied to the World Heritage Centre's letters on this issue. Despite of repeated requests, no materials had been provided on this project. It regretted that the Reactive Monitoring mission in 2015 was provided no details on this project, the mission expressed its concern that

the development had been approved and the first phase had commenced without EIAs, on 30 June 2016, the State Party provided a map on the sugar project, which showed the current the centre of the development is many kilometres away from the property, however it also showed that a large area for future development located being close to the property. No details had been provided on the infrastructure near the project, no clear buffer zone boundaries had been defined. A strategic impact assessment for the Sugar Development Corporation Project (Kuraz project) is being under taken until 2018. ICOMOS expressed extremely great disappointment about the missing information and its development, considered considering its the potential for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed its great concern on the OUV of the property and invited the Committee to consider the possibility of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It further informed the Committee that additional information was provided by the State Party and invited the State Party to present the information to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** invited the State Party to give a statements on its commitment to undertake clarification of boundary identification and submission of buffer zone, as well as HIAs and EIAs, and expressed its wishes to understand whether there can be better alignment under the EU project so that the concerns could be addressed in short period.

The Delegation of **Finland** reported to the Committee that extensive discussions had been held between the Delegation and the State Party mainly concerned the development of the Sugar Cane projects. The Delegation believed the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger decision would be pre-mature if the plan shows there the project is located are still 12 kilometres away from the property.

The Delegation of **Untied Republic of Tanzania** took note of the threats identified by the WHC and Advisory Bodies and appreciated their work, observed the site had no boundary identification, no management plan, no site manager, since 1980 when the property was inscribed. It also noted the impacts to the OUV and the local communities from the ongoing projects. It overserved noted the needs of for intensive consultation with the third party and the EU project will to sort out most of the issues, and regretted that the Reactive Monitoring mission failed to provide information on the buffer zone. The Delegation invited the Advisory Bodies to respond indicate what exactly should be addressed or expected as corrective measures and suggested to postpone the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to make sure there would be enough consultation in order to clarify the expectation after inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the statement made by Tanzania and Finland, admitted that much work is yet to be done undertaken between the State Party and Advisory Bodies, appealed to the committee to accept the revised decision in order to give more time to the State Party and the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre which will allow to resolve the communication problem and also to appreciate the efforts undertaken by the State Party in respond response to the previous Committee decisions.

The Delegation of **Poland** drew the attention of the Committee members to the fact that the project would not only affect the property in Ethiopia but also the property in Kenya. It invited the committee to review the circumstances at a wider perspective and invited ICOMOS to provide comments.

The Delegation of **Turkey** acknowledged the concrete steps taken by State Party, took note of the EU project, and further noted the initial Sugar Cane projects had been downsized. Taken into account the findings of the Reactive Monitoring mission report held in 2015, as well as the update information provided by the state party, it agreed that it would be premature for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger for at the present time being.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the comments of Finland.

The Delegation of **Angola** commended the efforts made by the State Party and welcomed the recent improvement and the additional information provided. It further suggested to continuously assess and monitor the development of the project. In order to acquire further clarification of the post-development, the Delegation supported the decision of postpone.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** join the consensus that it was premature for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger as the project was in the process of revision, and suggested to request the State Party to submit a SOC report in the next committee.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the position to avoid an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger at this time.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** commended the State Party's efforts and its strong will to protect the heritage.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** (Observer) appreciated the concerns raised by the Advisory Bodies regarding conservation of the Lower Omo Valley World Heritage Site. In view of this, Ethiopia invited a UNESCO/ICOMOS Joint Reactive Mission in April 2015. During the debriefing session, it was stated that there is no clear present threat to the site and provide the relevant recommendations which were appreciated by the Government of Ethiopia, which treasures and works diligently towards their implementation. Since then, Ethiopia has declared the precise location and extent of the Kuraz Sugar Development Project, and have has coordinated the efforts of relevant stakeholders to in conducting an improved EIA and facilitate the EU- funded, UNESCO partnered Project, which that aims to delineate the boundaries and develop management plan for the site. It guaranteed reassured the Committee that the site delineation and management plan for the Heritage Site would be given an utmost priority. It invited the Committee to consider favourably the responsible efforts made by the State Party and examine any issues of its concern following completion of the boundary delineation and submission of an improved HIA and EIA, which is are already under implementation.

IUCN provided its comments on the potential impact on the National Park in Kenya that expressing its remained concerns as the full impact by the final proposal of this project would need to be assessed further in detail. It recalled the request by the Committee to Ethiopia to ensure that the findings and potential impact on the OUV are fully taken into account and the EIA be submitted as part of the strategic management plan to be reviewed by 2015. It regretted that no further updates had been provide to IUCN by far.

ICOMOS underlined that there have been no confirmation of the final size and final scheme of the Sugar Cane project, from the maps provided for the further phases of the projects, due to the lack of clear boundary identification and buffer zone, it was difficult to clearly define the impact at this stage. Stressed It stressed despite the on-

site claim of the State Party, the mission report clearly indicates the agricultural development would lead potential serious implications on the OUV. In response to the questions by the Delegation of Tanzania regarding the corrective measures, it would request the State Party to provide absolute clarity on the project in its final form, clarity on the boundary of the property and the buffer zone, and a completed HIA and EIA and strategic impact assessment.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments submitted by the Delegations of Angola, Finland, United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.11** was adopted as amended.

Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev) – 40 COM 7B.13

Le **Secrétariat** présente l'état de conservation du bien.

ICOMOS remarked that the Reactive Monitoring mission that visited Djenné expressed concern that little work has been undertaken to address the priority action plan adopted by the Committee in 2014. ICOMOS further stated that the whole town of Djenné should be considered, and not only its mosques, where 2000 mud plastered houses are now suffering from degradation for various reasons. ICOMOS considered it essential to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed its appreciation for the report, commended the State Party for its efforts and proposed a change in the Draft Decision to recognize such an outstanding commitment to the conservation of cultural heritage.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** rappelle que le cas du Mali est toujours préoccupant et demande à la Présidente de bien vouloir donner la parole à l'EP afin qu'il puisse, en l'absence de rapport, donner des informations additionnelles.

The Delegation of **Turkey** agreed with the Advisory Bodies that, although some measures have been taken, the State Party has not been able to achieve notable progress due to conflict and political instability. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision, albeit with the addition of a paragraph. It also seconded Angola and requested the Chairperson to give the floor to the State Party to inform the Committee about the state of progress.

The **Chairperson** remarked that the floor will be given to the State Party after the discussion of the members of the Committee and gave the floor to Finland.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the points raised by Turkey and expressed its full confidence that Mali would benefit from the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** reminded the Committee that the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should not be considered as a punishment and fully supported the initiative.

La Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur) confirme que le site de Djenné connaît des problèmes et, du fait qu'il jouxte la région du nord insécurisée, subit les contrecoups de la crise sécuritaire, notamment car les forces de l'ordre qui protègent le site sont occupées à d'autres tâches. La Délégation du Mali informe que le site archéologique a été pillé par des trafiquants. Elle informe également le Comité que les autorités maliennes ont organisé, en février dernier, une rencontre sur le site avec l'UNESCO, la MINUSMA et que, depuis deux semaines, un nouveau chef de la mission culturelle a pris ses fonctions, prenant des mesures correctives afin de sécuriser le site. En ce qui concerne l'absence présumée d'un rapport sur l'état de conservation, la Délégation du Mali affirme avoir vérifié et confirme qu'un rapport a été fourni en avril dernier lors de la mission WHC- ICOMOS et demande à ce que des vérifications soient faites.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision with two proposed amendments, one by the United Republic of Tanzania and one by the Secretariat, and takes into account Turkey's points which were seconded by Finland by including a new paragraph.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.13** was adopted as amended.

Sukur Cultural Landscape (Nigeria) (C 938) - 40 COM 7B.17

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation for the property.

ICOMOS acknowledged the casualties of the attacks by insurgents and warned that the resilience of these communities is not high. ICOMOS considered the community should be commended for its efforts to maintain buildings and questioned how the community can be supported in the revitalization of the property.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** recalled the threats and losses that the local communities suffered and stressed that support is needed not just for the tangible heritage but also for the community.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed the initiative by the Advisory Bodies and stressed that it is crucial that the local communities are helped to recover from the attacks.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party on being proactive given the circumstances and agreed that an Emergency Rescue Plan is needed as well as a request for a Reactive Monitoring Mission and urged the State Party to start these two processes immediately.

The Observer Delegation of **Nigeria** announced that the situation has improved significantly and that the property functions as a safe haven now, attracting migration from surrounding areas. Nigeria stated that it is ready to go ahead and make further assessments of the situation.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendment had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.17** was adopted.

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099bis)-40 COM 7B.19

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the United Republic of Tanzania to justify its requested to open the state of conservation report of Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** stated that there were factual errors identified by South Africa, but that ICOMOS had corrected the errors and that the State Party was satisfied with these amendments.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat and ICOMOS to take the floor for further clarifications.

The **Secretariat** gave the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS stated that the changes in the Draft Decision relate to two paragraphs regarding the work at the K2 archaeological site as well as the integrated management plan. ICOMOS explained that the State Party was of the opinion that it had submitted a rehabilitation survey and it was therefore unclear why more information was requested, however after discussions with the State Party an agreement has been reached recognizing that more information needs to be submitted. This is why one paragraph has been amended to set out clearly what remains to be done. The second amendment related to the integrated management plan regarding a projective power station and a coal/ gas field outside the property, and ICOMOS noted with satisfaction that neither of these projects will go ahead.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** expressed its support for the Draft Decision after the addition of two new paragraphs.

The **Rapporteur** presented two amendments concerning Paragraphs 5 and 6.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.19** was adopted as amended.

Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev) – 40 COM 7B.21

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation of the property.

ICOMOS remarked that in past state of conservation reports, longstanding threats to this property have been detailed, such as the lack of effective conservation and management framework and the lack of empowerment of the Stone Town development authority have led to inappropriate developments such as the Mambo Msiige Hotel and the current state of the House of Wonders.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that an amendment to add a new Paragraph 5 had been submitted by the Secretariat.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.21** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Africa region that are to be adopted with no changes and are not open to discussion.

Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 15) – 40 COM 7B.10

Lamu Old Town (Kenya)(C 1055) 40 COM 7B.12

Le Morne Cultural Landscape (Mauritius) (C1259bis) – 40 COM 7B.14

Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599) - 40 COM 7B.15

Historic Centre of Agadez (Niger) (C 1268) – 40 COM 7B.16

Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956bis) – 40 COM 7B. 18

Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C144) - 40 COM 7B. 20

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

ARAB STATES

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of discussions about sites in Libya, and that a draft was under way, and that the request of Lebanon to place sites in Libya on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be discussed later.

Erbil Citadel (Iraq) (C 1437)

Le **Secrétariat** présente son rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien.

ICOMOS commended the work carried out by the State Party and presented the achievements in implementing previous recommendations of the Committee despite challenging circumstances. ICOMOS stated that plans for the museum should be provided for review by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as soon as possible before work proceeds.

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

La Délégation du **Liban** prend la parole pour se réjouir des informations fournies par le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS et des réussites exceptionnelles de l'État partie pour la mise en œuvre des recommandations émises à Doha. La Délégation du Liban rappelle la discussion lors de l'inscription et les encouragements à l'État partie, confirmant que lorsqu'il y a une réelle volonté d'agir, les actions sont possibles malgré toutes les difficultés.

The Delegation of **Turkey** highlighted the achievements and acknowledged that the main concerns of the World Heritage Centre at the time of inscription are being

addressed. It stressed that the involvement of local communities in the reconstruction process is vital and recommended due to the increasing instability that the State Party should continue with all relevant measures to prevent and limit the threats to its outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Poland** welcomed the efforts of the State Party and also thanked and encouraged the UNESCO Iraq office.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated Iraq for its commitment to the conservation of the site and recalled that a team of Portuguese archaeologists are working nearby.

La Délégation du **Koweït** félicite l'État partie pour tous ses efforts pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations du Comité. Elle rappelle que l'Iraq se bat sur plusieurs fronts et mérite qu'on l'encourage.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** souhaite abonder dans le même sens que les Délégations précédentes pour remercier vivement l'État Partie d'avoir honoré ses engagements malgré les difficultés et rappelle qu'il faut l'encourager à s'occuper de ses autres biens du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party of Iraq for addressing all the recommendations made at the time of inscription with determination.

The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the decision and asked the Rapporteur if there are amendments.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no amendments had been received for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.23** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** stated that the two items on Libya would be dealt with at a later stage and invited the Secretariat to read out the list of properties for which the adoption of Draft Decisions was proposed without discussion under this Item.

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

Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt) (C 86) – 40 COM 7B.22

Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433) – 40 COM 7B.26

Historic Jeddah, the Gate to Makkah (Saudi Arabia) (C 1361) – 40 COM 7B.27

Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073) – 40 COM 7B.28

Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37) – 40 COM 7B.29

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

ASIA-PACIFIC

Silk Roads: the Routes Network of Chang'an – Tian-shan Corridor (China/Kazakhstan/Kyrgyzstan) (C 1442) – 40 COM 7B.34

The **Secretariat** began with the first part of its presentation on the state of conservation of the property.

ICOMOS acknowledged that extensive information had been provided by the three States Parties, however in terms of interpretation more is to be done to explain each component and how it relates to the overall property of the Silk Road. ICOMOS outlined some of the interesting approaches that are being developed and pleaded for the inclusion of the minor monuments along the road, as well as a further enhancement into the exchange between settlements and their environment. ICOMOS remarked that the inscription entails further exploration of the property and that the dialogue between the three States Parties needs to be strengthened.

The **Secretariat** proceeded with the second part of its presentation, concerning the emergent conservation issues of the property, namely the construction of a road at the Talgar component site in Kazakhstan.

ICOMOS expressed concern that the fact that the project has developed so far before it came to the attention of the World Heritage Centre shows that there are serious management issues, and that if the road project would have continued it would have had an irreversible effect on the site and the outstanding universal value. ICOMOS took notice of the fact that fortunately it seems that the road project can be stopped.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite les trois États parties pour les progrès accomplis dans la mise à jour des plans de gestion, dans la présentation du bien et pour les initiatives visant à la participation des communautés locales.

The Delegation of **Turkey** invited the States Parties to adopt a Heritage Impact Assessment on the sites and noted that during a meeting held with Kazakhstan, the State Party fully recognized the issues and challenges and is taking measures. Turkey proposed some minor amendments to the decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** shared the evaluation of the Secretariat and ICOMOS both on the negative and positive sides and supported the recommendation that Kazakhstan puts a moratorium on the road construction. Portugal acknowledged that, according to Turkey, Kazakhstan apparently recognizes the issue but maintained that there is a need for concrete action.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** acknowledged the difficulties that a property spanning such a vast area entails and supported the remarks made by ICOMOS.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that she had received an amendment proposal from Turkey and presented the amendments.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.34** was adopted as amended.

Fujisan, sacred place and source of artistic inspiration (Japan) (C 1418) – 40 COM 7B.39

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation of the property.

ICOMOS noted that the State Party has undertaken all the recommendations put forth by ICOMOS and that the revised management plan is now a comprehensive document with a realistic vision that promotes sustainable relationships between people and Fujisan. ICOMOS suggested that the multidisciplinary work undertaken is exemplary.

The Delegation of **Portugal** shared what has been presented by the Secretariat and ICOMOS. The plan should be commended and be considered as best practice, especially in terms of local level and community engagement.

The Delegation of **Poland** welcomed the engagement of the State Party and remarked that the management plan should be considered as an example. Poland therefore asked for the report as well as the management plan to be submitted for review by the World Heritage Committee in the 42nd session.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party and supported the Draft Decision and comments by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat.

The Delegation of **Tukey** considered the great efforts by the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** expresses its sincere gratitude to the Committee members, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Japan referred to the participatory processes regarding conservation and management challenges and welcomed the idea of sharing their experience with other State Parties.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed by Poland.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.39** was adopted as amended.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C121bis) – 40 COM 7B.41

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation of the property.

ICOMOS acknowledged, also on behalf of ICCROM, the efforts made by the department of archaeology of Nepal following the extensive damage of the property after the earthquake and advised to consult experts of traditional building methods in the rehabilitation process. The State of Conservation included both ascertained and potential damage. It was stressed that ICCROM and ICOMOS are eager to use new approaches and technologies in the rebuilding of the property, including a cyclical renewal approach recommended by the Reactive Monitoring mission. ICOMOS stressed that the damage was a result of the earthquake and not the result of a lack of action by the State Party. ICOMOS deemed the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger as appropriate and in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** welcomed the State Party's efforts and supported the amendments and the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Philippines recalled that despite the earthquake many properties are still standing and requested more information on this from the State Party. The Philippines supported the plan for recovery with the involvement of the local communities and submitted amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** recalled its own experience with damage caused by earthquakes and expressed its belief that the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger may have a positive effect in the recovery of the property, however since the property's Outstanding Universal Value is unharmed the decision can be postponed to next year when further information is presented. Portugal expressed concern over the negative stance in the Missionary Report towards the use of more resilient, less authentic material in the reconstruction.

The **Chairperson** noted that more States Parties wished to take the floor and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting rose a 1pm.

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 13 July 2016

SIXTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 7. EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continuation)

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

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/7B
WHC/16/40.COM/7B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/7B.Add.2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.7 Rev

Decisions: 40 COM 7B.1 to 40 COM 7B.106

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C121bis) – 40 COM 7B.41 (continuation)

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the State Party and UNESCO to support the rehabilitation efforts at the World Heritage site following the natural disaster. The Delegation supported the postponement of the decision for Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger to allow the State Party to apply the new guidelines recently adopted.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** also supported the postponement of the Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in particular in view of the late arrival of the mission report to allow the State Party to review and implement the mission recommendation, supported by the Delegation of Indonesia and Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** referred to page 45 of the report on the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to the site in November 2015 and its suggestions, suggested to give another year to the State Party to continue the corrective measures and suggested postpone the decision of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the State Party conveyed a progress report at the next session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Finland** highlighted that the earthquake was a truly catastrophic event for this World Heritage property and that the inscription on the List of World

Heritage in Danger would be an excellent tool to help to conserve it and to draw the attention of the international community and therefore supported the original Draft Decision, supported by the Delegation of Poland.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** thanked the Secretariat for the mission report and acknowledged the measures that the State Party has taken in such short delays including the development of the rehabilitation guidelines. The Delegation therefore supports the decision to postpone the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegations of the **Republic of Korea, Jamaica, Kazakhstan, Tunisia, Turkey** and **Peru** supported the proposal of Azerbaijan.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled the discussion of the last World Heritage Committee and the reasons to postpone the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, namely to allow for a mission to assess the state of conservation of the property although the damage to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property were clear to the international community and this decision had already been critically received by the media thereby damaging the credibility of the World Heritage Committee as well as UNESCO, supported by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** commended the State Party in putting all its efforts into the continuous reservation and recovery of the heritage under the difficult situation. It also agreed to give more time to the State Party before inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party's work in restoration after the earthquake, supported a focus on the recovery master plan be shaped as a matter of urgency, recommended the postponement of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tunisia** commended the achievement of State Party in short period under the guidance of State Party, agreed to postpone the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to further encourage the State Party and requested an evaluation mission to be sent to the site.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the postponement of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Turkey** welcome and appreciated the work of State Party and applauded for the international support, joined the consensus for giving another year.

The Delegation of **Peru** commended the progress achieved by the State Party, supported for the postponement of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** acknowledged that the criteria for the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger has been satisfied but that the tool of the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger is only effective if the concerned State Party sees it as an helpful tool and therefore supports the postponement of the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Poland** recalled the purpose of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, although it thought the property should be inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Delegation join the consensus.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** reconnaît les efforts mis en œuvre par l'État membre et encourage davantage d'efforts.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted the growing trend of States Parties trying to avoid the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation further clarified that the Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be considered a sign to the State Party to address the issues in the best possible way. The Delegation insisted that this point should be kept in mind for the Committee's deliberations at the next session.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite informer que l'inscription d'un site en péril est prise par le Comité et non par le pays lui-même, mais note qu'il est préférable que l'État partie soit d'accord avec la décision du Comité, mais que des cas similaires se sont présentés par le passé.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported Lebanon's comments and confirmed that the *Operational Guidelines* do not indicate that the agreement of the State Party is required.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** assured the Committee that the State Party will honour its responsibilities under the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and reported on the measures taken to mitigate the impact of the earthquake including the elaboration of a 6 year rehabilitation plan. The Delegation further stated that it remained open to the continued cooperation with the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies as well as the Committee member.

The **Chairperson** noted that the majority of the Committee is in favour of the postponement of the decision to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and further invited ICOMOS to respond to the questions raised by the Committee members.

ICOMOS commented that Nepal's rapid reaction to this disaster should be recognized. It highlighted that the mission report gave a number of examples that the technical response to the conservation is requiring significant support and inputs since there is a lack of understanding for assessment of damage and reparation of traditional architecture. Clarified the Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would provide a helpful framework for all those involved and willing to help. Although many monuments are still standing but OUV is at risk. ICOMOS understands the State Party sees very little benefit for the postponement of the decision for the OUV, but there would be a significant benefit in terms of the intention of the global community, access to funds, the framework that would be provided by the desired state of conservation report and the corrective measures.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed by the Philippines, Indonesia and the Republic of Korea.

The Delegation of **Portugal** provided further comments and proposed an amendment to Paragraph 11.

The **Secretariat** and **ICOMOS** confirmed the mission should be a joint mission.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.41** was adopted as amended.

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

**Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708) – 40 COM 7A.29
(continuation)**

The **Chairperson** announced that the drafting group constituted yesterday to discuss the Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.29** on the **Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia)** has finished its work and is in a position to present a Draft Decision.

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

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments to Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 submitted by the Delegation of Kazakhstan and noted that this proposal had been made in consultation with ICOMOS and the State Party.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.29** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Delegation of Georgia for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171) – 40 COM 7B.43

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation of the property and specified that this report is opened for discussion in view of the current Orange Line Metro Train Project.

ICOMOS presented its comments on the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** thanked the Secretariat for the state of conservation report, which clearly highlighted the importance of linking conservation and community awareness. The Delegation asked the State Party of Pakistan to clarify the current status of the transport system.

La Délégation du **Liban** a pris en compte les erreurs factuelles par l'ICOMOS. Le Liban demande si cette ligne de métro affecte la visibilité du bien et indique qu'une étude de l'impact visuel est nécessaire pour qu'une décision soit prise.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted that this case illustrates the importance of balancing heritage preservation and economic development and trusted that the State Party will act responsibly in this regard. The Delegation also noted that a number of factual errors are contained in the state of conservation report which merit the revision of the Draft Decision. In addition, the Delegation requested the State Party of Pakistan to clarify which measures have been taken by the authorities to protect the Outstanding Universal Value and how they will fulfil the obligation under the *World Heritage Convention* in line with the domestic legislation, supported by the Delegation of Viet Nam, Azerbaijan and Kuwait.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that the state of conservation is affected by a number of issues but that the construction of the Orange Line is the most critical of all. The Delegation further encouraged the State Party of Pakistan to find a satisfactory solution of this modern infrastructure.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested the members of the World Heritage Committee to be coherent regarding the question of balance between development and preservation. The Delegation also asked a clarification to the Secretariat regarding the difference between a fact finding mission contained in the draft amendment and a Reactive Monitoring mission usually. The Delegation also requested clarifications from the Advisory Body ICOMOS if the factual errors alter the analysis on this matter.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** note que ce site est un cas typique de développement durable et de conservation du patrimoine. La solution qui sera trouvée pourrait être un exemple pour d'autres cas. La Tunisie demande quel impact précis ce projet aura sur la VUE et si l'État partie accepterait la venue d'une mission de suivi réactif.

The Observer Delegation of **Pakistan** addressed factual errors contained in the state of conservation report regarding the distance of the proposed metro line to the property and noted that the authorities had made efforts to avoid the impact of the metro line on the Outstanding Universal Value, including a deviation of the metro line at significant costs and the establishment of a *de facto* buffer zone at national level.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recalled the history of inscription as well as the placement of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and noted that the metro line would be indeed a major threat to the property.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** noted that, taking into account the criteria for which the site was inscribed, the metro construction is a most delicate issue for this property and requested the Secretariat and the Advisory Body to provide advice how to make the metro compatible with World Heritage status.

ICOMOS highlighted that the mission only makes sense if there is a genuine opportunity to change the project. ICOMOS acknowledged the factual errors regarding the distance contained in the report, but maintained that the actual distances still mean that the metro line would be in the field of vision to and from the property. In addition, regarding the distance to the water tanks there might be an issue of syntax. ICOMOS further regretted that there is no official buffer zone for the World Heritage property which could have been a helpful tool. Finally, ICOMOS clarified that despite the factual errors, the analysis still stands true.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified the difference between a fact-finding mission and a Reactive Monitoring mission and explained that in previous versions of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Reactive Monitoring mission was called fact-finding mission.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments proposed by Turkey and Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Turkey** explained that it had understood that the State Party was ready to receive a fact-finding mission, because such a mission did not take place for the preparation of this report.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted the Rapporteur's statement that the term "fact-finding mission" did not exist, so that the two options for the Draft Decision were either a Reactive Monitoring mission or an Advisory Mission. It indicated a preference for a Reactive Monitoring mission, but confirmed its agreement with the consensus. The Delegation supported the original text as amended by Lebanon and agreed to the other amendments proposed by Turkey.

The Delegations of **Finland, Poland, Tunisia, Viet Nam, Cuba, Azerbaijan, United Republic of Tanzania, the Philippines** and **Kuwait** supported the amendments proposed by Turkey and Lebanon and supported by Portugal.

The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption of the Draft Decision as amended, paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** advised that the numbering of paragraphs needed to be changed. It also requested to stick to the official terms mentioned in the *Operational Guidelines* with regard to Paragraph 6 and to keep the wording "Reactive Monitoring mission".

The Delegation of **Turkey** clarified that it wanted an Advisory Mission.

The request from Turkey was supported by the Delegations of **Kuwait, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan** and **Tunisia**.

The Delegation of **Poland** stated that it wanted a Reactive Monitoring mission.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** supported Poland's request.

The Delegation of **Portugal** repeated that it would join any consensus with a preference for a Reactive Monitoring mission.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** asked the Secretariat to clarify the difference between the two types of mission.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the two different missions were defined in Paragraph 28 of the *Operational Guidelines*. She noted that contrary to Advisory Missions, Reactive Monitoring missions were part of the statutory reporting by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to the Committee, whereas Advisory Missions were voluntarily initiated and funded by the State Party concerned.

The Delegation of **Finland** considered a Reactive Monitoring mission would be more appropriate in this case and was supported by the Delegations of **Peru, Jamaica** and **Angola**.

The Delegation of **Peru** added that both types of missions had a cooperative nature, involving close cooperation from the State Party in order to improve the conservation of the property.

The **Chairperson** asked whether those in favour of an Advisory Mission could agree to a Reactive Monitoring mission instead.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** déclare qu'elle rejoindra le consensus.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also indicated that it would join the consensus.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.43** was adopted as amended.

Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143) – 40 COM 7B.44 Rev

The **Secretariat** recalled that no state of conservation report had been received from the State Party, and that the Reactive Monitoring mission observed that neglect and inadequate maintenance and protection for a long time resulted in a serious deterioration of important attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, threatening its integrity. The Secretariat explained that in order to harmonize Draft Decisions submitted to the Committee, it had been decided after thorough discussions with the Advisory Bodies to propose only option A, which would give a delay before inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, possibly at the 41st session in 2017.

ICOMOS noted with concern the findings of the 2016 Reactive Monitoring mission. Despite the recommendations of two previous Reactive Monitoring missions (2006 and 2012), no major conservation works were carried out for at least a decade. The installation of crack monitors, a weather station and soil investigations had not occurred despite repeated requests from the Committee. The serious condition of the property, the lack of management and adequate governance needed to be addressed urgently to prevent threats to the attributes sustaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that this case illustrated the usefulness of Reactive Monitoring missions. It believed that Pakistan would do its utmost to fully address the recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring mission and solve the currently existing problems and agreed to postpone a possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger until 2017.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** supported option A.

The Delegation of **Finland** deeply regretted that the State Party did not submit a State of Conservation report to the Committee and noted that only a few recommendations made by the earlier monitoring missions had been implemented so far and that to date the State Party had addressed only very few short or long term conservation issues at the property. Nevertheless, it agreed to support Option A.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted the loss of integrity and the lack of conservation work at the site over the last decade. It expressed its concerns regarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and asked to inscribe it on the World Heritage List in Danger under Option A.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments made to the Draft Decision. Option B of the original decision was deleted and in Paragraph 9 the deadline for the submission of a report by the State Party was changed from December to February 2017, for the property to be reviewed at the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee with regard to a possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.44** was adopted as amended.

Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451) – 40 COM 7B.47

The **Secretariat** recalled that the main issues at the property were related to the development of the Port of Galle. The ICOMOS Advisory Mission encouraged by the Committee in order to consider the potential impact of the Port project did not take place. It was therefore proposed in the Draft Decision to request a joint WHC/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission. But after the sending of the working document, the State Party invited the ICOMOS Advisory Mission, which was currently taking place from 11 to 15 July 2016. Thus the Secretariat and ICOMOS were proposing to remove the mention of the joint WHC/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission in Paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

ICOMOS noted that the port facility had been considerably reduced in size and would serve only the tourism cruise market. The results of the Heritage Impact Assessment were generally positive, but it stressed the need for underwater investigations so that maritime heritage is appropriately managed. Some substantive management matters remained unresolved, including timing and funding for implementation of the integrated management system. A sustainable tourism strategy was necessary to promote the cultural values of the property and develop benefits for the local communities. It stressed the use of the current Advisory Mission to address all these issues.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the State Party to have halted the port development. It highlighted the importance of international cooperation with regard to underwater cultural heritage and expressed its interest to develop such a project with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended the State Party on the Heritage Impact Assessment undertaken, the development of a Management Plan and the rescaling of the port. It regretted that the recommendations regarding the extension of buffer zones were still ignored. It noted that such an extension was furthermore not included in the Draft Decision and asked ICOMOS for clarification whether this aspect was still relevant. The Delegation concluded that a Heritage Impact Assessment is only relevant if its recommendations are taken into consideration. It stated that it saw no need for a site mission, which should be left at the appreciation of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked the State Party for the reduction of the scale of the development project. It expressed its interest in the Heritage Impact Assessment prepared and proposed a wider dissemination of the document as a good practice.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated the State Party on balancing heritage conservation and port development, and welcomed the invitation of a Reactive Monitoring mission.

ICOMOS clarified that an Advisory Mission was currently taking place and that the boundary clarification issue was part of the current mission. It noted the view of the State Party that the values of its underwater cultural heritage was not part of the values for which the property was inscribed, it considered that it should not prevent this maritime archaeological heritage to be included in the buffer zone. It agreed that it was important to implement the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment and that a maritime archaeologist should be appointed.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee about an amendment made by the Delegation of Viet Nam, which deleted the mention of a Reactive Monitoring mission to replace it by an acknowledgment of the ICOMOS Advisory Mission, which was taking place simultaneously with the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee. A new Paragraph 7 was proposed to allow the State Party to start the port project before the expiry of the funding time line of the project if the observation of the current mission allowed.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** asked the Secretariat, regarding the content of new Paragraph 7 which authorized the State Party to start the Port Project before next Committee session, whether there was a precedent to such a decision.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed that she could not recall such a wording in past decisions, but that the records would have to be checked.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** asked for clarification what “expiry of funding time line” in new Paragraph 7 meant.

The Delegation of **Sri Lanka** (Observer) explained that the funding time line expired in May 2017. It stated that the State Party was currently developing measures to implement the recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment. It recalled that the current mission was discussing a sustainable tourism strategy as well as a time line which would be submitted to the Secretariat shortly. The Delegation asked whether an approval could be given for the development work to go ahead as the funding time line would be expired by the next session.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** acknowledged the concerns of Sri Lanka and noted that the formulation of Paragraph 7 was not adequate. It asked to postpone the examination of the decision in order to find a better wording and to give the State Party a possibility to use their funding within the timeline.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it agreed to examine the Draft Decision tomorrow morning.

The Delegation of **Peru** noted that the proposal by Lebanon concerned only Paragraph 7, and considered that the rest of the Draft Decision could be adopted.

The **Chairperson** agreed but clarified that without Paragraph 7, she could not proceed with the adoption of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Peru** proposed to adopt the Draft Decision except Paragraph 7, to look at this paragraph the day after and then adopt the whole Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared that all paragraphs were adopted except Paragraph 7 which needed to be redrafted. She declared that the Committee would come back to the decision the next day.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** came back to the question raised by Lebanon and noted that an earlier decision regarding the Douro Valley (Portugal) included a similar issue. The new Draft Decision could therefore be drafted in a similar way.

The **Chairperson** deferred the adoption of the entire Draft Decision until the new text was prepared.

Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz (Uzbekistan) (C 885) – 40 COM 7B.48

The **Secretariat** explained that the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to the property (28-31 March 2016) observed that major interventions had already been carried out, involving the demolition of buildings on 70 ha in the medieval quarters, which represented 30% of the urban fabric located in the boundaries on the property. No comprehensive management plan was in place. An inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would allow for a thorough assessment on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value and whether mitigation corrective measures could be defined or whether the authenticity and integrity were irreversibly affected. The State Party stated in a letter dated 5 July 2016 that it would welcome a Reactive Monitoring mission.

ICOMOS recalled that the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List not only because of the monuments themselves, but also because of the overall urban planning as a testimony of the Timurid period which was remarkably intact. It regretted that now considerable destructions had taken place, destroying 70 ha. A Reactive Monitoring mission is urgently needed to assess whether the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value survived and how far the urban centre could still be seen as having coherence and integrity.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** referred to the inscription dossier, which stated that in 2,000, most of the buildings were well preserved. It recalled different national acts that were protecting the site even before inscription on the World Heritage List. The Delegation was deeply upset and noted that the pictures of the city now resembled post-war Beirut. It regretted that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property had probably disappeared. A Reactive Monitoring mission should go there and might try to find a way to change completely the Outstanding Universal Value, i.e. as a group of monuments and no longer as a city. It stressed that the site needed to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that developments and reconstructions had a negative impact on authenticity and integrity of the property. It supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Portugal** recalled that an inscription on the World Heritage List required the will of the State Party to preserve the site's Outstanding Universal Value for future generations, and that it had not been the case. It also noted that the destruction of the property was a deliberate action by a responsible State and agreed to the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It encouraged the State Party to cooperate with the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Finland** considered this site to be one of the most alarming cases not related to a conflict situation. It noted that the massive changes reported by the Reactive Monitoring mission almost spoke in favour of a deletion of the property from the World Heritage List. The inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was

as a first step for an assessment of the threats to the site's Outstanding Universal Value and the exploration of possibilities to reverse their effects. It supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** spoke in the same lines and asked whether there was a prospect of halting the development projects.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** considered the presence of Uzbekistan's Minister of Culture at the Committee session as a sign of the State Party's awareness. It noted that the State Party needed time to implement the recommendations and recalled that it was the first time this site was included in the state of conservation process. It recommended not to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger but to change the Draft Decision to alert the State Party with regard to a possible inscription of the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2017. It encouraged a new Reactive Monitoring mission and asked that the floor be given to the Uzbek Minister.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** regretted the developments on site and the non-compliance with decisions from previous years. It urged the State Party to engage with the Secretariat and ICOMOS to address the issues. It agreed to the inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Peru** considered that the Outstanding Universal Value was compromised to such an extent that the retention of the property on the List itself was under question. It agreed with the proposal for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** shared the concerns expressed by previous speakers regarding the irreversible damage incurred to the Outstanding Universal Value by demolition and rebuilding activities. It welcomed the readiness of the State Party to invite a Reactive Monitoring mission and to work in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development projects. The Delegation asked the Chairperson to give the floor to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Turkey** shared the concerns expressed by ICOMOS. It further acknowledged that the State Party had made efforts and already stopped further reconstruction. It supported the request for a mission and called upon giving the State Party an extra year before inscribing it on the World Heritage List in Danger.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stressed that this issue was a matter of credibility of this Committee. It strongly called upon the Committee not to deny the current state of affairs at the property.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** supported the inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger. It noted that even a deletion from the World Heritage List or a redefinition of the boundaries of the property needed to be considered in the future. The Advisory Bodies would have to help the State Party to see what could be done for the property.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** strongly supported the position expressed by the Delegation of Portugal and called upon the Committee to distinguish politics from heritage, this decision being one of heritage protection and not of politics. It requested that the Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger not to be postponed. *(applause)*

The **Minister of Culture of Uzbekistan** explained that the State Party put a specific emphasis on the conservation and transmission of tangible cultural heritage to future generations. It recalled that the results of studies assessing the impacts of the developments envisaged on the historic parts of the city had been discussed at various conferences organized in Uzbekistan with the assistance of UNESCO. In accordance with the recommendations of the scientific meetings, water drainage systems were introduced, pedestrian pathways were constructed, traditional houses and gardens were revitalized. It stressed that at present all construction and reconstruction works had been halted. Taking into account these efforts, it requested the Committee to withdraw Paragraph 6 which would inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Uzbekistan** (Observer) further added that the photos on the screen were inaccurate since the buildings inscribed were untouched and that only old houses had been demolished because of the threat they posed to the stability of historical monuments. It stressed that the construction of pedestrian ways was also made to preserve the historical monuments and expressed the State Party's willingness to receive a Reactive Monitoring mission.

The **Secretariat** noted that the images on the slides came from the Reactive Monitoring mission report, which had been sent to the State Party, and that no factual error letter had been submitted.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime que les autorités de l'Ouzbékistan ont une conception du patrimoine qui n'a rien à voir avec celle existant dans le cadre de cette *Convention*. La Valeur universelle exceptionnelle était représentée par tout le tissu urbain historique, et pas seulement par les monuments, et sa destruction équivaut à la destruction de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that an amendment was proposed by Kazakhstan, which deleted the proposition of inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and instead added the possible consideration of such a process in the future.

The Delegations of **Finland, Lebanon, Portugal, Jamaica, Poland** and **Peru** supported the original Draft Decision, without the amendment made by Kazakhstan.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.48** was adopted.

LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REGION FOR WHICH THE REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) (C 705) - 40 COM 7B.30

Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707ter) - 40 COM 7B.31

Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu (China) (C 704) - 40 COM 7B.32

The Grand Canal (China) (C 1443) - 40 COM 7B.33

Hill Forts of Rajasthan (India) (C 247rev) - 40 COM 7B.35

Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593) - 40 COM 7B.36

Masjed-e Jame of Isfahan (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 1397) - 40 COM 7B.37

Shahr-i Sokhta (Iran, Islamic Republic of) (C 1456) - 40 COM 7B.38

Pyu Ancient Cities (Myanmar) (C 1444) - 40 COM 7B.40

Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666rev) - 40 COM 7B.42

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C 722) - 40 COM 7B.45

Golden Temple of Dambulla (Sri Lanka) (C 561) - 40 COM 7B.46

All Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

ARAB STATES

Erbil Citadel (Iraq) (C 1437) – 40 COM 7B.23 (continued)

The **Chairperson** invited the Iraqi Ambassador to comment on the property of Erbil Citadel (Iraq), which was presented on the third day of the Committee and for which the Draft Decision had been adopted.

The Delegation of **Iraq** (Observer) thanked ICOMOS for its valuable report, the World Heritage Centre for the follow-up on Erbil Citadel, as well as Committee members and UNESCO Members States for their support. It considered that the Erbil Citadel had become immune to the threats from terrorists thanks to the international support. The Iraqi and local governments were seeking to strengthen the conservation activities in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Office in Iraq. The Delegation committed to submitting a full report in 2017 on the measures implemented. It stressed the will of Iraq to do its best to implement all the recommendations concerning this property and to inscribe the cultural sites of Mesopotamia on the World Heritage List.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced the Side Events to be held in the evening.

The meeting rose at 6.30pm.

FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY 14 July 2016

SEVENTH MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continuation)

The **Chairperson** recalled the order for the items to be examined, i.e. first Item 7A for the revised Draft Decision on Niokolo-Koba National Park and the small amendment on the Draft Decision on Virunga National Park, then Item 7B with Libyan sites, the revised the Draft Decision for the Old Town of Galle, followed by the European and North American sites in the normal order (cultural, mixed and natural sites). She also recalled that consultations should take place outside the plenary meeting room.

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153) – 40 COM 7A.46 (continuation)

The **Chairperson** explained that the text of the revised Draft Decision had been prepared and was currently being distributed in the room.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.46** was adopted as amended.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63) - 40 COM 7A.41 (continuation)

The **Chairperson** explained that the text of the revised Draft Decision had been prepared.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.41** was adopted as amended.

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

Documents WHC/16/40.COM/7B
WHC/16/40.COM/7B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/7B.Add.2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.7 Rev

Decisions: **40 COM 7B.1 to 40 COM 7B.106**

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

**Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) (C 451) - 40 COM 7B.47
(continuation)**

The **Chairperson** explained that the text of the revised Draft Decision had been prepared.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.47** was adopted as amended.

ARAB STATES

General Decision on Libyan sites – 40 COM 7B.106

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Delegation of Lebanon had requested the Secretariat to prepare a new Draft Decision in view of inscribing all five World Heritage sites in Libya on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and that this new Draft Decision was circulated the preceding day.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the new Draft Decision, recalling that it was related to the discussions on heritage in conflict situations which would be discussed under Item 7. She noted that the Director of Antiquities in Libya was contacted.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** explained that under Item 7B, there was a high concern regarding the state conservation of the two Libyan sites open for discussion (Cyrene and Tadrart Acacus) as well as regarding the security conditions prevailing at the sites. The Delegation indicated that due to the lack of reliable information, there was no report on the state of conservation on the three other World Heritage properties in Libya, but that according to information provided by the Libyan authorities, these properties are under threat because of various armed groups. The Delegation of Lebanon therefore suggested that the Committee take a decision to include all Libyan World Heritage properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as it was previously done for World Heritage sites in Syria, Iraq and Yemen, and in line with

Article 11.4 of the *World Heritage Convention*. It added that the corresponding Draft Decision was prepared by Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies.

Le **Secrétariat** précise que l'État partie de la Libye fait face à une situation de conflit et que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et ses partenaires sont mobilisés pour l'aider. Le Secrétariat indique qu'une réunion internationale d'experts s'est tenue à Tunis en mai 2016, afin de faire l'état des lieux du patrimoine culturel en Libye, et qu'elle a permis de collecter des informations préoccupantes concernant les sites, de mettre à jour la nécessité de sécuriser les sites et de renforcer les capacités. Le Secrétariat ajoute que le résultat le plus satisfaisant a été d'amorcer une dynamique de coopération et de rassembler les experts de toutes les parties prenantes dans un pays divisé. Il conclut en indiquant que bien que les sites libyens n'aient pas encore subi de destructions irréversibles, la menace réelle justifie leur inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

L'**ICOMOS**, après examen des informations reçues, soutient la demande d'inscription sur la Liste en péril de tous les sites libyens.

The Delegation of **Portugal** fully supported the new Draft Decision which addressed dramatic issues more or less the same as Iraq. It thanked the Delegation of Lebanon to have taken this initiative.

Les Délégations de la **Tunisie** et du **Koweït** remercient le représentant de la Délégation du **Liban** d'avoir proposé ce projet de décision car la Libye a de réelles difficultés à sécuriser ses biens et s'est par ailleurs, engagée dans un processus de formation et de conservation.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) soutient ce projet de décision et souligne qu'en plus du patrimoine monumental, les objets d'art doivent également être préservés. La Délégation informe le Comité qu'une tête sculptée venue de Cyrène a été récupérée grâce au Directeur des antiquités israéliennes et sera remise aux autorités libyennes le 30 septembre prochain lors du prochain Comité de la Convention de 1970, avec le concours du Musée du Louvre.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Delegation of France for the information given and recalled that both Committees and the Chairpersons of the 1972 and 1970 Conventions worked hand in hand.

The **Rapporteur** read out the only amendment received from the Delegation of Tunisia.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.106** was adopted as amended.

Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libya) (C 190) - 40 COM 7B.24

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'État partie n'a pas soumis de rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien malgré les informations inquiétantes reçues l'année dernière relatives à des constructions illégales à l'intérieur du bien, à l'augmentation de l'empiètement urbain et au vandalisme. Le Département des antiquités et les autorités locales responsables tentent de réduire l'impact négatif des constructions sur le bien mais le Secrétariat demeure inquiet quant à la capacité de l'État partie à protéger le site dans la situation actuelle du pays. Le Secrétariat considère qu'il faut d'urgence mettre en œuvre les mesures prises et envoyer une mission sur le site dès

que possible. Il indique également que la décision est amendée afin de coïncider avec la Décision générale prise sur les cinq sites libyens.

L'**ICOMOS** reconnaît que la situation actuelle n'est pas favorable à la mise en œuvre des décisions visant à protéger le site et prend note des destructions de tombes monumentales et de l'empiètement urbain. Il soutient la décision de renforcer les capacités et se félicite de l'engagement de la société civile, tout aussi déterminant que celui de la communauté internationale.

The **Rapporteur** read out the only amendment, which derives from the General Decision on Libyan sites and proposes the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.24** was adopted as amended.

Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libya) (C 287) - 40 COM 7B.25

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'État partie n'a pas fourni de rapport et que les seules informations disponibles proviennent de la réunion de Tunis : Il semble qu'il n'y ait pas eu de nouveaux actes de vandalisme sur les peintures rupestres depuis 2009. Par contre, le bien étant un point de passage pour nombre de migrants, les gardiens n'ont pas les moyens de le protéger et l'engagement de la communauté locale des Touaregs est insuffisant. Les informations sont préoccupantes et l'État partie devrait d'urgence fournir des informations actualisées et ne prendre aucune mesure corrective sur le traitement des graffiti, sans consulter préalablement le Centre et les Organisations consultatives et, d'autre part, l'envoi d'une nouvelle mission conjointe WHC/ICOMOS serait souhaitable. Il indique également que la décision est amendée afin de coïncider avec la Décision générale prise sur les cinq sites libyens.

L'**ICOMOS** constate avec regret que la situation actuelle n'est pas favorable à la restauration de l'art rupestre et souhaite recevoir, dès que la situation le permettra, des informations actualisées.

The **Rapporteur** read out the only amendment, which derives from the General Decision on Libyan sites and proposes the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.25** was adopted as amended.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Historic Centre of Vienna (Austria) (C 1033) - 40 COM 7B.49

The Delegation of **Lebanon** explained that the issue of development pressure on the Historic Centre of Vienna threatening its Outstanding Universal Value was an old story and recalled that at the time of inscription in 2001, the Committee insisted on controlling heights and volumes of the development projects in order not to impair the visual integrity of the property. Less than one year later, the Municipality of Vienna had delivered a permit for several towers which would affect the centre's cityscape. Following threats from the Committee to start the process for delisting of the property, the project was modified in order to better preserve the city's skyline, but

the Committee was forced to accept the almost completed Vienna City Tower (80 m), which was described as an error and a bad example in urban planning. This was the starting point of the reflection of the Committee on the Historical Urban Landscapes, which led ultimately to the adoption of the related HUL Recommendation in 2011. The Delegation pointed out that 15 years later, the same story was repeating itself and indicated that the Vienna City Council adopted in 2014 the “High Rise Concept” project, including the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel project, which was purely speculative and not a public service project, and hence highly questionable. The Delegation considered that the Committee could not accept once again a “fait accompli” and should send a clear message to Vienna Municipal authorities. It stressed that both the “High Rise Concept” project and the “Glacis Master Plan” adopted by the Municipality Council in December 2014 should be cancelled, since both plans would irremediably affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The **Secretariat** explained that it had been receiving lots of letters from civil society expressing concerns about the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel development project, and that these letters were all forwarded to the State Party. On 19 May 2016, the State Party sent a letter informing the World Heritage Centre of its decision not to pursue the land use planning procedures regarding the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel Vienna – Konzerthaus development project. In another letter dated 7 July 2016, the State Party further explained that an independent Advisory Board of Architecture commissioned by the City of Vienna pointed out the need to adapt the current plans of the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel Vienna – Konzerthaus development project in order to ensure their compatibility with the World Heritage status. The letter also mentioned that a Strategic Impact Environmental Assessment would be conducted according to Austrian law, as well as a Heritage Impact Assessment with a 3D visualization of the amended projects.

ICOMOS recalled that the development projects reached a critical level and threatened the integrity and authenticity of the property. The planning regulations and guidelines adopted by the Municipality Council, allowing for increased building height and density, were inconsistent with the historic built form and would adversely affect the cityscape. The cumulative impacts of the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel Vienna – Konzerthaus development project would irreversibly affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. ICOMOS welcomed the recent initiatives of the State Party to halt the projects and to ensure their compatibility with attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value, which could be acknowledged by the Committee, but noted that the Committee should also confirm that the building height should be reduced at the level recommended by the 2012 Reactive Monitoring mission. ICOMOS insisted that it would be also essential and urgent to change the planning documents and guidelines to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, since the current ones enabled for the conception of these highly inappropriate projects.

The Delegation of **Portugal** fully concurred with what was said by the Delegation of Lebanon and supported the revised Draft Decision. It recalled that all issues related to heritage preservation versus economic and social developments should be treated in the same consistent way, for the sake of the credibility of the Committee. It also concurred with ICOMOS that the issue was not only related to a specific project, but to the whole approach and the legal framework supporting it.

The Delegation of **Poland** was alarmed not only by the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel Vienna project, but also by the planning provisions allowing for a significant increase in building height and density within the property and its buffer zone. It recalled that this could have also a direct impact on the property of Schönbrunn, as well as indirect impacts on other World Heritage properties. The Delegation recalled that many countries looked at European historic centres as standard-setting places for heritage protection and noted that while city centres are living sites with high demands, the Viennese approach might not be the right one.

La Délégation du **Pérou**, attentive à l'intervention du Secrétariat fournissant des informations complémentaires à celles fournies dans le rapport écrit de l'ICOMOS, considère que l'État partie a pris des mesures pour atténuer les menaces liées à ces projets mais que l'augmentation de la densité et du volume des établissements urbains à l'intérieur du centre-ville débouche sur un risque d'impact négatif sur le bien. Elle ajoute qu'il faudrait que l'État partie procède à une pleine mise en œuvre des décisions prises par le Comité. La Délégation considère que le Comité devrait prendre une décision cohérente et appuie pleinement le projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that with the case of Vienna, the Committee would be addressing again the issues of visual integrity and visual impact in a developing urban environment, which were very challenging. It recalled that ICOMOS was in the process of updating its guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments. It further noted that without a good guidance, these issues might be dealt with on an emotional basis or without a common approach.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported what had been said by the Delegations of Lebanon and Portugal. It recalled the lessons learnt from the projects foreseen in Istanbul which had been postponed and amended, which induced loss of time and money. It noted that the city of Vienna considered that the development projects would not impact negatively the Outstanding Universal Value of the property because of the consultations currently undertaken and that the final decision would be made later in 2016, implying that, if approved, construction would only start in 2018. It finally recalled that the city of Vienna stated that stopping the projects at this time did not seem feasible. Given the information given by Vienna Municipality on one hand, and the content of the report on the state of conservation of the property on the other hand, the Delegation considered that a strong message should be sent to the authorities of Vienna to follow the criteria and guidelines set by the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** agreed with previous speakers and supported the Draft Decision in order to send a strong message to the Vienna authorities.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** wanted to add a small paragraph in the Draft Decision to acknowledge the strong commitment of the State Party to stop the constructions and revise the projects. It asked whether the Secretariat could draft a small paragraph in order to adopt the amended Draft Decision later on during the day.

The **Chairperson** asked whether ICOMOS could draft a paragraph along these lines and present it to the Committee when it would be ready.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments. She brought the attention of the Committee that Paragraph 9 which already took into account what Lebanon suggested.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** agreed that this paragraph was sufficient and asked ICOMOS whether that it would be possible to request, in Paragraph 11, an updated report by February 2017 instead of December 2017, because it feared that it may already be too late by that point.

ICOMOS suggested adding to Paragraph 9, sub-paragraph a): “to comply with the recommendations of the 2012 mission report”, so that there would be no doubt on the height restriction that should apply. ICOMOS also fully agreed with the Delegation of Lebanon that the timing should be changed. It finally suggested giving the floor to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Austria** (Observer) fully supported the Draft Decision as amended. It recalled that the report of the 2015 mission was discussed with the Municipality of Vienna. A representative of the municipality further explained that at the end of May 2016, following a meeting with the World heritage Centre, the Vienna Ice Skating Club – Intercontinental Hotel Vienna – Konzerthaus development project was temporarily put on hold to rethink it, taking into account both the results of the 2015 mission and the advice of the independent advisory body for city planning. The Delegation indicated that exclusion zones would be also redefined and agreed that a report could be prepared for February 2017.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.49** was adopted as amended.

Venice and its Lagoon (Italy) (C 394) – 40 COM 7B.52

The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled that the campaign to rescue Venice, which was threatened by dramatic floods in the mid-sixties, was one of the first of this type launched by UNESCO and paved the way for the birth of the idea of the *World Heritage Convention*. It also noted that the state of conservation of Venice, which had been worsening over time and now reached a critical level, had never been discussed by the World Heritage Committee since its inscription. It also considered that, since Venice illustrated in an extensive manner the issues faced by historic cities, the Committee needed to act quickly. It suggested that a new rescue campaign be launched.

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que la première mission conjointe de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine/UICN/RAMSAR a eu lieu en octobre 2015 et que le rapport a été transmis à l'État partie en juin 2016. Les principales menaces relevées sont les constructions et transformations dans la ville historique, les grands projets d'aménagement proposés sur le pourtour de la lagune ainsi que l'extension de l'aéroport et des nouveaux terminaux portuaires, qui peuvent induire une grave détérioration des systèmes écologiques et culturels de la lagune ainsi que de la cohérence architecturale et urbanistique de la ville historique. Le Secrétariat précise cependant que des progrès ont été réalisés par l'État partie, mais que le Centre a reçu des informations émanant de la société civile qui témoignent de sa vive préoccupation quant à l'état de conservation du bien et soulignent son aggravation depuis la mission. Il précise que le bien a été examiné lors de la 38e session du Comité.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the state of conservation of Venice was discussed by the Committee in 1989 and in 2014, and that a Reactive Monitoring mission was requested in 2014 and its report now in front of the Committee.

ICOMOS recalled that Venice was not inscribed as a city, but as a city made of islands around the lagoon. In 2014, the Committee raised concerns on infrastructure projects and on the impact of tourism on the hydro-geological balances of the lagoon. The 2015 Reactive Monitoring mission found that although considerable progress had been made by the State Party to develop a management plan, many large-scale developments threatened the property and, if implemented, would cause irreversible changes in the relationship between the city and its lagoon. The overexploitation of the city by tourism could lead to substantial loss in authenticity and integrity, in both material and immaterial terms, and in a lack of resilience of the communities living and working in the city. ICOMOS considered that a new vision for the overall city and its lagoon, a full review of planning regulations and a tourism strategy were needed.

La Délégation du **Koweït** rappelle que Venise est un joyau pour la planète et veut remercier l'Italie qui aide financièrement nombre d'États présents dans la salle. Elle précise qu'il faut faire confiance à l'État partie et souhaite qu'il soit entendu.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** considered that a clear balance should be kept between conservation on one side and development and tourism projects on the other side. It recalled the involvement of the State Party in heritage protection. It finally considered that the State Party had both the capacities and the will to mitigate the threats in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that this case was very similar to previous ones, with the tension between economic development and preservation. It trusted that the State Party would take the situation seriously and that corrective measures would be in place very soon. It supported the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed concerns with regard to the threats affecting Venice. It considered that despite the measures already taken by the authorities of Venice, many more solutions should be found to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It supported the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'associe aux États parties qui ont soutenu la volonté de l'Italie de maintenir la valeur du bien et la remercie de son soutien en faveur des pays de la méditerranée dans la sauvegarde de leurs sites. Elle propose un amendement au Paragraphe 10 de projet de décision pour envisager l'inscription en péril en 2018 plutôt qu'en 2017.

The Delegation of **Croatia** shared the concerns expressed by the previous speakers. It would like to hear from the State Party which measures it was taking and what was its short-term plan.

La Délégation du **Pérou** insiste sur le fait que Venise est le plus emblématique des sites de la Liste du patrimoine mondial mais qu'il est néanmoins clair qu'il existe d'importants problèmes sur le plan de la gestion. Elle considère qu'il est indispensable de mettre en œuvre les différentes recommandations du Comité mais se montre confiante quant au fait que l'État partie pourra faire face aux problèmes rencontrés.

The Delegation of **Poland** shared the concerns expressed by the previous speakers. It fully supported the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Turkey** shared the concerns expressed by the previous speakers. But it commended the efforts made by the State Party to raise extra-budgetary funding and try to make tourism a bit more sustainable in the city. Therefore it proposed to give it more time for reporting on expected progress, hoping there would be no need for considering inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger later on.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked Lebanon for having opened this case. It supported what had already been said by the Delegations of Portugal and Viet Nam.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** (Observateur) remercie le Comité pour l'attention réservée à Venise, symbole majeur de l'engagement collectif en faveur du patrimoine, et rappelle que l'Italie y a consacré de grandes ressources financières, humaines et scientifiques bien avant l'adoption de la *Convention* de 1972. L'État partie assure le Comité du patrimoine mondial de sa volonté et de sa capacité à protéger son patrimoine culturel et rappelle son engagement non seulement en Italie mais ailleurs dans le monde, comme le démontre la campagne « Unis pour le patrimoine », soulignant qu'il s'agit d'un devoir éthique et moral. La Délégation assure que les activités pour assurer la préservation de Venise et de sa lagune ont commencé et qu'un mécanisme national a été mis en place pour la gestion intégrée du site, notamment l'étude d'impact. La Délégation annonce le lancement, le 27 juillet prochain, du plan national du tourisme. Elle garantit également qu'un rapport exhaustif sur l'état de conservation du bien sera présenté dans les mois à venir.

The NGO **Europa Nostra** (Observer) underlined that the property is of highest value for Europe and is facing continuous threats. It recalled that the city of Venice and European investment bank institute declared on March 2016 that this property is the most endangered site in Europe a document was forwarded to UNESCO summarizing the main challenges and threats confronted by the property. It called for the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, supported the recommendations in the SOC reports and expressed its wishes to launch a new appeal together with UNESCO, to Italian authorities, to urgently adopt measures for the safeguarding of the City and its Lagoon. Europa Nostra kept the hope that Italian authorities at all level, with the involvement of civil society, will adopt a practical plan for the safeguarding of the city and the Lagoon. It believed that the EU-UN partnerships would be ready to live up to their responsibility. The representative stated that the Europa Nostra and other international cultural, natural and environmental NGOs stands at the disposal of UNESCO and Italian authorities to engage in consultation to ensure a more promising and sustainable future of the property.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** revient sur sa déclaration précédente, précisant qu'elle voulait dire 2017 et non 2018.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** reviewed the role UNESCO had played during the last 50 years, recalled the very substantial support provided to the State Party after the great flood in November 1966 and the establishment of the UNESCO Field Office of Venice. He stressed the rising new threats faced by Venice, which seemed to have lost its capacity of defining its future and addressing the challenges. He made a call to the international authorities to join efforts with the Government of Italy to help Venice defining the future direction and measures to be taken to ensure the survival of the property. The Assistant Director-General for Culture reiterated UNESCO's readiness to play its role.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.52** was adopted.

Auschwitz Birkenau - German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31) – 40 COM 7B.55

Le **Secrétariat** présente le bien et les informations additionnelles reçues de l'État Partie le 30 juin 2016. Le Secrétariat relève une erreur dans la version française du rapport sur l'état de conservation concernant la mission proposée, qui est une mission de conseil et non une mission de suivi réactif. Le Secrétariat propose notamment d'amender le projet de décision afin de refléter cette correction.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.55** was adopted as amended.

Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) – 40 COM 7B.61

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** reported to the Committee that it had been provided some additional information from Ukraine which gave the reason for the Delegation to request open the SOCs for discussion. The Delegation thanked the State party's efforts for regulating conservation and constructions issues at the property and its buffer zone and hoped the State Party would invite a joint Reactive Monitoring mission, welcome the fact of the management plan will be prepared with close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, in line with previous decision of the committee. The Delegation was not in favour of keeping the reference of "possible inscription of the property into the list of Heritage in Danger "before the joint Reactive Monitoring mission.

Le **Secrétariat** présente les nouvelles informations reçues de l'État partie après la publication du rapport sur l'état de conservation concernant les activités menées dans le monastère et rappelle que l'étude technique préparée par l'ICOMOS a été transmise à l'État partie le 22 juin dernier.

ICOMOS recalled the potential threats to the OUV and its integrity identified in the previous decision. Recognized the progress made by the State Party following the Reactive monitoring mission in 2013 and subsequent resolutions by the committee, regretted the State Party failed to finalize the management plan for the property and met part of the requests listed in the previous decisions. Regarding the Rehabilitation Activities Plan for the Monastery economic courtyard on the Far Caves of Kyiv-Pechersk Preserve, it suggested the committee to request the State Party to immediately halt any ongoing or planned construction/reconstruction works and also reiterated its request to the State Party to submit relevant documentation, including Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), to the World Heritage Centre, in line with Paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*, before any final decisions are made or any works start on major development projects within the property, its buffer zone and setting.

The Delegation of **Portugal** insisted the Committee should remain coherent and not have double standards.

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** shared the concern of the World Heritage Centre that the construction activities within the buffer zone of the property are not properly regarded, drew the attention of the committee to the draft law developed by the government on the monitoring construction activities with the buffer zone of World Heritage properties which has been implemented by the key local authorities. It

further drew the attention to the fact that the Centre and Advisory bodies were well informed prior to the reconstruction in 2013 and no objection was given, the same information was also provided in the 2015 SOC report. It underlined the reconstruction of the building does not affect the OUV. The State Party is ready to receive a joint Reactive Monitoring mission and requested the committee do not pre-judge before receive the outcome of the mission. The Deputy Mayor of Kiev City reiterated the Government's commitment for the protection of the property and its buffer zone and requested for a fair decision from the committee.

The Delegation of **Turkey** found the statement by the Deputy Mayor encouraging and expressed its appreciation to the effort made regarding management plan, the reduction of the height-limit of the non-confirming buildings in the buffer zone, noted the State Party is committed and cautious on new constructions. The Delegation supported the amended Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** presented the two amendments proposed by Azerbaijan and Viet Nam.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Portugal** suggested using the original phrasing of Paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its full support to the proposal of Portugal.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** stressed that the building is not in buffer zone according to the letter provided by the State Party.

La Délégation du **Pérou** propose d'examiner le Paragraphe 4 en dernier, afin que le Secrétariat informe le Comité de la situation factuelle de ces édifices.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of Paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 and moved on to Paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Portugal** considered it may be redundant to use "In line with the decision of World Heritage Committee and in accordance with the *World Heritage Convention*" in Paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** clarified its proposed amendment is just a linguistic improvement.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** accepted the proposal.

La Délégation du **Pérou** rappelle que la Délégation du Portugal pensait pouvoir accepter la rédaction actuelle et en conclut que le Comité pourrait donc accepter le Paragraphe 8 tel qu'amendé à l'origine.

The **Chairperson** adopted the Paragraph 8 as amended.

The **Rapporteur** obtained clarifications from Azerbaijan concerning the adoption of the original text of Paragraph 4.

The **Chairperson** declared the Paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** opened the debate on Paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** reminded the Committee to be careful with the way it treats similar situations. The Delegation indicated that it was in favour of the logical outcome and of the original phrasing of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** wished to retain the original paragraph to ensure the consistency with the other resolutions approved.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the proposals of Portugal and the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** raised the need to put everything in historical context before make any decision and joined the consensus on Paragraph 4. With regard to Paragraph 9, it stated that it agreed to a formulated and standard wording and suggested adding a word of appreciation to the State Party to encourage further efforts.

La Délégation du **Pérou** souhaite reprendre ce qu'a dit le Viet Nam et rappeler qu'au-delà d'un aspect théorique, ces recommandations ont un aspect pratique. Elle reconnaît qu'il faut saluer les pouvoirs publics d'avoir le courage de démolir une partie des édifices.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** pointed out there is no sentence in the *Operational Guidelines* that requests the Committee to notify the State Party before inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** recalled provisions for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger in the *Operational Guidelines* and clarified that it is up to the Committee, but that in many cases, a warning was given to the State Party so that it can comply with the Decisions of the Committee and avoid the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** expressed its support for the common practice regarding inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and requested that, as a first step, the State Party be informed of that intention, so that it can be prepared in advance. The Delegation agreed with the original text for Paragraph 9 and suggested that a sentence be inserted to explain the reason for notifying State Party.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** recalled the *Rules of Procedure* concerning the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and pointed out that the State Party does not have to be informed of the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger or the removal from the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Angola** acknowledged the efforts made by the State Party, concurred with the position of Portugal and agreed with the comments made by Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** agreed with Portugal and Finland that the original wording should be retained.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** joined the consensus.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** joined the consensus.

The **Chairperson** indicated that a majority was in favour of the original draft of Paragraph 9.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.61** was adopted as amended.

Ancient City of Tauric Chersonese and its Chora (Ukraine) (C 1411) – 40 COM 7B.62

The Delegation of **Poland** requested to give the floor to State Party to share important new information it provided to the Centre.

The Observer Delegation of **Ukraine** thanked Poland for initiating the debate and introducing the relevant amendments into the Draft Decision. It reported that a letter from the Minister of Culture of Ukraine addressed to the World Heritage Centre had been circulated and that, as it contained information on the state of conservation of the property, it had requested that the information be open to the public. It appreciated the concerns of the Committee and referred to the information provided in the letter, welcomed a Reactive Monitoring mission as soon as the situation allows, with the possible participation of experts from institutions of the State Parties. The mission report could be examined in the next Committee, with a view of considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment proposed by Poland.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed to the new Paragraph 3 and suggested to rephrase “the assessment can only be based on” in Paragraph 8, which is not limited to single resources.

La Délégation du **Pérou** indique qu’un tel paragraphe demanderait un amendement des *Orientations* et aurait une portée tout autre. Elle souhaite conserver le libellé d’origine.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the proposal made by Poland.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported the position of Peru.

The Delegation **Portugal** pointed out that ‘reiterates’ is inappropriate and suggested to delete the word ‘sole’.

The Delegation of **Angola** noted that the proposed addition is too limiting and proposed to keep the original text.

La Délégation du **Pérou** affirme que c’est une question complexe du point de vue juridique, signifiant que les informations de l’État partie sont une obligation pour les Organisations consultatives, alors qu’il s’avère parfois que ces informations sont jugées inappropriées.

ICOMOS and **IUCN** expressed their concern regarding the proposed amendment to Paragraph 8, as the report of Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies is based on variety of sources, and indicated that the current proposal is extremely limiting.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** agreed that there is no need to add an additional paragraph to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** supported the deletion, following the clarification of ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Croatia** supported the deletion, following the clarification of ICOMOS.

La Délégation de **Cuba** annonce que, suite aux informations fournies par l'ICOMOS, elle se rallie à la proposition visant à biffer ce paragraphe.

The **Chairperson** considered that there was a consensus on the amendment to Paragraph 8.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.62** was adopted as amended.

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

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Old City of Dubrovnik (Croatia) (C 95bis) – 40 COM 7B.50

Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey (Germany) (C1447) – 40 Com 7B.51

Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C994) – 40 COM 7B.53

Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125ter) – 40Com 7B.54

Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632) 40 COM 7B.56

Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation) (C1170) – 40 COM 7B.57

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544) – 40 Com 7B.58

Pergamon and its Multi-Layered Cultural Landscape (Turkey) (C 1457) – 40 COM 7B.59

Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape (Turkey) (C 1488) – 40 COM 7B.60

All Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

MIXED PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

The **Secretariat** read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion:

Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche (Mexico) (C/N 1061bis)

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.63** was adopted without discussion.

AFRICA

Cliff of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) (Mali) (C/N 516) – 40 COM 7B.64

Le **Secrétariat** présente son rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien et lance un appel à tous les États parties qui sont également parties à la Convention de 1970 concernant les mesures à prendre pour interdire et empêcher l'importation, l'exportation et le transfert de propriété illicites des biens culturels, et à soutenir le Mali dans sa lutte contre le commerce illicite.

ICOMOS pointed the huge challenge of strengthening the local community and ensuring the security of the property, underlined the need for management and conservation plans that would bring into consideration the socio-economic factors.

IUCN shared the concerns stated by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

The **Rapporteur** reported that no amendments had been submitted for this Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.64** was adopted.

ARAB STATES

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

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Wadi Rum Protected Area (Jordan) (C/N 1377)

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.65** was adopted without discussion.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Trang An Landscape Complex (Viet Nam) (C/N 1438) - 40 COM 7B.67

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that no additional information had been provided since the dispatching of the working document and invited IUCN to provide further comments.

IUCN informed the Committee of its meeting with the State Party, which clarified that no rock or mountain climbing occurs within the property and indicated that no additional recreational activities are foreseen in the property. IUCN considered that this should be further clarified and confirmed in the Management Plan, and welcomed the progress made by the State Party in addressing the concerns raised by the Committee regarding the boundaries of the property and for its initiative to host an international workshop on the revision of Management Plan, which was attended by IUCN and ICOMOS, and which was reflected in the amendments proposed by Indonesia.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** supported the points made by IUCN.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment proposed by Indonesia.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.67** was adopted as amended.

LIST OF CULTURAL PROPERTIES ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ASIA AND THE PACIFIC REGION FOR WHICH REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 quinquies)

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.66** was adopted without discussion.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

The **Secretariat** read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion:

Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia) (C/N 99ter) –

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.68** was adopted without discussion.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355) – 40 COM 7B.70

The Delegation of **Lebanon** presented its justification for opening the report for discussion.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that the World Heritage had received relevant information from the State Party on 11 July, concerning the signature, on 7 June 2016, of a Letter of Intent among the Administración de Parques Nacionales de Argentina, the Chico Mendes Institute in Brazil / the Iguaçu National Park in Brazil / and the Iguazú National Park in Argentina. This letter of intent contained provisions to strengthen cooperation among the relevant Brazilian and Argentinian authorities responsible for the protection of the Parks. The Secretariat also indicated that the Brazilian authorities transmitted a document containing information on the implementation of the conditions established by the Chico Mendes Institute in Brazil / for the approval of the environmental license to the construction of Baixo Iguaçu Project, / in conformity with the Recommendations made by the 2015 IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission. The State Party had further informed the Secretariat that the developer and the Chico Mendes Institute had developed an action plan to safeguard the aquatic and semi-aquatic species, as well as a risk management plan.

IUCN added that the recently signed letter of intent represented a significant step strengthening and formulizing the trans-boundary cooperation which was requested by the previous committee. ICUN indicated that this encouraging step should be used as an opportunity to ensure coordination between the relevant authorities in Brazil and in Argentina and to assess the potential impact for both properties.

The Delegation of **Portugal** appreciated the good news and congratulated Brazil and Argentina for strengthening their cooperation, congratulated Brazil for the progress, it trusts both Brazil and Argentina would work together to reinforce the cooperation and looking forward to the revised draft considering the significant development.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** commended the cooperation between Brazil and Argentina, welcomed the Letter of Intent and noted that the management plan for the property is being developed.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** joined Portugal and the Philippines in congratulating the two States Parties for joining forces in the conservation and implementation of the Committee's recommendations and supported the revision of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** welcomed the two State Parties' efforts to enhance cooperation.

La Délégation d'**Angola** soutient ces efforts réalisés par Brésil et l'Argentine, soulignant qu'il s'agit d'un bon exemple de coopération qui pourrait inspirer les autres États parties, et annonce soutenir fermement l'amendement.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** salue l'initiative du Liban de proposer ce bien pout discussion et s'aligne aux orateurs précédents pour féliciter les États parties d'avoir signé cette charte d'intention. Elle souhaite proposer une modification du

Paragraphe 9 de la décision précédente (**40 COM 7B.69**) et du Paragraphe 10 de la présente décision en ajoutant « appelle et encourage ».

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** noted the progress achieved by the States Parties and welcomed the signature of the Letter of Intent, and requested that it be reflected in the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** concurred with the other Committee members in supporting the Draft Decisions as amended.

La Délégation du **Pérou** se félicite de l'engagement du gouvernement brésilien et souligne l'importance de la lettre d'intention.

La Délégation du **Koweït** souhaite féliciter l'Argentine et le Brésil, donnant ainsi un exemple de la coopération mettant en avant l'intérêt général et donne son accord sur toutes propositions formulées.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments to the Draft Decision proposed by Finland and Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** proposed an amendment to Paragraph 10.

The Delegation of **Peru** endorsed the amendments proposed by Finland, Lebanon and Tunisia.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.70** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its gratitude to the Committee Members for granting the the State Party an opportunity to provide the new information on the national park and thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the constructive dialogue established for this property. The Delegation assured the Committee that the newly signed letter of intent will strengthen the cooperation between the two state parties and reassured its commitment to the protection of the property.

La Délégation du **Pérou** fait référence au projet de décision qui vient d'être adopté et souhaite établir un lien avec la décision **40 COM 7B.69** adoptée sans débat pour le bien Iguazú National Park située en Argentine, qu'il faudrait également modifier.

Upon the request and permission of the Committee, the Secretariat announced that the two Draft Decisions would be aligned by the Rapporteur to ensure consistency.

The meeting rose at 1pm.

FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY 14 July 2016

EIGHTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continuation)

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica/Panama) (N 205bis) – 40 COM 7B.72

The **Secretariat** presented its report on the state of conservation of this property and the additional information received from Panama and Costa Rica. This information contained the commitments expressed by the Ministry of Environment of Panama and the Ministry of Environment and Energy of Costa Rica to ensure the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee in previous decisions. The Secretariat emphasized that this information had been clarified in Istanbul by the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and the State Parties involved.

IUCN recalled that the Committee had noted during the last World Heritage Committee that any development of new hydropower projects would lead to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in danger. The construction of the new dam had been yet on-going and IUCN recognized that a number of additional steps were still required including the assessment of cumulative impacts of the construction. It welcomed dialogues and commitment expressed by the State's Parties to make progress on the state of the conservation of the property.

La Délégation **de Cuba** propose une modification du projet de décision qu'elle justifie par le fait que les deux pays ont continué à fournir des efforts pour répondre aux recommandations du Comité du patrimoine mondial tel que relevé par la mission de suivi réactif de janvier 2016. Elle cite les mesures entreprises par les deux États parties notamment le renforcement du cadre institutionnel, une évaluation environnementale stratégique au Panama qui sera également réalisée au Costa Rica, ce qui permettra une gestion adéquate de ce bien. La Délégation insiste sur l'intérêt de cette gestion bilatérale qui s'est établie depuis une vingtaine d'années et qui sera un exemple à suivre pour tous les autres biens transfrontaliers.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its concern on the development of the hydropower plants in Panama. It further noted with satisfaction that Panama and Costa Rica had been working together to improve their status, and encouraged both States Parties to further strengthen efforts to mitigate the negative impact that the construction of the dam could have and to closely monitor the site, involving the local communities and NGOs.

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime sa satisfaction quant aux correspondances de deux pays durant les mois de juin et de juillet, qui concrétisent un engagement qui devrait être pris pour exemple par les autres États parties et espère que cela permettra avec l'aide de l'UICN de préserver le bien.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the progress and efforts already made by the State Parties. It also acknowledged the commitment firmly made by both State Parties. It therefore recommended the State Parties would be given more time to implement the requested actions and the proposed that the site would not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the efforts made by the State Parties to work together on the joint programme and supported the call to give them more time to implement the new agreements and to ensure the implementation of the recommendations made regarding the property.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** appreciated the progress and negotiations made by the State Parties. It expressed its support to postponement of the consideration of inscribing the site on the endangered list.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** salue l'engagement des deux États parties en les encourageant à continuer leur coopération et choisi l'option de donner plus de temps à Panama et au Costa Rica avant d'envisager l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended both State Parties for the progress and efforts to work closely together on this transboundary issue. While underlining that it would require more time to settle the issues, Portugal supported giving more time to the State Parties and not putting immediately this property in the endangered list.

The Delegation of **Turkey** urged not to underestimate the negative effect of power plant's construction. The possible negative implications on the indigenous community should be clarified. It strongly supported giving more time for dialogue and making future plans before the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, underlining that reducing the implication of power plant would require more time.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** joined voices of other State Parties to commend the efforts made by the State Parties concerned. Given the complexity of the cross-border collaboration, it supported to give more time to the State Parties to work on a way forward.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** appreciated the Report as well as efforts and progress achieved by Panama and Costa Rica. More time should be given to the State Parties before putting the site in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Pérou** considère que les actions entreprises par les deux pays témoignent d'un travail remarquable et les remercie pour leurs efforts. La Délégation estime que le bien ne doit pas être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** appuie la position des autres Délégations pour donner plus de temps aux deux États parties avant d'envisager l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** joined the previous speakers to praise successful achievement and progress made on this cross-border collaboration as well as to give one more year to further implement recommendations.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the proposal of Cuba and previous speakers to reconsider the placement of the site in the World Heritage list in danger.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment from Cuba, which had been already distributed to all State Parties, and briefly explained the proposed amendments on the screen.

The **Secretariat** explained Paragraph 8 and suggested to add the words "to be completed by 2018" at the end of the paragraph in order to be in line with the commitment expressed by the States Parties.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.72** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation du **Panama** (Observateur) remercie l'UICN et le Secrétariat pour le temps et les efforts qu'ils ont consacrés à ce dossier ainsi que les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour la prise en considération des informations supplémentaires que les deux États parties ont fourni. La Délégation indique que cette décision permettra aux deux États Parties d'avancer sur la mise en œuvre des recommandations du Comité.

La Délégation du **Costa Rica** (Observateur) remercie les membres du Comité pour la décision adoptée et indique que le Costa Rica s'est engagé à travailler en collaboration avec le Panama pour une bonne gestion du site conformément aux recommandations formulées par le Comité. La Délégation explique que le pays dispose de normes innovantes dans le domaine environnemental notamment l'évaluation environnementale stratégique avec l'implication de l'ensemble des acteurs y compris les communautés locales. Elle appuie les mesures prises par le Panama pour une gestion binationale renforcée du bien et s'engage à promouvoir la biodiversité dans le site.

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

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Iguazú National Park (Argentina) (N 303) – 40 COM 7B.69 (amended in line with Decision **40 COM 7B.69**)

Cerrado Protected areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1035) - 40 COM 7B.71

Morne - Trois Pitons National Park (Dominica) (N 814) - 40 COM 7B.73

Gal ápagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1bis) - 40 COM 7B.74

Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico) (N 1182ter) - 40 COM 7B.75

Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) (N 1138rev) - 40 COM 7B.76

Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161) - 40 COM 7B.77

All the Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

AFRICA

Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407) – 40 COM 7B.79

Le **Secrétariat** indique que l'UICN et le Centre du patrimoine mondial accueillent favorablement les efforts consentis par l'État partie pour améliorer l'état de conservation du bien notamment par la constitution d'un comité interministériel, l'augmentation des budgets alloués au site, l'amélioration des connaissances sur la grande faune, le contrôle constant des unités forestières d'aménagement et la validation des termes de références de la stratégie de financement de l'Évaluation Environnementale Stratégique et Sociale (EESS) des projets majeurs autour du bien. Cependant le Secrétariat exprime sa vive préoccupation et celle de l'UICN concernant les graves menaces auxquelles est soumise la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien à savoir la construction du barrage de Mékin et l'amplification du braconnage. Le Secrétariat considère que ces menaces représentent un péril prouvé pour le bien conformément au Paragraphe 180 des *Orientations*. En outre le Secrétariat indique qu'il est demandé à l'État partie d'élaborer, en consultation avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN, une proposition d'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril (DSOCR) pour examen par le Comité à sa 41^e session en 2017.

L'**UICN** salue les efforts entrepris par l'État partie constatés par la mission de décembre 2015, mais souligne le fait que l'augmentation du braconnage et la construction du barrage de Mékin sont de graves menaces pour la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien déjà soulevées durant les précédentes missions (2006, 2009 et 2012). Le représentant de l'UICN indique que rien que la population des éléphants a diminuée de 85%. L'UICN maintient sa recommandation d'inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** prend note des recommandations de l'UICN et du Secrétariat d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril au regard des facteurs qui affectent sa Valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La Délégation indique cependant que la mission de 2015 a également relevé la prise de mesures par l'État partie pour améliorer la conservation du bien, notamment contre le braconnage et rappelle que le barrage de Mékin est en dehors de la zone tampon et que ce dernier pourrait en effet avoir un impact négatif sur le bien seulement si des mesures idoines ne sont pas prises. La Délégation demande à ce que la décision de mettre le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril soit reportée afin de laisser plus de temps à l'État partie pour mettre en œuvres les recommandations des missions de suivi réactif et souhaite que la Présidente donne la parole à l'État partie.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Parties for positive development and action and efforts taken on the property. It further noted that the site was still threatened and stated that in application of the *Operational Guidelines*, there was no option except to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee had given additional time to address the issues since 2013 and to give credibility, action needed to be taken. It urged Cameroon to utilize this opportunity to obtain more support and attention to safeguard the site and its ecosystem.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** proposed to give the State Party an opportunity to present the case.

The Chairperson confirmed that the State Party would have an opportunity to do so later.

The Delegation of **Poland** underlined that the State Party had implemented several mitigation measures to improve the situation. Inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would not be the best way to motivate the State Party to improve the state of conservation. It supported postponement of the decision as proposed by Burkina Faso.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** applauded the new state of conservation of Dja and significant positive efforts made by the State Party. It noted the positive efforts signs regarding the site, such as an increase in the financial resources and the stable number of large mammals, and recommended that the State Party be given more time to consolidate efforts as proposed by Burkina Faso.

The Delegation of the Philippines acknowledged the efforts of Cameroon to improve the state of conservation and enhance operational activities. It also noted some serious concerns to be addressed but joined the proposal of Burkina Faso to postpone the decision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted with satisfaction Cameroon's commendable action to improve the state of conservation of the property and suggested that the State Party be given more time to fully implement plans to address the issues and that the decision be delayed at least until 41st session of the World Heritage Committee.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** partage les préoccupations de l'UICN en ce qui concerne les menaces qui pèsent sur le bien, mais salue les efforts consentis par l'État partie afin d'améliorer l'état de conservation du bien. La Délégation exprime son soutien à l'amendement proposé par le Burkina Faso.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** rejoint la position du Viet Nam et les autres Délégations pour appuyer l'amendement proposé par le Burkina Faso.

La Délégation de **Cuba** appuie la proposition du Burkina Faso et souhaite donner plus de temps au Cameroun pour compléter les mesures nécessaires afin d'atténuer les menaces qui pèsent sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the State Party for its efforts and progress on the conservation of the site and supported the postponement of the decision to put it in the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Turkey** recommended that given the positive progress and support from the State Parties, the Committee should allow one more year for the State Party to take corrective measures as proposed by Burkina Faso.

La Délégation du **Cameroun** (Observateur) exprime son engagement à mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations du Comité et de celles de la mission de suivi réactif de décembre 2015. Elle fait état des efforts déployés pour diminuer l'impact négatif que pourraient avoir sur le bien les projets situés autour du site. La Délégation déclare en outre vouloir disposer d'un délai jusqu'en 2018 pour le prochain examen de l'état de conservation du bien.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** appuie la proposition du Burkina Faso et demande au Comité de prendre en considération les efforts consentis par le Cameroun dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations du Secrétariat et de l'IUCN.

Le **Secrétariat** explique que l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril encouragera la mobilisation de ressources financières pour soutenir les actions de l'État partie sur le terrain et rappelle que conformément au Paragraphe 180 des *Orientations*, la forte diminution de la population des éléphants justifie à elle seule l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

L'**IUCN** rappelle que la mise en péril du site a été annoncée depuis la mission de suivi réactif de 2006 puis celle de 2009, de 2012 et en fin de décembre 2015. L'IUCN indique que les efforts menés par l'État partie jusque-là n'ont pas été à la hauteur des menaces qui pèsent sur le site et estime qu'inscrire le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril donnerait plus de temps à l'État partie pour mettre en œuvre les mesures nécessaires pour la protection de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the decision and asked the rapporteur if any amendment had been received.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed two amendments were received from Burkina Faso and Finland respectively. She explained the conflicting positions of the two amendments and asked the Chairperson to decide upon different options proposed by Burkina Faso and Finland for Paragraphs 6 and 7.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Finland if it intended to keep its amendment or go along with other amendments.

The Delegation of **Finland** confirmed that it would go along with the majority.

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to take the floor.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the Committee had agreed on a position on Paragraph 7 which should be deleted entirely but concerning Paragraph 6, the committee needed to decide on which option to take.

The **Chairperson** proposed to keep option 1 for Paragraph 6.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** soutient la proposition du Burkina Faso et propose un nouvel amendement pour donner à l'État partie un délai supplémentaire d'une année afin de lui permettre de mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations du Comité et de la mission de suivi réactif.

The **Chairperson** reaffirmed Angola's proposal to postpone the submission deadline until February 2018 then invited the Committee to look at the two options on which decision was required.

The **Rapporteur** underlined, given that the initial part of two options was similar, it could be addressed in the last paragraph proposed by Burkina Faso and proposed that the Committee go along with Burkina Faso's proposal if Finland agrees.

The Delegation of **Finland** confirmed that it agreed.

The **Chairperson** observed no objection to Angola's proposal to change the date to 2018.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that everything was cleared.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.79** was adopted as amended.

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

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Okavango Delta (Botswana) (N 1432) – 40 COM 7B.78

Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis) – 40 COM 7B.80

Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi) (N 289) - 40 COM 7B.81

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684) – 40 COM 7B.82

Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156) – 40 COM 7B.83

Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302) – 40 COM 7B.84

All the Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

ARAB STATES

Socotra Archipelago (Yemen) (N 1263) – 40 COM 7B.86

Le **Secrétariat** explique que les deux cyclones qui ont frappé l'archipel de Socotra ont causé des dommages à son environnement naturel et aux établissements humains. Le Secrétariat informe le Comité qu'un atelier visant l'évaluation des besoins du bien a été organisé par le Centre régional pour le patrimoine mondial (ARC-WH) en coopération avec le gouvernement yéménite et l'UNESCO en présence de plusieurs partenaires internationaux. Cet atelier a débouché sur un plan d'action dont la mise en œuvre requiert la mobilisation de ressources financières. Le Secrétariat fait état des avancées dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations de la mission de suivi réactif de 2012 grâce aux informations transmises par l'État partie et de différentes initiatives pour le renforcement du suivi biologique de l'archipel. Cependant le Secrétariat exprime sa préoccupation concernant la valeur universelle

exceptionnelle du bien fragilisée par les deux cyclones qui ont frappé l'archipel et la situation sécuritaire du pays. Le Secrétariat énumère également d'autres menaces qui affectent le bien notamment l'augmentation de la collecte de bois, le surpâturage et le danger que pourraient avoir de futurs projets de développement touristiques ainsi que l'exploitation illégale de carrières de pierre et la collecte de coraux.

L'**UICN** présente ses sincères condoléances à l'État du Yémen et les habitants de l'archipel de Socotra pour les pertes en vies humaines suite aux deux cyclones qui ont frappé l'archipel. L'UICN explique que malgré la situation sécuritaire instable qui prévaut dans le pays, l'État partie a accompli d'importants progrès dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations de la mission de suivi réactif de 2012. Cependant, l'UICN exprime sa préoccupation quant à la fragilisation de l'état de conservation du bien due aux conditions de sécurité et le manque de carburant ce qui a induit une augmentation de la collecte de bois dans l'archipel ainsi qu'aux deux cyclones qui ont frappé l'archipel. L'UICN exprime également sa vive préoccupation au sujet des nouveaux projets de développement prévus dans l'archipel et recommande à l'État partie d'inviter une mission de suivi réactif Centre du patrimoine mondial/UICN pour évaluer l'état de conservation du bien et soutenir l'État partie dans l'identification d'actions de réhabilitation prioritaire.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its condolences to the inhabitants of Socotra for the damage from last year's devastating cyclones. It encouraged the State Party to fill its intention on the successful planning and to allocate the required resources to provide local communities with the necessary knowledge and tools. It also called upon the international community to support the protection of the site and expressed its full support to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed deep condolences to the people of Yemen suffering from the cyclones. It joined the voice of Finland and expressed the importance of the international community's support to clean up the site and said that the State Parties should invite IUCN with the World Heritage Centre to assess the level of damage.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed deep sympathy for the loss and damages from two cyclones. It commended Yemen for its progress achieved in spite of the ongoing conflict in the region and reminded that the State Party was requested by the World Heritage Centre to continue its efforts. It supported the recommendation for the State Party to invite the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to assess the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** joined previous speakers in expressing condolences for the damages from cyclones and expressed its appreciation for the effort of Yemen to mitigate impact of major development projects.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** also joined previous speakers in expressing condolences to the people of Yemen for the damages. It agreed with the decision, underlining that active monitoring should take place and corrective measures be implemented in the property.

Le **Secrétariat** appelle les États parties à soutenir financièrement le gouvernement du Yémen afin qu'il puisse faire face aux menaces qui pèsent sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

L'**UICN** appuie l'appel du Secrétariat aux États parties pour soutenir financièrement le Yémen dans la protection de Socotra.

The Draft Decision **40 COM7B.86** was adopted.

LIST OF NATURAL PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST LOCATED IN THE ARAB STATES FOR WHICH REPORTS ARE PROPOSED FOR ADOPTION WITHOUT DISCUSSION

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.86** was adopted without discussion.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590rev) – 40 COM 7B.90

The **Secretariat** presented its report on Dong Phrayayen Khao Yai Forest Complex and noted that on 6 June 2016 Thailand submitted to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN additional information, which is currently being evaluated by IUCN. The Secretariat recalled the previous Committee decisions to consider whether the property should be included on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 2012. At its 39th session, the Committee decided to consider, should the ascertained or potential danger to the OUV of the property be confirmed, the possible inscription of the property on the List of WH in Danger at the present session. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledge the progress made by the State Party to address some of the threats affecting the property. In light of the remaining threat of illegal logging and the trade of Siamese rosewood, the Secretariat and IUCN recommend that the Committee may decide to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN presented its report on Dong Phrayayen Khao Yai Forest Complex and recommends that the Committee inscribed the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted the significant progress made by the State Party of Thailand to reduce the number of incidents of illegal logging of Siamese Rosewood and welcomes the enhanced collaboration with neighbouring countries – People's Republic of China, Laos PDR, Cambodia and Viet Nam – particularly as regards the elaboration of joint action plans. The Delegation suggests that the State Party of Thailand be given the floor to provide updated information. The Delegation considered it premature to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and recommended that IUCN carry out a Reactive Monitoring mission to the property and report to the next session of the Committee. The Delegation stated that it has submitted amendments to this Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the great efforts made by Thailand to correct a number of outstanding issues, such as the proposed construction of the Huay Satone Dam and the closing of certain roads, and considers that Thailand should be given

another year to properly address such issues. The Delegation noted the reduction of illegal logging of Siamese Rosewood and the improved regional dialogue since 2014 and expressed its agreement with the amendments proposed by the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its agreement with the remarks expressed by Turkey. The Delegation expressed its support for the draft amendment submitted by the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** commended Thailand for its effort to address the outstanding issues and considered that it was premature to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and stated that it would welcome an IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission. The Delegation has proposed a draft amendment.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** commended Thailand for its efforts particularly as regards promoting international dialogue and its willingness to implement the proposed recommendations.

La Délégation de l'**Angola** considère que, compte tenu des efforts considérables notamment sur les mesures préventives contre l'abattage illégal des espèces qui ont conduit à des campagnes de sensibilisation des différents acteurs et les questions de budget qui ont été prises en compte, ainsi que les mesures sur le plan de la législation, il est souhaitable de donner une année supplémentaire à l'État parti pour continuer tous ses efforts.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that since 2012 the Committee has carefully considered inscribing this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and that the information has sometimes been contradictory. It expressed its support to inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, which will serve as a tool to assist the State Party in protecting the property and in obtaining additional financial support in this regard.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** prend note du rapport fourni par le CPM sur le complexe forestier de dong. IUCN recommande son déclassement sur la liste en péril. L'État parti a informé les évolutions et les mesures prises sur la coopération avec le Cambodge. Le suivi écologique a permis de classer un grand nombre d'espèces d'arbres. Mission de suivi réactive pour apprécier les mesures prises sur le terrain et souhaite que soit donné un délai supplémentaire pour permettre à l'État parti d'observer les recommandations.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the efforts of Thailand and expressed its agreement with the positions expressed and the emerging consensus to postpone the consideration of Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger until the next session of the Committee.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** constate que la Thaïlande est allée dans le sens d'une amélioration comprenant beaucoup d'efforts sur les populations locales. Le dialogue avec les pays voisins devrait être maintenu. La Délégation de la Tunisie soutient l'amendement demandé par les Philippines et demande à ne pas inscrire le site immédiatement mais de donner un temps d'accompagnement d'une mission réactive de la part de l'UICN.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that there were seven Delegations that wished to take the floor and asked if these Delegations agreed with the consensus of the Committee on this Draft Decision as amended.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.90** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** delivered a statement to acknowledge the concerns expressed by the Committee and to reiterate its commitment to protect the property by carrying out the recommended measures in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Committee.

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

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340) – 40 COM 7B.87

Great Himalayan National Park Conservation Area (India) (N 1406rev) – 40 COM 7B.88

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120) – 40 COM 7B.89

All Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Białowieża Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33ter) – 40 COM 7B.92

The Secretariat presented its report on Białowieża Forest.

IUCN presented its report on Białowieża Forest.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that it considers the questions raised in the Draft Decision very important but that more time is needed to analyze the report of the IUCN Advisory Mission that took place in June 2016. The Delegation noted that the State Party of Poland has a good record of following the Committee recommendations and commended Poland for the new management plan established in 2014 and the signature of an agreement regarding the property with Belarus. The Delegation stated that it does not consider a new Reactive Monitoring mission opportune at this time and that it has submitted amendments elaborated in collaboration with IUCN.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed its support for the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** recognized the fruitful collaboration between Poland and Belarus and supports the amended Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed that Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger should be postponed but requested clarification from IUCN regarding the request for concrete areas of action.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated Poland and Belarus for extending the boundaries of the property in 2014 and noted Poland's action in response to the bug bark beetle outbreak. Finland stressed its experience in the area of forest management and its conviction that forests should be left to regenerate naturally. The Delegation remarked that it was wise to strengthen the protection of the site by considering expanding the national park, which currently encompasses only 70 per cent of the Polish part. The Delegation recommended that this be acknowledged in the decision.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** salue les différentes missions organisées du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN pour s'assurer de la disponibilité de l'État partie pour fournir toutes les informations nécessaires, notamment sur les dégradations du site de certains habitats connus, en lien avec la propagation du bostryche typographe. En mai 2016 un programme du ministère de l'environnement polonais a établi une zone où aucune intervention ne sera autorisée et respectera l'habitat dans les deux tiers de la surface du district. La Délégation du Burkina Faso adhère aux amendements proposés par la République du Kazakhstan.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** noted that the State Party has collaborated with the IUCN and expressed its support for the issues presented.

La Délégation du **Liban** souhaite la proposition du Portugal.

The Delegation of **Croatia** stated that it would like to give more time to the State Party to take into account results of the report of June 2016.

La Délégation du **Pérou** porte un avis très positif sur le rôle joué par l'UICN et également sur la bonne volonté des États parties notamment à conserver un bien transfrontalier. Les amendements sont raisonnables et la Délégation du Pérou les appuie.

La Délégation du **Koweït** soutient le collègue libanais et l'Ambassadeur du Portugal.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the commitment of the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** pointed out that most of work was done after Doha meeting as indicated by the Advisory bodies, it suggested a revision to the Draft Decision.

The **Vice-Chairperson** requested the IUCN to respond to the clarification requested by Portugal.

IUCN proposed instead to give its clarifications to the amendments proposed by Kazakhstan when the Draft Decision will be examined paragraph by paragraph by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Portugal** reiterated its request to IUCN to provide a general evaluation of the proposed amendments.

IUCN considered that as the Advisory Mission is too recent and its recommendations should not be included in the Draft Decision, which should simply recognize that the

Advisory Mission took place, in order to give adequate time to the State Party. IUCN also agreed that a Reactive Monitoring mission is premature at the present time.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that in light of IUCN's evaluation, it agrees to the amendments proposed by Kazakhstan.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that amendments have been submitted by Kazakhstan and presents the amendments.

The Delegation of **Portugal** suggests one stylistic amendment to Paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested clarification from IUCN on Paragraph 8 regarding the phrase 'no commercial timber extraction'.

IUCN responded that commercial extraction is the most serious threat but noted that alternative wording could be suggested

The Delegation of **Finland** suggested deleting the word 'commercial'

The Delegation of **Portugal** considered that the word "commercial" should not be deleted

The Delegation of **Finland** explained its interpretation of the passage.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** requested that the word "commercial" be deleted.

The **Chairperson** requested Kazakhstan to consider retaining the word "commercial".

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** agreed to retain the word "commercial".

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.92** was adopted as amended.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225bis) – 40 COM 7B.93

The **Vice-Chairperson** requested Kazakhstan to justify why it requested to open for discussion the state of conservation report on Prin National Park.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged the positive steps taken by the State Party, but noted however that the amendments it is proposing concern primarily the management plan, which lacks investment elements. The Delegation stated that the amendments were discussed with both the State Party and IUCN and were intended to assist the State Party in fulfilling the requests of the Committee.

IUCN gave its comments on the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** proposed a minor amendment regarding the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its concern that the new management plan will pave the way for further developments and insists that the cumulative impacts be taking into account. The Delegation also expressed its belief that national legislation should be reinforced to protect the property.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its support of the amendments proposed by Kazakhstan and Viet Nam, specifying that they will allow the State Party to meet the requirements of the Committee while also conforming to European Union legislation.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that it did not receive a paper copy of the amendments and shares the concerns expressed by Finland. The Delegation requested to see the amendment and requested clarification from Kazakhstan.

The **Vice- Chairperson** proposed to put the amended Draft Decision on the screen.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** expressed it wish that the State Party invite an IUCN mission.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** stated that the State Party has fully implemented the recommendations of the 2011 Reactive Monitoring mission. It also notes that the new Management Plan limits new developments and that the State Party has declared that all new developments have been reviewed for their environmental impact.

La Délégation du **Pérou** est entièrement d'accord avec les évaluation de l'IUCN et recommandations sommes d'accord que le plan de gestion soit fonctionnel et une autre question importante pour la préservation de la VUE c'est l'absence d'infrastructure touristique à l'intérieur des limites du bien dans la zone tampon toute forme d'installation n'est acceptable que suite à évaluation d'impact, mission de l'IUCN et du centre nous soumette des recommandations détaillées à la prochaine session pour qu'on soit assuré que les mesures prises ont pour objectif concret la préservation de la VUE.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the NGO "WWF Bulgaria".

The NGO **WWF Bulgaria** (Observer) commended the Centre and IUCN and expressed its support for the Draft Decision without amendments, welcoming Paragraph 6. It expressed its concern about the potential negative impacts of the new management plan. WWF Bulgaria requested that the draft management plan be revised and reviewed by IUCN.

The **Rapporteur** apologized for not distributing in a timely fashion the amended Draft Decision and read the amendments. The Rapporteur requested guidance in clarifying the amendments to Paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested Viet Nam to provide clarification on the proposed amendments and particularly the reference to "strategic environmental assessment".

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** requested clarification on the difference between "environmental impact assessment" and "strategic environment assessment".

IUCN explained that an environmental impact assessment is used for individual projects and less well suited to studying cumulative impacts, while a strategic environment assessment is used to analyze multi-faceted aspects. IUCN also noted that it agreed with Portugal regarding the need to ensure safeguards to ensure protection of OUV.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that in light of the clarification provided by IUCN, it supports the amendments proposed by Viet Nam

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked IUCN for its clarification and expressed its wish to retain the original Draft Decision without amendment.

La Délégation du **Kuwait**, après les clarifications de l'IUCN et des organes consultatifs, soutient le Kazakhstan car cela sert les intérêts du pays.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its supports for Portugal's proposal to retain the original Draft Decision.

The Delegations **Kazakhstan** and **Poland** expressed their support of retaining both amendments.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that the majority of Delegations supported the amendments and requested Portugal and Finland to consider accepting the amendments.

The Delegations of **Portugal** and **Finland** agreed to accept the proposed amendments proposed by Kazakhstan.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** provided clarification on its proposal for a deletion to Paragraph 6

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** agreed to accept the amendment proposed by Viet Nam.

The Delegation of **Portugal** proposed a minor grammatical correction on Paragraph 6.

The proposal by Portugal was not adopted.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.93** was adopted as amended.

Gros Morne National Park (Canada) (N 419) – 40 COM 7B.94

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the state of conservation of this property.

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the debate on this item. As there were no comments from Committee members, the Chairperson gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendment to the Draft Decision had been received.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.94** was adopted.

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

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion under this Item:

Plitvice Lakes National Park (Croatia) (N 98bis) – 40 COM 7B.95

Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768rev) – 40 COM 7B.96

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) - 40 COM 7B.97

Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve (Russian Federation) (N 1023rev) – 40 COM 7B.98

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) - 40 COM 7B.99

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765bis) - 40 COM 7B.100

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900) - 40 COM 7B.101

Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 369) - 40 COM 7B.102

Gough and Inaccessible Islands (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 740bis) - 40 COM 7B.103

Grand Canyon National Park (United States of America) (N 75) – 40 COM 7B.104

All Draft Decisions listed above were adopted without discussion.

OMNIBUS

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the NGO “Greenpeace”.

The NGO **Greenpeace** (Observer) expressed its concern about new threats to the OUV of several Russian properties located in the Western Caucasus region resulting from authorizations for construction development given by the Russian authorities. The observer stated that an IUCN mission would be a good first step to address this situation.

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to read the list of properties which form the “Omnibus” this year:

- **Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan)**
- **Bolgar Historical and Archaeological Complex (Russian Federation)**
- **New Lanark (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)**
- **Monumental Earthworks of Poverty Point (United States of America)**

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7B.105** was adopted.

La Delegation de la **Suisse** (Observateur) fait part de sa décision de doubler les contributions au bénéfice du Fonds du patrimoine mondial.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** expressed thanks to Switzerland for its comments and specifically for doubling its contribution to the World Heritage Fund. The Director also thanked Australia and Turkey for increasing their contributions and encouraged others States Parties to do the same.

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

The **Vice-Chairperson** requested comments from Delegations on Item 7.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that Delegations were given an opportunity to submit additional comments to this Draft Decision when discussed on Monday 11 July.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that one amendment was submitted by Jamaica and read the amendment.

The Delegation of **Poland** informed the Committee it submitted an amendment.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** informed the Committee it also submitted an amendment which it proceeded to read out. It added that the amendment is supported by the Delegations of Turkey, Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

The **Rapporteur** requested that the amendments proposed by Poland and the Philippines be submitted in writing.

The **Vice-Chairperson** noted that the amendment submitted by the Philippines are in line with what was discussed at Arusha [*Note from Secretariat: reference to Arusha International Conference “Safeguarding African World Heritage as a Driver of Sustainable Development” co-organized by UNESCO in Tanzania, 31 May–3 June 2016.*]

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Philippines.

La Délégation du **Pérou** indique ne pas avoir d'objection mais émet des doutes quant à la phrase parlant de la nécessité de trouver un équilibre entre la protection du patrimoine et le développement socio-économique. La Délégation considère que la question se pose alors de savoir quel est le point d'équilibre, et ce qui se passerait si la VUE n'autorise pas d'activité économique. Elle considère également qu'il convient de respecter le point d'équilibre tout en préservant la VUE. La Délégation indique qu'elle préfère parler d'un lien établi entre la protection du patrimoine et le

développement durable sans évoquer quelque chose d'aussi précis qu'un point d'équilibre.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** expressed its support to the amendment proposed by the Philippines. It informed the Committee that it wished to review the amendment proposed by Jamaica for linguistic purposes.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that it mostly supports the amendment submitted by the Philippines and proposed its own amendment.

The Delegation of **Poland** proposed to read its amendment.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its support for the amendment proposed by Poland and the comments made by Peru. It also suggested additional amendments to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Pérou** s'associe à la proposition de l'ambassadeur du Portugal avec l'ajout du mot « durable ».

The Delegation of **Portugal** proposed a stylistic amendment.

The **Vice-Chairperson** assured the Committee that all amendments would be duly taken into account and translated and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting rose at 6.30pm.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 15 JULY 2016

NINTH MEETING

9.30 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 8. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/8B
WHC/16/40.COM/8B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Add and Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Add and Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B3
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B4

Draft Decisions: **40 COM 8B.1** to **40 COM 8B.50**

The **Chairperson** gave an overview of the documents for the item and invited the Secretariat to read out the list of nominations for which factual error notifications has been received, and to provide some explanations in this regard.

The **Secretariat** read out the list of nominations for which factual error letters had been submitted by the States Parties after evaluation by the Advisory Bodies:

- Canada, Mistaken Point
- China, Hubei Shennongjia
- France, Tectono-volcanic Ensemble of the Chaîne des Puys and Limagne Fault
- Islamic Republic of Iran, Lut Desert
- Mexico, Archipiélago de Revillagigedo
- Sudan, Sanganeb Marine National Park and Dungenab Bay - Mukkawar Island Marine National Park
- Thailand, Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex
- Turkmenistan, Mountain Ecosystems of Koytendag
- Canada, Pimachiowin Aki
- Chad, Ennedi Massif: Natural and Cultural Landscape
- India, Khangchendzonga National Park

- Iraq, The Ahwar of Southern Iraq: Refuge of Biodiversity and the Relict Landscape of the Mesopotamian Cities
- Argentina / Belgium / France / Germany / India / Japan / Switzerland, The Architectural Work of Le Corbusier, an Outstanding Contribution to the Modern Movement
- Bosnia and Herzegovina / Croatia / Montenegro / Serbia, Stećci – Medieval Tombstones
- China, Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape
- Greece, Archaeological Site of Philippi
- India, Excavated remains of Nalanda Mahavihara
- Islamic Republic of Iran, The Persian Qanat
- Federated States of Micronesia, Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia
- Turkey, Archaeological Site of Ani
- United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Gibraltar Neanderthal Caves and Environments
- United States of America, Key Works of Modern Architecture by Frank Lloyd Wright
- Japan, Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range

The Secretariat informed the Committee that, if a factual error notification was received, it would announce it before the Advisory Bodies present their evaluation for each site. The Secretariat noted that, if the notification of factual error has an impact on the proposed Statement of OUV, the amendment would already be included in the text shown on the screen. Only notifications received by the statutory deadline and submitted using the form in Annex 12 of the *Operational Guidelines* were made available in Document WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B4.

The **Chairperson** noted that since there were no objections, the Committee could now proceed to examine the Item on the proposed changes to the names of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of the requests for changes to the names of the following inscribed properties:

- France, The Climats, terroirs of Burgundy
- France, Champagne Hillsides, Houses and Cellars
- Peru, Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana
- Philippines, Historic Town of Vigan
- Portugal, Historic Centre of Oporto
- Singapore, Singapore Botanical Gardens

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no objections to the name change requests.

The Draft Decisions **40 COM 8B.1**, **40 COM 8B.2**, **40 COM 8B.3**, **40 COM 8B.4**, **40 COM 8B.5** and **40 COM 8B.49** were adopted.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Secretariat** read the list of nominations withdrawn or postponed at the request of the States Parties:

- Croatia, Roman Urbanism of the Zadar Peninsula with the Monumental Complex on the Forum
- Czech Republic / Germany: Mining Cultural Landscape Erzgebirge / Krušnohoří
- Germany, Francke Foundations, Halle
- Japan, Churches and Christian Sites in Nagasaki
- Montenegro, Historic Centre of Cetinje
- Republic of Korea, Seowon, Neo-Confucian Academies of the Joseon Dynasty
- Russian Federation, Western Caucasus
- Russian Federation, Virgin Komi Forests
- Thailand, Phu Phrabat Historical Park

The **Chairperson** noted that there were no comments and proceeded to move on to the examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List and recalled the procedure for the examination of nominations put forth by the States Parties.

CULTURAL NOMINATIONS

Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape, China

Decision: 40 COM 8B.19

The **Secretariat** indicated that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination and confirmed that this notification had no effect on the proposed Statement of OUV.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the property.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** supported the recommendation for the inscription of this outstanding example of a Cultural Landscape that captures the legacy, spirituality, creativity and sacred practices of the people whose history it represents. It expressed the opinion that the site is significant for future generations and their understanding and appreciation of the diverse cultural experiences of humanity. The Delegation acknowledged the State Party's legislation aimed at protecting the rock art sites and urges the State Party to complete the plan to put all its sites under the highest protection level.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** acknowledged the evaluation of ICOMOS and agreed with its recommendation to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List and congratulated the state party for its excellent work.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party for its nomination and appreciated that beautiful rock art is harmonised with the landscape in this nomination.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated the State Party for nominating such an outstanding Cultural Landscape and noted the uniqueness of the documented activities of a historic population related to nature and to cultural traditions of modern relevance. The Delegation indicated that the rock art's integration into a natural landscape renders its exceptional artistic manifestations open to natural threats. In line with the Advisory Bodies' recommendations, the Delegation proposed the enhancement of the risk management plans and supported the extension of the conservation and monitoring programs to cover all the rock art sites. The Delegation expressed its confidence in the State Party's capacity to fulfil all the suggested recommendations.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated the State Party and commended the widespread support from the local communities. It recalled that the serial nomination's components share common values and functionality, but are physically separated, and therefore requested more connectivity between the components and for the implementation of an inclusive approach when implementing the additional recommendations. The Delegation expressed its confidence that the State Party is able to address fully all these recommendations and therefore supported the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** congratulated the State Party for this nomination and highlighted the property's special combination of landscape and rock art. The Delegation remarked how the site vividly conveys the vigorous spiritual and social life of the people inhabiting the area and expressed its full support for the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List, pointing out the cultural links between the nominated sites and Viet Nam's own heritage.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** congratulated the State Party for this nomination and noted that the addition of this site would enrich the future generations' outlook and appreciation of the planet's beautiful and preserved cultural sites. The Delegation joined others in supporting the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** congratulated the State Party for the nomination of this exceptional site which bears testimony to a vivid social and spiritual life and a unique philosophy. The Delegation indicated that it viewed the inscription of these sites as an enriching addition to the World Heritage List, expressed its support of the Advisory Bodies' recommendations, and asserted the State Party's capacity to follow these recommendations.

The Delegation of **Cuba** congratulated the State Party for this important nomination and extended its recognition to the Advisory Bodies for the clarity and depth of the evaluation carried out during the assessment of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its supports for the inscription of this Cultural Landscape and congratulated the State Party for the nomination. The Delegation noted the exceptional features of the rock arts and the great commitment of the local community, appreciating the exemplary care and understanding of this heritage. The Delegation requested an amendment to the Draft Decision in the form of a standard paragraph requesting the State Party to submit a progress report.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the only amendment proposal received so far was the one by the Delegation of Poland.

The **Chairperson** requests the state party of Poland to clarify the timing of this report.

The Delegation of **Poland** suggested that the time frame be a standardized two years report already carried out in the previous year.

The **Rapporteur** amended the paragraph as requested by the Delegation of **Poland**.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.19** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated China on behalf of the Committee for the inscription of this property and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of China.

On behalf of the Observer Delegation of **China**, the Director-General of the State Office of Cultural Heritage expressed his gratitude for the inscription of a new type of heritage among China's World Heritage properties and highlighted the efforts and commitment of the local people who contribute greatly to the protection of the site. The Director-General extended his thanks to Advisory Bodies and the host country and assured of his State Party's commitment and readiness to conserve and manage the site adequately. Finally, the Director-General condemned the acts of terrorism and expresses his solidarity with Turkey and France.

Excavated remains of Nalanda Mahavihara, India

Decision: **40 COM 8B.20**

The **Secretariat** indicated that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the property.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported ICOMOS' recommendations and suggested that they be addressed at length. The Delegation indicated that the nominated property and its buffer zone are sufficient to address the concerns over the actual geographical limitations of the site, and that the elements contained within have sufficient attributes to support the site's the Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation therefore suggested that the integrity of the site was assured and that the site's authenticity was also confirmed, despite the replacement of some simpler incomplete structures. The Delegation considered that these additions cannot hinder the authenticity of the site, as excavated structures are retained where they were originally found, and highlighted the architectural influence of the site on other Asian countries. The Delegation finally noted that it considered the criteria justified and therefore supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** congratulated the State Party for this nomination and highlighted the site's outstanding attributes and its resemblance to a modern-day university. The Delegation recalled its own State Party's connections with the site, as many Indonesian scholars studied in this establishment. The Delegation noted the importance and influence of the site on the Indian subcontinent and indicated that it was satisfied with the clarification and additional information provided by the State Party in response to ICOMOS' request. The Delegation expressed its support for the

amendment by which the name of the site was changed and for the site's inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party for this nomination and indicated that it considers the site to have potential to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation commended the enriching and interesting contributions of the exchange between the State Party and ICOMOS and requested further clarification on the links between integrity and the unknown extent of the site. While the Delegation indicated that it considers this missing information predictable, it requested further clarification from ICOMOS on why such information is needed before the inscription.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** complimented the State Party for this nomination, noted that the site evidently demonstrates Outstanding Universal Value, and supported the State Party's clarifications. The Delegation stressed that the site was both an educational and a spiritual centre, attracting scholars from neighbouring regions. The Delegation indicated that it agreed with the amendment and supported the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted the historical significance of this site as one of the earliest examples of a fully functioning centre of learning and religious thinking. The Delegation stressed the influence that this establishment has had on the region's cultural and educational heritage and indicated that it saw merit in ICOMOS' recommendations, yet supported the State Party's choice of criteria. In line with ICOMOS' recommendations, the Delegation requested the State Party to carry out further research to identify all repair works throughout the site and to conduct a Heritage Impact Assessment. The Delegation acknowledged the steps made by the State Party and appreciated the assurances given that no large developments would affect the property's integrity. The Delegation supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the importance of the nominated property for its tangible and intangible values and attributes. The State Party sees the addition of this site to the World Heritage List as a chance to contribute to a more representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List. The Delegation indicated that its national experts are of the opinion that this autonomous centre of higher learning influenced positively South Asia and South East Asia, and considers that the additional information provided by the State Party in reply to ICOMOS provides technically convincing clarifications. The Delegation noted the efforts of the State Party for the conservation interventions and the continuing research activities of the nominated property. It indicated that it considered a re-evaluation and new missions unnecessary and acknowledged the statement by the State Party that the Master Plan is under preparation.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stressed the universal importance of the nominated property and commended the State Party for the preparation of the nomination. The Delegation also emphasized the importance of educational centres, especially for UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee and indicated that it considers the site to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation expressed confidence in the State Party's appropriate and efficient response to ICOMOS' concerns. The Delegation highlights its cultural and human exchange with its Indian counterpart and voiced its support of the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** commended the State Party for proposing the site and for preparing an outstanding nomination dossier. The Delegation commended the

comprehensive responses to all the issues raised by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation emphasized the State Party's commitment to protecting the property for the benefit of current and future generations and agreed with the State Party's proposed criteria. The Delegation indicated that it considers that the Outstanding Universal Value, the integrity and authenticity of the site are well articulated and commended the State Party for the adequate frameworks in place for the protection of the site. The Delegation therefore recommended that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que le site, dont la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle est reconnue par l'ICOMOS, mérite une attention particulière. Elle considère que les fonctions religieuse et universitaire du site sont presque uniques dans le sous-continent indien et la région Asie, et que le critère (vi) relié à la fonction du bien dans l'étude de l'enseignement bouddhiste est évident, car l'université Nalanda a influencé le développement des grandes écoles de pensée bouddhistes à travers toute l'Asie. En conclusion, la Délégation considère que ce site mérite d'être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et se joint à l'analyse faite par la Finlande concernant les questions d'intégrité et d'authenticité.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party for its efforts in preserving and safeguarding the site. The Delegation indicated that it was satisfied with the additional information provided by the State Party in response to the legitimate concerns raised by the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation indicated that it considers the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the site adequately presented, and welcomed the fact that the management processes include a traditional management framework and a visitor management system. The Delegation requested the State Party to continue its historical research and to establish a methodology and an implementation plan for the documentation of this research.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** recognized the importance of this site for Buddhist heritage and its great influence on other parts of Asia. The Delegation stressed the need to protect and study the site in depth and supported the amendments proposed thus far.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** reiterated the importance of this site, as one of the earliest and longest-serving monastic scholastic establishments. The Delegation indicated that it considers the legal protection in place sufficient, and that the site is in a good state of preservation. It further noted that the integrity and authenticity are adequate, as demonstrated by the State Party. The Delegation noted that the protected area contains all attributes to support Outstanding Universal Value, and that the construction that worries ICOMOS is beyond the designated Buffer Zone of the property. The Delegation expressed its support for the amendments put forth by Viet Nam and Indonesia regarding the inscription of the site under Criteria (iv) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** stressed the importance of the site and its influence on the development of architecture and the evolution of artistic traditions in all regions of Asia. The Delegation explained how the surviving remains in the proposed property demonstrate its unique attributes and noted that excavated remains use minimal intervention for consolidation work and retain the original materials of the original construction. The Delegation indicated that it was reassured that the site's management is ensured by the Government of India and considered that the site met the criteria mentioned in the nomination dossier and agreed with other Committee Members on the need to revise the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** indique que les réponses fournies par l'État partie suite à l'évaluation de l'ICOMOS l'ont convaincue, et qu'elle a été très sensible aux explications avancées par le Viet Nam et l'Indonésie. La Délégation exprime son soutien à l'inscription de ce bien culturel, qui révèle parfaitement son authenticité et son intégrité et incarne à la fois toute une vie culturelle spirituelle qui avait eu une influence dans toute la région du sud-est asiatique. Par ailleurs, la Délégation de la Tunisie est sûre que l'Inde saura répondre, dans un future proche, aux demandes et recommandations de l'ICOMOS. Par conséquent elle recommande l'inscription de ce bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party for this remarkable nomination and supported previous remarks regarding the artistic attributes, history, importance and influence of the site. The Delegation therefore expressed its support to the Draft Decision and requested to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Poland** joined the common display of agreement regarding the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List and also supported the amendment made by ICOMOS regarding the validity of Criterion (iii) rather than Criterion (vi) for inscription, but indicated that it was ready to align with the majority of opinions regarding this matter.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed satisfaction with the information provided by the State Party in response to the evaluation by ICOMOS and acknowledged the Outstanding Universal Value of the site, its integrity and authenticity. The Delegation indicated that it was convinced by the State Party's ability to put the Advisory Bodies' recommendations into practice as concerns further historical research and ensuring adequate protection mechanisms. The Delegation therefore supported the revised Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supports the proposed amendment by the Delegations of Indonesia and Viet Nam for the inscription of this archaeological site on the World Heritage List. The Delegation noted the lasting impacts of the site, expressed its satisfaction with the clarifications offered by the State Party to justify its choice of criteria, and admired the institutional framework put in place to manage and protect the site.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** considère que les informations fournies par l'État partie sont rassurantes par rapport aux observations faites par l'ICOMOS, et soutient les amendements proposés par le Viet Nam pour l'inscription du bien. Concernant la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle du site, la Délégation du Burkina Faso considère que le dossier de candidature contient des éléments qui répondent aux Critères requis, et que des mesures juridiques et de conservation du bien ont bien été prises par l'État partie.

La Délégation d'**Angola** recommande à l'État partie de mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations de l'ICOMOS, notamment l'approfondissement des études scientifiques sur les valeurs du système éducatif et religieux de ce bien, qui pourraient influencer les modèles de formation académique et religieuse actuelle, surtout la formation des jeunes et apporter une contribution significative au développement de notre planète. Elle indique également prendre en compte les éléments supplémentaires apportés par l'État partie en réponse à l'ICOMOS, et considère que la VUE du bien est clairement prouvée, et la Délégation soutient donc l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

ICOMOS responded to the question concerning the integrity of the property in relation to the established boundaries, raised by Finland and supported by Lebanon and Portugal. ICOMOS informed the Committee that some surface remains are structural and that artefacts exist in the Buffer Zone. ICOMOS expressed concerns that there may be some remains beyond the Buffer Zone, and that development pressure outside the Buffer Zone could possibly damage such remains.

The Delegation of **Cuba** stressed the importance of ICOMOS' intervention and indicated that the inscription is not necessarily static, but that future research may affect the boundaries with positive modifications. The Delegation mentioned precedents in this regard and suggested that the *Convention* includes mechanisms to alter a property's boundaries and the definition of integrity in its Statement of OUV.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed having received amendment proposals from the Delegations of Viet Nam and Indonesia.

The Delegation of **Finland** suggested the insertion of a paragraph requesting a report for the review at the 42nd session of the Committee, as was done earlier for the "Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape" (China).

The Delegation of **Poland** seconded this proposal.

The **Rapporteur** amended the Draft Decision accordingly.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.20** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated India for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee Members for their recognition of this unique and unmatched site and stressed that the nomination is clearly of an exceptional and outstanding nature. It noted the importance of the University in instructing brilliant minds from different regions, particularly in South Asia, East Asia and South-East Asia. The Delegation expressed that it saw this inscription as a great tribute to knowledge, which is a theme at the heart of UNESCO.

The Persian Qanat, Islamic Republic of Iran

Decision: **40 COM 8B.21**

The **Secretariat** indicated that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS introduced the evaluation by the Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments by the Committee members.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** stressed the importance of the return to traditional cultural heritage associated to water in the present critical context related to the access and use of water and climate change. The Delegation quoted the 2015 ICOMOS Thematic Study on Cultural Heritage of Water in the Middle East and Maghreb as one of the bases of the nomination dossier and noted that, from the nomination submitted under Criteria (i), (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) and (vi), ICOMOS recognised that Criteria (iii) and (iv) could be justified and that Criterion (ii) required the inclusion

of water catchment and downstream demand areas within the nominated property. The Delegation noted that the additional information provided by the State Party clearly showed that these areas are included in the core zone and buffer zone. Regarding the thorough analysis required by ICOMOS for Criterion (iii), the Delegation recalled that the Nara document considered that Outstanding Universal Value should be assessed in relation to geo-cultural specificities. In this sense, the Delegation stressed that the Persian Qanat's specificities constitute the technological ensemble, the underground desert urban planning, the intangible elements associated and many other elements. Therefore, and since the conservation measures and management system are adequate, the Delegation proposed to inscribe the property under Criteria (ii) (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended Iran for the submission of this nomination and recognised the unquestionable Outstanding Universal Value of the property and its rightful place on the World Heritage List. It noted that irrigation systems are outstanding engineering works, and that their recognition highlights also the capacity of human beings to adapt to extreme environments. The Delegation expressed its confidence that the State Party is capable of addressing the recommendations of the Committee and therefore supported the inscription of the property under Criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Kuwait** indicated that the Persian Qanat are one of the most valued items in the world, as this construction of channels ensures that an arid area can be supplied with water. Nevertheless, the Delegation indicated that, if the Committee were to inscribe this site, it would need to take into account ICOMOS's recommendation. The Delegation drew attention to the supplementary information supplied by the State Party and expressed support to the proposal by Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its appreciation to Iran for the submission of this nomination. It considered it as a regional achievement, given the importance of water management within this region, and noted that the Persian Qanat is an example of eco-friendly technology that can last for centuries. In answer to the comparative analysis requested by ICOMOS, it noted that the additional information submitted by the State Party showed that the Persian Qanat is unique, in particular because of its location. Furthermore, it noted the importance of the Qanats as a fundamental factor for the development of the underground urban area of the Yad. The Delegation therefore supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** noted the existence of 50,000 qanats in the world, in more than 40 countries, some of which are already inscribed as part of World Heritage properties. It further stressed that the nominated desert qanats were chosen on the basis of their historical context, geographical variation and technical evaluation as well as their unique features. While agreeing with ICOMOS's evaluation, it considered that a mission to the property was unnecessary and that, as long as the State Party is capable of answering the Committee's requirements by the next session, the property could be inscribed at the next session of the Committee under Criteria (iii), (iv) and (v). The Delegation therefore supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated Iran for this nomination and noted that the Persian Qanat displays a highly sophisticated technological construction, in particular given the climatic cultural social conditions of the region. It acknowledged the tangible and intangible values attributed to the property and congratulated the

constructive dialogue established with ICOMOS during the nomination process. Finally, it noted the added value of the site for the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the role of Qanats for the creation and expansion of agriculture and irrigation in arid regions of the world, as well as the associated cultural traditions. The Delegation considered that the 11 qanaqs nominated demonstrate the development of qanats in regions with very diverse cultural, political and social circumstances. It further considered this system as an example of the evolution of technology in the face of extreme geographic conditions in arid regions and noted how it shaped the landscape as it integrates into urban infrastructure. The Delegation recognised the important agreement signed between the Government of Iran and UNESCO for an International Centre of Qanaq and Historic Hydraulic Structures, with an annual budget of US\$ 15 million allocated from 2005 to 2009 for the reconstruction and maintenance of the qanats. Finally, the Delegation congratulated the State Party's efforts for the protection of the sites and supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List under Criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted the property's significant value, in particular its important role in the formation of the civilisation. It agreed with ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre's recommendations, particularly regarding more thorough comparative studies, and requested the State Party to implement these recommendations.

The Delegation of **Peru** highlighted the importance of the qanats as a traditional system based on the careful management of water as an essential natural resource. While noting that the State Party included Criteria (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) and (vi) to justify the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the Delegation agreed with ICOMOS's technical evaluation, which proposed inscribing the site under Criteria (iii) and (iv). The Delegation therefore supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party for presenting this nomination and considered that this system was well ahead of its time, as demonstrated by the 11 qanats selected. Moreover, the Delegation noted that the site's integrity is highlighted by its survival through centuries, whereas its authenticity makes reference to design, technology, tradition and indigenous cultures. Moreover, the Delegation indicated that, based on the additional information provided the State Party, it considered that the OUV was adequately justified and supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** acknowledged that the qanat system shows outstanding and innovative techniques with regard to its challenging location. Based on the additional information provided by the State Party, it agreed that Criteria (iii) and (iv) are justified, and the Delegation strongly supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** recognised the importance of the qanat system, especially considering its location. It noted that the coordination and interaction with nature showcased by this traditional method represents an outstanding example of sustainable development. In light of the additional information submitted by the State Party, the Delegation supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** noted that, compared with other regions, the uniqueness of the Persian qanats is well established. It also considered that the issue of technology, diversity and its role in the formation of town settlements is

demonstrated, and the Delegation therefore supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List under Criteria (iii) and (iv).

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** reconnaît les valeurs exceptionnelles de la création architecturale et technologique du bien. Elle considère justifiée et appropriée la nouvelle proposition de l'État partie pour prendre en compte les Critères (iii) et (iv). Enfin, la Délégation félicite l'Iran, soutient l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et encourage l'Iran à faire tout son possible pour sa préservation.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** considered that the importance of this nomination and its contribution to humanity is the understanding of the benefits that arise from careful management of resources and for this reason it congratulated Iran for submitting this site for inscription. It considered that the qanat system showed all elements of sustainable development a hundred years before the issue was even considered. It expressed its satisfaction with the measures put in place for the protection and management of the property and with the clarification on the Statement of OUV, which follows the Advisory Bodies' recommendations. After recommending that the State Party work very closely with ICOMOS to address the proposed recommendations, the Delegation supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Poland** recognised the positive effect of the preparation of a nomination dossier, as it benefits protection of the site and capacity building. The Delegation stressed that the nomination dossier alone proves that the State Party and the site managers fully understand the significance of the property. Finally, while supporting the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List, the Delegation added that it would feel more comfortable if the justification was clearer and more convincing.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** s'aligne aux amendements apportés par le Liban, en ajoutant que le bien est unique notamment dans le Maghreb pour la distribution de l'eau, et qu'il a un impact sur l'économie qui en découle. La Tunisie recommande l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Rapporteur** noted the amendments submitted.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** noted that the State Party initially proposed the nomination under six criteria, which became two after the debates. It pointed out that ICOMOS's evaluation strongly considered Criterion (v) and stressed that when Criteria (iii) and (iv) were fulfilled, so was Criterion (v), as it is example of traditional human settlement and given that the interaction between human beings and nature are addressed by both criteria. The Delegation therefore proposed the inclusion of Criterion (v) in the amendment proposed by Lebanon.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** questioned the possibility of including Criterion (v) and requested the technical opinion of ICOMOS on this matter, considering the current state of the dossier.

The Delegation of **Cuba** supported the general consensus to inscribe the property; nevertheless it requested ICOMOS's technical opinion on the Criteria for inscription, considering the current OUV of the property and all the actions required for its conservation.

ICOMOS thanked the Delegation of Lebanon for its question. In answer to the proposal for inclusion of Criterion (v), it noted that although human interaction with environment could be documented by the water management system represented by the qanat, ICOMOS had concerns regarding the integrity. It further considered that this largely human interaction with the environment would require to be illustrated by a complete system, including components that are not currently part of the nomination file, e.g. the water catchment areas or the use of resources and resources distribution in agricultural area. ICOMOS stressed that the enhancement to Criterion (v) would go beyond the technological aspects represented by Criteria (iv) and the cultural tradition embodied by Criterion (iii), which are perhaps better within the current property boundaries

The **Secretariat** answered the Delegation of Lebanon by referring to Paragraph 166 of the *Operational Guidelines*, which regards the re-nomination process in case of additional criteria.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** thanked the Secretariat for its answer and, in light of ICOMOS's technical opinion, considered it best not to include Criterion (v) for the time being, in order to keep coherence of the integrity of the property.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** pointed out that the original nomination file included Criterion (v) and quoted the ICOMOS evaluation, which states that the qanat system could provide an outstanding example of human interaction with the environment. The Delegation expressed its incomprehension regarding ICOMOS's statement but, in order to support the consensus, Viet Nam withdrew its amendment proposal.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the inscription of the site under Criteria (iii) and (iv).

The Draft Decision **40.COM 8B.21** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated Iran on the inscription of this property and gave the floor to the Delegation of Iran.

The Delegation of **Iran** thanked all the Committee members, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre. It referred to the travel book written by Nasser Khosro, 1,000 years ago, which mentions one of the qanat inscribed and describes it as being 700 m and naming it after the mythological king of Persia. Therefore, the Delegation considered that with this decision, the Committee has gone beyond history. After highlighting this as a historical moment for tradition and for spirit, the Delegate recited a poem.

Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia, Federated States of Micronesia

Decision: **40 COM 8B.22**

The **Secretariat** indicated that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments from the Committee Members.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated Micronesia for its first nomination to the World Heritage List. It indicated that it considers this unique heritage as underrepresented on the World Heritage List and expressed the opinion that it was in conformity with Criterion (i). While it commended the protection measures put in place by the State Party, the Delegation expressed deep concern as to the site's vulnerability. The Delegation agreed on a simultaneous listing on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger, in order to benefit from international assistance and capacity building. Moreover, it considered important to dispatch a Reactive Monitoring mission to assist Micronesia with the implementation of the Committee's recommendations and the extension of the deadline for the submission of the report expected from the State Party. Finally, the Delegation considered that countries with insufficient resources and a lack of capacity should be prioritised for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger over new nominations from over-represented regions.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated Micronesia and supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. It also acknowledged the recommendation for simultaneous inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and urged the State Party to take the necessary steps to facilitate a mission to develop the Desired State of Conservation for the Removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger (DSOCR).

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** agreed with ICOMOS's recommendation to inscribe the property under Criteria (i), (iii), (iv) and (vi). It suggested that the State Party adequately develop and implement, as soon as possible, the Management Plan to minimise potential threats to its integrity and improve the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated Micronesia for the nomination of the property on the World Heritage List and on the World Heritage List in Danger in order to protect the property. It considered moving forward soon with the development of the DSOCR an essential next step. The Delegation supported the inscription of the property and requested international support for its protection.

The Delegation of **Turkey** extended its heartfelt congratulations to Micronesia for its first inscription since the ratification of the *Convention* in 2002. It also commended the proposal for simultaneous inscription on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation highlighted the evaluation process as a remarkable effort by ICOMOS to reinforce dialogue with a State Party. Finally, it considered that this inscription would contribute to the geographical balance of the List.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated Micronesia for its first nomination to the World Heritage List and further requested a clarification from ICOMOS regarding one of its recommendations.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** congratulated Micronesia for the comprehensive work undertaken for the preparation of the nomination dossier.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the conclusions of the ICOMOS evaluation and the simultaneous inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation expressed its wish that the State Party make every effort to cooperate with the Advisory Bodies to ensure the sustainable conservation of the property and the development of a suitable management plan.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended Micronesia for putting forward this nomination and, noting the concerns expressed by the State Party regarding its simultaneous inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, noted the *rationale* of this procedure to raise the international profile of the property and enhance donor support for urgent conservation measures. The Delegation noted that the State Party agreed on a tentative date for the Reactive Monitoring mission for the establishment of the DSOCR as well as a programme of corrective measures. Therefore, the Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted Micronesia's and ICOMOS's efforts to develop this nomination. It remarked that Japan has been supporting the nomination process of this property as part of the UNESCO/Japan project for Small Islands Developing States and through capacity building on heritage conservation and management for local communities. The Delegation further expressed its wish for the success of the Micronesia's continued efforts to address the issue of management and conservation identified by the Committee.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) soutient l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. En réponse à la demande de soutien technique de la Micronésie auprès des autorités françaises, la Délégation indique qu'une mission sur l'état de conservation du bien est déjà programmée pour septembre-octobre 2016.

L'**ICOMOS** regrette ne pas pouvoir répondre à la question spécifique posée par la Délégation de la Finlande sur l'archéologie maritime, étant donné qu'ils ne sont pas spécialistes dans ce domaine. L'avis de l'ICOMOS était de nettoyer les canaux de façon à ce qu'on puisse encore faire de la navigation, et c'est pour cette raison que l'ICOMOS a recommandé, avec l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril, de réaliser au plus vite une mission sur place, accompagnée bien sûr d'agents spécialisés, afin d'établir un plan de gestion incluant cet aspect de nettoyage de canaux.

The **Rapporteur** listed the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested to add "without jeopardizing possible cultural layers on the seafloor" to Paragraph 6, as requested earlier.

The **Rapporteur** noted that Paragraph 5 already referred to the Reactive Monitoring mission to the property, and therefore suggested to remove the new Paragraph 8 proposed by Philippines and instead to specify the year of the mission.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.21** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated the Federated States of Micronesia on the inscription of this property and gave them the floor.

The Observer Delegation of the **Federated States of Micronesia** extended its appreciation in particular to the Government of Japan for their generous support. It expressed its delight for the recognition of this outstanding property and Micronesia's first ever inscription on the List. It highlighted that Micronesia comes from the Pacific region, an area that occupies a third of the world and is indeed under-represented. It further asked the Committee to prioritise this region and to provide assistance in the framework of climate change, which they experience every day.

Stećci – Medieval Tombstones, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia.

Decision: **40 COM 8B.22**

The **Secretariat** indicated that a factual error notification had been received for this nomination.

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation de la proposition d'inscription.

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

The Delegation of **Lebanon** noted similarities with the Qanat dossier, particularly on the important number of components, which rendered its evaluation very delicate within the timeframe imposed. While generally agreeing with ICOMOS's evaluation on the recognition of Criterion (iii), and further queries for Criterion (ii), the Delegation expressed its lack of understanding as to how Criteria (vi) was denied for these sites that evidently exhibit intangible associations. It further noted that the authenticity, protection and management system of the property was adequate, but that ICOMOS recommended to improve the rationale for the selection of some components. The Delegation noted that, to answer ICOMOS's requests, the States Parties reduced the number of nominated components, adjusted the core and buffer zones and amended the name of the property. Finally, the Delegation considered that, although the nomination required further improvement, the Committee should recognise the powerful symbol that the transboundary efforts represent for these 4 countries seeking to showcase a common cultural background, and presented an amendment in this sense to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that the States Parties have implemented an important part of ICOMOS's recommendations, including the Management Plan for the protected components, but also noted that there are still issues that need to be addressed. The Delegation stressed the importance of highlighting the common effort and willingness of the four States Parties to overcome a turbulent past and move forward to promote peace and civility through culture. It considered that this represents everything that UNESCO stands for and is at the core of the *Convention*. In this sense, the Delegation considered that the inscription of the site would further encourage such efforts, and therefore supported its inscription at the 40th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted the powerful message of peace manifested by this dossier and also noted the joint efforts of the team of experts from the four States Parties during the nomination process. The Delegation agreed with ICOMOS on the inscription of this property under Criterion (iii), but after careful evaluation of the nomination dossier, it considered that Criterion (vi) should also be considered. Finally, it supported the inscription of the site along with the amendments to the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon.

The **Chairperson** noted 16 more requests for the floor and therefore adjourned the meeting.

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee of the Side Events taking place that day.

The meeting rose at 1pm.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY 15 July 2016

TENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 8. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(continuation)

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/8B
WHC/16/40.COM/8B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Add and Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Add and Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B3
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B4

Decisions: **40 COM 8B.1 to 40 COM 8B.52**

Stećci – Medieval Tombstones (Bosnia and Herzegovina/Croatia/Montenegro/Serbia) (N 1504) (continuation)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.24**

The **Chairperson** reopened the floor to continue with the Committee Members' interventions.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** commended the States Parties for their efforts in the nomination process and expressed its opinion that this nomination was an outstanding example of international cooperation for the preservation of cultural heritage and a symbol for the synergy between States Parties that were once at war. It supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** soutient la proposition d'inscription et l'usage du Critère (vi). La Délégation estime que, même si le Critère (vi) ne devrait pas être utilisé seul pour justifier une inscription, il représente néanmoins le critère de référence, car il reflète l'esprit de réconciliation et de tolérance. La Délégation estime que la valeur du site tient aussi en ce qu'il représente un pont entre le présent et le passé, et elle soutient donc l'amendement proposé.

The Delegation of **Poland** supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and echoed the other Delegations' appreciation of the symbolism of this nomination for values such as peace, tolerance and stability through cultural cooperation. The Delegation stressed the property's importance for post-conflict peace building and sustainable development in the region.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** salue l'initiative des quatre pays et souligne que le dossier des monuments tombeaux médiévaux constitue un des modèles de réussite en matière de coopération culturelle scientifique politique mais aussi diplomatique, et qu'il est enfin porteur d'un message universel. Compte tenu des démarches entreprises par les pays pour suivre les recommandations formulées, notamment le Critère (vi) relevé par le Liban, ainsi que la mise en œuvre d'un plan de gestion des biens protégés, la Délégation exprime son soutien à la Bosnie Herzégovine, à la Croatie, au Monténégro et à la Serbie et invite le Comité à soutenir et à accompagner la proposition en vue de l'inscription de ces sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Koweït** félicite les États parties pour cette proposition d'inscription et estime que ce bien représente un témoignage exceptionnel de l'histoire de cette région et de la culture médiévale. La Délégation soutient cette proposition d'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** welcomed this serial nomination, which it considers to be one of the most complex projects in the field of built heritage. The Delegation acknowledged the exceptional level of regional cooperation and noted that reporting on the ICOMOS recommendations will be the most difficult process. The Delegation supported the inscription of the property under Criteria (iii) and (vi).

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** joined the previous speakers in commending the States Parties for their close cooperation. The Delegation emphasized that this cooperation is a true example of the spirit of the *World Heritage Convention*. It supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and expressed hopes for the development of a joint management system.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** agreed to the value of the site as a symbol for peace, dialogue and reconciliation. It recalled the two criteria proposed by ICOMOS and expressed its optimism with regard to the future cooperation of the States Parties. It noted that all four States Parties have signed European conventions regarding the protection and management of the site, acknowledged the 10-year Management Plan, and supported the inscription of the property.

La Délégation du **Pérou** considère que cette candidature représente une multitude d'identités selon l'analyse des Organisations consultatives au titre du Critère (iii) et estime que les conditions d'authenticité et d'intégrité ainsi que l'usage du Critère (vi) sont pleinement justifiés grâce aux informations supplémentaires fournies par les États parties. Cependant, la Délégation appelle les États membres à s'engager à identifier et développer tous les éléments constituant le Critère (vi). La Délégation soutient l'inscription du bien et le projet de décision révisé.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** underlined that the sole presentation of this nomination sends an important universal message of tolerance, dialogue and mutual understanding, and congratulated the State Parties on this step. The Delegation noted that the tomb stones bridge political, ethnical, religious and geographical gaps between the countries. It referred to similar tomb stones in Azerbaijan and noted that people visit those places regardless of their ethnic and religious origin, and that such

a site enhances communication. The Delegation supported the inscription under Criteria (iii) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the inscription due to the property's exceptional testimony to Eastern European culture and arts over 400 years. It agreed that the tomb stones bridged the differences of social classes and that the site therefore promotes peace and partnerships amongst the State Parties. The Delegation trusted that the States Parties can adequately protect and manage the property.

The Delegation of **Finland** described the site as an important testimony to the medieval culture of South-Eastern Europe which cannot be found anywhere else. It commended the States Parties for their cooperation and expressed that it believes that a deferral would have been of use to give more time for further elaboration. The Delegation however expressed its agreement with the consensus and asked ICOMOS whether the deletion of Paragraph 5c, as proposed by Lebanon, should be maintained.

La Délégation de **Cuba** explique que cette proposition d'inscription contribue au dialogue et à l'amélioration de la situation et à l'esprit de paix entre les peuples concernés. La Délégation soutient la proposition du Liban et exprime son accord pour les Critères (iii) et (vi).

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son analyse et considère que le bien mérite d'être inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation estime que les points soulevés par l'ICOMOS dans son évaluation sont certes importants mais ne constituent guère un obstacle à la justification de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien. Elle appuie la décision d'inscrire ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the States Parties for the submission of this nomination which developed a situation of peace, cooperation and sustainable management of a shared cultural heritage. The Delegation acknowledged that the information provided does not necessarily demand more information, as requested by ICOMOS, and agreed to the inscription under the aforementioned criteria.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** joined other Committee Members in commending the States Parties and stated that this nomination is a proof that World Heritage properties have no borders and are for all of humankind. It supported an inscription under Criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi), as proposed by the State Parties. It noted the implementation of the Management Plan as requested by ICOMOS and pointed out the important message of the site.

La Délégation du **Pérou**, après avoir constaté que la présentation de cette proposition d'inscription de la part de la Bosnie Herzégovine, de la Croatie, du Monténégro et de la Serbie constitue la présentation d'un bien en série et que ce bien en série reçoit le soutien de la majorité des Délégations entendues, souligne par ailleurs la série d'identités présentée par cette candidature. La Délégation du Pérou revient exprime son désaccord avec l'ICOMOS sur le critère (vi) et considère que les informations apportées par les États partie permettent d'établir qu'il faut prendre en compte ce critère dans la définition de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La Délégation du Pérou rejoint les pays qui ont coparrainé le projet de décision tout en enjoignant les états parti à identifier et à développer les éléments constituant le critère (vi) et ce pour toutes les composantes tout en mettant l'accent sur le système de gestion.

La Délégation de **Tunisie** remercie l'ICOMOS de son évaluation et considère que le bien mérite d'ores et déjà d'être inscrit en raison de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle indéniable et des trois Critères (ii) (iii) (vi) et en cela la Délégation de Tunisie souscrit au texte amendé présenté par le Liban. Elle exprime également son soutien concernant l'adoption par les États parties de la nouvelle nomination proposée par l'ICOMOS : « cimetière des tombes médiévales stećci ». La Délégation de Tunisie réitère son appui pour l'inscription de ce bien en série au patrimoine mondial et invite le comité à encourager et féliciter ce groupe d'États qui par-delà les souvenirs douloureux d'un passé récent et, malgré les différences des croyances, ont su se rassembler autour d'un bien commun emblématique qui constituera dans le futur un catalyseur de la paix et un exemple à suivre.

La Délégation du **Liban** revient sur sa décision concernant le Critère (vi) et exprime sa volonté de le conserver et demande que la parole soit donnée aux États parties concernant la question du nombre de sites, afin qu'ils précisent s'il y en a 30 ou 28 et qu'ils définissent les sites qu'ils ont enlevés s'il y en a 28.

La Délégation du **Koweït** reconnaît que les pays ont pris en compte un grand nombre de considérations de l'ICOMOS et ont entrepris toutes les mesures nécessaires et souligne que ce dossier commun entre la Bosnie Herzégovine, la Croatie, le Monténégro et la Serbie est un dossier exceptionnel, un témoignage de la culture médiévale dont nous gardons une trace. La Délégation du Koweït soutient la proposition du Liban au sujet l'inscription du site en vertu des Critères (iii) et (vi).

L'**ICOMOS** répond à la question qui a été posée par la Délégation de la Finlande en ce qui concerne la suppression du Paragraphe 5c) du projet de décision en indiquant qu'il est très important de garder de ce dernier. L'ICOMOS indique que très peu de composantes présentent un bon état de conservation, notamment à cause des facteurs naturels. L'ICOMOS souhaite toutefois clarifier auprès des États parties soumissionnaires le nombre exact de sites qui composent cette proposition d'inscription en série.

La Délégation du **Liban** prend note de la remarque de l'ICOMOS et déclare s'être trompée en enlevant le Paragraphe 5c) qui devra être maintenu. La Délégation demande à la Présidente de donner la parole aux États parties concernés concernant la question du nombre de sites.

La Délégation de la **Bosnie-Herzégovine** (Observateur) répond à la question de l'ICOMOS et déclare avoir enlevé les deux sites de Pale et Tuzla de la proposition d'inscription.

The **Rapporteur** presented the proposed amendments to the Draft Decision which were submitted by the Delegations of Lebanon, the Philippines and Viet Nam.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.24** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated Bosnia Herzegovina, Croatia, Montenegro and Serbia for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The **Minister of Civil Affairs of Bosnia and Herzegovina** made a statement to thank the Committee for the inscription. The Minister stressed the importance of the site as a symbol that culture can build bridges that politics cannot. He further expressed his condolences to France for the terrorist attack.

Archaeological Site of Philippi (Greece) (N 1517)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.26**

The **Secretariat** indicated that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination which has an impact on the proposed Statement of OUV.

L'**ICOMOS** présente son évaluation de la proposition d'inscription.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision and informed the Committee that there were no amendments, just factual error corrections.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.26** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated Greece for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Greece** expressed its condolences for the Nice terrorist attack and thanked Turkey for its hospitality. The Delegation expressed its joy at the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and its determination to promote the UNESCO spirit to local communities and visitors. The State Party invited those present to a side event to celebrate the property's inscription.

Antequera Dolmens Site (Spain) (N 1501)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.27**

ICOMOS presented the evaluation of the nomination of this serial property.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated Spain for the well-prepared dossier, which confirms the unique nature of the site. It recalled the nature and importance of the property and praised the Comparative Analysis provided. It agreed that the three megalithic monuments are prime examples of creative human genius. The Delegation recommended the serial nomination for inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** congratulated the State Party for the inscription and acknowledged that only few heritage sites represent megalithic structures and expressed its interest in collaborating with Spain in future research and protection.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** agreed to the importance of the site for European megalithism, which illustrates a significant stage of human history and gives insights into funerary and ritual practices of prehistoric society. It supported the inscription of the site under Criteria (i), (iii) and (iv) and thanked ICOMOS for proposing additional criteria to the original nomination.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated the State Party on the good condition and integrity of the site, as well as its authenticity. It thanked ICOMOS for the recommendations to the State Party and indicated that it supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Turkey** underlined the relation of this site with Çatalhöyük and congratulated Spain for an excellent nomination of underrepresented Neolithic sites

on the World Heritage List. It commended the State Party on the well-formulated nomination and its development, as the result of a dialogue with the Advisory Bodies. It noted that the continuously existing integrity and authenticity of the site despite a long research tradition are a guarantee of a sustainable future for the property. The Delegation expressed its support for the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** joined other Committee Members in congratulating the State Party and praised the strategic management system. The Delegation recommended the inscription of the property as an act of peace.

The Delegations of **Zimbabwe** and **Croatia** joined the congratulations and supported the proposed inscription.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** félicite l'Espagne pour cette proposition d'inscription concernant les structures mégalithiques et considère que ce site va enrichir les connaissances sur le mégalithisme. La Délégation remercie l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour leurs recommandations pertinentes concernant la gestion de ce bien et recommande d'aller dans le sens de la proposition de l'ICOMOS.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite l'Espagne pour cette proposition d'inscription et attire l'attention sur l'ingéniosité du système juridique qui gouverne la structure publique et privée de gestion du site, qui devrait être un exemple pour des structures similaires.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie l'Espagne pour cette proposition d'inscription.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that no amendments were received with regard to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.27** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated Spain for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** expressed its gratitude for support given by the Members of the Committee and for the unique collaboration with ICOMOS in this matter, which has made the inscription of this property possible. It highlighted that the inclusion of such an example of megalith culture is exceptional and opens the door to more important, similar sites. The Delegation saluted the joint efforts of all experts and local governments involved and gave the floor to the representatives of local the governments concerned.

The Representative of Andalusia expressed his thanks to the people of Antequera who were able to preserve this site over the centuries. It also extended his recognition to the scientific community, which allowed the showcasing of the property's OUV.

The Representative of Antequera thanked all those who made this 6,000-years-old dream come true, and especially the Committee Members and those who have helped to make this important heritage available to all.

Archaeological Site of Ani (Turkey) (N 1518)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.28**

The **Secretariat** indicated that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination, acknowledging the factual error letter received.

The Delegation of **Finland** acknowledged that the site of Ani was once an important crossroad of the Silk Roads and appreciated the efforts made by the State Party. However, it understood that at this stage, the dossier still needs some additional information to demonstrate the OUV, therefore Finland supported the original Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its appreciation to the Government of Turkey for its conservation efforts in Ani. It further took note of the concerns of the Advisory Bodies, but stated that it observed a great potential for OUV upon careful examination of the nomination. Therefore, the Delegation of Indonesia believed that the property deserved to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** acknowledged the OUV of the property and commended the efforts made by the State Party for its conservation. However, it asked the State Party to improve the nomination dossier to ensure that it is accurate and balanced, as recommended in the Draft Decision, in particular the site's interpretation aspect. The Delegation stated that it joins the previous speakers in supporting the amendment proposed by Croatia.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** indicated that it believes the uniqueness of the site fully demonstrates the OUV and hence justifies the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** considered that the Comparative Analysis is complete, contrary to the evaluation of ICOMOS, and further considers that the individual authenticity is demonstrated. Taking these factors into account, the Delegation recommended the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Poland** stated that it joins previous speakers in supporting the inscription, and that it believed the inscription would promote further conservation of the site.

La Délégation d'**Angola**, après avoir pris acte des efforts fournis par l'État partie et salué le processus de dialogue et d'accompagnement entrepris par l'ICOMOS, encourage l'État partie à poursuivre ses efforts, et notamment à consolider son plan de gestion en prenant en compte les risques sismiques dont le site est potentiellement victime afin que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle qui vient d'être justifiée ne puisse pas être menacée. La Délégation d'Angola s'aligne sur les autres États membres du comité pour appuyer l'inscription du site.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.28** was adopted.

The Committee Members congratulated Turkey for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** thanked the members of the Committee and UNESCO.

The Observer Delegation of **Armenia** noted that, as a nation whose cultural heritage is greatly situated outside its administrative borders, Armenia highly values that its neighbours protect the cultural heritage created by its forefathers. The Delegation notes that Ani, as the ancient capital of Armenia and a jewel of Armenian architecture, has played an important role in the history of Armenia and the region. The Delegation points out that it has read the nomination file and the ICOMOS evaluation with great attention, as this was an important nomination for Armenia. It noted that jewels such as Ani belong to humanity, and indicated that it was glad that this masterpiece had now taken its place on the World Heritage List. The Delegation further pointed out that another neighbour, Iran, had inscribed earlier three Armenian monastic complexes situated on its territory, but that this was the first site inscribed by Turkey, and the Delegation expressed its confidence that this would not be the last.

Gorham's Cave Complex (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (N 1500)

Decision: **40 COM 8B. 29**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination. The Secretariat further informed the Committee that it had received a communication from Spain on 14 June 2016, expressing concern over the marine buffer zone proposed by ICOMOS during the evaluation process. The Secretariat announced that Spain and the State Party had a meeting, during which it was agreed to withdraw the buffer zone proposed by ICOMOS and to keep the original name of the site instead of the one presented in the working document.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Finland** welcomed this important nomination dossier and supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported the Draft Decision and ICOMOS's recommendations and commended the State Party on this successful nomination dossier.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** congratulated on the submission of the nomination dossier by the State Party and expressed its full support of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** also supported the inscription of the proposed site on the World Heritage List and commended the State Party for its efforts.

The Delegation of **Portugal** also supported the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation du **Pérou** exprime son soutien quant à l'inscription de ce bien et accueille favorablement l'entente entre la Délégation du Royaume-Uni et la Délégation d'Espagne concernant la zone tampon et le choix du nom.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** fully supported the revised Draft Decision, congratulated the State Party, appreciated the name change, and expressed the opinion that the nomination deserved the support of all the Committee members.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** strongly supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List and welcomed the solution found for the issue concerning the buffer zone.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the name of the property had been revised and presented the revised Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.29** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Vice-Chairperson** congratulated the State Party for the inscription of the property.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland** expressed its appreciation to Turkey for its hospitality at this challenging time. It welcomed the decision of the World Heritage Committee and indicated that it would enthusiastically meet its obligations under the *Convention*, and would protect and enhance the OUV of the site. Express its appreciation for Del of Spain for their cooperation in the consideration of this dossier. Read out a short statement by the Hon. Fabian Picardo, Chief Minister of Gibraltar.

Key works of Modern Architecture by Frank Lloyd Wright (United States of America) (N 1496)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.30**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Liban** revient sur les considérations de l'ICOMOS qui souhaite différer l'examen de la nomination et réduire la série à quatre éléments. La Délégation exprime son désaccord, considérant que l'œuvre de l'architecte Frank Lloyd Wright est aussi importante pour l'histoire du XXe siècle que celle du Corbusier, souligne que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle des œuvres de Frank Lloyd Wright est indéniable, et recommande de renvoyer la candidature à l'État partie afin de lui permettre de travailler avec l'ICOMOS pour mettre au point un nouveau dossier qui serait inscrit avec un large consensus.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with the statement made by Lebanon and emphasized that, while all his works have OUV, the Committee faces the same problem as some years ago when dealing with the nomination of Le Corbusier's works. The Delegation took note of the comment made by ICOMOS and proposed to refer the nomination dossier.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** stated that it could not understand the logic behind ICOMOS' argument on this item and indicated that it believed that the nominated sites deserved to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Croatia** considered the works of Frank Lloyd Wright some of the most important in the 20th century, and therefore proposed that only the four sites proposed by the State Party be inscribed on the World Heritage List this year. The Delegation proposed an amendment in this sense.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** félicite le Gouvernement des États-Unis pour sa volonté d'inscrire ce bien en série et soutient l'inscription des quatre sites proposés.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** commended the State Party's excellent work and considered that it would be very difficult not to inscribe these outstanding architectural works on the World Heritage List. As ICOMOS agreed that at least 4 architectural works clearly have Outstanding Universal Value, it proposed to put these 4 works on the World Heritage List this year.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor again to ICOMOS for some clarifications.

ICOMOS clarified that it had had no prior discussions with the State Party.

The **Vice-Chairperson** indicated that there were still seven members of the Committee who wished to take floor and proposed to continue discussion of this item at the next session.

The meeting rose at 6.30pm.

SATURDAY 16 JULY 2016

The session was suspended.

SIXTH DAY – SUNDAY 17 July 2016

ELEVENTH MEETING

9.30 p.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

The **Chairperson** resumed the session and made the following statement:

“Dear Colleagues,

Let me resume our work.

As you know, extraordinary circumstances led us yesterday to suspend our session.

Indeed, in close coordination with both UN headquarters and national security and safety authorities, we deemed wise to do so for the sake of the members of our committee as well as for all states parties to our convention.

All constitutional mechanisms are in place in Turkey. The public order is restored in best terms.

As a result of our meticulous efforts yesterday, tighter security measures were taken here, at and around our premises, even in the absence of activity of our committee and presence of its members.

Protection is fully operational and doubled in number as of today.

I thank so many members and states parties that have displayed full trust on security while they were also showing solidarity with Turkey after recent developments.

However, despite vigorous security measures undertaken and that full normality prevails all over the country, in light of security instructions of UN headquarters we received yesterday, we understand this intergovernmental committee is not able to complete its work as it was planned.

Subsequently, we as host country have been told by UNESCO Secretariat reportedly in consultation with Director-General Bokova to resume our work as of now and conclude it as soon as possible by the end of this very day.

During our last session today we are therefore invited to complete the items on our agenda as much as we can.

Please also note that the Minister of Culture and Tourism of Turkey, Mr Nabi Avcı will be present to deliver a closing speech this afternoon at around 3 pm.”

The Chairperson then invited the Committee to pursue and complete the examination of Item 8B. She appealed to the Committee members to facilitate the work as far as possible in view of the limited time available for discussion and announced that, when no amendments have been submitted, she would move to the adoption of the Draft Decision immediately after the presentation by the Advisory Bodies. She drew the attention of the Committee to Item 17 and recalled that an invitation was extended by Poland to host the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee in 2017. Meanwhile, she indicated that the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee would meet again in Paris to resume the work and examine the remaining

Agenda Items, and that the Secretariat would communicate exact dates as soon as possible.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the new dates would be communicated shortly and announced that translation was available in English and French, but Spanish only in passive voice, while Arabic translation was not available.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/8B
WHC/16/40.COM/8B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Add and Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Add and Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B3
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B4

Decisions: **40 COM 8B.1 to 40 COM 8B.52**

Key Works of Modern Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright (United States of America) (N 1496) (continuation)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.30**

The **Chairperson** invited the members of World Heritage Committee to resume the discussion on this item.

A number of Delegations took the floor to express their solidarity with the democratically elected Government and the people of the Republic of Turkey, following the recent tragic events, including the Delegations of **Finland, Cuba, Portugal, Azerbaijan, Viet Nam, and Croatia.**

The Delegation of **Finland** acknowledged the important influence of the architect Frank Lloyd Wright on Finish architecture, but noted that the nomination file lacked an in-depth analysis of the attributes and questioned the selection of components for this serial property. The Delegation therefore supported the proposal from the Delegations of Portugal and Lebanon.

The Delegations of **Turkey** and **Cuba** also took the floor to support the request for referral of this nomination.

La Délégation de **Cuba** souhaite souligner qu'il est très important de reconnaître cet œuvre, qu'il s'agit d'un œuvre majeur qui a eu par ailleurs une influence très importante sur toute l'architecture contemporaine.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** reminded the Committee of its support to the initiatives on Modern architecture and noted the extraordinary contribution of Frank Lloyd Wright, as one of its pioneers to this movement. The Delegation therefore supported the inscription on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de **Pérou** indique qu'il a bien noté que l'État partie avait réduit le nombre de bien et revient sur l'importance et la signification de cette proposition d'inscription. Elle annonce qu'il n'est pas possible de refuser l'inscription des œuvres de cet architecte, qui compte parmi quatre ou cinq grands architectes du XXe siècle, particulièrement pas parce que l'analyse comparative n'aurait pas été suffisamment exhaustive. La Délégation considère que cette proposition mérite l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, et que le Comité a une responsabilité à cet égard.

La Délégation du **Liban** déclare que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle de la proposition d'inscription en série est évidente, avant de noter que le problème réside plutôt dans la définition même des valeurs destinées à être protégées à travers cette inscription. La Délégation critique le choix des autorités américaines de présenter quatre bâtiments indépendants, précisant qu'il serait dommage de ne pas inclure l'ensemble des œuvres de Frank Lloyd Wright dans cette nomination, sur le modèle de l'inscription de l'œuvre architecturale de Le Corbusier sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** supported the inscription of four components of the serial nomination on the basis of Criteria (i) and (ii), as these four components demonstrate the general principles of modern architecture.

The Delegations of **Azerbaijan, Poland, Viet Nam** and the **Republic of Korea** supported the proposal to inscribe the site with four components and added a further recommendation concerning the establishment of an integrated and coordinated management program.

The Delegation of **Portugal** noted that a serial nomination should be more than the sum of its parts and that the nomination file should be strengthened in terms of its coherence. The Delegation reminded the Committee that the Le Corbusier nomination had also taken several years to complete, and therefore continued to support the referral of this nomination.

The Delegation of **Angola** supported Portugal's proposal.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** noted that there seems to be some discordance between the State Party and ICOMOS and asked for clarification from the State Party with regards to the assessment of the values of the components.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** informed the Committee that it has submitted an amendment to the Draft Decision supporting inscription, to do justice to Frank Lloyd Wright.

La Délégation d'**Angola** indique qu'elle considère le rapport de l'ICOMOS objectif et reconnaît les efforts fournis par l'État partie, mais considère que l'État partie devrait continuer à travailler sur ce dossier en apportant des éléments additionnels, notamment concernant le Critère (ii), l'intégrité et l'analyse comparative. La Délégation maintient donc son soutien à un renvoi de la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Portugal** also requested clarifications from ICOMOS regarding the assessment of values, once the nominating State Party has provided the expected explanations.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** informed the Committee that there has been a good and enlightening dialogue with the representatives of ICOMOS, who maintained their opinion about the nomination file.

ICOMOS indicated that it fully supports the idea of Frank Lloyd Wright being represented on the World Heritage List, but that the key question is how the works and the important influence of Wright can be represented under the *World Heritage Convention* in an adequate way. ICOMOS also clarified that, concerning the nomination of Le Corbusier, it never asked for a reduction of the number of components but requested clarification of how each of the components corresponded to the Outstanding Universal Value of the series as a whole, in line with the *Operational Guidelines*. ICOMOS further clarified that it did not suggest reducing to four components the nomination of the works of Frank Lloyd Wright. ICOMOS did however state that some of these components would be justified under criteria (i) if they were put forward individually. ICOMOS also noted that the reduced number of components would not match the definition of the Outstanding Universal Value as currently expressed under criteria (i) and (ii).

The **Chairperson** moved to the discussion of decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the two amendments put forward respectively by the Delegations of **Croatia** and **Viet Nam** (in favour of inscription) and the Delegation of **Kuwait** (in favour of referral).

The Delegations of **Cuba, Peru, Poland, Burkina Faso, Croatia** expressed their support for the amendment in favour of inscription, while the Delegations of **Lebanon, Portugal, Finland, Turkey, the Philippines** and **Angola** supported the amendment in favour of a referral.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** made a point of order, proposing to discuss the amendment in favour of inscription, as it differed more from the original Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Liban** précise qu'il s'agit ici d'adopter une décision et invite les membres du Comité à indiquer clairement s'ils souhaitent un vote.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** requested that some time be allotted for consultation among the Committee Members to work towards a consensus.

La Délégation d'**Angola** réaffirme sa position en faveur de l'amendement proposé par le Koweït, compte tenu des éléments apportés par l'ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** noted that the majority of the Committee was in favour of the referral.

La Délégation de **Pérou** note qu'il existe une division assez claire au sujet de cette décision et que, pour éviter un vote informel, il vaut mieux avoir un vote formel. La Délégation demande donc que la décision soit adoptée par vote et indique que, conformément au Règlement, il faut voter d'abord sur la proposition la plus éloignée du texte initial, soit la proposition de la Croatie et du Viet Nam.

The Delegation of **Portugal** requested a clarification from the nominating State Party whether an inscription on the World Heritage List by way of voting was acceptable, as it could undermine the credibility of this nomination and showcase the division that reigns within this Committee regarding this nomination.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed the opinion that voting was not a good way forward. It expressed the hope that the Committee could proceed with the inscription immediately and reminded the Committee about the resources that were needed to review the nomination for Le Corbusier.

The Delegation of **Portugal** repeated the request to ask for the position of the State Party with regards to the voting.

The Delegations of **Lebanon** and **Croatia** supported Portugal's request.

The Observer Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Committee for its support, along with the Advisory Bodies, and appreciated the wish of some Committee members to reach this decision by consensus. However, considering the millions of people who appreciate and value the architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright, the Delegation considered that a vote would be acceptable.

The Delegation of **Peru** proposed to have more time for consultation among the Committee members.

The **Chairperson** agreed to give more time for consultation, as properties are usually not inscribed on the World Heritage List by way of voting. She invited the States Parties to have consultations in order to conclude this item as soon as possible, and moved on to next item on the Agenda.

The architectural Work of Le Corbusier, an Outstanding Contribution to the Modern Movement (Argentina / Belgium / France / Germany / India / Japan / Switzerland) (N 1321 rev)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.31**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that, in view of the time constraints, she would like to move straight to the discussion of the Draft Decision.

Le représentant du **Liban** propose que les Organisations consultatives raccourcissent leurs présentations, dans la mesure où tous les représentants ont lu les dossiers et les recommandations. La Délégation se félicite de cette proposition d'inscription qui viendrait enrichir une catégorie sous-représentée sur la Liste, à savoir le patrimoine moderne. La Délégation indique toutefois qu'elle ne comprend pas que, parmi les Critères retenus pour attester de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, le Critère (i) ait été écarté. Ce critère avait été proposé par l'État partie lors de la précédente proposition d'inscription, mais il semble qu'il ait été retiré suite à la recommandation des experts de l'ICOMOS. La Délégation rappelle qu'un nombre important de biens inscrits dans la catégorie du patrimoine moderne sont inscrits sur la base du critère (i), et rappelle la place majeure qu'occupent les

œuvres du Corbusier dans l'histoire de l'architecture moderne. La Délégation lit également un hommage à l'architecte Brésilien Oscar Niemeyer et demande donc que le Critère (i) soit inclus dans les Critères d'inscription de l'œuvre du Corbusier. La Délégation annonce qu'elle propose une autre modification concernant l'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien, qui sera partagée en vue des recommandations.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that, in view of the time constraints, they would not read out a two-page statement, but merely express their satisfaction with this proposed nomination and the serious work that has gone into it. The Delegation also supported the issues raised by the Delegation of Lebanon regarding the addition of Criterion (i).

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Lebanon and further noted that a change of criteria also requires a revision of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, thus the proposal would be for the Committee to take note of the Provisional Statement.

La Délégation du **Liban** exprime sa position quant à l'authenticité et à l'intégrité du bien. Elle note qu'il y a eu des longs débats entre les experts autour des nouvelles constructions et de leur influence sur la valeur des œuvres du Corbusier. La Délégation considère que le Comité ne peut pas rentrer dans des discussions sur ce sujet, ce pourquoi elle propose de supprimer toute référence à ce sujet et au sujet de la porte Molitor.

ICOMOS explained that Criterion (i) had been taken out after long, collaborative, joint deliberations with the States Parties, as it is not applicable to the whole series.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.30** was adopted as amended.

Key Works of Modern Architecture of Frank Lloyd Wright (United States of America) (N 1496) – 40 COM 8B.30 (continuation)

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that, since no consensus was reached regarding the Frank Lloyd Wright nomination, the Committee could proceed with a vote by secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** asked whether the Delegation of Portugal's proposal was seconded.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** seconded the motion by Portugal.

The **Chairperson** announced that a vote by secret ballot would take place and asked the Legal Advisor to explain the voting procedure.

Le **Conseiller juridique** rappelle les dispositions du *Règlement intérieur* du Comité quant à la procédure de vote, décrite à l'article 42 dudit Règlement.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said that before the vote started, the Legal Advisor needed to clarify if abstention was possible or not in the voting procedure.

Le **Conseiller juridique** explique que, pour des votes à scrutin secret lors de précédentes sessions du Comité, l'abstention était assimilée à un bulletin blanc.

Le Délégué du **Pérou** indique être tout à fait d'accord avec l'explication apportée par le Conseiller juridique, précisant que c'est également la lecture qu'elle fait du *Règlement intérieur* sur ce point.

La Délégué du **Portugal** remercie le Conseiller juridique, mais estime qu'il faudrait dire clairement que l'abstention est possible et que les États membres du Comité ont donc la possibilité de voter oui, non, blanc ou de s'abstenir.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** asked to see the four sites on the screen.

La Délégué du **Liban** estime que le Comité n'a pas le temps d'aller chercher les photos des sites, tel que demandé par le représentant du Viet Nam. Il ajoute que tout le monde est censé avoir lu les dossiers et que, par conséquent, une telle demande ne ferait que retarder les travaux du Comité.

La Délégué du **Pérou** considère que ce qui a été demandé par le Viet Nam ne va pas à l'encontre du règlement et qu'il faut par conséquent donner suite à cette demande.

The Delegation of **Portugal** said the screens were needed for the text and there was no space for viewing the photographs.

The **Chairperson** announced the start of the vote and asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to take the floor.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** called on the Committee members one by one to vote.

The vote took place and the Secretariat counted the votes.

The **Chairperson** announced the results of the vote as follows:

- Majority: 12 members (2/3 of the Committee)
- 21 votes: 3 abstentions, 18 valid votes
- 8 votes in favour, 10 votes against.

The amendment was therefore rejected and the Chairperson asked to adopt the referral of the nomination by consensus.

La Délégué du **Pérou** soutient la demande d'approbation de la décision par consensus, telle qu'amendée.

The **Chairperson** proposed to go with the amendment for referral and asked that it be projected on the screen.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.30** was adopted as amended.

Antigua Naval Dockyard and related Archaeological Sites (Antigua and Barbuda) (N 1499)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.32**

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** announced that no amendment had been received to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** underlined that the whole Caribbean was celebrating as we spoke and highlighted the importance of this site in showcasing the history of the enslaved and of the British Empire trade. It also noted that this inscription reinforced the emerging presence of SIDS in the *World Heritage Convention*, along with the earlier inscription of a new property in Micronesia, and concluded by fully supporting the inscription of this site.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.32** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party for its first inscription on the World Heritage List and invited the State Party to deliver a brief statement.

The Observer Delegation of **Antigua and Barbuda** thanked the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, the World Heritage Committee, as well as the Japanese Cooperation (JICA) for their support in the area of capacity building in the Caribbean. The Delegation underlined that this inscription provided a morale boost, and reassured the Committee of their commitment to the implementation of ICOMOS's recommendations, some of which have already been implemented. It concluded by thanking Turkey for their hospitality.

Pampulha Modern Ensemble (Brazil) (N 1493)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.33**

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated Brazil and expressed its thanks for the nomination of this site. The Delegation supported its inscription and underlined that, although the site was built for a time that no longer exists, Brazil had managed to keep its contemporaneity.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.33** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party of Brazil to take the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its solidarity with Turkey. It recalled that the architect Niemeyer was invited to do a project for leisure, which included diverse cultural expressions: architecture, painting, sculpture and ceramics. It linked the inscribed property with a renewed sense of national identity and pride. The Delegation also thanked the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, the World Heritage Committee, the Brazilian civil servants, and the Brazilian institutions involved in the nomination file and in protecting and managing the site, as well as the civil society,

which brings life to the property. I also asked that the floor be given to the Mayor of Belo Horizonte.

The **Mayor of Belo Horizonte** underlined that the preparation of the nomination dossier was a multi-actor and multi-level engagement, which gave them pride. He also underlined that this inscription was a milestone in their cultural heritage history and for their citizens. He assured the Committee that they embraced their responsibility and thanked the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee.

SIGNIFICANT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Archaeological Site and Historic Centre of Panama City (Panama) (N 790 Ter)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.34**

ICOMOS recalled the background for the Committee's request for a significant boundary modification following a development project that was implemented; it recommended non-approval, and recommended a mission and a substantial review of the proposal.

The **Rapporteur** presented the two amendments received.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.34** was adopted as amended.

The **Secretariat** announced a change in the order of the examination of the nominations, so as to address the easiest ones at first, starting with the sites recommended for inscription, followed by those proposed for referral, then deferral and finally those recommended for non-inscription.

Khangchendzonga National Park (Panama) (N 1513)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.17**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS and **IUCN** presented their evaluation of the significant boundary modification.

The **Chairperson** stated that no amendments to the Draft Decision were received.

The Delegation of **Turkey** asked for a minor editorial proposal in Paragraph 5c and 5d, by substituting "manmade" with "human-made" to make it consistent with the Operation guidelines.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.17** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated India and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation.

The Observer Delegation of **India** expressed its gratitude on behalf of 1.3 billion Indians for the inscription of this mixed site. It considered that it gave recognition of the inextricable links between nature and culture, and highlighted the attributes of the property: a cradle of Buddhism where the highest mountain of the world is located, and home to a variety of important species. India highlighted that the nomination file was a result of the upstream process.

The Delegation of **Portugal** congratulated India for the inscription of the site, and highlighted the importance of the cooperation between India and Nepal on its management. It expressed hope that a future transboundary extension could be envisaged.

Pimachiowin Aki (Canada) (N 1415 rev) – 40 COM 8B.18

The **Secretariat** indicated that it had received factual error notifications and indicated that, in view of recent governance-related issues, Canada wished to ask for referral despite the fact that both ICOMOS and IUCN have recommended the inscription of the property, as this should allow the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation sufficient time to consider the path forward for their organization regarding this nomination.

ICOMOS explained that the nomination was deferred to allow for a full understanding of the interaction between culture and nature, and highlighted that it assisted the State Party in the comparative analysis.

IUCN presented their evaluation of the significant boundary modification.

The **Chairperson** asked if the Delegation of Canada had any objection.

La Délégation du **Canada** (Observateur) remercie la Turquie de son hospitalité et lui exprime, à l'instar des autres Délégations, sa solidarité pendant ces moments difficiles. The Delegation highlighted how this site embodied, in an exemplary manner, the indivisibility between nature and culture and the importance of its management in an integrated manner. It expressed its appreciation to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for having recommended this site for inscription on the World Heritage List. It invoked issues related to governance and asked the Committee to refer the nomination dossier to allow further reflection on the importance of indigenous peoples and to work further on finding an acceptable solution for all, so that the requirements for management and conservation can be met.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed sympathy with Turkey. It underlined that this site deserved to be on the World Heritage List and supported the wish of the State Party of Canada to refer it, in order to allow the streamlining of the considerations related to indigenous peoples.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** congratulated Canada for expressing their intention to refer the inscription of the site despite the positive recommendation for inscription by IUCN and ICOMOS, and underlined that this was a good example that other States Parties could learn from, one that is consistent with the *Operational Guidelines* on Indigenous peoples; it highlighted the importance of appropriate consultation with First Nations.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that although there was need to speed-up the work of the Committee, it was important to underline the importance of Canada's

approach. It underlined the significance of the site's cultural and natural values, commended the State Party for taking their concerns fully into consideration, and supported the Draft Decision for referral.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated Canada and the Advisory Bodies for successfully completing the nomination file, and noted that Canada was not ready yet for the inscription. It expressed appreciation for the State Party's responsible action in this regard; it recalled the outstanding qualities of the site and underlined that the role of First Nations could be expressed enough.

The Delegation of **Turkey** congratulated Canada for a successful file and expressed respect for the request of Canada to give enough time to resolve issues related to governance.

La Délégation d'**Angola** félicite l'État partie pour le travail accompli et, considérant le caractère sacré de ce site, estime qu'il n'est pas possible de se passer des communautés locales, car c'est avec elles que l'on peut assurer la gestion durable du site et le maintien à long terme de sa VUE. La Délégation souhaite donc qu'une note particulière relative à la demande du Canada de renvoyer cette proposition d'inscription soit incluse dans les conclusions générales de cette 40e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, alors que le site réunit toutes les conditions pour être inscrit. Elle estime que cette attitude est un exemple de mise en œuvre efficace de la *Convention* que les États parties devraient suivre, et que cela mérite des applaudissements.

La Délégation du **Pérou** déclare être tout à fait d'accord pour soutenir l'inscription du bien. Elle considère néanmoins que la réflexion menée par le Canada est un acte de responsabilité assumée pour ouvrir le dialogue avec l'une des Premières nations concernées par cette proposition d'inscription. La Délégation considère que cette attitude est exemplaire et montre le respect vis-à-vis des communautés locales pour mettre en place des consensus, et soutient pleinement la proposition de renvoi de la proposition d'inscription en vue de son approbation à la prochaine session du Comité.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendments proposed by Finland.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.18** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1pm.

SIXTH DAY – SUNDAY 17 July 2016

TWELFTH MEETING

2.00 p.m. – 9 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

**8B. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(continuation)**

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/8B
WHC/16/40.COM/8B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B3
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B4

Decisions: **40 COM 8B.1 to 40 COM 8B.52**

Hubei Shennongjia (China) (N 1509)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.7**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

IUCN proposed to display a series of slides related to this property and to provide its conclusions rather than making a full presentation, in the interest of time.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no requests for amendments had been received.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.7** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party on behalf of the Committee on the inscription of Hubei Shennongjia.

The Observer Delegation of **China** thanked the Committee, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN and expressed its commitment to protect the site in the spirit of the *World Heritage Convention*. The Delegation extended an invitation to visit China.

Mistaken Point (Canada) (N 1497)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.12**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

IUCN briefly presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Rapporteur** noted that no amendments had been received for this site.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.12** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated Canada for this inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Canada** thanked the IUCN and the Committee and noted that, with this nomination, Canada was proud to have 18 sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. It noted that this nomination was the culmination of years of collaboration between the local community, the province and academic institutions.

Archipel de Revillagigedo (Mexico) (N 1510)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.14**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

IUCN presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that she had not received any amendments.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.14** was adopted.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairperson congratulated Mexico for this inscription on the World Heritage List.

Le représentant du **Mexique** (Observateur) souligne que le Mexique est heureux et fier de cette nouvelle inscription et exprime aussi sa solidarité avec le peuple turc. Il remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'appui fourni au cours de la procédure de nomination ainsi que l'IUCN pour son travail d'évaluation. En matière de protection, l'inscription renforcera les mesures prises pour la conservation du bien, notamment pour l'application de la Convention d'Aichi, dont la prochaine conférence est prévue au Mexique en vue d'intégrer la biodiversité. Le Mexique souligne également ses efforts en vue d'obtenir une Liste du patrimoine mondial plus équilibrée, notamment pour les biens du Pacifique.

Sanganeb Marine National Park and Dungonab Bay – Mukkawar Island Marine National Park (Sudan) (N 262 rev)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.6**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

IUCN presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** noted that this unique site located in the Red Sea features undisturbed and impressive natural phenomena and great natural beauty, adding that it is one of best diving sites in the region and the world. It further noted that the only minor problem concerns the boundaries connecting the two parts of the site. It further noted that the State Party worked on this issue with IUCN and that the Delegation Viet Nam proposed to amend the Draft Decision accordingly.

The Delegation of **Finland** noted that this nomination was referred at the last Committee session and that at the time, Sudan had assured the Committee that it would address the issues related to the site's boundaries and its management framework. The Delegation considered that Sudan has done so in a satisfactory manner and therefore expressed its support for the inscription of this site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** echoed the comments made by the Delegation of Finland and expressed its support for inscription, noting the excellent collaboration between the State Party and IUCN.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its appreciation for the efforts of the State Party to protect and preserve this site, which constitutes an exceptional ecosystem of global significance. While recognizing the boundary issues, the Delegation expressed its belief that inscription will further encourage the State Party to improve the management of the site, and the Delegation supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the State Party for the work carried out and considered that the State Party had responded satisfactorily to the concerns previously expressed, even though certain boundary issues remain. The Delegation recommended inscription and stated that it is assured that the recommendations will be implemented.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie**, sur la base des compléments apportés par l'UICN et par les Délégations, note avec satisfaction l'attitude de l'État Partie pour ce dossier d'inscription. Elle indique que ce qui ressort des discussions avec l'UICN est l'amélioration du cadre de gestion. Par conséquent, la Tunisie souscrit à l'inscription du bien, en appelant à un continuum de collaboration avec l'UICN.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** considered that remaining questions of boundaries and management framework can be resolved, and therefore supported the inscription of this site.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** recognized the scientific importance of this site and its high level of biodiversity. The Delegation congratulated Sudan for this nomination and recommended inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** applauded Sudan for the nomination of this exceptional site and stated that this inscription would contribute to ensuring a more balanced

World Heritage List. The Delegation considered that the State Party had responded adequately to the concerns expressed by the Committee, particularly as regarding the boundaries and the management plan. The Delegation expressed its support for this inscription.

The Delegation of **Turkey** commended the State Party for its patience, noting that this nomination has been examined by the Committee at three sessions. It further commended the State Party for making all the improvements requested by the Committee and expressed its support for the inscription of this site.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** estime que le site démontre une Valeur universelle exceptionnelle au titre des Critères (ix) et (x). Afin d'engager l'État Partie à poursuivre son engagement et son travail pour le site, la Délégation soutient l'amendement présenté par le Viet Nam qui vise à l'inscription du bien.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** echoed previous Delegations in expressing its support for the inscription of this impressively preserved site and commended the fruitful collaboration between the State Party and IUCN. It stated that it looked forward to IUCN's reports regarding the successful implementation of the requested measures.

The Delegation of **Angola** commended the efforts made by the State Party in addressing the issues raised by the Committee over this long process. While acknowledging that some issues remain, the Delegation expressed its confidence that they will be resolved in collaboration with IUCN. The Delegation also noted that the management of this site has been made more challenging owing to its off-shore location.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** stated that it joins other Delegations in commending and supporting this inscription.

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient l'inscription du bien en raison de son potentiel indéniable à remplir les critères requis.

La Délégation du **Pérou** apporte son soutien l'inscription du bien.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the State Party and expressed its support for the inscription of this site.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** expressed its support for the inscription of this site and added that it was confident that the State Party would address the concerns raised.

La Délégation de **Cuba** soutient l'inscription en raison de l'importance des aires marines dans la mise en œuvre de la *Convention*.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its support for the inscription of this site and stressed the importance of adopting an integrated, common property protection and a management plan based on a participatory approach.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment proposed by Viet Nam.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.6** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the Chairperson congratulated Sudan for this inscription on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** condemned the acts recently perpetrated in the host country. It thanked the Committee for this inscription, along with the African World Heritage Fund, IUCN, the regional organization protecting the Red Sea, all State Parties who supported the nomination as well as the local communities concerned. It noted that this recognition will enable Sudan to take all necessary measures to launch an integrated management plan to ensure the sustainability of this site.

The **Chairperson** thanked Sudan for its kind words of solidarity with Turkey and announced that the Turkish Minister of Culture wished to address the Committee.

The **Minister of Culture of Turkey** made a statement which can be found in full in **Annex II** of the present Summary Records.

Lut Desert (Islamic Republic of Iran) (N 1505)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.8**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

IUCN presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** noted the uniqueness of the Lut Desert, as one of the few places on earth with such extreme environmental and unique climatic conditions. It commended the State Party for its efforts in preparing the dossier and maintaining mechanisms for its protection and management and took note of IUCN's view that the site enjoys adequate legal protection. The Delegation supported inscription of the Lut Desert owing to its obvious OUV, its status as one of six non-polar deserts in the world and its unique climatic conditions. It further recognized that the State Party had fully addressed the concerns expressed by IUCN, particularly related to its centralized management (the Iranian Cultural Heritage Handicraft and Tourism Organization), in cooperation with local communities and other stakeholders and expressed its belief that the State Party is committed to protecting its World Heritage properties. The Delegation recommended inscribing the Lut Desert on the basis of Criteria (vii) and (viii) and indicated that it had submitted an amendment in this regard.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed on the substance of the remarks made by the Philippines and noted the excellent collaboration between the State Party and IUCN. It recognized that additional studies must be carried out, but stated that it strongly supported the inscription of the Lut Desert on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** commended the State Party and noted that the site represents a unique example of geological processes. It expressed its belief that the State Party has undertaken the necessary measures for its protection and that the inscription would encourage it to improve the management of site. The Delegation expressed its support for the amendment submitted by the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** considered that the State Party had met all the requirements regarding the management of site and is committed to safeguarding the site. The Delegation stated that it was in favour of the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** noted that the nomination of Lut Desert constitutes a good example of cooperation between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation considered that the issues of boundaries and management of this huge site have been resolved and noted that, in the future, the State Party must consider the issues related to increasing tourism, climate change and the protections of the site's biodiversity and ecosystem. The Delegation stated that it fully supports the inscription of the Lut Desert on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** se réfère aux aspects positifs relevés dans les commentaires et le projet de décision et affirme que le désert du Lut est un joyau dans sa catégorie morphologique. En raison, en outre, de l'attitude positive et constructive de l'État partie concernant la délimitation et le plan de gestion pour la conservation du bien, la Tunisie propose d'inscrire le bien.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** recognized that the State Party has met all the recommendations expressed by of the Committee and strongly supported its inscription as proposed by the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** expressed its thanks the Centre and the Advisory Bodies and congratulated the State Party for addressing all the concerns raised by the Committee and stated its support for inscription.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that the State Party has implemented the requests of the Committee and expressed its support for the inscription of the Lut Desert as the first natural World Heritage site in the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** welcomed the in-depth analysis of IUCN and expressed its satisfaction that the institutional and management issues raised have been addressed. The Delegation stated its unreserved support for inscription.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** recognized that this site is the first natural site proposed for inscription by the State Party. It expressed its support for the inscription of this site.

The Delegation of **Poland** lent its voice to previous voices in support of inscription of the Lut Desert.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** noted that this unique site met both criteria proposed and considered that the issues related to the local villages can be dealt with by management plan.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed its support for the inscription of this site, noting that it constitutes an exceptional example of ongoing geological processes. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to work with IUCN for the minor boundary modification, as recommended.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** considère les commentaires de l'UICN et malgré quelques préoccupations sur les limites juridiques, il est important de sauvegarder les spécificités morphologiques du bien. Compte tenu du fait que l'État partie

s'engage à mettre en place les limites du bien, la Délégation soutient l'inscription du bien en vue de pour préparer un plan de gestion plus concerté.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the Islamic Republic of Iran and IUCN for their collaboration and expressed its support for inscription.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendment submitted by the Philippines, Indonesia and Viet Nam.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.8** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated the Islamic Republic of Iran on the inscription of Lut Desert.

The Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** thanked the Committee for inscribing Lut Desert on the World Heritage List. The Representative of the Delegation recited a poem penned especially for the occasion.

Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 5593)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.11**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

IUCN presented its evaluation of the nomination.

The **Vice-Chairperson** recalled the questions raised by Myanmar concerning this nomination and invited Thailand and Myanmar to make brief statements concerning this nomination.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** gave the floor to Myanmar.

The Observer Delegation of **Myanmar** expressed its deepest solidarity with Turkey. The Delegation indicated that the nominated site is connected with a forest complex in Myanmar and regretted that Myanmar did not receive sufficient prior notification from Thailand, especially as part of the nominated site appears to be on Myanmar's soil. The Delegation noted that the World Heritage Centre encouraged dialogue between the States Parties and informed the Committee that, during recent a visit of State Consulate in Bangkok, the matter was discussed and it was agreed that the nomination would proceed only once the boundaries issues have been clarified. However, the Delegation noted that the Delegation received the amendment with coordinates just before the session, which might imply a significant change to the boundaries. It indicated its wish that the agreement reached between the two countries be honoured and regretted that the present nomination did not do so. The Delegation requested that the Committee consider closely whether the nomination is in compliance with all provisions of the *Convention*, bearing in mind the boundary issues.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** addressed the points raised by Myanmar and indicated that the coordinates had been clarified to show only the most extreme points of the nominated property, and that these points had nothing to do with the boundary line between the two countries. It pointed out that the map attached in the nomination file respects the international convention between the two countries on

border definition. In response to the concerns raised by Myanmar, the Delegation indicated that consultations had been conducted in the spirit of the discussion between the leaders of the two countries, and that Thailand had submitted a set of coordinates located approximately in the middle of the property, as indicated in the *Operational Guidelines*, and that these coordinates are located squarely within the boundaries of Thailand. Finally, the Delegation expressed its commitment to dialogue and to finding an amicable solution to the boundary issue during the one-year period while this nomination is under referral.

The Observer Delegation of **Myanmar** raised a point of order and indicated that, concerning the amended coordinates, this information had only been received just before the session and should still be considered as a significant modification of the boundaries. Concerning the single point located in the centre of the proposed property, the Delegation indicated that it makes it difficult to determine whether the proposed property intrudes into Myanmar's territory, and reiterated its request for sufficient time to review this issue.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** recalled that the item was examined by the Committee last year and that the Committee discussed it at length and considered that it had full potential for being inscribed. However, due to a concern raised by the Advisory Bodies regarding consultation with the indigenous community, the item was referred. The Delegation noted that this year, another concern has been raised by the Delegation of Myanmar. It also informed the members of the Committee that the ASEAN Group Ambassadors had discussed this nomination and proposed an amendment, which was being put forward by Viet Nam and the Philippines.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** concurred with the statement made by Viet Nam and proposed to refer the nomination, which the Delegation indicated had been agreed upon by both Thailand and Myanmar. The Delegation further remarked that this would also give more time for a better nomination dossier for Thailand.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** supported the amendment proposed by Viet Nam and the Philippines, as well as the comments made by the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** extended congratulations to the State Party for the excellent preparation of the nomination. It also stated that in its view, it would be ideal to proceed with a transboundary nomination, taking into account various concerns surrounding the boundaries and demarcations. The Delegation asked whether the Advisory Bodies have an opinion about this.

La Délégation du **Portugal** rejoint les orateurs précédents qui ont souligné les efforts des deux Etats parties du Myanmar et de la Thaïlande, et se réjouit du fait que ces efforts continuent. Il soutient les amendements déjà proposés et l'octroi d'un délai pour les clarifications ayant traités aux frontières sur lesquelles l'État partie a pris des engagements.

The **Chairperson** invited IUCN to reply to the question posed by Jamaica.

IUCN stated that, initially, IUCN made a comment on a potential transboundary nomination, and pointed out that Myanmar's Tentative List also includes some sites of the Kaeng Krachan Forest Complex.

La Délégation du **Pérou** soutient le projet de décision, mais souligne qu'un tel soutien n'implique pas une prise de position sur la question de la souveraineté de

l'un ou de l'autre État partie sur la zone tampon du site en question, et souligne qu'il n'appartient pas au Comité de s'exprimer sur de telles questions.

The **Rapporteur** presented the amendment submitted by Viet Nam and the Philippines.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** supported the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** stressed that the concern on this subject is the boundary, as expressed by Myanmar, and suggested to look at Paragraph 7 more closely.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** soutient aussi l'amendement proposé par le Viet Nam, les Philippines et l'Indonésie.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** expressed that it understands the concern expressed by the members of the Committee, but points out that the language of the amendment proposed by Viet Nam and Philippines were chosen carefully by the ASEAN Group Ambassadors, and therefore requested other members of the Committee to endorse it without alteration.

The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Myanmar to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Myanmar** informed the Committee that the language proposed by Jamaica and supported by Tunisia is the one agreed with Myanmar and Thailand, and that therefore Myanmar cannot agree to Viet Nam's amendment to this proposal.

The **Chairperson** highlighted that the Committee has agreed upon all paragraphs of the proposed amendment except Paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** supported the amendment made by Jamaica and Tunisia.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie**, ayant appris qu'il y a eu une réunion entre les États Parties concernés, n'apporte pas son soutien à l'amendement du Viet Nam.

The **Rapporteur** informed that she has received an amendment for Paragraph 7.

La Délégation du **Pérou** souligne que le Comité n'est pas compétent pour s'exprimer, ne serait-ce qu'implicitement, sur un différend territorial. La Délégation estime que, dans ce contexte, le Comité ne devrait pas s'exprimer sur ce dossier de nomination avant que les États Parties concernés aient résolu entre eux la question territoriale qui les divise. La Délégation propose que le Comité attende une prochaine session pour prendre une décision.

La Délégation d'**Angola** demande si ce sont les Membres du Comité ou bien les États parties concernés par l'inscription qui doivent s'exprimer et décider de cette question, et fait une suggestion d'amendement.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** reiterated its support to Viet Nam's amendment. It further added that this is a bilateral issue and needs to respect the wishes of the concerned States Parties.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** proposed to rephrase to avoid any vague formulaiton.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed discomfort at dealing with this issue, which can only be solved by the two countries involved. It proposed to incorporate a footnote below the text.

La Délégation d'**Angola** observe que ce qui empêche l'inscription de ce bien à ce stade est le différend territorial entre les deux États Parties concernés et propose de revoir le projet de décision afin de trouver un libellé satisfaisant pour tous.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** reiterated once again that it supports the proposal made by Viet Nam and Philippines with the spirit of ASEAN family and supports crossing out the last sentence.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the proposal made by the Chairperson and Portugal, as there have been ongoing consultations between the two State Parties.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** recalled that there was a recommendation from Angola to delete the terms “recommend”, and to replace it with “encourage”.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** supported what had been said by Portugal and Peru and further supported the language of “encourage”.

La Délégation du **Pérou** intervient pour souligner la complexité de ce dossier et demande la position du Conseiller juridique sur le mandat du Comité à s'exprimer en matière des questions ayant trait aux frontières. Il propose que l'on suspende le débat sur cette proposition d'inscription, pour donner le temps aux deux États Parties de résoudre leur différend.

La Délégation du **Portugal** intervient sur le libellé d'une partie de la décision, en soulignant que la version française lui semble plus fidèle au contenu recherché.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the proposal made by Portugal, as it is important to clarify the terms, and also supported the wording of 'Encourage'.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** concurred with what was proposed by Finland and Portugal. Nevertheless, it called upon the ASEAN countries to indicate whether they would agree to it or not.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** proposed, considering the lack of time and the seriousness of the issue, to adjourn the discussion and resume it in Paris.

Le **Conseiller juridique** confirme qu'il n'est pas dans les attributions du Comité de s'exprimer sur des questions territoriales ayant trait aux sites proposés pour inscription. Il ne voit pas d'inconvénient à ce que l'examen de cette question soit suspendu.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** indicated that time was needed for consultations, and therefore proposed to adjourn the discussion immediately.

The **Chairperson** agreed and proposed to adjourn the discussion immediately.

The examination of this nomination was suspended until the next meeting of the 40th session of the Committee in October 2016 (Paris).

Ennedi Massif: Natural and Cultural Landscape (Chad) (N 1475)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.15**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification for this nomination.

ICOMOS and **IUCN** each presented their evaluation of the nomination.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** souligne l'importance des remarques positives des Organisations consultatives, mais note que les observations de l'UICN concernant les modifications des limites ne semblent pas suffisantes à en mettre en doute la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle, et donc l'inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial, particulièrement au vu de la priorité Afrique. Elle indique par conséquent qu'elle a proposé un amendement au projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** considered that the reduction of the boundaries does not affect the OUV and recalled that the item is the only candidate for nomination from Africa this year, and therefore fully supports the inscription of the property at the present session.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** exprime des réserves quant aux observations de l'UICN concernant les limites du bien et recommande l'inscription de ce site mixte sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** souligne que les attributs de ce site en permettent l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et soutient la proposition d'amendement du Viet Nam, aussi à la lumière du besoin d'enrichir la liste de biens mixtes africains sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** stated that it considers the report of the Advisory Bodies adequate, but that, since the Advisory Bodies acknowledged the OUV, the only apparent problem was the boundaries, and hence proposed to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List this year.

La Délégation du **Liban** considère que la proposition d'inscription était excellente avant que l'État partie ne décide d'en réduire les limites de manière non justifiée. Par conséquent, elle propose que l'on inscrive ce site sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial mais qu'une modification de ses limites soit également demandée, et propose un amendement dans ce sens.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** considered that the change of the boundaries would not affect the OUV, and therefore supports the amendment proposed by Viet Nam and calls for the inscription this year.

The Delegation of **Croatia** stated that it was impressed by the site and considered it important to have the property on the list of World Heritage, as there are only a few mixed sites in Africa.

La Délégation d'**Angola** apporte un élément d'information additionnel sur la protection légale accordée au site et demande que l'État partie intervienne pour justifier les modifications des limites qu'il a souhaité introduire dans la proposition d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** stated that the Kazakh experts considered that the attributes for the Criteria (ii) and (vii) were fully met within the reduced boundaries, further highlighted the considerable efforts made by the State Party, and hence proposed to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List immediately.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** invited the World Heritage Committee to revise the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Finland** congratulated the State Party for the excellent nomination dossier but regretted that the size of the site had been considerably reduced only recently, which should justify a revised nomination dossier. It supports the view expressed by Angola and Lebanon but expressed its willingness to go along with the consensus, considering that this is the only dossier from Africa.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** supported the inscription of the site at the present session. Despite the reduction of boundaries, the Delegation was of the view that the OUV remains intact.

The Delegation of **Turkey** regretted that some important parts of the site were removed and suggested giving the floor to the State Party. Nonetheless, the Delegation supported the inscription of the site at the present session.

The Delegations of **Poland** and of the **Philippines** supported the inscription of the site at the present session.

La Délégation du **Portugal** souligne que les biens mixtes constituent toujours un défi et que cette proposition d'inscription demeure valide malgré les éléments critiques mis en évidence.

La Délégation de La **France** (Observateur) soutient tout ce que les membres du Comité ont déjà dit, notamment concernant les caractéristiques exceptionnelles de ce site, et indique qu'il faut encourager l'État partie.

Le Délégation du **Mali** (Observateur), en tant que gestionnaire d'un site mixte, veut mettre l'accent sur importance du site et du Critère (iii), et précise que la diversité biologique et culturelle de ce désert est un témoignage extraordinaire de l'activité humaine depuis le paléolithique. D'un point de vue esthétique, la Délégation exprime qu'elle remarque que des grands chercheurs sont tombés amoureux cette partie du désert et souligne que la richesse scientifique du bien pourrait déclencher la dynamique du patrimoine comme moteur du développement durable contre les changements climatiques et géostratégiques qui affectent la région.

La Délégation du **Tchad** (Observateur) fournit plusieurs éclaircissements : les experts de l'UICN et de l'ICOMOS ont constaté qu'il n'y avait aucune menace, ce pourquoi il n'y avait que 1 363 km² de zone tampon. Elle indique que suite à la demande de l'ICOMOS et de l'UICN, cette zone tampon a été augmentée à 7 778 km². Quant à la protection juridique du bien, la Délégation indique qu'il y aurait déjà des lois et décrets nationaux et que l'État partie souhaite ériger le site en Zone de catégorie 6, selon les normes de l'UICN. La Délégation indique que, dans cet effort de restructuration, l'État partie fait aussi appel à l'ONG 'African Park Network' et à l'Union Européenne, qui offre un soutien financier de 4,7 millions euros pour le renforcement des capacités locales. Concernant le rôle de la communauté locale autochtone, la Délégation confirme que la population locale a été impliquée dans tout le processus d'inscription et de mise en œuvre du plan de gestion. Elle explique que les œuvres artistiques à l'intérieur du bien sont sacrées pour la population et qu'elles

seront donc préservées. Concernant l'art rupestre dans la région, l'État partie souhaiterait étendre le périmètre du site pour inclure tous les sites d'art rupestre de la région. Pour ce qui est de l'exploitation énergétique du bien, la Délégation déclare qu'il n'y aura aucune exploitation du pétrole dans cette zone et rappelle que la correspondance concernant cette question a déjà été envoyée à la Directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial non seulement par l'État-partie mais aussi par l'ONG 'African Park Network.'

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that there were two similar amendments received, one from Viet Nam and the other one from Lebanon: Viet Nam's position was to inscribe the site on the basis of Criteria (iii), (vii) and (ix), while Lebanon's amendment proposes to inscribe the site on the basis of Criteria (vii) and (ix) only.

La Délégation du **Portugal** remercie l'État partie pour la transmission de ces informations importantes et indique que, compte tenu de l'engagement très soutenu de l'État partie, déjà visible dans le dossier d'inscription, la Délégation peut se joindre au consensus pour inscrire ce site en tant que site mixte, aussi sous le Critère (iii), à condition qu'il y ait une collaboration étroite entre l'État partie et les Organisations consultatives et que ce travail soit suivi par le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour garantir les qualités exceptionnelles de ce site mixte.

La Délégation du **Pérou** s'exprime en faveur de l'inscription.

The Delegations of **United Republic of Tanzania, Jamaica** and **Turkey** joined Peru and Portugal and indicated that they were in favour of including Criterion (iii).

The Delegation of **Finland** asked ICOMOS about rock art, which was mentioned as the most important part of the site but was excluded when the boundaries were reduced.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** indique qu'elle n'a pas de doute quant à l'engagement pris par l'État partie, tout en observant que des sites importants sont actuellement exclus des limites, selon les indications que le même État partie vient de fournir.

ICOMOS indicated that it contacted the IUCN experts regarding the rock art in the area as soon as the boundary modification proposal was received. It highlighted that around 30 rock art sites, including some of the most widely studied and famous, had been removed from the property's boundaries. ICOMOS explained that it is the removal of these important sites, which would have justified an inscription under cultural criteria, which led it to recommend the referral of the nomination in order to consider the applicability of Criterion (iii).

La Délégation du **Liban** indique qu'en écoutant les clarifications de l'État partie, il est difficile de comprendre pourquoi la modification des limites a été introduite dans la proposition d'inscription, mais qu'elle souhaite finalement se rallier à la majorité et s'exprime en faveur de l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** explained that there is consensus for the inscription of this site as a mixed site.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.15** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation du **Tchad** (Observateur) remercie les membres du Comité et s'engage solennellement à mettre en œuvre toutes les recommandations du Comité et à transmettre ce patrimoine aux générations futures.

The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from Finland.

The Delegation of **Finland** explained that it was necessary to go over the Draft Decision again, was not final yet since it included a lot of recommendations which had still not accepted Criterion (iii). The Delegation requested to review and revise the amended Decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the final text and asked whether Paragraph 5 can be deleted, now that Criterion (iii) has been included in the inscription. She explained that some clarification is needed, since it was also suggested to revise the northern border, and asked for clarifications from the Committee.

The Delegation of **Finland** requested to add the word 'extend' instead of 'revise'.

La Délégation du **Liban** accepte la proposition de la Finlande et propose d'enlever la phrase 'that may further justify the application of Criterion (iii)', puisque le bien vient d'être inscrit sur la base des Critères (iii), (vii) and (ix).

The **Rapporteur** amended the Decision accordingly, but indicated that there were still conflicting messages in Paragraph 7.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose, suite aux renseignements fournis par l'État partie, d'introduire 'thanks the State Party for its commitment not to develop oil exploitation programmes in areas within the property and the buffer zone' et de supprimer le reste du paragraphe.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** requested a small amendment to Paragraph 5, requesting to replace 'requests' with 'encourages', regarding the extension of the boundaries.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** suggested 'recommends' instead of 'encourages'.

IUCN wished to comment on Paragraph, 5 as it was not clear whether the Decision had already been adopted. IUCN explained that the boundary modification also has an impact on natural attributes, not just on cultural aspects. It therefore suggested to add language to include all attributes of the OUV, including the rock art sites, in Paragraph 5, as IUCN knows that there are some attributes of the natural system in that area.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** supported the proposal by IUCN.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that the Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.15** had been already adopted.

The Ahwar of Southern Iraq: Refuge of Biodiversity and the Relict Landscape of the Mesopotamian Cities (Iraq) (N 1481)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.16**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that it had received a factual error notification concerning nomination. The Secretariat read out a joint statement from Iraq and Iran insisting on the 'friendly relations' between the two countries while proposing a few modifications.

ICOMOS and **IUCN** presented their evaluation and recommendations for the site.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** pointed out that this was the first nomination for a site that is both a mixed and a serial property. The Delegation emphasized that although both IUCN's and ICOMOS's reports recognized the potential OUV of individual components, they had difficulty asserting the OUV of the nomination as a whole.

ICOMOS highlighted that the *Operational Guidelines* require that every component of a serial nomination should contribute to each of the proposed criteria. Therefore, since ICOMOS considers that the three archaeological sites do not contribute to the justification of the natural criteria, while the four wetland marshes do not contribute to the cultural criteria, it recommends that the nomination should be revised as two separate nominations.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** explained that there is no text in the *Convention*, and particularly in Article 137 of the *Operational Guidelines*, that could support such an interpretation. The Delegation recalled that, whereas the OUV of Cultural Landscapes derives from the relationship between nature and culture, mixed properties are inscribed under cultural and natural criteria because they meet both criteria independently and simply share the same geographical location. The Delegation expressed the opinion that this clear definition invalidates the argument by the Advisory Bodies to reject the serial approach proposed in the nomination. It further pointed out that the relationship between the three archaeological sites and the wetland marshes is not only symbolic, but exemplifies the link between the demise of the cities and the environmental changes related to the unstable delta. The Delegation further highlighted that the wetland areas have been in a dramatic situation during the previous political regimes, when they were subjected to a brutal policy aiming at expelling their population, along with a deliberate draining of the marshes. The Delegation emphasized that the State Party had engaged for several years in a coherent policy aiming at recovering the wetlands and redefining the rights of local populations after decades of neglect. Finally, the Delegation stated that it is the duty of the Committee to recognize this exceptional endeavour, and therefore supported the inscription of the site and noted that the recommendations should be adopted.

La Délégation du **Koweït** félicite l'Iraq pour cette ambitieuse proposition d'inscription alors que le patrimoine de la région arabe subit des attaques terroristes. La Délégation estime que le rôle du Comité du patrimoine mondial face à ces efforts d'annihilation ne peut se limiter à inscrire des sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, et que le Comité se doit aussi d'attirer l'attention de la communauté internationale sur les efforts des États parties qui sont sur les lignes de front d'une guerre idéologique qui nous concerne tous. La Délégation ajoute que, pour préparer cette nomination et mettre en œuvre des actions de conservation des marées et des sites sumériennes, l'Iraq, en tant que pays en reconstruction, a fourni des efforts considérables, et que grâce à un soutien international, ces sites de première importance sont à présent protégés par des professionnels formés et des programmes de conservation. La Délégation souligne que ces efforts doivent certes être amplifiés, mais qu'ils doivent avant tout être reconnus et soutenus. Or, la Délégation estime que les exigences techniques de l'ICOMOS et de l'IUCN pour justifier de différer l'inscription vont au-delà de ce que requièrent les *Orientations*, et que les efforts de l'Iraq pour protéger et mettre en valeur le patrimoine culturel et naturel doivent être reconnus par le Comité, en signe de la reconnaissance internationale que ce pays mérite pour qu'il ne se tienne pas seul sur le front de la guerre contre le terrorisme culturel. La Délégation ajoute que la proposition d'inscrire « Les Ahwar du sud de l'Iraq » sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial offre au Comité

une occasion de reconnaître que l'Iraq tient ses engagements internationaux en matière de protection de son patrimoine culturel et naturel. Enfin, la Délégation prie tous les membres du Comité de soutenir l'Iraq.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed appreciation to the State Party for submitting this nomination of both historical and natural importance, and asserted that it is a complicated site. The Delegation explained that the nominated serial site has geographically separate natural and cultural values, and that it remains unclear whether and how these relate to each other. The Delegation requested that the Advisory Bodies explain why a joint field mission to the site did not take place.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed appreciation for the overall vision which underpins the nomination of Iraq. The Delegation noted that Iraq submitted a consolidated Management Plan for both the natural and cultural parts, which was elaborated with technical input from UNEP, the IUCN regional office for West Africa and the Arab regional Centre for World Heritage. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** congratulated the State Party for this nomination and supported its inscription.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** commended the State Party for protecting their cultural heritage and expressed that the inscription of the property will send a clear message from international community to ISIL and the terrorist who are destroying the value of heritage of the East areas. The Delegation supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Portugal** commended the State Party for this complex and extremely stimulating nomination. The Delegation further commended the State Party for the work that has been undertaken to recover the wetland areas in southern Iraq. The Delegation explained that some challenges remain regarding management and conservation, but remained fully confident that the State Party will overcome these challenges in the future, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation encouraged dialogue between the State Party and its neighbouring countries to address the water challenges and further encouraged the important cooperation between Iraq and Iran to overcome their differences about this nomination. The Delegation expressed that, by supporting this inscription, this Committee would send a strong signal of encouragement to Iraq and the Iraqi people.

The Delegation of **Croatia** highlighted that the three Mesopotamian cities have been studied since the beginning of the 20th Century, and that there is a wealth of academic production across all disciplines on the matter. It highlighted that the natural attributes of the nominated property are also very well presented. The Delegation expressed its support for the proposal of Lebanon.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite vivement l'État partie pour cette proposition d'inscription et souligne que les États arabes ont seulement deux biens mixtes inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation souligne également l'ancienneté et la richesse de l'histoire de l'Iraq et de sa civilisation, et note que le pays passe par une période d'insécurité et de lutte contre le terrorisme, qui a causé des dégâts considérables et parfois irrévocables à ses biens culturels, sans compter les nombreuses victimes humaines qu'elle déplore. La Délégation rappelle qu'au moment d'affronter le danger terroriste, l'État partie n'a pas oublié son patrimoine, et qu'il a bien au contraire fourni un effort louable au cours de ces dernières années pour essayer de le sauvegarder et de le promouvoir. La Délégation rappelle

l'importance de cette région, tant au plan de ses valeurs de biodiversité qu'archéologiques, et souligne particulièrement certaines de ses cités florissantes qui ont fortement marqué la civilisation tant à l'échelle régionale qu'universelle. Elle cite parmi tant d'autres les deux cités millénaires d'Ur et d'Uruk, dont la richesse et l'impact civilisationnel sont de portée universelle. La Délégation questionne toutefois les réserves exprimées par l'UICN et l'ICOMOS et observe que les liens entre nature et culture sont bel et bien établis par les tablettes cunéiformes, mais aussi par l'occupation humaine alentour, si bien que les cités en question n'auraient pu se développer que grâce aux eaux des marées drainées à la fois pour la navigation et pour la culture. La Délégation ajoute que, s'il est vrai que le champ archéologique fouillé n'est pas très étendu et ne permet pas pour l'heure de démontrer suffisamment bien ces liens, la tâche n'est pas simple à mener, la problématique étant complexe et sa résolution demandant des années de travail. La Délégation rappelle que, pour la plupart des faits historiques, les preuves archéologiques se révèlent après les preuves littéraires ou épigraphiques, et s'affirme confiante que l'archéologie suivra. Par conséquent, la Délégation suggère qu'au lieu d'attendre des campagnes de fouilles à grande échelle qui prendront beaucoup de temps, celles-ci soient mises en œuvre dès maintenant, en même temps qu'une inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation espère qu'une telle inscription générera une dynamique d'investigation de terrain tant au plan national qu'international, et qu'elle encouragera l'État partie, meurtri par le terrorisme, en lui permettant d'inscrire ce bien et de répondre aux recommandations des Organisations consultatives. La Délégation soutient donc une inscription à effet immédiat.

The Delegation of **Poland** explained that they support the Delegation of Lebanon's proposal and the inscription of the site as a mixed site.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** expressed its gratitude for the hard work of the Advisory Bodies, who in their evaluation recognized the potential of this site. The Delegation stated that all three Mesopotamian urban centres are demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value and that the marshland areas are also recognized internationally by the Ramsar List of Wetlands. Against the Advisory Bodies' proposal that the three cities should be separated from the wetlands, the Delegation stressed that the cities are indivisible from their surrounding landscape and therefore supported the inscription as a mixed site. Furthermore, the State party developed a comprehensive Management Plan after the submission of the nomination dossier for evaluation. The Delegation suggested that the Committee inscribe this mixed property after making the necessary amendments to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation d'**Angola** félicite l'État partie pour cette proposition d'inscription audacieuse et, au regard des recommandations des Organisations consultatives, estime que les apparentes incohérences conceptuelles sont tout à fait compréhensibles, compte tenue de la double complexité de cette proposition d'inscription qui est à la fois un site mixte et en série. La Délégation soutient donc l'inscription de ce site, tout en encourageant l'État partie à renforcer le système de gestion et de conservation du bien proposé.

La Délégation du **Liban** relève que l'évaluation de cette nomination est très complexe et qu'il s'agit d'un cas sans précédent. Elle précise qu'au cours des discussions autour des *Orientations*, la possibilité d'allonger la période de nomination pour des sites aussi complexes a été soulevée, afin qu'elle se déroule sur un cycle de deux ans et demi au lieu d'un an et demi, ce qui donnerait le temps aux Organisations consultatives de réellement faire un travail de fond et de faire face aux problèmes méthodologiques et conceptuels, afin de pouvoir organiser dans des conditions optimales une mission et un travail de coordination communs.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** félicite l'État partie pour cette proposition d'inscription qui renferme des espèces de mammifères, d'oiseaux ou de poissons menacées ou en danger selon les Critères de la Liste rouge de l'UICN. La Délégation ajoute que le site proposé renferme une importante zone de migrations saisonnières de nombreuses espèces. La Délégation estime que l'inscription de ce site serait un moyen de préserver ces espèces menacées ou en danger et de baliser la coopération avec d'autres conventions. La Délégation soutient donc l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, afin de permettre à l'État partie d'élaborer un Plan de gestion qui permettrait une meilleure conservation des espèces en danger.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** congratulated Iraq for the submission of this complex nomination dossier and indicated that Iraq apparently submitted a detailed report and inventory of the marshes, and that it had launched a project to restore these marshes. The Delegation reiterated that Iraq had gone through terrible times and that the reconstruction of the country has only just started, and that this inscription should therefore be used as an encouragement.

La Délégation du **Pérou** s'ajoute aux autres Délégations qui se sont montrées en faveur de l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** also supported the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Iran**, speaking as a neighbouring country, stressed just how important it is not only for the country but for the entire region that this site be inscribed at the present session. Reiterating the Secretariat's comments on the need to strengthen cooperation between Iran and Iraq, the Delegation stressed that this inscription could accelerate the rapprochement and civilized cooperation in the wider region. The Delegation also thanked Iraq for its work during the nomination process and stressed that the cooperation between the two countries had been exemplary. The Delegation stressed that the inscription of this cradle of civilization would showcase the spirit of the *Convention*, one of mutual trust and recognition.

La Délégation du **Saint-siège** (Observateur) exprime son soutien à la candidature du site présenté par l'Iraq. Elle partage les arguments favorables exprimés par différents membres du Comité et souligne l'importance du site comme symbole et comme un instrument utile pour le dialogue interculturel et interreligieux. La Délégation ajoute qu'Ur fut la ville où Abraham vécut jusqu'à l'âge de 75 ans, ce qui confirme l'expression « religions abrahamiques » pour désigner les trois religions monothéistes (Christianisme, Judaïsme et Islam), signalant ainsi leurs origines géographiques, historiques et culturelles communes. La Délégation souligne que, dans le domaine des études philosophiques, des chercheurs emploient le terme « abrahamisme » pour désigner une forme de sagesse du monde fondée sur les écritures dans les religions révélées ou abrahamiques, où ils décrivent le développement en rapport à d'autres modèles de sagesse. En ce sens, la Délégation cite Jacques Derrida, lequel parlait d'hybridation gréco-abrahamique pour décrire la culture dominante du monde occidental actuel comme résultant du mélange continu des positions philosophiques grecques revisités et de celles des religions abrahamiques. Enfin, la Délégation soutient l'inscription de ce site en vertu de l'importance du dialogue interculturel.

The Delegation of **Japan** joined the previous speakers in commending and celebrating the efforts of the State Party to nominate this outstanding biodiversity and archaeological site. The Delegation indicated that it had played a small part in this

process by providing capacity building for the restoration of the marshlands. It pointed out that, while there are still challenges ahead, it supported the inscription of the site at the present session.

ICOMOS explained that the Advisory Bodies always plan missions to nominated sites, including the present nomination, but that last-minute visa problems did not allow for this mission to take place. ICOMOS further explained that they would welcome further discussion on the Delegation of Lebanon's proposal to extend the nomination period for sites of such complexity.

IUCN also emphasized that these increasingly complex nominations need more time to be evaluated, especially as some sites can evolve during the evaluation process.

The **Rapporteur** read out the Draft Decision and its amendments paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** proposed to delete Paragraph 2 and added a paragraph requesting the State party to submit a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the Committee's recommendations to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2017, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 42nd Session in 2018.

The **Secretariat** made an addition regarding the Joint Statement by Iraq and Iran, pointing out that Iraq made a commitment to revising the nomination file: 'Further requests the State Party to submit and edited version of the nomination file, according to the Statement jointly signed with the Islamic Republic of Iran'.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.16** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** thanked the World Heritage Centre expressed its gratitude for this historic inscription. The representative stressed that Iraq would preserve this World Heritage Site and fight terrorism, together with all the countries which supported this endeavour.

Western Tien Shan (Kazakhstan/Kyrgyzstan/Uzbekistan) (N 1490)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.9**

IUCN presented their evaluation and recommendations for this site.

The Delegation of **Poland** informed members that the State Party of Kazakhstan had requested to remove criterion (viii) and retain criterion (x). The Delegation showed their support in favour of the inscription, since the justification of criterion (x) was clearly presented in the nomination dossier and approved by IUCN. The Delegation regretted that Central Asia has only a few World Heritage properties inscribed on the List, and pointed out that the Committee had a great chance to improve this situation. The Delegation highlighted that the variety of agrobiodiversity represents not only our World Heritage but also provides an invaluable source of genetic material, especially in the face of climate change. The Delegation stated that questions of refined mapping and measurement of a property do not affect its Outstanding Universal Value and cannot be solved in a short time. The Delegation welcomed and supported the inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that this transnational site has much potential for criterion (x). However, from the point of view of criterion (viii), the Delegation considered that the conditions are not fully met. It emphasized that this serial nomination from Central Asia is crucial to promote both the principle of multinational nominations and the interregional balance of the World Heritage List. The Delegation fully supported this inscription on the basis of Criterion (x) and invited a national expert on natural sites to share some technical details.

The Turkish expert mentioned that the World Bank financed a 5-year project for these three countries, selecting the sites within each country based on the presence of wild crop relatives and highlighted that all the selected sites have a strong protection status as nature reserves. The expert pointed out that, because of past projects, these countries have experience in integrated management, and that a tripartite memorandum is in the process of completion and signature.

The Delegation of **Croatia** added that the OUV of the biodiversity of Western Tien Shan is hard to overestimate. It pointed out that this region has a wide variety of landscapes and an exceptionally rich biodiversity, including numerous endemic species. The Delegation commended the States Parties for this important regional cooperation in Central Asia and supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** explained that the nominated site has natural values and is a holistic object for the population that reflects the values of Tien Shan. The Delegation pointed out that such a transnational site, located on high mountain areas, would usually face questions of management and boundary definition, but noted that, fortunately, the Western Tien Shan areas already have an established administration and protection system. The Delegation also noted that the boundaries of the property generally adhere to the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines*, and that a minor part will be adjusted to strengthen the integrity of the site. The Delegation also evoked the memorandum for the joint management of the property, which has already been created by concerned State Parties. The Delegation finally asserted that the property has OUV and fulfils at least criterion (x).

The Delegations of **Finland** and **Poland** proposed amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.9** was adopted as amended.

Mountain Ecosystems of Koytendag (Turkmenistan)

Decision: **40 COM 8B.10**

IUCN presented their evaluation and recommendations for the site.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed its appreciation to the State Party of Turkmenistan for protecting these ecosystems, which are particularly important for birds. However, the Delegation stated that this site does not meet World Heritage criteria and encouraged the State Party to assess and possibly revise their Tentative List, possibly via the Upstream Process and in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, in order to identify sites that have the potential of demonstrating OUV.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that this nomination did not get a fair review by the IUCN, as the dossier was incomplete and lacked concrete information, which led the reviewer to make an unfavourable conclusion. The Delegation expressed the opinion

that the Koytendag Mountain Ecosystem has potential OUV with respect to criteria (ix) and (x), as it consists of three wildlife sanctuaries and one nature reserve. However, the Delegation acknowledged that there were problems with management and zoning regarding the buffer zone and biodiversity. It pointed out nonetheless that the size and the location of the site as well as the presence of 124 wild crop relative species were crucial factors. The Delegation affirmed that, if the State Party re-evaluates the nomination taking into account the 300 caves as well as the fauna biodiversity, this site would have potential to be inscribed, and therefore proposed that this nomination be deferred.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported the proposal by Turkey.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** drew the attention of the Committee Members to the fact that this was the first nomination for natural heritage put forward by Turkmenistan, and proposed that this nomination be deferred.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** supported the deferral of this site.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** soutient la proposition de la Turquie et propose de différer l'inscription pour donner à l'État partie un peu plus de temps afin de resoumettre le dossier de proposition d'inscription.

The **Rapporteur** read the amended Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.10** was adopted as amended.

L'Ensemble Tectono-volcanique Chaîne des Puys-faille de Limagne (France) (N 5643)

Decision : **40 COM 8B.13**

IUCN presented their evaluation and recommendations for the site.

La Délégation du **Liban** rappelle qu'il s'agit d'un site naturel exceptionnel dont la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle est clairement reconnue par la mission technique indépendante constituée à la demande du Comité. La Délégation rappelle également que l'IUCN considère que le paysage du site est insuffisamment naturel pour être inscrit au titre du critère (vii). L'interprétation de ce critère étant relativement subjective, la Délégation propose de ne pas le retenir pour se rapprocher d'un consensus. En revanche, le critère (viii) peut être retenu compte tenu du fait que les formes géologiques sont quasiment intactes. Afin de renforcer l'intégrité du site, la Délégation propose d'exclure de ses limites les deux carrières incluses dans le périmètre du bien et propose donc, dans l'esprit du consensus, de renvoyer le bien à l'État partie afin qu'il propose un dossier révisé sur la base du critère (viii).

La Délégation du **Portugal** reconnaît les efforts fournis par l'État partie et l'IUCN et soutient la Délégation du Liban en ce qui concerne le Critère (viii) et les efforts de l'État partie concernant les carrières. La Délégation estime que le travail qui a été fourni par cette collaboration étroite doit être vu comme un exemple important de l'engagement de l'État partie et de l'Organisation consultative dans le processus. La Délégation soutient le travail de ces derniers jours qui a eu pour résultat la proposition d'amendement introduite par le Liban.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported another referral based on the strong commitment of the State Party to revise the file and bring it up to the standards for inscription under Criterion (viii).

The Delegation of **Finland** shared IUCN's concern over the shortcomings of the Comparative Analysis and recalled that the technical mission is not an assessment according to the *Operational Guidelines*, and that the property's scientific and educational values are not equivalent to OUV. The Delegation asked IUCN if Criterion (viii) is now met.

IUCN responded that Criterion (viii) is not met.

The Delegation of **Finland** suggested an amendment to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne une difficulté méthodologique selon laquelle le terme « Valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle » doit être associé au terme « defer » alors que le terme « refer » implique que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle est reconnue.

La Délégation du **Koweït** considère qu'il n'est pas possible de décider d'une non-inscription ou d'un différé pour ce dossier. Elle estime que toutes les conditions seraient aujourd'hui requises pour inscrire le site dès la présente session et que le site remplit les conditions pour être inscrit au titre du Critère (viii), selon son exceptionnelle valeur scientifique et patrimoniale, pleinement démontrée d'un point de vue géologique. La Délégation entend cependant les remarques de ses collègues et est en faveur d'un consensus. Enfin, la Délégation soutient l'amendement proposé par la Tanzanie et la proposition du Liban.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** supported Finland's proposal concerning the potential to meet Criterion (viii).

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** supported Finland's proposal. The Delegation congratulated the State Party and IUCN for their efforts and recommendation regarding this site.

La Délégation du **Portugal** souligne que l'État partie et les Organisations consultatives ont beaucoup avancé malgré les différences dans l'évaluation scientifique des valeurs de ce site, et ont évolué vers une plateforme commune. Dans ce sens, la Délégation interprète ce projet d'amendement comme allant vers un travail soutenu sur un seul critère bien défini, indiquant ainsi ce sur quoi l'État partie doit travailler, en étroite collaboration avec l'Organisation consultative. La Délégation propose de garder le projet d'amendement comme présenté par la Tanzanie.

La Délégation du **Liban** souligne que, depuis les années 1990-2000, la question de la différence entre « refer » et « differ » est posée, et elle estime qu'il avait été clair que « référer » implique qu'il y ait Valeur universelle exceptionnelle pour au moins un des Critères, mais qu'il existe des problèmes au niveau de la conservation, de la protection, des limites, de l'authenticité partielle, alors que « différer » implique que la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle est seulement potentielle. La Délégation estime qu'il y a contradiction, et que si cet amendement est accepté avec « référer » et « potentielle », tout le système d'explication basé sur les *Orientations* serait remis en cause, et que cela causerait un retour en arrière de dix ou quinze ans. La Délégation demande donc de clarifier ce point.

The Delegation of **Finland** asked the Secretariat to clarify this contradiction in Paragraph 4 and help them with the wording.

The **Secretariat** referred to the Paragraph 159 *Operational Guidelines*, which deals with referrals, and Paragraph 160, which deals with deferrals. The Secretariat clarified that in cases of deferral, a more in-depth study is required, whereas in cases of referral, only minor additional information is required from the State Party. In response to the Delegation of Lebanon's comment, the Secretariat stated that they do not include a text on the specific criterion in question, but that the text is only included once the property is inscribed, since there may be changes to the text concerning each criterion between the initial referral and the eventual inscription. The Secretariat cited a specific case where a property was referred to the State Party, demonstrating that the wording "potential to meet criteria [x, y and z]" is part of the practice of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** stated that there is a clear checklist prepared by each Advisory Body where the properties in question are categorized according to deferral and referral. The Delegation drew attention to the problematic nature of the practice of modifying the criteria at each Committee session and requested that the Advisory Bodies modify their checklist. The Delegation suggested that the two categories be combined into one category with recommendations for each site. However, realizing that this is not a reality, the Delegation stressed that there is an inherent contradiction in the current practice.

La Délégation **d'Angola** propose de demander à l'UICN de clarifier ce point par rapport à « différer ».

La Délégation du **Portugal** admet que la définition du critère peut contraindre l'évolution du dossier, mais l'interprète en tant que feuille de route très utile afin que l'État partie et l'Organisation consultative puissent travailler ensemble. La Délégation considère que si cela peut et doit évoluer, il s'agit d'une feuille de route importante pour continuer de manière constructive le travail mené très étroitement entre l'État partie et l'Organisation consultative dans les mois à venir.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.13** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 17. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 41ST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2017)

La Délégation de la **Pologne** invite le Comité du patrimoine mondial à tenir sa prochaine session en Pologne, à Cracovie, au début du mois de juillet 2017. La Délégation se réjouit à l'idée d'accueillir le Comité et ajoute que cette ville a fait partie des 12 premières inscriptions sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, en 1978, en tant que première ville historique européenne. La Délégation espère vivement qu'une ville située aux confins de différentes cultures aura créer un climat de coopération et de travail très fructueux.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** congratulated Poland for having the privilege and honor to host the next session of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation expressed its wish to host the Committee in the near future.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 17** was adopted.

The newly-elected Chairperson of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee was announced: Professor Joseph Bourkla.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** thanked and congratulated Poland for offering to host the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation confirmed that the Budget and *Operational Guidelines* working groups would continue their work where they left off until the resumed session in Paris in October.

La Délégation du **Liban** félicite le Professeur Joseph Bourkla, nouveau Président de la 41e session, ainsi que la Pologne. La Délégation remercie la Turquie, qui a relevé le défi de terminer, malgré les événements, cette 40e session. Consciente des difficultés, la Délégation considère cela comme un tour de force, et salue la pénible décision de clôturer la session à Istanbul et de la poursuivre à Paris, avec la générosité traditionnelle du peuple turc.

La Délégation de la **Palestine** exprime son profond regret concernant les déclarations israéliennes, selon lesquelles la décision du Comité du patrimoine mondial concernant Jérusalem aurait échoué et aurait été refusée par le Comité. La Délégation considère ces propos inacceptables et regrettables, et comme une réponse maladroite à l'ouverture dont elle a fait preuve, alors qu'elle aurait pu pousser l'adoption ce jour. La Délégation finit en remerciant profondément la Délégation turque, la population turque et les jeunes volontaires. Elle félicite la Pologne pour l'accueil du Comité l'année prochaine et tous les membres du Comité qui ont fait preuve d'une grande ouverture d'esprit. La Délégation remercie le Secrétariat, les Organisations consultatives, le Rapporteur, et le Conseiller juridique.

The meeting rose at 9pm.

PART II

**SUMMARY RECORDS OF THE DEBATES HELD
AT UNESCO HEADQUARTERS
(24-26 OCTOBER 2016)**

ITEMS EXAMINED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE IN UNESCO HEADQUARTERS (OCTOBER 2016)

EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

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

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

- 8. Establishment of the World Heritage List and of the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8A. Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2016
 - 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List*
 - 8C. Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8D. Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties
 - 8E. Review and approval of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

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

- 9. Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
 - 9A. Progress report on the reflection concerning the Upstream Processes

PERIODIC REPORTS

- 10. Periodic Reports
 - 10A. Progress report on the Periodic Reporting Reflection (2015-2017)
 - 10B. Follow-up to the second cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise for all regions

WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS

- 11. Revision of the *Operational Guidelines***
- 12. Progress report on the Policy Guidelines Document

13. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods and outcomes of the ad-hoc working group
 - 13A. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods: Outcomes of the Ad-Hoc Working Group**
 - 13B. Follow-up to the Recommendations of the External Auditor's "Report on the governance of UNESCO and dependant funds, programmes and entities" (Document 38C/23)

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

14. International Assistance
15. Presentation of the final accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2014-2015 and implementation of the World Heritage Fund under the biennium 2016-2017**
16. Other business

CLOSING SESSION

17. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee (2017)*
18. Provisional Agenda of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee (2017)
19. Adoption of Decisions

* Continuation of the Istanbul session (see Part I).

** Continuation – Working Groups established at the Istanbul session (see Part I).

FIRST DAY – MONDAY 24 October 2016

THIRTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 13.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

Participants

The continuation of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee was organized in UNESCO Headquarters in Room II from 24 to 26 October 2016.

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

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

The following 104 States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

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

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

The **Chairperson** welcomed the participants to the continuation session of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee and gave a brief overview of the session in Istanbul in July 2016. The Chairperson recalled the major achievements of the session so far and highlighted the Youth Forum; the Istanbul Declaration, which was initiated by the Turkish authorities; the number of the reports on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties already reviewed; the sites added to the

List of World Heritage in Danger; and the new inscriptions on the World Heritage List. She also gave a brief overview of the progress made by the Working Groups on the Budget and the *Operational Guidelines* and indicated that the work of the two Working Groups would be reprised during this continuation session. The Chairperson also introduced the media coverage of the Committee.

The Chairperson announced that the Committee will pursue the examination of pending items 7, 7A, 8B and 17, and proceed with the examination of the remaining items: 8A, 8C, 8D, 8E, 9A, 10A, 10B, 11, 12, 13A, 13B, 14, 15, 16, 18 and 19. She specified that no additional documents were prepared for this session, with the exception of the Timetable and the Annotated Agenda.

The Chairperson further recalled that, in accordance with Decision **35 COM 12B**, Paragraph 22, the proceedings of our meeting will be live-streamed over the web and announced that interpretation would be available in English and French only.

The Chairperson recalled Decision **40 COM 2** and indicated that since Item 2 of the Agenda was closed, only observers already accredited in Istanbul were invited to the Paris continuation session.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** presented a review of the Annotated Agenda and Timetable of work for the session as well as the time and venue for the meeting of two Working Groups. The Director also evoked the two side events to be held during the session: “COOL! World Heritage education in the Netherlands” by The Netherlands and a presentation by Culture Sector of the UNESCO Global Report on Culture and Sustainable Urban Development.

The **Chairperson** brought to the attention of the Committee a written request from a non-Committee member requesting that Item 8A be postponed until Item 11 has been discussed, while a request was received from another non-Committee member to keep the original timetable. The Chairperson asked for the Committee’s comments on the request to postpone Item 8A.

The Delegation of **Cuba** expressed its support to the postponement proposal.

La Délégation du **Liban** soulève un point d’information en tant que Président du groupe de travail sur le point 68 des *Orientations* : il y a un point à l’ordre du jour sur les Listes indicatives, qui sera discuté dans le cadre du Groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its support to the postponement proposal.

The Delegation of **Finland** asked whether the Committee would discuss the second proposal to keep the original timetable.

The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Advisor to make a suggestion.

Le **Conseiller juridique** précise qu’il relève de la compétence du Comité de décider de reporter un point. S’il n’y a pas d’objections de la part des membres du Comité à la lumière des informations fournies, le point pourra être reporté comme proposé.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** clarified that this is only a question of time management and that the Secretariat would make an assessment for timing.

The Delegation of **Portugal** pointed out that it is an issue of principle, and that the only logical conclusion is that the timeframe issue must adapt to substantial issue.

La Délégation du **Liban** propose de commencer le mercredi à 9h pour discuter de ce point.

The **Chairperson** adopted the Agenda and indicated that Item 8A would be discussed on Wednesday 26 October after the adoption of Item 11, with an early start.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

8B. NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continuation*)

Documents: WHC/16/40.COM/8B
WHC/16/40.COM/8B.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B1.Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Add
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B2.Corr
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B3
WHC/16/40.COM/INF.8B4

Decisions: **40 COM 8B.1 to 40 COM 8B.50**

EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA / PACIFIC

The Grand Canal (China) (1443bis) – 40 COM 8B.38

L'**ICOMOS** présente la proposition de modification des zones tampons des six composantes du bien.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.38** was adopted.

Humayun's Tomb, Delhi (India) (232bis) – 40 COM 8B.39

The **Secretariat** reported that it received a factual error notification from Japan for this minor boundary modification.

ICOMOS supported this proposal, which will be beneficial for the property.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.40** was adopted.

Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) (602bis) – 40 COM 8B.40

ICOMOS supported the proposed boundary modification, but indicated nonetheless that the State Party must reinforce the management tools for the property.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.41** was adopted.

Itchan Kala (Uzbekistan) (543bis) – 40 COM 8B.42

ICOMOS expressed its supported this proposal in principle, but emphasized that the State Party must reinforce the management tools for the property and the protection policies and mechanisms that ensure that the OUV of this property is given primary importance when reviewing urban development applications within the buffer zone. It therefore recommended that this proposal be referred back to the State Party.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.42** was adopted.

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Place Stanislas, Place de la Carrière and Place d'Alliance in Nancy (France) (229bis) – 40 COM 8B.43

ICOMOS expressed its support of this proposal.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.43** was adopted.

Mudéjar Architecture of Aragón (Spain) (378bis) – 40 COM 8B.44

ICOMOS expressed its overall support of this proposal, but recommended that it be referred to the State Party.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.44** was adopted.

Old Town of Cáceres (Spain) (384bis) – 40 COM 8B.45

ICOMOS supported this proposal, but indicated that the State Party must reinforce the management tools for the property.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.45** was adopted.

Monuments of Oviedo and the Kingdom of the Asturias (Spain) (312Ter) – 40 COM 8B.46

ICOMOS indicated that it did not support this proposal and that it should be regarded as an extension, and that therefore a request for a major boundary modification should be submitted instead.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.46** was adopted.

Cahokia Mounds State Historic Site (United States of America) (198bis) – 40 COM 8B.47

ICOMOS supported this proposal, but emphasized that the State Party must reinforce the management tools for this property.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.47** adopted.

La Fortaleza and San Juan National Historic Site in Puerto Rico (United States of America) (266bis) – 40 COM 8B.48

ICOMOS supported this proposal, but emphasized that the State Party must reinforce the management tools for this property.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.48** was adopted.

STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE OF 7 PROPERTIES INSCRIBED AT THE 38th (DOHA, 2014) AND 39th (BONN, 2015) SESSIONS AND NOT ADOPTED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The **Secretariat** presented the item on the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value of 7 properties inscribed at the 38th (Doha, 2014) and 39th (Bonn, 2015) sessions and not yet adopted by the World Heritage Committee, concerning the following properties:

- **France, Climats, terroirs of Burgundy;**
- **Jordan, Baptism Site “Bethany Beyond the Jordan” (Al-Maghtas);**
- **Mongolia, Great Burkhan Khaldun Mountain and its surrounding sacred landscape;**
- **Saudi Arabia, Rock Art in the Hail Region of Saudi Arabia;**
- **Turkey, Diyarbakır Fortress and Hevsel Gardens Cultural Landscape;**
- **Turkey, Ephesus;**
- **Viet Nam, Trang An Landscape Complex.**

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8B.50** was adopted.

8D. CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND AREAS BY STATES PARTIES

The **Secretariat** presented the item on the clarification of property boundaries and areas submitted by the States Parties.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8D** was adopted.

8E. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

The **Secretariat** presented the item on the review and approval of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and reminded the Committee of the context and core objectives of this exercise.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8E** was adopted.

The meeting rose at 1pm.

FIRST DAY – MONDAY 24 October 2016

THIRTEENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

ITEM 9. Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List

9A. Progress Report on the Upstream Processes

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/9A

Decision: 40 COM 9A

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider item 9A.

The **Secretariat** presented the progress report on the Upstream Processes, as part of the Global Strategy for a Representative, Balanced and Credible World Heritage List.

The **Advisory Bodies**, ICOMOS and IUCN presented their reports on the Upstream Processes.

A number of Delegations welcomed the reports on the implementation of the pilot projects for the Upstream Processes, including the Republic of the Philippines, Poland, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe, Finland, Azerbaijan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Cuba, Tunisia, Angola and the United Arab Emirates.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** proposed an amendment to Paragraph 11 of the Draft Decision, noting that the needs of the countries of the African region should be taken into account in proposals for the Upstream Processes.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** agreed with the assessment of Paragraphs 22 and 23 of the working document and Paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision. The Delegation also noted that a Donors Forum, as discussed by the Ad-Hoc Working Group, would generate resources for projects, and that the process should be embedded in global capacity building. The Delegation further agreed that the process should benefit countries from under-represented regions, and that criteria should be considered for future projects.

The Delegation of **Poland** noted that the process has been beneficial for capacity building and nominations. The Delegation also noted that access to the services could be uneven due to financial concerns, and that possible conflicts of interest should be taken into account in the review of the implementation of the process. The Delegation further noted a possible confusion in the definition of the Upstream Processes in the *Operational Guidelines* (Paragraphs 71 and 122), which propose

that advice be supplied prior to the submission of nominations to the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation noted its surprise to see nomination recommendations proposing that States Parties seek advice in the framework of the Upstream Processes. The Delegation finally noted that the Committee could consider the Upstream Processes rather as a means of encouraging knowledge-sharing and collaboration between States Parties.

The Delegation of **Turkey** also noted that the process is a promising tool to help States Parties to build capacities and prepare nominations, and that further reflection is required to make it equitably available to all States Parties. The Delegation suggested that the World Heritage Centre consider restructuring to include a reinforced unit working on nominations and Tentative Lists, in order to better help States Parties in need. Furthermore, the Delegation expressed its support to the creation of a Donors Forum, as proposed by the Ad-Hoc Working Group, as a tool for international cooperation, and added that the possibility of local-level funding sources should be considered. The Delegation also suggested that revisions could be made to the request form, in order to include more detailed information.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** déclare qu'elle a appliqué le processus en amont et encourage les autres pays à l'appliquer également. Elle insiste sur le fait que ce processus doit reposer sur une base volontaire, et non obligatoire. La Délégation indique que l'aide du Centre du patrimoine mondial en terme d'expertise est très utile, en particulier pour les pays en développement. La Délégation remercie le Centre pour son soutien tout au long du processus de constitution du dossier de candidature, ainsi qu'après l'inscription des biens par le Comité du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation félicite également le Centre ainsi que les Organisations consultatives pour l'aide apportée en amont aux pays concernés. Elle espère également que ces aides seront étendues, notamment aux pays les moins avancés ainsi qu'aux régions sous-représentées sur la Liste, de telle sorte qu'ils puissent bénéficier de ce processus en amont de la nomination, avec le soutien du Centre.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** welcomed the amendment and noted that the process is a good opportunity to correct the geographic imbalance in the World Heritage List. The Delegation reiterated that the review of the lessons learned should include the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Finland** expressed concern that the Upstream Processes could lead to further imbalance for financial reasons and suggested that the process focus on under-represented types of heritage in the least developed and middle-income countries, and in countries that have only one or no World Heritage sites. The Delegation further suggested that this information be included in the request form. It also noted that only one application has been made to revise Tentative Lists, and that States Parties should take advantage of this assistance.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** noted that, at its core, this process exists to enable all States Parties, regardless of their financial situation, to benefit from expert advice. The Delegation therefore suggested that funds should be provided and that the process should be incorporated into global capacity building.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** noted that its amendment to the Draft Decision is in line with the Priority Africa and constitutes a means of addressing the inequitable access to the Upstream Processes.

La Délégation de **Cuba** partage l'idée qu'il est nécessaire d'aider la région Afrique, mais souligne que certains autres États moins développés, comme Haïti, doivent

rester mentionnés dans ce paragraphe, ainsi que les Petits États Insulaires en Développement, qui font l'objet d'un Plan d'Action destiné à améliorer les relations de travail avec les pays rencontrant des problèmes similaires.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** apporte un soutien fort au processus en amont et note d'ailleurs qu'elle a sollicité l'engagement de l'ICOMOS pour l'inscription de l'île de Djerba sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Délégation considère toutefois que, dans un souci d'équité, les pays développés pourraient s'engager à couvrir le financement de ce processus, et que les pays en voie de développement seraient invités à y participer, afin qu'ils se sentent impliqués. Enfin, la Délégation de la Tunisie demande que l'on présente une idée du coût de cette opération afin que les pays concernés puissent se préparer à dégager une partie de ce financement en amont.

La Délégation d'**Angola** se rallie aux déclarations précédentes et apporte son soutien à cette transformation, notamment en ce qui concerne l'aide apportée en amont du processus de nomination. Elle demande également que des informations complémentaires soient ajoutées au formulaire de demande.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** commented that the addition of the Upstream Processes request form in Annex I of the document would not allow for the level of flexibility required in such a complex process as nominations. It suggested that the addition of good practice examples on the World Heritage Centre website would be a less bureaucratic alternative.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that, in response to the suggestion by the Delegation of Turkey, the suggested improvements to the nominations team at the Centre would require resources. She noted that some confusion is possible between the Midstream and Upstream Processes. With regards to funding, the Director stated that the Centre would be happy to facilitate direct funding and partnering options, and that the question of costs would be further discussed with the Advisory Bodies. She further noted, in response to the comment of Germany, that the form was included for reasons of transparency.

La Délégation de la **France** (Observateur) déclare que la traduction française n'est pas suffisamment positive comparée à la version anglaise. Elle propose notamment de remplacer "revoir les leçons apprises" par "mettre à profit les retours d'expérience".

La Délégation du **Liban** soutient la demande de la France.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** remarque que le texte mentionne les "besoins de la région Afrique ainsi que l'ensemble des pays développés", et propose de ne mentionner uniquement "les pays qui en ont le plus besoin", trouvant que mentionner uniquement l'Afrique pourrait s'avérer restrictif.

La Délégation du **Liban** note qu'il est préférable d'éviter une déclaration d'ordre général, alors qu'il est clair que l'Afrique et les Petits États Insulaires en Développement sont les pays qui ont le plus besoin de soutien. Ainsi, la Délégation propose de conserver la formulation proposée par la Délégation de Cuba.

Les Délégations de **Cuba**, d'**Angola** et du **Pérou** apportent leur soutien à la déclaration de la Délégation du Liban.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 9A** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 10. PERIODIC REPORTS

10A. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE PERIODIC REPORTING REFLECTION (2015-2017)

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/10A

Decision: **40 COM 10A**

The **Secretariat** presented the item on the progress report on the Periodic Reporting Reflection. It highlighted the first and second meetings of the expert group that had taken place after the working document was published and explained the progress accomplished and the next steps. It also indicated that no funding for reflection meetings has been provided by States Parties and suggested an amendment to the proposed decision appealing to States Parties to volunteer for the testing phase of revised questionnaire.

The Delegation of **Finland** supported the amended decision and highlighted that most States Parties are satisfied with Periodic Reporting and see it as a useful tool. It also proposed that the next cycle be launched as soon as possible, and that Finland, which hosted the final meeting for Periodic Reporting in Europe, leading to the Helsinki Action Plan for Europe and the publication *World Heritage in Europe Today*, would lend its full support to the Reflection process and to future cycles of the exercise.

The **Rapporteur** noted the amendment to the Draft Decision proposed by the Secretariat.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 10A** was adopted as amended.

10B. FOLLOW-UP TO THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR ALL REGIONS

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/10B

10B.I Follow-up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Asia and the Pacific

Decision: **40 COM 10B.1**

The **Secretariat** presented the follow-up activities after the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Asia and the Pacific region.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Draft Decision **40 COM 10B.1**.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed there was no proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** expressed its sincere gratitude to the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for supporting the activities of the Inter-Governmental Coordinating Committee of the Silk Roads World Heritage nomination, which

comprises 14 countries. It noted that the ICOMOS Thematic Study on the Silk Roads has been very useful and important for the implementation of the Silk Roads project, as the result of the Almaty coordination meeting held in November 2015. The Delegation introduced the new Silk Roads project in Central Asia, which is under study, and thanked the Governments of China and Japan for their support in that regard.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 10B.1** was adopted.

10B.II Follow-up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Africa

Decision: **40 COM 10B.2**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider item 10B.2.

The **Secretariat** presented the report on follow-up activities to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Africa.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the United Republic of Tanzania requested to add a new Paragraph 9 and made amendments to the Draft Decision in Paragraphs 8 and 10.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** expressed satisfaction with the work carried out to involve local communities and traditional management systems in an effort to achieve sustainable conservation that benefits communities. The Delegation thanked the donors, the World Heritage Centre and the UNESCO Field Offices for their support and expressed its agreement with the amendments proposed by the United Republic of Tanzania.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial et note que ces activités répondent aux objectifs visés dans le Plan d'action 2012-2017 pour la région Afrique concernant la représentation du patrimoine Africain sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, l'appui des propositions d'inscription, l'état de conservation et les stratégies pour concilier la conservation du patrimoine et les besoins du développement. La Délégation note le faible taux de mise en œuvre du Plan régional par les États africains et encourage le Centre à corriger cette tendance, notamment en mobilisant des acteurs pour le financement du programme et du Plan d'action. La Délégation remercie les acteurs ayant soutenu le programme financièrement et soutient l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la République-Unie de Tanzanie.

La Délégation d'**Angola** soutient également cet amendement et félicite le Centre pour l'organisation de l'exposition itinérante et remercie les donateurs ayant permis la mise en œuvre du programme régional de renforcement des capacités, conformément au Plan d'action 2012-2017.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** stated that a more unified format and structure for the Periodic Reporting exercise should be developed to better assess performance indicators. The Delegation also noted that the amendments were submitted in order to consider the achievements more fully.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 10B.2** was adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 6.30pm.

SECOND DAY – TUESDAY 25 October 2016

FOURTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Professor Elizabeth K. Kiondo (Tanzania) (Vice-Chairperson)

The **Vice-Chairperson** opened the session and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre for a few remarks.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** opened the session with an announcement regarding the newly appointed Deputy-Director of the Heritage Division, Mr Lazare Eloundou Assomo, whom she invited to take the floor.

The **Deputy-Director of the Heritage Division** expressed his happiness at returning to the World Heritage Centre.

ITEM 10. PERIODIC REPORTS (continuation)

10B. FOLLOW-UP TO THE SECOND CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING EXERCISE FOR ALL REGIONS (continuation)

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/10B

10B.III Follow-up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for the Arab States

Decision: 40 COM 10B.3

Le **Secrétariat** présente son rapport sur les activités mises en œuvre suite au deuxième cycle de l'exercice de soumission des Rapports périodiques dans la région des États arabes.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that Tanzania had proposed an amendment to Paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** proposed an amendment to refer to the Unite for Heritage Campaign.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** commente le Paragraphe 5 du projet de décision et propose que le Centre du patrimoine mondial envoie une deuxième lettre en guise de rappel aux États arabes pour les inciter à l'établissement d'entités nationales pour le patrimoine mondial.

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

The Draft Decision **40 COM 10B.3** was adopted as amended.

10B.IV Follow-up to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Latin America and the Caribbean

Decision: **40 COM 10B.4**

The **Secretariat** presented the report on follow-up activities to the second cycle of Periodic Reporting for Latin America and the Caribbean.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the Delegation of Tanzania had proposed an amendment to the report similar to that proposed for Draft Decision 40 COM 10B.3.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed the gratitude of its Government for this report and the working relationship established with the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation also expressed its wish for a clarification on Tanzania's amendment.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** responded that the amendment was intended to ensure that the progress report was in line with the Action Plan of the region concerned.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the amendments submitted by Tanzania.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 10B.4** was adopted as amended.

10B.V Activités de suivi du Deuxième cycle des Rapports périodiques pour l'Europe et l'Amérique du Nord

Decision: **40 COM 10B.5**

Le **Secrétariat** présente son rapport sur les activités mises en œuvre suite au deuxième cycle de l'exercice de soumission des Rapports périodiques dans la région Europe et Amérique du Nord.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that no proposed amendment to the revised Draft Decision was received.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked the World Heritage Centre and, noting the importance of improving synergies, suggested that more attention be given to the dissemination of good practices. The Delegation emphasized the importance of the Helsinki Action Plan for Europe, its usefulness for Portugal, and stated that it looks forward to learning of its results at the next session of the Committee. The Delegation commended the various publications produced and evoked the international conference on heritage in danger organized by Portugal in November 2016.

The Delegation of **Finland** stated that it welcomed the monitoring survey realised for the Helsinki Action Plan and thanked the World Heritage Centre for the side event organized in Istanbul during the Committee session. The Delegation indicated that looks forward to learning of the progress on the Plan at the Committee's next session.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its appreciation for the efforts deployed by the World Heritage Centre and commended the Helsinki Action Plan. The Delegation noted that Turkey, which has the largest Tentative List, is concerned about the credibility of Tentative Lists, and that a study on Tentative Lists will be pursued. Regarding Periodic Reporting, the Delegation expressed its wish to hear of the experiences of other States Parties and proposed that regional meetings be organized. The Delegation proposed a slight revision to Paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** requested a clarification from the Delegation of Turkey regarding this amendment.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 10B.5** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 12. PROGRESS REPORT ON THE POLICY GUIDELINES DOCUMENT

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/12

Decision: **40 COM 12**

The **Secretariat** introduced the item, mentioning that funding for this project was provided by the Government of Australia. The Secretariat noted that the scoping study would be submitted before the end of 2016 and that the World Heritage Centre has worked closely with ICCROM in preparing this study.

ICCROM thanked Australia for its financial support and noted that the study responds to a need for long-term consistency in the Committee's decisions, particularly considering the rapid turnover of Committee members and the need to ensure enhanced awareness amongst specialists and the public at large. ICCROM acknowledged that the Policy Guidelines and the *Operational Guidelines* are often overlapping notions and that, after examining three UNESCO conventions and three non-UNESCO conventions, the study concluded that there was no model that could be used for the *World Heritage Convention*, implying that a new approach must be developed. ICCROM stated that the term "Policy Compendium" was preferred, to mark a clear distinction with the *Operational Guidelines*. ICCROM noted that two options were considered: either an index or simple listing of policies developed by the Committee, or a compendium/collection of texts. ICCROM specified that the report recommends the second option and that the relationship between the *Operational Guidelines* and the Compendium would require clarification, and suggested the need create a working group to check for consistency.

Regarding the structure of the compendium, ICCROM put forward two proposals without making a recommendation: the compendium could be organized by subject in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines* or by Strategic Objectives of the Convention (5Cs). ICCROM noted however that there could be some overlap and recommended that the structure be determined once the compendium has been developed. ICCROM also highlighted the issue of deciding which documents to include, taking into account the designation of the document (e.g., policy, strategy, declaration, recommendation), its adoption status (e.g., adopted, agreed, endorsed), and case law. ICCROM also suggested a phased approach: first compiling texts in a common format, then streamlining to ensure consistent narrative, and finally rewriting policies into a single document. ICCROM noted that the rewriting phase would take several years to complete and require substantial resources and should be re-

considered once work has progressed. ICCROM concluded by noting that an estimate of costs is presented in the last section of the study and that some funding was available.

The **Rapporteur** noted that an amendment was proposed by the Philippines and Turkey at the Committee session in Istanbul.

The Delegation of **Portugal** thanked ICCROM for its work and expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Philippines and Turkey. Mindful of the magnitude of the work ahead, the Delegation expressed its approval of the two-phase approach and looked forward to reviewing the draft next year.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** stated that after carefully reviewing the report, it considered that the streamlined compendium is the appropriate method. It further stated that this approach would ensure consistency in Committee decisions and enhance programme delivery. The Delegation announced that funding from the Korea FiT is available to support the study for a period of two years.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its thanks to ICCROM for undertaking the scoping study and to Australia for its financial support. The Delegation considered that much progress has been made on this key issue, which has an important impact on the Committee's credibility. The Delegation stated that it agreed with the compendium approach and agreed that the final format could be determined once the compendium was compiled. The Delegation concluded by expressing its thanks to Korea for its offer to provide financial support.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its thanks to ICCROM for carrying out the scoping study, adding that it will be a useful reference tool for States Parties. The Delegation noted that the documents vary significantly and that some are dated and need to be revised. It suggested that the views of Committee members should be considered before the draft is submitted for their approval.

The Delegation of **Finland** joined the previous Delegations in congratulating ICCROM and Australia and considered this an excellent basis for further work, as it would respond to the need to preserve institutional memory, and agreed that the compendium approach was the best way forward. The Delegation also welcomed a case law approach and stressed the need for the involvement of the Advisory Bodies and relevant NGOs in the process. The Delegation concluded by expressing its interest in participating in a working group on this issue.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** commended ICCROM for the scoping study and expressed its appreciation for the financial support provided. The Delegation stressed that this important project will provide a comprehensive approach to Committee policies and help prepare management plans. The Delegation expressed its support for this initiative and its interest in having one of its experts participate in the working group

La Délégation d'**Angola** se joint aux autres Délégation et se félicite de cette étude de cadrage et propose d'impliquer d'autres parties prenantes telles que l'ICOMOS, l'IUCN, les Centres de catégorie 2, les chaires UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** joined the previous Delegations in thanking ICCROM and Australia for making the scoping study possible. The Delegation considered that a compendium is necessary as a complement to the *Operational Guidelines* and will serve to ensure consistency in the Committee's work.

The Delegation of **Turkey** joined the previous Delegations in thanking ICCROM and Australia for making the scoping study possible. The Delegation considered the report's recommendations reasonable and suggested that the document should be user-friendly and address current issues such as sustainable development. The Delegation raised the question of what should be included in the compendium beyond statutory documents and suggested that the results of all expert meetings should be included. The Delegation stated the importance of ensuring consistency with the *Operational Guidelines* and suggested considering merging the two documents.

The Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** stated its appreciation for the fact that the scoping study was carried out in cooperation with IUCN. The Delegation expressed its full support of the amendment by the Philippines and the recommendation of Angola.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that the debate was rich and expressed thanks to Republic of Korea for its offer of financial support.

The **Rapporteur** presented the Draft Decision as amended.

The **Secretariat** proposed a revision to Paragraph 7 to ensure a more realistic timeline.

The **Rapporteur** read to the Committee the amendments to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation d'**Angola** apporte son soutien à la révision proposée par le Secrétariat au Paragraphe 7.

ICCROM requested the Delegation of Angola to add ICCROM to the list of participating parties.

The Délégation d'**Angola** exprime son accord avec la requête de l'ICCROM.

The Draft Decision **40 COM.12** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 14. INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/14

Decision: **40 COM 14**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Item 14 concerning International Assistance under the World Heritage Fund.

The **Secretariat** presented Item 14 on International Assistance and reported that the revised timeline for the International Assistance process to ensure more equitable distribution (from a two-year cycle to a one-year cycle, as adopted by the Committee in 2012 through a revision of the *Operational Guidelines*) had not changed the types of International Assistance requests received, but that there had been an increase of 43% in the number of requests received. The one-year cycle helped streamlining the process and prioritization, and most requests were targeted at conservation and management and submitted by priority countries as set out by the Committee, but this had not changed the poor funding situation of International Assistance. The

Secretariat proposed a new “Marketplace” for non-funded requests on the Secretariats’ website to attract the interest of States Parties and other donors to support these projects, and was looking forward to further developing the mechanism, beyond the four requests advertised online at the time. The Secretariat presented the additional funding that had been made available for International Assistance from the States Parties and donors through voluntary contributions, but concluded that although important, this support not a predictable and reliable source of funding. The Secretariat emphasized that available funds for International Assistance had considerably diminished, especially over the last 15 years, while International Assistance was at the core and among the most regulated processes of the Convention, as articulated in the *Convention*.

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

The **Rapporteur** read through the amendments to the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Zimbabwe.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked the Secretariat for the report, sharing the concern over the low level of funds available for International Assistance. It warmly supported the Marketplace practice for non-funded requests and wished that it be shared widely, so that not only Governments but also by other types of donors, such as private sector, can view the proposals. The Delegation indicated that improvements to the overall financial situation of the Convention would also be discussed within the ad-hoc Working Group, should its mandate be extended under Item 13A. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** thanked the Secretariat for the report and indicated that it shares the Secretariat’s concern over the diminishing resources available for International Assistance. The Delegation noted that International Assistance went a long way to ensure a balanced and credible World Heritage List, with many African countries requesting assistance for the preparation of nominations. It supported the proposal for a Marketplace to ensure support from other donors and requested that a clear mechanism be developed to ensure equitable sharing of opportunities from the Marketplace. It also highlighted the importance of technical assistance in addition to financial assistance, for which successful examples were available to develop nominations, and had suggested the amendments to the Draft Decision to strengthen partnerships with Category 2 Centres.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** agreed that International Assistance was a core function of the Convention and deplored its lack of funding, but would have preferred that the Marketplace be presented and discussed in the ad-hoc Working Group first.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** welcomed comments on the need to work more towards a representative and balanced World Heritage List, and indicated that technical assistance and capacity-building support from the Secretariat, the UNESCO Field Offices and the Advisory Bodies would continue to be available on issues related to the preparation of nominations. The Director clarified that the Marketplace was an additional means to seek project funding and asked whether the proposed amendment to the Draft Decision could be considered under Item 15.

The **Chairperson** agreed that the amendment to the Draft Decision should be considered under Item 15.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** agreed with the proposal of the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Chairperson.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 14** was adopted.

ITEM 13. FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS AND OUTCOMES OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP

13B. FOLLOW-UP TO THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR'S "REPORT ON THE GOVERNANCE OF UNESCO AND DEPENDANT FUNDS, PROGRAMMES AND ENTITIES" (DOCUMENT 38 C/23)

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/13B

Decision: 40 COM 13B

The **Chairperson** recalled the Resolution **38C/101** of the General Conference, which invites all intergovernmental programmes, committees and organs of the Conventions to inscribe an agenda item concerning the follow-up to the recommendations of the External Auditor's report and to report on their proposals for improving their governance to the Chairperson of the Open-Ended Working Group. The Chairperson recalled the circular letter of 6 May 2016, which inscribed Item 13B on Committee's Agenda.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented Item 13B and reported that most statutory organs of the six UNESCO Culture Conventions had inscribed such an item on the agendas of their meetings, and that in a letter dated 17 October 2016, the President of the General Conference requested that deliberations be transferred by 5 December 2016 to facilitate Member States' exchanges.

La Délégation de **Cuba** remercie le Secrétariat pour les informations fournies et considère que la question de la gouvernance est une question générale qui doit être traité par les groupes de travail et qui doit surtout être examinée par l'Assemblée générale de la Convention. Elle précise que la Résolution 101 demande de commencer à travailler sur cette question de gouvernance, mais les groupes de travail vont fonctionner surtout à partir de 2017 et non 2016 car ils sont concentrés pour le moment sur le Conseil exécutif et la Conférence générale.

The Delegation of **Finland** was pleased to note that the World Heritage Committee was among the most active Governing Bodies of UNESCO to address governance, as evidenced in the work of the Convention, including discussion for Item 15 of the Agenda, the evolving *Operational Guidelines* and the new Policy Compendium, but noted that the improvement of the governance is an ongoing effort, and that enhanced cooperation among the UNESCO Culture Conventions and among the biodiversity-related conventions were steps to that direction. The efficient use of the Upstream Process to ensure the credibility of the Convention, embracing conservation at the heart of the Convention, focusing on improving the state of conservation of the properties and inscribing only sites that met the criteria were among the many examples to improve governance. The Delegation called for the involvement of all stakeholders in the processes and supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the Philippines highlighted the importance of the discussion and informed that the Delegation co-chaired the subgroups of the Open-Ended Working Group on governance. The Delegation expressed that governance goes beyond the evaluation report of the External Auditor, and recalled the important work already carried out by the Ad-Hoc Working Group, the good practice it sets, which could be transferred to the President of the Open-Ended Working Group and which were reflected in the proposed amendments to the Draft Decision. The Delegation asked about ways to enhance the Committee's cooperation with Category 2 Centres and suggested that the meeting of the Chairs of the UNESCO Culture Conventions could become more interactive and provide recommendations on how to increase cooperation and synergies.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took note of the request by the Delegation of Cuba to add the item on the agenda of the General Assembly taking place at the end of 2017. She also took note of the request of The Delegation of the Philippines to add the report of the Ad-Hoc Working Group to the response letter due by 5 December 2016, and informed the session that a meeting with the Category 2 Centres would be held in India at the end of November and that issues of governance and the support of the Centres to the Convention would be discussed, and later extended to exchanges with the UNESCO Chairs. The Director provided further details of the last meeting of the Chairpersons of the UNESCO Culture Convention on 26 September 2016, which had discussed protection of heritage in conflict areas and the Sustainable Development Goals, while noting that not all Governing Bodies share the idea that the Chairpersons could make proposals and represent their respective Committees. Finally, she noted the increasing synergies among the seven biodiversity-related conventions, recalling the February 2016 workshop, where the Bureaus and Secretariats had met.

La Délégation de **Cuba** remercie le Secrétariat pour les explications données et souligne que si les réunions du Comité sont certes opportunes pour ces débats sur la gouvernance, ces dernières doivent être avant tout un débat qui devrait intervenir lors de l'Assemblée générale des États parties. Elle ajoute que la majorité des organes de l'UNESCO ont déjà commencé un débat sur la gouvernance, et souligne que, concernant le rapport d'audit, seules 3 recommandations ont été suivies.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Cuba for its comments.

The Delegation of **Portugal** expressed its appreciation to the Secretariat for the efforts made over the past years to review its working methods for greater effectiveness, recalled the good exchanges already held to respond to Resolution **38C/101**, and expressed the importance of the Committee for providing inputs to the work of the Open-Ended Working Group.

IUCN noted the important cooperation with the Category 2 Centres, whose role could be further acknowledged but is addressed in Items 6 and 10 of the Agenda, referring to the collaboration for example in the Arab States, Africa and Asia and the Pacific regions. IUCN referred to the discussion on synergies and recalled the IUCN publication on site-based Conventions and programmes, launched at the World Conservation Congress, which would be made available to the Committee members the next day when discussing Item 7.

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

The **Rapporteur** read through the amendments to the Draft Decision as proposed by the Philippines regarding the work of the Ad-Hoc Working Group.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Paragraph 5 of the Decision.

La Délégation de **Cuba** propose la méthode de travail suivante : commencer par le Paragraphe 1 et non le Paragraphe 5 car il est important de rajouter des références au sein du Paragraphe 1, notamment la Résolution **38C/101** de la Conférence générale.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** supported the proposal of Cuba.

The Delegation of **Portugal** agreed with the spirit of Cuba's proposal and made a suggestion for a linguistic amendment.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed support to the proposal of Cuba.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended.

Paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision was adopted.

Paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision was adopted.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the proposal by the Philippines on Paragraphs 5 and 6.

Paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de **Cuba** demande l'insertion d'un nouveau paragraphe entre le 5 et le 6 afin de clarifier que le thème de la gouvernance relève avant tout de l'Assemblée générale, en soulignant que le débat entre les groupes de travail est certes pertinent, mais qu'il est restreint au Comité. Or, c'est un débat intergouvernemental qui doit avoir lieu à l'Assemblée générale. La Délégation demande l'avis du Secrétariat sur ce point.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked if the Delegation of Cuba wanted to inscribe an item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

La Délégation de **Cuba** propose de soumettre à l'Assemblée générale le rapport des Groupes de travail portant sur la gouvernance, mais aussi de leur donner la possibilité de débattre ouvertement sur cette question. Cuba souligne que ce processus a déjà eu lieu dans d'autres organes et qu'il doit conduire à l'harmonisation des deux processus.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** requested a clarification as to whether a new paragraph should be added to the Draft Decision, between Paragraphs 5 and 6, to inscribe an item on the agenda of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of the Philippines supported the proposal by the Delegation of Cuba to inscribe an item on the agenda of the General Assembly, which is in line with the aforementioned Resolution, but the concern was only raised as regards the timing of those inputs to be provided to the Open-Ended Working Group, as requested by the President of the General Conference.

La Délégation du **Portugal** exprime son accord avec Cuba concernant l'importance de l'Assemblée générale des États parties sur ce point. Cependant, la Délégation considère qu'il est également important que le Comité soumette aussi des recommandations concernant la gouvernance, sans que cela ne remette en cause les prérogatives de l'Assemblée générale des États parties.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the proposals by the Delegations of Cuba, Philippines and Portugal.

The **Rapporteur** read through the amendments to the Draft Decision as proposed by the Delegation of Cuba.

Paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision, as amended by the Delegations of Philippines, Turkey and Peru

La Délégation de **Cuba** soutient la proposition des Philippines, du Pérou et de la Turquie de soumettre le rapport du groupe de travail. Cependant, si ce rapport est envoyé juste après le Comité et non après l'Assemblée générale (qui a lieu après la Conférence générale), il faut ajouter que ce rapport ne fait état que de conclusions « préliminaires » pour laisser l'Assemblée débattre et apporter son point de vue quand elle se réunira.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Decision was for the Committee to make and each body could submit its own inputs to the process, and this specific document would be transferred as a response of the Committee, whereas the General Assembly would provide its own inputs.

La Délégation de **Cuba** précise qu'il existe un rapport général de tous les organes sur les mécanismes de l'UNESCO et en ce qui concerne la gouvernance, on ne peut pas considérer séparément le Comité et l'Assemblée générale, car c'est précisément l'objet de la gouvernance. C'est la Convention dans son ensemble qui va donner son rapport sur la gouvernance, donc le Comité ne peut pas rendre des conclusions isolées.

The Delegation of **Portugal** indicated that it understood the position of Cuba and the need for a comprehensive document, but noted the challenging timeframe to provide inputs, bearing in mind the need to follow the Resolution and the request of the President, and recommended that the Committee provide its own deliberations and inputs to the exercise at this stage.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** agreed with the Delegation of Portugal that the strict deadline given by the President of the General Conference should be followed. The Delegation indicated that while it shares the views of the Delegation of Cuba concerning greater coherence, it did not see the request for inputs from each Governing Body as conflicting with these aims. The Delegation suggested to delete the word "preliminary" when referring to the results of the Ad-Hoc Working Group in Paragraph 7.

The **Rapporteur** clarified that this word had been added following suggestion made by the Delegation of Cuba.

La Délégation de **Cuba** accepte la suppression du terme « préliminaires », mais continue de souligner qu'il doit être clair que les conclusions du Groupe de travail sont seulement indicatives.

La Délégation du **Portugal** remercie la Délégation de Cuba de s'être ralliée à la proposition initiale faite par les Philippines, la Turquie et le Pérou. La Délégation est d'accord pour appuyer que le caractère intégré doit figurer dans les résumés de cette discussion.

Paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 13B** was adopted as amended.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that Items 16 and 17 would be examined in the afternoon and provided details of the schedule of the Working Groups for the *Operational Guidelines* and the Budget.

The meeting rose at 1pm.

SECOND DAY – TUESDAY 25 October 2016

FIFTHTEENTH MEETING

3.00 p.m. – 3.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Professor Elizabeth K. Kiondo (Tanzania) (Vice-Chairperson)

ITEM 16. OTHER BUSINESS

(No document)

The **Vice-Chairperson** invited States Parties to bring forward any other business under Item 16.

No other business was notified.

**ITEM 17. ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND
RAPPORTEUR OF THE 41ST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE (2017)**

(No document)

17.2 NOMINATION OF VICE-CHAIRPERSONS

The **Vice-Chairperson** recalled that Item 17.1 on the election of the Chairperson of the 41st session was adopted in Istanbul and proceeded with Item 17.2 on to the election of the next Vice-Chairpersons.

The Delegation of the **Philippines**, on behalf of the Asia-Pacific region, proposed the Republic of Korea as Vice-Chairperson of the 41st session.

The proposal was adopted.

The Delegation of **Finland**, on behalf of Europe and North America region, proposed Portugal as the Vice-Chairperson of the 41st session.

The proposal was adopted.

La Délégation de **Cuba**, de la part de la région Amérique latine et Caraïbes, propose le Pérou pour la Vice-Présidence de la 41eme session du Comité.

The proposal was adopted.

The Delegation of **Lebanon**, on behalf of the Arab States, proposed Kuwait as the Vice-Chairperson of the 41st session.

The proposal was adopted.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania**, on behalf of the Africa region, proposed Angola as the Vice-Chairperson of the 41st session.

The proposal was adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** proceeded with the election of the Rapporteur of the 41st session.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** nominated Mr Mohamed Juma, from the United Republic of Tanzania, as the Rapporteur of the 41st session.

The proposal was adopted.

The **Vice-Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Poland, host of the 41st session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson and it is honoured welcome the 41st session in Krakow. The Delegation showed a video on the city of Krakow, the ancient capital of Poland and one of the first Polish properties on the World Heritage List. The Delegation recalled its commitment to the organization of the session in favourable circumstances.

The meeting rose at 3.30pm.

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY 26 October 2016

SIXTHTEENTH MEETING

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Her Excellency Mrs Lale Ülker (Turkey)

The **Chairperson** opened the meeting and presented the schedule for the day. She invited the Committee to begin by considering Item 7A.13 on the property “Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls”.

**ITEM 7. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES
(continuation)**

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

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/7A.Add.2

Decision: **40 COM 7A.13**

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

The **Chairperson** underlined that the decision in front of the Delegates was the result of long negotiations, and proposed to adopt it by consensus without opening the debate.

The Delegation of **Tanzania** requested a vote by secret ballot.

The Delegation of **Croatia** seconded this request.

The Delegations of **Lebanon, Indonesia, Cuba, Angola, Tunisia, Kuwait, Kazakhstan, Turkey, and Azerbaijan** took the floor to support the Chairperson’s proposal.

The **Legal Advisor** reminded the session that Article 41 of the *Rules of Procedure* states that a decision shall be voted on by secret ballot whenever two or more members shall so request.

La Délégation du **Liban** demande clarification sur l’objet du vote, à savoir s’il s’agit de voter sur la proposition de la Présidente ou sur le projet de décision 7A.13.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the question will be projected on the screens.

La Délégation du **Liban** signale avoir compris que le vote au scrutin secret concernait la proposition de la Présidente de voter par consensus et non pas le projet de décision.

The **Chairperson** asked a clarification from the Legal Advisor on the question raised by Lebanon.

Le **Conseiller juridique** précise que, suite à la demande de deux membres du Comité d'invoquer l'article 41, le Comité est amené à voter sur le projet de décision 7A.13 tel que proposé par le Koweït, le Liban et la Tunisie.

A la suite d'un long débat concernant l'objet du vote ainsi que les procédures y afférentes notamment en réponse aux questionnements des Délégations du Liban, de Cuba, de la Tanzanie, de la Croatie et de la Tunisie, le **Conseiller juridique** réitère sa confirmation qu'il s'agit de procéder au vote sur l'adoption ou non du projet de décision tel que présenté à l'écran.

The **Chairperson** designated the tellers: Ms Katarzyna Piotrowska (Poland) and Mr Vincent Sedego (Burkina Faso).

The **Chairperson** invited the tellers to reach the podium in order to proceed to the vote; she informed the Committee that the decision to be voted upon was visible on the screen.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** called all the voters in alphabetical order.

After the vote, the **Chairperson** communicated the results:

- Required majority: 8
- 20 Committee members present (1 Committee member absent)
- 10 Yes - 2 No - 8 Abstentions

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7A.13** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Lebanon** took the floor to thank the Chairperson for her commitment and dedication.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** also thanked the Chairperson and regretted that the decision could not be adopted by consensus, lamenting the political instrumentalization of UNESCO matters.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the Chairperson and expressed reservations concerning the legal advice provided; it also regretted the politicization of this matter.

The Delegation of **Cuba** expressed its appreciation for the Chairperson's leadership and supported the comments of the previous representatives, also expressing itself in favour of the adopted decision.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite la Présidente pour la gestion de ce point et regrette que l'adoption de cette décision ne se soit pas faite par consensus.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** regretted that the Draft Decision had to be discussed in a politicized context.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observers who are concerned by this matter to intervene.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed strong criticism against the decision just adopted, pointing out that it is against Israel and the Jewish people, as well as against UNESCO's principles. It affirmed that the sovereignty of Israel over Jerusalem is an unquestionable truth.

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the Chairperson and all the Delegations who voted in favour of the adopted decision. It underlined that it was based on international law and pointed out the illegality of the Israeli occupation. It added that, since the King of Jordan is the custodian of all holy places in Jerusalem, Jordan will continue to strive for their protection.

La Délégation de **Palestine** remercie la Directrice générale pour son soutien afin de trouver un consensus, et félicite également la Présidente d'avoir déployé tous les efforts pour arriver à un consensus. Elle salue également tous les pays européens qui avaient proposé le texte pour une résolution consensuelle. Elle exprime néanmoins sa perplexité quant à la réaction du représentant d'Israël, regrettant des tentatives permanentes de politisation de la religion, et réitère qu'elle demeure ouverte au dialogue.

The representative of the **United States of America** pointed out that the adoption of this decision, which ignores the three diverse religious heritage components of Jerusalem, would damage the reputation of UNESCO, whose work should exclusively focus on the protection of World Heritage, avoiding political instrumentalization. The Delegation expressed the opinion that UNESCO should embrace an approach that allows everybody to unite and work together.

ITEM 7. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continued)

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/7

Decision: **40 COM 7**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** gave an overview of the documents to be reviewed.

The **Rapporteur** asked for amendments, and confirmed that the distributed document was the form distributed in Istanbul, and that three amendments had been received in the past three days. Proposals from Jamaica for Paragraphs 4, 5 and 10, and a new paragraph proposed by the Philippines. The Rapporteur indicated that Paragraph 26 included amendments accepted in Istanbul plus new additions.

The Delegation of **Poland** suggested changing subtitles and proposed clarifying that the planned conference was on Reconstruction, not specifically on the reconstruction of World Heritage.

The Delegation of the Philippines suggested deleting 'of the World Heritage Committee' from Finland's suggestion, since it could be considered redundant.

The Delegation of **Finland** stated that the phrase should stay.

La Délégation de **Cuba** observe qu'il manque à ce document toute référence au Plan d'action que le Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO vient de discuter.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that Document 7 had been prepared in April, while the Action Plan was just adopted by the Executive Board in October.

The Delegation of **Turkey** supported the proposal by the Philippines to remove the redundant reference to the World Heritage Committee in the proposal by Finland.

The Delegation of **Finland** agreed it could be deleted and requested Poland to elaborate on the last paragraph, since it would add to the workload of World Heritage Centre and was unclear.

The Delegation of **Poland** indicated that, according to its experience with Reactive Monitoring, more guidance is needed. The Delegation acknowledged that this would create more of a burden, but that financial support could be provided, as maintaining World Heritage properties is crucial.

The Delegation of **Finland** suggested adding the phrase, 'if funds are available'.

The Delegation of **Poland** agreed.

La Délégation du **Liban** estime que les délais proposés ne sont pas réalistes, et suggère un délai jusqu'en 2018.

The Delegation of **Poland** agreed.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** requested minor stylistic amendments to Paragraph 4.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 7** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 8C. UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/8C

Decisions: 40 COM 8C1, 40 COM 8C2, 40 COM 8C3

The **Secretariat** presented the item.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** commented on workload and governance and highlighted that timing is important for new inscriptions on the World Heritage List, as sometimes the Statement of OUV or the management plan for a site are not complete at the time of inscription. She stated that the Secretariat is of course happy to help, but that this situation contributes to increasing the workload, and cited statistics related to the volume of state of conservation reports and other documents treated by the Secretariat.

The Draft Decisions **40 COM 8C1, 40 COM 8C2, and 40 COM 8C3** were adopted and Item 8C closed.

ITEM 11. REVISION OF THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/11

Decision: 40 COM 11

The **Chair of the Ad-Hoc Working Group for the Revision of the *Operational Guidelines*** explained the process of the Working Group, including its three sessions, and presented its conclusions.

The Delegation of **Finland** thanked the Working Group, its Chair, the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and Turkey. It recognized that revising Paragraph 61 on the mechanism of nominations was within the mandate of group and that the group had worked extensively on it. The Delegation supported the consensus proposal of the group, as the emphasis should be set on the conservation and protection of sites, as well as on inscription. This would also be a step towards a more balanced World Heritage List, with improved geographical distribution. Regarding Paragraph 68 on the submission of Tentative Lists, Finland thinks it needs further deliberation. The Delegation also encouraged a full upstream process before inscription on Tentative Lists.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** demande des clarifications quant aux limites apportées au nombre d'inscriptions.

Le **Président du Groupe de travail** explique qu'afin de donner la priorité à un nombre restreint d'États parties, la limite du nombre d'inscriptions doit rester très basse.

The Delegation of **Portugal** supported the statement made by Finland and the Draft Decision. The Delegation also stated that, while it understood Tunisia's concern, this represented an adequate compromise.

The Delegation of the **Philippines** expressed its support for Paragraph 61 as amended, for a more balanced World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Turkey** expressed its thanks to the Chair of the Working Group and stated that regarding Paragraph 61, States Parties had been consulted throughout the year and a good compromise had been reached. Regarding Paragraph 68, further reflection was needed and should be continued within an extended Ad Hoc Working Group.

La Délégation du **Koweït** indique qu'elle partage les préoccupations de la Turquie et propose de reporter ce point à l'après-midi.

The Delegation of **Croatia** congratulated the Working Group for its work and expressed hope that a solution for Paragraph 68 would be reached soon.

The Delegation of **Portugal** stated that time was being wasted and that a decision needed to be made.

The Delegation of **Poland** expressed support for the adoption of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated it supported the text as presented and wanted to further discuss Paragraph 68.

The Delegation of **Kazakhstan** agreed to the consensus and pointed out that the point has been under discussion for more than three years.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** stated it wanted to give the floor to an Observer.

The **Chairperson** indicated that this would be possible after the adoption of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** highlighted that the solution in the Draft Decision was proposed on a trial basis. The Delegation agreed with the consensus and reminded the session that the decision is open for review at a later point, and not a closed decision.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** agreed to the need for new approaches to the World Heritage List, the prioritisation of the workload and the actions for a more balanced List. Regarding Paragraph 68, as stated by the Working Group, the Delegation agreed that there is a problem to be resolved and joined the consensus to continue working toward this goal.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** agreed with the consensus on Paragraph 61.

The Delegation of **Portugal** suggested that the session approve the adoption of the Draft Decision, since it is temporary, and give floor to Observers.

The **Chairperson** agreed with the proposal of Portugal.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie**, s'exprimant au nom du Groupe arabe, soutient proposition du Koweït et demande de reporter la décision sur ce point à l'après-midi.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out that there was little time left in the session and no working session in the afternoon.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** suggested a change to Paragraph 61, changing the number of properties for a State Party to be given priority from 3 to 10.

The **Chair of the Ad-hoc Working Group** explained that statistically, going to 10 from three would mean that 80% of States Parties would have priority. The Chair reminded the session that prioritization is a formal question, and that all statistics of the last 15 years indicate that, even if one were to retroactively apply the principle of one site per State Party, the cap of 35 sites would not be reached. This means that the prioritization system is a fall back, and therefore there is no point in discussing something that would most likely never be applied.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** apporte son soutien à la proposition du Koweït.

The Delegation of **Finland** stated that the limit should remain 3 properties, since it has been explained that this is the way to assist countries with fewer properties on the List.

The Delegation of **Portugal** also indicated that it wanted to keep the cap at 3 properties, stating that, as had been clearly explained, prioritization with 10 properties does not make sense. The Delegation pointed out that this had been discussed exhaustively.

The **Chair of the Ad-hoc Working Group** decided to make a proposal that could lead to consensus, and proposed raising the number of sites from 3 to 4, if that would convince Kuwait and Tunisia to agree.

The Delegation of **Turkey** stated that this should be negotiated and the number should be kept to 3.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** agreed with Finland and Portugal, as the work had already been done, and the goal was to help States Parties with few or no sites.

The Delegation of **Poland** also supported keeping the limit at 3 properties.

La Délégation du **Burkina Faso** fait écho aux félicitations adressées au Président du groupe de travail se dit favorable à ce qui a été proposé, à savoir de maintenir le plafond à 3 biens.

The Delegation of **Croatia** also supported keeping the limit at 3 properties.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** appuie les orateurs précédents, favorables au plafond des 3 sites inscrits.

The Delegations of **Angola** and the **Republic of Korea** also supported keeping the limit at 3 properties.

The **Chairperson** stated that the Draft Decision should therefore remain as it is.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 11** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **China** commended the Chair's leadership and expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Working Group, supporting the revision of Paragraph 68. China agreed that the discussion should continue, even though its proposal was not accepted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 11.

ITEM 15. PRESENTATION OF THE FINAL ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND FOR 2014-2015 AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND UNDER THE BIENNIUM 2016-2017

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/15

Decision: 40 COM 15

The **Chair of Working Group on the Budget** presented the outcomes of its work.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 15** was adopted and Item 15 closed.

ITEM 13. FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS AND OUTCOMES OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP (continuation)

13A. FOLLOW-UP TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF EVALUATIONS AND AUDITS ON WORKING METHODS: OUTCOMES OF THE AD-HOC WORKING GROUP (continuation)

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/13A

Decision: **40 COM 13A**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Item 13A.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 13A** was adopted as amended and Item 13A was closed.

ITEM 8A. TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF 15 APRIL 2016

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/8A

Decision: **40 COM 8A**

The **Secretariat** presented the document.

La Délégation du **Viet Nam** fait remarquer que les Listes indicatives contiennent des informations qui ne permettent pas de connaître et comprendre d'une façon profonde et complète les dossiers. Elle rappelle les principes de l'Organisation traduits par l'Article 11 de la *Convention* et par les Paragraphes 135 et 138 des *Orientations*, selon lesquels l'UNESCO ne doit pas traiter les dossiers concernant des sites se trouvant sur un territoire faisant l'objet de revendications de souveraineté ou de juridiction sans le consentement des pays concernés.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 8A** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **China** made the following statement:

"Madam Chair,

China regrets the decision to adopt Item 8A, which includes Japan's proposition of the Four Islands. China expresses strong opposition to this proposition.

China and Japan have territorial disputes over Diaoyu Dao and its surrounding waters, and have not carried out maritime delimitation in the East China Sea. Japan's proposition may involve the overlapping areas of the two countries' maritime claims and serves to enhance its unlawful claims over China's Diaoyu Dao and its surrounding waters.

Japan tried to include Diaoyu Dao in its first proposition which was referred back by the Secretariat. Although Japan has changed the site name and boundary of the property for the moment, its substance and intention have never changed. This decision is a de facto endorsement of Japan's intention and will involve the

Committee in the territorial and maritime disputes between two States Parties. This is not only contrary to Article 11.3 of the Convention, but also against the mission of UNESCO.

As a victim of Japanese invasion with a huge loss of human lives and a huge number of culture heritage with outstanding universal values destroyed, China highly values peace, cherishes cultural and natural heritage. China has contributed to the Committee by its effective participation and donation and hosting the 28th Session of the Committee.

China would like to see the Committee keep a neutral, impartial and objective stand and encourage direct negotiation between China and Japan, and postpone registration of Japan's proposition until after consensus has been reached by the two countries.

Thank you for your attention."

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** made the following statement:

"Thank you, Madam Chair,

I would like to make the following statement regarding this agenda item.

According to Paragraph 62 of the Operational Guidelines, a Tentative List is an inventory which each State Party considers suitable. Therefore, the right and responsibility to prepare and revise the list lies with the State Party.

With regard to the most recent submission in our Tentative List, we have held discussions on a number of occasions with other State Parties, including China. Therefore, it is difficult for us to understand the points made by that State Party today.

The main component of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of this property lies in the endemic terrestrial species on these four islands, affected by the geological isolation and incapable of moving over a wide range of areas.

Based on this, the proposed property and its buffer zone will not be extended beyond the four islands.

As this property is yet to be nominated, Japan is willing to continue discussions with other States Parties on the substance of its file, including with scientists.

Regarding the Senkaku Islands, I will not repeat Japan's position, as it is well known."

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8A.

ITEM 18. PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 41ST SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2017)

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/18

Decision: **40 COM 18**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified items on the Provisional Agenda.

The Draft Decision **40 COM 18** was adopted.

ITEM 19. ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Document: WHC/16/40.COM/19

The **Chairperson** moved on to the final task, the adoption of the Report of Decisions of the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee, which is divided in two parts: Decisions in Part I were adopted in Istanbul, while Decisions in Part II were adopted in Paris. The two parts will be merged into one single report. The Chairperson asked the Secretariat to make the necessary arrangements and recalled that decisions included in this report have already been adopted by the Committee, therefore the debate will not be reopened.

The **Rapporteur** summed up the procedure to produce the Final Report and expressed gratitude to the Chairperson and the Committee as well as the World Heritage Centre for the responsibility to serve as Rapporteur. The Rapporteur noted that all amendments submitted via email or manually written by hand were integrated in the report in both English and French during the session and were double checked with the World Heritage Centre when necessary. The Rapporteur noted that 236 Decisions were adopted in this meeting.

The **Chairperson** asked all Committee members to indicate if there are factual or editorial errors in Part I of the Decisions Report which they wish to adjust.

There were no such requests.

The **Chairperson** asked if all Members had the chance to review the report and noted that there were no objections.

Part I of the Decisions Report was adopted.

The **Chairperson** asked all Committee members to indicate if there are factual or editorial errors in Part II of the Decisions Report which they wish to adjust.

There were no such requests.

The **Chairperson** asked if all Members had the chance to review the report and noted that there were no objections.

Part II of the Decisions Report was adopted.

The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the Decisions Report as a whole.

The **Decisions of the 40th Committee Session** were adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **China** requested the floor and made the following statement:

“As an observer of the Committee, China considers it is important to continue the revision of Paragraph 68 of the Operational Guidelines of the Convention. China regrets the way Decisions on Item 8A was rushed through this morning, China does not accept the decision, and request the Committee to include China’s position into the report.”

The **Chairperson** replied that Decision **40 COM 8A** was adopted by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Cuba** stressed that, in the current international scenario, World Heritage has been deliberately destroyed, and that this confirms Cuba's total commitment to strengthening the role of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre as well as cooperation amongst all of the States Parties.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** made the following statement:

“Thank you Madame Chair,

Very briefly I would like to get back to decision Item 8A, that this morning we adopted by consensus, but I would like to make a very brief general comment. The parties directly concerned, Japan and China, China and Japan, are very friendly and very important to the Republic of Korea as a neighbouring country. And as you may know Japan is the second largest contributor to UNESCO and China is the third largest contributor to UNESCO. And they are both the leader countries in the international community.

So, I think it is very, very difficult. No member state in this house can solve the issue of high political sensitivity. So I'd like to emphasize the need, the importance of bilateral talks in the future to dissolve this kind of issue of high political sensitivity. And once again the Republic of Korea Delegation would like to urge the two parties directly concerned, China and Japan, Japan and China, to keep talking to bring about solomonic solutions in the future.

Thank you.”

La Délégation du **Koweït** remercie les pays qui ont soutenu le projet de décision sur Jérusalem et exprime sa déception d'avoir vu apparaître, de la part du représentant d'un État partie, un lexique qui n'appartient ni au langage de ce Comité ni à celui devant être utilisé pour parler d'un bien du patrimoine mondial dont l'occupation est reconnue par deux résolutions des Nations Unies (2.4.2 et 3.3.8) depuis 1967.

The Delegation of **Azerbaijan** expressed confidence that politically controversial issues have to be settled by bilateral talks between the countries.

The Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** made the following statement:

“Thank you dear Chairperson and the distinguished members of the Committee,

Following the events during the adoption of the decision 40 COM 7A 18 on the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls, the United Republic of Tanzania would like to put on record by reiterating its position that the proposal this morning to initiate a vote by secret ballot on the Draft Decision should not be interpreted as support to a particular position but rather a need to ensure these processes are as transparent as possible and the results of the vote today was a confirmation of this. In keeping with the spirit of UNESCO Tanzania supports and promotes tolerance and intercultural dialogue by making sure that parties do any contestations resolve their disagreements through dialogue in order to reach a consensus. Once again, we would like to assure UNESCO Committee members and all state parties that Tanzania as a non-aligned country is in no way associated with any particular position.

Thank you Madame Chair”

The **Chairperson** expressed heartfelt gratitude to all Committee members for their support and active contributions to the meeting, and noted that it was an honour to work with all Member and Observer States. The Chairperson expressed her gratitude for the confidence put in her and thanked Director Mechtild Rössler and her team, the

Vice-Chairperson, the Rapporteur, the Advisory Bodies and NGOs, the Permanent Delegation of Turkey, her own team, the interpreters, as well as the room clerks and other staff. The Chairperson extended her wishes for good chairmanship to Poland for the next session in Kraków.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Chairperson, the Committee Members, the Rapporteur, the Observers, the Advisory Bodies, her own team, the Chiefs of regional units, the interpreters, the Legal Advisor, as well as the team in the directorate of the World Heritage Centre, and wished all safe travel home and to Cracow.

The Delegation of **Poland** invited all Delegates to the Polish Embassy for a reception and a piano concert at 7pm.

The **Chairperson** declared the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

The session rose at 6pm.

ANNEX I

ISTANBUL DECLARATION ON THE PROTECTION OF WORLD HERITAGE

40th session of the World Heritage Committee

Istanbul, 11 July 2016

ISTANBUL DECLARATION ON THE PROTECTION OF WORLD HERITAGE

(40th session of the World Heritage Committee, Istanbul, 11 July 2016)

We, members of the World Heritage Committee, gathered in Istanbul today on 11 July 2016 on the occasion of its 40th session, declare the following:

Fully aware of the paramount importance of cultural and natural heritage for people's values, identities and memory, as well as for sustainable social and economic development;

Fully determined to harness cultural heritage as a force for dialogue and mutual understanding, to foster a sense of common history and the intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity, as the lasting foundation for peace, in the Spirit of UNESCO Constitution;

Bearing in mind the task entrusted to UNESCO by its Constitution, to ensure conservation and protection of the world's inheritance of books, works of art and monuments of history and science;

Mindful of UNESCO's *acquis* on the protection of cultural and natural heritage;

Recalling the relevant United Nations Security Council and General Assembly Resolutions, especially UNSC 2199 (2015) and 2253 (2015);

Welcoming the references to culture in the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development that recognize and reinforce the important role of culture and cultural diversity in peaceful and inclusive societies and sustainable development;

Reaffirming the commitment made by the 2015 Bonn Declaration on World Heritage in order to strengthen the international protection of cultural and natural heritage;

Welcoming the 2016 Ngorongoro Declaration on Safeguarding African World Heritage as a Driver of Sustainable Development;

Expressing serious concern about the destruction of and particularly the growing number of deliberate attacks against cultural heritage worldwide;

Emphasizing that cultural diversity is essential and contributes to the richness of the common cultural heritage of mankind, and therefore must be respected, celebrated and protected;

Deeply distressed by the increase of illegal excavations, as well as looting and illicit trafficking of artefacts which poses serious threat to World Heritage;

Recognizing also the negative impact of factors such as climate change, environmental hazards and increasing social and economic pressure on heritage properties;

Reiterating our commitment to the Global Coalition for *#Unite4Heritage* campaign launched by the Director-General;

Fully cognizant that the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* is the most effective international instrument for the protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage that are increasingly threatened with destruction not only by the traditional causes of decay;

Also recognizing the increasing constraints impeding the proper implementation of the Convention, such as the lack of financial and human resources which threatens the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund;

Invite all States Parties to consider innovative and effective solutions in a determined way to better address the evolving needs in heritage preservation;

Strongly encourage all States Parties to contribute financially both by budgetary and extra-budgetary means to secure without further delay full and sound implementation of the Convention;

Remind all States Parties of their obligation to safeguard cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value at national and international levels and to take all appropriate legislative measures in that direction where necessary;

Call upon States Parties to integrate the protection of cultural and natural heritage in their policy making processes and security strategies;

Call for a relevant and significant international assistance mechanism providing a more coherent expertise and resources sharing approach, as intensified international cooperation lies in the heart of the Convention;

Call on States Parties to exercise proactive policy supported by decisive initiatives towards protection and restoration of cultural and natural heritage sites, especially those included on the List of World Heritage in Danger;

Invite States Parties to reflect on how to better increase synergies between UNESCO's Culture Conventions; as well as continue on-going collaboration to enhance synergies between biodiversity conventions;

Unanimously commit ourselves to promote and implement the objectives of this Declaration.

DÉCLARATION D'ISTANBUL SUR LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

40e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial

Istanbul, le 11 juillet 2016

Nous, membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial, réunis ce jour, 11 juillet 2016, à Istanbul à l'occasion de la 40e session, déclarons ce qui suit :

Pleinement conscients de l'importance primordiale du patrimoine culturel et naturel pour les valeurs, les identités et la mémoire des peuples, ainsi que pour le développement social et économique durable ;

Résolument déterminés à tirer parti du patrimoine culturel en tant que force de dialogue et de compréhension mutuelle, à encourager un sentiment d'histoire commune et la solidarité intellectuelle et morale de l'humanité, fondements durables de la paix, dans l'esprit de l'Acte constitutif de l'UNESCO ;

Gardant à l'esprit la tâche confiée à l'UNESCO par son Acte constitutif, de veiller à la conservation et protection du patrimoine universel de livres, d'œuvres d'art et de monuments d'intérêt historique et scientifique ;

Attentifs à l'acquis de l'UNESCO dans le domaine de la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel ;

Rappelant les résolutions pertinentes du Conseil de sécurité et de l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies, en particulier les résolutions UNSC 2199 (2015) et 2253 (2015) ;

Accueille favorablement les références à la Culture dans l'Agenda 2030 pour le Développement durable qui reconnaissent et renforcent le rôle primordial que jouent la culture et la diversité culturelle au sein de sociétés pacifiques et inclusives et pour le développement durable ;

Réaffirmant l'engagement pris en 2015, dans la Déclaration de Bonn sur le patrimoine mondial, de renforcer la protection internationale du patrimoine culturel et naturel ;

Saluant la Déclaration de Ngorongoro (2016) sur la sauvegarde du patrimoine mondial africain, moteur du développement durable ;

Exprimant de vives préoccupations quant à la destruction du patrimoine culturel dans le monde entier et, en particulier, le nombre croissant d'attaques délibérées contre celui-ci ;

Souligne que la diversité culturelle est essentielle et contribue à la richesse du patrimoine culturel commun de l'humanité, et qu'elle doit de ce fait être respectée, célébrée et protégée ;

Extrêmement inquiets du nombre croissant de fouilles illégales, ainsi que du pillage et du trafic illicite d'objets qui constituent de graves menaces pour le patrimoine mondial ;

Reconnaissant également l'impact négatif de facteurs tels que le changement climatique et les risques environnementaux, et les pressions sociales et économiques croissantes exercées sur les biens du patrimoine ;

Exprimant à nouveau notre engagement en faveur de la campagne de la Coalition mondiale #UnisPourLe Patrimoine lancée par la Directrice générale ;

Pleinement conscients que la Convention du patrimoine mondial de 1972 est l'instrument international le plus efficace pour la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel mondial qui est de plus en plus menacé de destruction, et désormais plus seulement par les causes habituelles de dégradation ;

Reconnaissant également les contraintes croissantes qui entravent la bonne mise en œuvre de la Convention telles que le manque de ressources financières et humaines qui menace la viabilité du Fonds du patrimoine mondial ;

Invitons tous les États parties à envisager avec détermination des solutions innovantes et efficaces afin de mieux répondre aux besoins en constante évolution de la préservation du patrimoine ;

Encourageons vivement tous les États parties à contribuer financièrement, tant par des moyens budgétaires qu'extrabudgétaires, afin d'assurer sans délai à la mise en œuvre pleine et entière de la Convention ;

Rappelons à tous les États parties leur obligation de sauvegarder le patrimoine culturel et naturel de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, tant au niveau national qu'international, et de prendre, le cas échéant, toutes les mesures législatives adéquates dans ce sens ;

Prions avec insistance les États parties d'intégrer la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel dans leurs processus décisionnels et leurs stratégies de sécurité ;

Appelons de nos vœux un mécanisme d'assistance internationale conséquent et pertinent, fournissant une expertise plus cohérente et proposant une approche de partage des ressources, la coopération internationale renforcée étant au cœur de la Convention ;

Appelons les États parties à appliquer une politique proactive, soutenue par des initiatives décisives en faveur de la protection et la restauration des sites du patrimoine culturel et naturel, en particulier ceux inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ;

Invitons les États parties à réfléchir aux moyens d'améliorer les synergies entre les conventions culturelles de l'UNESCO ainsi qu'à poursuivre la collaboration déjà entamée pour renforcer la synergie entre les conventions ayant trait à la biodiversité ;

Nous engageons unanimement à promouvoir et à mettre en œuvre les objectifs de cette Déclaration.

ANNEX II

Statement by H.E. Mr Nabi Avci, Minister of Culture and Tourism of the Republic of Turkey

17 July 2016

(Original language of delivery: Turkish)

“For the Ministry of Culture, let me say how pleased I am to be here among you at the closure at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee and send you greetings from the Turkish Government.

Dear friends, even though we are having such a peace-oriented meeting, we have, as you are all aware, seen some very significant and unexpected events take place in our country. The situation, which has been of great concern to us and to our guests, could thankfully be calmly resolved, and thanks to the determination and pro-democracy spirit of the people of Turkey, we were able to restore calm throughout the country.

Consequently, we would have liked for the 40th session of the Committee to continue with a full programme right through to 20 July, and the highest possible security measures were taken so that this might be the case. However, despite the reassurance that security could be ensured, the United Nations Security Division and UNESCO have nonetheless decided that the final day of the session would be today and that the session would be closed at the end of today’s discussions. Any subsequent issues would be dealt with at a later date in Paris.

We are still hoping nonetheless that we can finish with the most important items, and deliberations are moving along satisfactorily. Indeed, I am saddened by the fact that some of you are having to leave Istanbul earlier than foreseen under rather unfortunate circumstances, but for those who would like to stay and continue their sightseeing here, including those registered for site visits, I hope you enjoy it, and our thanks go to the organisers. I would like to wish you all an agreeable stay for the rest of your time in Turkey and in Istanbul.

Dear friends, on 12 July, 108 States Parties and the Advisory Bodies were invited, along with other stakeholders, media and representatives, and all in all, 2,608 people were invited to this session of World Heritage Committee. Despite everything, and thanks to the talent of those participating, we were able to take extremely important decisions as part of the 40th session of the Committee, in the framework of the 1972 World Heritage Convention, so that we can further the good work of the Convention. The World Heritage Committee, here at its 40th session, has adopted the Istanbul Declaration on 11 July, and a good number of reports and decisions were examined thanks to inputs from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, such as Sustainable Development and the priorities for the Convention. On 12 July, we were able to assess the reports on the protection of the state of conservation of 108 World Heritage properties, including 48 on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Nineteen cultural sites as well as a good many natural and mixed sites were also examined and many decisions taken. From 13 July and for a period of 2 days, we were able to look at the reports on the state of conservation of 22 mixed and natural sites already inscribed on World Heritage List, and 16 Side Events were held. On 15 July, work got underway as concerns the examination of the nominations of sites to the World Heritage List: 15 cultural sites nominations were evaluated and 13 July

inscribed on the World Heritage List. We are particularly delighted that our Archaeological Site of Ani was inscribed during this session, which gives us great satisfaction. I should like to take this opportunity to wholeheartedly thank the Committee, the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO and ICOMOS.

Dear guests, we are coming to the end of this 40th session of the World Heritage Committee, and we have had a most useful meeting. It has notably given me the opportunity to connect in a very useful manner with stakeholders from culture, and as a former head of Turkey's Delegation to UNESCO, it has been an opportunity to reconnect with many old friends.

Dear friends, on that note, I should like to extend my thanks to everyone who has made this session of the Committee a success, and above all to all those who have been working in the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Town Council of Istanbul, the administrators of the site of Istanbul, and all our colleagues in the Ministry of Culture—my thanks to all of you.

I hope that we can meet next year for the 41st session and wish you all an excellent end to this session.

Thank you.”