



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

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

Организация
Объединенных Наций по
вопросам образования,
науки и культуры

منظمة الأمم المتحدة
للتربية والعلم والثقافة

联合国教育、
科学及文化组织

World Heritage

18 GA

Distribution Limited

WHC-11/18.GA/INF.12

Original: English/French

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
7- 9 November 2011

SUMMARY RECORDS

RESUME DES TRAVAUX

FIRST DAY – Monday, 7 November 2011

FIRST MEETING

10.00 a.m. –1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. M. Pablo César GROUX

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

1A. Opening of the General Assembly by the Director-General

No document

The General Assembly was opened by the **Director-General**, who welcomed all States Parties to the 18th session of the General Assembly. With regard to current developments, she referred to a number of disasters that have affected World Heritage properties over the past years (including natural disasters in Southeast Asia, severe flooding in Pakistan, Thailand and Cambodia, the earthquake in Haiti, typhoon-like conditions in the Philippines and a tropical storm in El Salvador) and reported on UNESCO's efforts in the assessment of damages, capacity-building and policy development.

She commended the joint commitment of six States Parties in the nomination of Qapaq Nan and wished to remind how World Heritage was heavily exposed to illicit traffic in the Arab springs, especially in Libya. She mentioned that World Heritage can vanish in hours and take years if not centuries to be returned.

She expressed hope that, despite a difficult economic situation, more investments for the conservation of heritage can be obtained in connection with the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*. She promoted the overall theme of the anniversary, namely the role of local communities who are an integral and essential part of World Heritage sites. She stated that there could be no preservation without the knowledge and support of indigenous peoples.

She further stressed the role of World Heritage as a powerful contributor to sustainable development.

La Directrice générale a salué l'avancée constituée par la Résolution de l'Assemblée des Nations Unies sur le lien entre la culture et le développement, considérant cela comme une étape majeure dans le plaidoyer de l'UNESCO. L'étape suivante sera celle du sommet de Rio + 20. Ce sera l'occasion de montrer qu'il n'y a pas de contradiction entre la conservation et le développement. Le patrimoine est une source d'identité, de cohésion sociale durable, mais c'est aussi une source d'emplois et de commerces. Aussi, selon elle, négliger le patrimoine, c'est se briser les ailes.

Moreover, the Director-General informed about the partnership with Panasonic to raise awareness among the general public about the need to strengthen the protection of heritage and the environment

L'UNESCO a encouragé des dizaines de groupes de travail pour la conservation. Des modèles innovants de partenariats entre le public, le privé et le local ont été développés. Il convient de profiter de cet anniversaire pour diffuser ces idées. L'anniversaire est une

opportunité 'révélée', il débutera par un événement le 30 janvier 2012 avec Herbie Hancock, Ambassadeur de bonne volonté de l'UNESCO et se terminera à Kyoto au Japon du 6 au 8 novembre 2012.

La Directrice générale conclut en disant que la communauté des Etats parties à une obligation de résultats pour montrer le rôle crucial que joue le patrimoine mondial dans le développement économique. L'avenir de la *Convention* est entre les mains des populations comme des Etats parties. La *Convention* est l'antidote à une lecture nationaliste du patrimoine.

[Le discours de la Directrice générale se trouve à l'Annexe I du présent document]

1B. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the General Assembly

Document: WHC-11/18.GA/1B
WHC-11/18.GA/INF.1B

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 1B**

La Délégation de l'Equateur présente la candidature de S. Exc. M. Pablo César GROUX (Etat plurinational de Bolivie) comme Président de l'Assemblée. Cette candidature est soutenue par la Délégation du Pérou.

A la suite de quoi, l'Assemblée générale élit **Mme Hyosang JO (République de Corée)** comme Rapporteur de la 18^e et la **Slovénie**, le **Cap-Vert** et le **Koweït** comme Vice-présidents.

Le Projet de Résolution **18GA 1B** est adopté.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 1 of the Agenda

ITEM 2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND TIMETABLE FOR THE ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

2A. Adoption of the Agenda of the 18th session of the General Assembly

Documents: WHC-11/18.GA/2A
WHC-11/18.GA/INF.2A
WHC-11/18.GA/INF.2A Rev

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 2A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the Agenda, which was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session, indicating that the presentation of the Report of the 17th General Assembly was added to the draft Agenda proposed. He also mentioned that the list of candidates for election of the World Heritage Committee contained

23 candidates. He added that in Document WHC-11/18.GA/6 the statement of accounts was slightly amended.

The Draft Resolution **18 GA 2A** was adopted.

2B. Adoption of the Timetable of the 18th General Assembly and of the Timetable for the elections to the World Heritage Committee

Document: WHC-11/18.GA/2B

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 2B**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the timetable indicating that there were minor changes as the General Assembly would resume at 3 p.m. on Monday 7 November instead of 2.30 p.m. and at 3.30 p.m. on Tuesday 8 November as the External Auditor was not available before. He mentioned that if the elections were held on time, the General Assembly might examine additional items. He concluded by indicating that on Wednesday 9 November the 10th Extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee would start at 2 p.m. and would comprise the old Committee members. This extraordinary session will be chaired by Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The General Assembly would reconvene after the extraordinary session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Draft Resolution **18 GA 2B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 2 of the Agenda

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 17TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (UNESCO, 2009)

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 4**

Ms Dagnija Baltina (Latvia), **Rapporteur of the 17th session of the General Assembly of States Parties** to the *Convention*, presented her Report. She described the new rules of procedures derived from the Kondo Open-ended Working Group, namely a four-year gap between two mandates, one seat reserved for an unrepresented State Party on the World Heritage List. She also insisted on the capacity-building of World Heritage Committee members and on the discussion that had taken place about the Future of the *Convention*, which she considered as the main issue. She also recalled the debate on the relationship between sustainable conservation and development. She indicated that the debate had also covered issues such as the work of statutory organs, the decision-making process, the transparency and need for expert meetings, the mobilization of more expertise and the strategic management of the *Convention*. The debate on the Future of the *Convention* also insisted on the need for more voluntary contributions, a management audit on staffing policies and the relationship with the Advisory Bodies.

The Draft resolution **18 GA 4** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 4 of the Agenda.

**ITEM 5 REPORT OF THE CHAIRPERSON OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE
COMMITTEE**

Document: See document **36C/REP/13**

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 5**

The **Chairperson of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee**, Her Excellency Sheika Mai bint Muhammad Al Khalifa, Minister of Culture of Bahrain, presented her Report.

The Chairperson commended the General Assembly for being a unique opportunity for all States Parties to discuss about the strategic implementation of the *Convention*, a unique legal instrument for the protection and conservation of our World Heritage. She insisted on the fact that the reputation of the *Convention* was confronted to an unprecedented challenge as its credibility is at threat. She indicated in this regard that the 40th anniversary is a unique opportunity to address this issue. She recalled the five strategic objectives of the *Convention*, namely 1.Credibility 2.Conservation 3.Capacity-building, 4.Communication and 5. Communities.

She mentioned the fact that the *Convention* is close to universality, as Equatorial Guinea became a State Party in March 2010 and Brunei Dar-Es-Salaam would become a State Party on 12 November 2011. She indicated that since the last General Assembly, 46 properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List. The List now counts 936 properties, 725 cultural, 183 natural, 28 mixed. 82 properties are located in Africa, 70 in the Arab States, 205 in Asia and the Pacific, 452 in Europe and North America and 127 in Latin America and the Caribbean. She stressed the fact that 35 properties are on the World Heritage List in Danger and five States Parties have inscribed their first property on the World Heritage List, namely Barbados, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Tajikistan and United Arab Emirates, while still 35 States Parties have no property inscribed on the List.

She insisted on the fact that state of conservation reports were the basis of the *Convention*. It is an important tool to evaluate the conservation of properties. Since the last General Assembly, 301 states of conservation reports were examined, one property was withdrawn from the List and six properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger.

She also informed about the status of the second cycle of periodic reporting and on the reinforced monitoring mechanism which was evaluated by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session and which the Committee decided to keep on the basis of an annual evaluation as there is a risk of losing the Outstanding Universal Value in some cases in the short term.

The Chairperson mentioned the Global Training Strategy which will be implemented by ICCROM in conjunction with UNESCO Chairs, Category 2 Centres and all other partners. She urged the General Assembly to find additional funds to achieve this Strategy. She further indicated that the kit World Heritage in Young Hands was translated in seven additional languages since the last General Assembly and four additional episodes of the cartoon of Patrimonito's adventures had been achieved.

Speaking of the publications, the Chairperson mentioned the publication of six quarterly issues of the World Heritage Magazine since the previous General Assembly and two Resource Manuals, namely on Risk Management and Nominations both published in English and French.

She concluded by acknowledging the Rapporteurs and the Vice-Presidents, in particular Ms Alissandra Cummins, Barbados for her role during the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Draft Resolution **18 GA 5** was adopted.

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

ITEM 3 ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-11/18.GA/3
WHC-11/18.GA/INF.3A.Rev
WHC-11/18.GA/INF.3B

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 3**

Le **Rapporteur** annonce les résultats du premier tour du scrutin concernant le Siègre réservé aux Etats parties n'ayant pas de site sur la Liste, comme suit:

Nombre de votants : 171
Nombre de bulletins nuls : 4
Nombre de bulletins valides : 167

Majorité requise : 84

Résultats des votes :

Jamaïque : 60 voix
Qatar : 76 voix
Palau 31 voix

La majorité absolue requise pour ce siège n'étant pas atteinte, le **Rapporteur** annonce donc un deuxième tour de scrutin.

Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique les modalités liées à cette élection tout en précisant qu'au second tour, la majorité absolue ne sera plus requise.

FIRST DAY – Monday, 7 November 2011

SECOND MEETING

4.30 p.m. –6.30 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. M. Pablo César GROUX

ITEM 3 ELECTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (*Continuation*)

Le **Rapporteur** annonce les résultats du premier tour du scrutin pour les Sièges ouverts, comme suit:

Total votes: 172

Valid votes: 170

Invalid votes: 2

Majority required: 86

Results of Voting

	Candidates	Number of votes in favour	
1	Algeria	101	Elected
2	Bosnia and Herzegovina	21	
3	Colombia	81	
4	Côte d'Ivoire	15	
5	Democratic Republic of Congo	19	
6	Denmark	81	
7	Germany	105	Elected
8	Greece	82	
9	India	111	Elected
10	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30	
11	Jamaica	44	
12	Japan	113	Elected
13	Malaysia	96	Elected
14	Malta	35	
15	Mauritania	50	
16	Niger	13	
17	Palau	22	
18	Qatar	<i>Elected for the reserved seat (SP with non-WH List)</i>	
19	Saudi Arabia	<i>Withdrew before the First round</i>	
20	Senegal	97	Elected
21	Serbia	86	Elected
22	Sudan	51	
23	Zambia	14	

Les Délégations de **Côte d'Ivoire, du Niger et de Malte** annoncent qu'elles retirent leur candidature pour faciliter le processus des élections.

The Delegation of **Sudan** announced that it maintained its candidature.

The Delegation of **Mexico** requested the Secretariat to show the current composition of the Committee on the screen so that all States Parties could examine how the composition was

at this moment in terms of geographical distribution. It was concerned that the Latin America and the Caribbean Group would be weakened by this voting.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** s'oppose à la demande exprimée par la Délégation du Mexique étant donné que le processus de vote est en cours.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** endorsed the request submitted by the Delegation of Mexico and reminded the recommendation from the previous General Assembly for an equitable geographical composition.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** comprend les points de vue des Délégations du Mexique et de Sainte Lucie. Toutefois elle souligne que leur demande ne serait recevable que s'il n'y avait aucune représentation de ce Groupe régional au sein du Comité, ce qui n'est pas le cas. Elle sollicite par conséquent l'avis du Conseiller juridique.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** made a suggestion for Delegations to refer to Document INF3B on the composition of the World Heritage Committee since 1976. The Delegation of **Denmark** decided to maintain its candidature.

Les Délégations de la **Zambie, de la République Démocratique du Congo, de la Mauritanie et de la Jamaïque** annoncent qu'elles retirent leurs candidatures.

The Delegation of **Palau** decided to maintain its candidature.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce les résultats du second tour du scrutin pour les Sièges ouverts, comme suit:

Total votes: 167
Valid votes: 162
Invalid votes: 5
Majority required: N/A

Result of Voting:

	Candidates	Number of Votes in favour	
1	Bosnia and Herzegovina	1	
2	Colombia	59	Elected
3	Denmark	32	
4	Greece	20	
5	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	6	
6	Palau	10	
7	Sudan	34	

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** took the floor and expressed its satisfaction for the representation of two Latin American countries to the Committee after the second round. However, it stressed that it would submit an amendment to the *Rules of procedure* for the next General Assembly to make the election completely different, and to distribute the seats per different regional group on a pro rata basis like other conventions for an equitable geographical representation in the Committee.

La Délégation du **Soudan** félicite la Délégation de la Colombie pour son élection et affirme qu'elle restera engagée dans les travaux accomplis par le Comité.

The Delegation of **Venezuela** reiterated that the imbalance of geographical representation in the Committee should be addressed and supported the Delegation of Saint Lucia's proposal.

The Delegation of **India** thanked all the countries who supported it and emphasized its continuous support for the *World Heritage Convention* through its high responsibility as a member of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Colombia** committed itself to work together with Member States as well as with the Committee members to make the Committee have a high visibility and reputation.

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

The meeting rose at 6.30 pm.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 8 November 2011

THIRD MEETING

10.00 a.m. –1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. M. Pablo César GROUX

ITEM 6 EXAMINATION OF THE STATEMENT OF ACCOUNTS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND, INCLUDING THE STATUS OF THE STATES PARTIES' CONTRIBUTIONS

*Document: WHC-11/18.GA/6 and Corr
 WHC-11/18.GA/INF.6*

Draft Resolution: 18 GA 6

The **Chairperson** introduced the item and asked the Secretariat to present the report under Item 6. There were no interventions on this item.

The Draft Resolution **18GA 6** was adopted.

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

ITEM 7 DETERMINATION OF THE AMOUNT OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS OF ARTICLE 16 OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

*Document: WHC-11/18.GA/7
 WHC-11/18.GA/INF.7*

Draft Resolution: 18 GA 7

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre presented the report under Item 7.

The Delegate from **Sweden** called attention to the unsatisfactory situation of the World Heritage Fund which is caused by the continually growing number of properties on the World Heritage List, and the increasing assistance which needs to be provided while there is no increase in the contribution to the World Heritage Fund. So far, no solution has been agreed upon by the World Heritage Committee, therefore, it is important that analytical solutions are sought to work more effectively in the future. The Strategic Action Plan is an important step in this direction.

The Draft Resolution **18.GA 7** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 7 of the Agenda.

**ITEM 9 AUDIT PLAN ON THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE BY THE INTERNAL
OVERSIGHT SERVICE (IOS)**

Document: WHC-11/18.GA/9

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 9**

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 9 and asked the Secretariat to present the report.

The representative of **IOS** gave a brief presentation of the Audit Plan for 2012 contained in Document 9 and explained that they foresee to take stock of all earlier audits and recommendations since 1997, and review contracts, chairs and activities.

The Delegate of **Canada** noted that it was fundamental to follow-up on the audits carried out of the World Heritage Centre and asked for more details on which recommendations will be reviewed by the audit.

The representative of **IOS** explained that a number of audits have been carried out since 1997 and that of the previous audits, 9 out of 15 recommendations have been implemented while 6 are in progress. The audit will give an overview of which recommendations may still be outstanding and provide an input to the risk management workshop which will be carried out within this audit.

The **Director** of the World Heritage Centre supplemented this information and explained that progress reports on the implementation of the recommendations have been provided to the World Heritage Committee each year and this will be continued for all subsequent recommendations.

The Delegate from **Uruguay** mentioned that it would be interesting to also analyse not only the activities of the headquarters but also the field offices, the UNESCO Chairs and the advisory work and also integrate this to the World Heritage landscape/work of the Member States.

The Draft Resolution **18.GA 9** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 9 of the Agenda.

**ITEM 10 REPORT ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE RELATED
CATEGORY 2 CENTRES**

Document: WHC-11/18.GA/10
 WHC-11/18.GA/INF.10

Draft Resolution : **18 GA 10**

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the category 2 centres related to World Heritage: the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF); the World Heritage Institute of Training and Research-Asia and Pacific (WHITR-AP) in China; the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-WH) in Bahrain; the Regional Heritage Management Training Centre in Brazil; the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF), and the Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas, Mexico.

It underlined that the first annual meeting of existing and future category 2 centres, held from 19 to 20 December 2010 in Bahrain, was an excellent occasion to undertake a mapping exercise of existing training and capacity-building resources and to develop an individual strategy for every existing category 2 centre. This report has been provided to the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee and in conformity with Decision 35 COM 6 transmitted to this 18 GA. The World Heritage Committee supported the capacity-building strategy and the proposed role of category 2 centres to work with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies and encouraged other States Parties to organize annual meetings in the future. The Committee also stressed the fact that category 2 centres are a perfect illustration of Article 7 of the Convention on an international cooperation system for conservation and further encouraged the enhanced cooperation between the different category 2 centres. The Advisory Bodies have also noted the on-going progress of World Heritage category 2 centres and increasing efforts for capacity-building at regional levels.

Concluding, the **Secretariat** informed the General Assembly that the Culture Commission considered under item 5.9 the establishment of 2 category 2 centres under the auspices of UNESCO and recommended the establishment of an International Institute for Economy of Heritage in Turin (Italy) (doc 36C/29 part VII) and the International Centre for Rock Art and the World Heritage Convention in Spain (doc 36C/29 part XVI). The Italian Government has offered to host the annual meeting of category 2 centres in January 2012.

La Délégation de la **France** a noté avec satisfaction le remarquable travail et les activités réalisés, notamment au titre du Fonds africain. Cependant, il a souligné qu'il est nécessaire de développer une bonne communication autour de ces actions tout en prévenant leur atomisation.

The Delegate of **Kenya** supported the observations made by the Delegate of France and asked for more information of the activities of these Centres.

While appreciating the work of the Category 2 Centres the Delegation of **Zimbabwe** underlined the work accomplished by the African World Heritage Fund. The extensive report on activities which was presented in its abbreviated form to the World Heritage Committee is a good example and should be applied as a standard for all other Centres.

Noting the world wide initiative in support of World Heritage conservation and enhancing the visibility and impact of the Convention, the Delegation from **Sweden** emphasized that although each centre has different areas of expertise, there should be harmonization and coordination of the strategies, as well as result based management should be developed.

The Delegate of **Jordan** supported the interventions made by the other Delegates and hoped that there is no overlapping of activities but concentration on specific areas.

While calling for stronger collaboration among the Category 2 Centres, the Delegate of **South Africa** thanked the African World Heritage Fund for the benefits provided to the region in capacity building, conservation and credibility of the Convention, and encouraged the States parties to continue their contributions to the Fund.

The Delegate of **Cuba** highlighted the importance of training especially for some States Parties and sites and that in view of document 6 a lot still needs to be achieved, therefore it is important to allocate funds to the Category 2 centres.

The Delegate of **Oman** joined other delegates in appreciating the activities of the Category 2 Centres and the results of the Bahrain meeting.

Speaking on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, the representative of **ICCROM** appreciated the progress made in capacity building strategy and the important work of the Centres. The Advisory Bodies are ready to continue assisting these Centres with the development of their strategies in line with the Strategic Objectives.

Le délégué du **Cameroun** a souligné qu'il est nécessaire d'encourager la création des Centres de catégorie 2, afin de renforcer les capacités et notamment en Afrique.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** emphasised the important work of the Category 2 Centres for the implementation of the Global Capacity Building Strategy. He further pointed out that as of now reports of the Centres will be presented on a yearly basis to the World Heritage Committee. As regards the annual meeting of Category 2 Centres, this will depend very much on the initiative of a host Country as is the case now for the newly appointed Centre in Italy, which will be hosting a meeting in January 2012. In reply to the observation of the Delegate of Cuba, he underlined that the principle of the category 2 Centres is that there is no financial liability for UNESCO and that they have to be created and fully funded by themselves. As regards the decentralization of funds, this concerns the Regular Programme budget of which 47% are decentralized in coordination with our Field Offices.

The Delegate of **Bahrain** recalled that the first meeting of Category 2 Centres held in Bahrain has resulted in a set of recommendations which include the development of individual strategies focusing on the strategic objectives. Reporting to the World Heritage Committee should follow a common format would be very useful.

The **Secretariat** underlined the complementarity and synergy of these centres is an important focus as well as their regional relevance.

The Delegate from **Zimbabwe** wished to recognize the role and the important financial contribution made by the host countries of these centres.

The **Chairperson** also wished to recognize this contribution.

The Draft Resolution **18.GA10** was adopted.

The Chairperson closed Item 10 of the Agenda.

[At the request of the delegation of Norway, the position of the Delegation on this item can be found in **Annex III** of the present Document]

ITEM 11 The Future of the *World Heritage Convention*, including: 40th Anniversary of the *Convention*

Document: *WHC-11/18.GA/11*
 WHC-11/18.GA/INF.11

Draft Resolution : **18 GA 11**

La Délégation de **Saint Marin** tient à remercier la Délégation de l'Australie pour le rapport présenté ainsi que pour son apport. Elle souligne la nécessité d'encourager une répartition géographique plus équitable afin de soutenir tous les Etats parties et d'assurer la crédibilité de la *Convention*. Elle remercie également le Secrétariat d'avoir mis l'accent sur le message universel de la *Convention* ainsi que pour ses initiatives.

The Delegation of **Oman** noted that the Arab States Region already presented its periodic report with a clear indication of its recommendations, notably to divide the Region into three parts in order to achieve its objectives.

The Delegation of **Barbados** welcomed the report and expressed its support for the document presented. It noted that Decisions of the World Heritage Committee often conflict with the recommendations formulated by the Advisory Bodies. It further noted that the World Heritage Committee should be regarded as a technical body. It was of the view that the *Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention* are critical. Thus one should ensure that they are fully understood. It concluded by saying that the work related to World Heritage is becoming more complex and more time consuming, including an increasing complexity of missions.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Government of Australia for the Document prepared and noted that the *World Heritage Convention* is a fantastic tool for conservation. It further noted that the forthcoming ten years will be most challenging in view of the increasing environmental issues and challenges. For the *World Heritage Convention* to succeed it is of the opinion that it is critical to concentrate more on sustainability and take the rising conservation challenges into account.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the Government of Australia and the team for the Document presented. It noted that recognizing issues related to representativeness is critical for its Region. It was of the view that there is a need for credibility of the World Heritage List. It further noted that issues related to community involvement are critical for Nigeria. Communities need to be fully integrated into conservation management to ensure their understanding and support. It concluded that the report should be adopted.

La Délégation de **Chili** souligne l'importance de véhiculer le message de la *Convention* de manière partagée par tous. Les Etats parties doivent être impliqués dans la mise en œuvre de la *Convention* dans l'optique de 2022. Elle insiste sur le rôle primordial des communautés locales qui doivent non seulement constituer le lien entre l'UNESCO et le patrimoine mondial, mais l'être de manière effective en bénéficiant des apports positifs de la *Convention*. Les besoins environnementaux et sociaux des populations doivent également être pris en compte de façon efficace.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted the importance to study in a strategic manner ways to preserve World Heritage properties. It further confirmed that it is currently preparing the final event for the closure of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention* from 6 to 8 November 2012 in Kyoto, Japan.

La Délégation de **Mali** salue le plan d'action stratégique qui assure la mise en place d'un cadre permettant de travailler de façon optimale et d'obtenir des résultats solides. Cependant, elle est d'avis que des efforts supplémentaires doivent être accomplis pour que la Liste du patrimoine mondial soit plus équilibrée dans sa représentation des différentes zones et régions du monde. Elle demande des clarifications quant à la notion « marque de fabrique », employée pour la définition de l'objectif 4. Elle émet également des réserves sur l'utilisation du verbe « pouvoir », et suggère de privilégier un terme plus affirmatif. Elle conclut en approuvant néanmoins le plan proposé, malgré ces réserves.

La Délégation de l'**Uruguay** note qu'une meilleure coopération entre Etats parties est nécessaire. Un équilibre entre développement et conservation doit être trouvé. Elle attire l'attention sur l'importance d'impliquer les communautés. Tous les Etats parties doivent se sentir impliqués afin la *Convention* gagne en crédibilité. Les sites doivent réellement avoir une Valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle est d'avis que le mode de fonctionnement est parfois trop formel. La *Convention* devrait également prévenir toute exploitation commerciale. La participation de la société constitue en outre un élément primordial. Des campagnes de sensibilisation et d'information devraient être mises en oeuvre au sein des populations.

The Delegation of **China** approved the Strategic Action Plan and expressed its thanks to the Government of Australia and its team for its preparation. It noted that States Parties should undertake more efforts to protect their sites. It concluded by announcing that it would organize events in celebration of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Hungary** expressed its thanks for the excellent Document which was written in a constructive and creative manner. It noted that the World Heritage Committee has a crucial role to play in embracing the implementation of the *Convention*. It supported the comment of the Delegation of Finland on the World Heritage Committee as a standard setting body. It further congratulated all the newly elected States parties to the World Heritage Committee and called upon them to implement the Strategic Action Plan. It noted that the time to start with the implementation is now.

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the Government of Australia for the Document. It supported the fact that the credibility of the World Heritage List and the concept of Outstanding Universal Value are at the centre of the Strategic Action Plan. It expressed that one should now focus towards the implementation of this Plan. The Delegation invited the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre and all concerned to develop from now on an implementation plan to ensure that the Strategic Action Plan becomes a meaningful Document. The Delegation informed that it had sent an amendment concerning the Draft Decision. It listed the components that now need focus and should be included in a Draft Implementation Plan.

La Délégation du **Mexique** approuve le plan d'action stratégique. Elle insiste sur l'importance de l'objectif 6 « Les Décisions prises lors de rencontres statutaires font l'objet d'une publication et sont réellement mises en œuvre ». Il est vital que le Comité prenne en compte tous les aspects politiques de la mise en œuvre du plan, souvent ignorés par manque de temps. Elle a de ce fait proposé un amendement concernant la mise en œuvre et le suivi par l'Assemblée générale.

The Delegation of **Iran (Islamic Republic of)** congratulated Dr. Greg Terrill of the Government of Australia for his work on the Strategic Action Plan and stressed the importance of a vision as well as an equitable geographic distribution. It noted that it is committed to World Heritage and, together with the Delegation of Pakistan, is ready to implement other joint initiatives with other countries in the Region.

La Délégation de la **France** mentionne l'apparition de deux nouveaux concepts : l'impact du changement climatique et la stratégie sur la prévention des risques naturels. Elle demande par ailleurs des éclaircissements sur le terme ambigu « catastrophe ». Elle évoque également l'assistance technique existante, notamment la Convention France-UNESCO pour le patrimoine. Elle souligne que le rapport ne prend pas en compte les aspects environnementaux, notamment en ce qui concerne les pays ne disposant pas d'experts formés faute de moyens. En plus du 40^e anniversaire de la *Convention*, elle informe que la France célébrera aussi en 2012 le 50^e anniversaire de la loi Malraux sur la conservation des immeubles anciens situés dans certaines zones protégées. Des événements seront ainsi organisés au cours de l'année 2012 pour honorer ces deux textes. La Délégation effectuera aussi une contribution spéciale dans le cadre de la 17^e session de l'Assemblée générale de l'ICOMOS International qui se tiendra du 25 novembre au 2 décembre 2011, au Siège de l'UNESCO.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** congratulated Dr. Greg Terrill of the Government of Australia on his remarkable capacity to manage the work. The Delegation also expressed its thanks to the Secretariat for having ensured a better disposal of the working documents. It noted that the plan is comprehensive and gets the full support of the Delegation but that an equitable geographic distribution is important.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** commended the excellence of the Document and stated that goals 1, 2 and 6 should be considered in light of the future representation of the World Heritage Committee. It was called upon the Secretariat and the Committee to consider the question of geographic representation. It further noted that the World Heritage Committee is the most important legal tool for conservation and that it endorsed the Strategic Action Plan.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its great appreciation for the Strategic Action Plan and noted that Goal 6 allows a focus on what is needed in the future. A clarification was made on the fact that it will organize an international conference from 28 April to 2 May 2012 on prehistory and World Heritage as part of the 40th anniversary of the *Convention* celebrations. Preparations are being made for the programme in consultation with the Secretariat.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** félicite le Président de l'Assemblée générale à la veille du 40^e anniversaire de la *Convention* et de l'inscription du 1000^e site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle salue aussi la ratification d'un 187^e Etat partie. Elle précise que PACt garantira la transmission du patrimoine mondial aux générations futures. Elle adhère aux recommandations exprimées à propos de l'appropriation du patrimoine mondial par les populations locales et souligne l'importance de la déontologie de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Ces deux points devront être partie intégrante des objectifs pour les dix années à venir.

La Délégation de **Cuba** indique que l'utilisation du subjonctif en espagnol n'est pas adéquate et souhaite privilégier l'utilisation du verbe « devoir ». Elle suggère l'introduction d'un registre régional pour des sites qui auraient une valeur régionale plutôt qu'universelle.

The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated all those who assisted with the development of the Strategic Action Plan. It noted that a link between Rio+20 and the *World Heritage Convention* could not be more appropriate. It further noted that the need for a balanced geographic representation, as raised by the Delegation of Jamaica, needs to be reflected in the World Heritage Committee. It pointed out that a change in the rules for the World Heritage Committee might be needed to accommodate this.

The Delegation of **Korea** congratulated on the Strategic Action Plan and all those involved. It noted that local communities are crucial in the conservation of World Heritage. The Delegation welcomed the opening remark in this regard by the Director-General of UNESCO

at the opening session of the General Assembly. It noted that future actions of both the Committee and the Secretariat should include the importance of local communities. The Delegation reminded that the Republic of Korea hosted a meeting during the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee on this topic. It concluded by stating that it wishes to continue this important discussion with all parties involved.

La Délégation de la **Syrie** se félicite de ce rapport. Elle insiste par ailleurs sur le fait que le 40^e anniversaire de la *Convention* devrait être bien préparé et bénéficier d'une couverture médiatique conséquente. Elle fait part de son désir de faire découvrir les sites syriens du patrimoine mondial. Plusieurs événements seront organisés en République arabe syrienne pour démontrer le souci de conservation et préservation des sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle approuve les suggestions des Délégations des Emirats Arabes Unis et de l'Iran concernant l'organisation d'activités en collaboration avec d'autres pays arabes.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Government of Australia for the carefully articulated Strategic Action Plan and expressed its support to move forward. The Delegation welcomed the importance of regional cooperation and professionalism in World Heritage issues. It further noted that lessons should be learned from the past 40 years. It fully supported moving towards a good *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Colombia** congratulated the Government of Australia on the Strategic Action Plan and noted that the document can improve credibility. It further noted that continuous debate is needed on the working methods. The Delegation supported the call from the Delegations of Jamaica and Brazil for an equitable geographic representation.

The Delegation of **Norway** congratulated the Government of Australia for the work on the Strategic Action Plan and noted that the plan forms part of an open-ended and inclusive process. The Delegation welcomed the inclusion of aspects raised by the External Auditors and expressed its support to the Strategic Action Plan. It further noted that implementing it would now be a major step forward. It added that a draft implementation strategy is now needed and should in fact be presented at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012. The Delegation informed that it planned to host an interregional conference on conservation and development in May 2012. The conference would focus on Europe and Africa and address many of the questions raised in the debate on balancing conservation and development. The Delegation expressed its hope to announce the results of this conference during the 40th anniversary closing event organized by the Delegation of Japan.

The Delegation of **Viet Nam** congratulated the Government of Australia for the Strategic Action Plan and expressed its support for the crucial focus of the report on the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value. It further noted that both conservation and sustainable development are essential. They cannot be disconnected when it comes to the management of World Heritage properties. Both the 40th anniversary and Rio+20 are crucial opportunities to address issues related to conservation and sustainable development. The Delegation informed about the intention of Viet Nam to host a sub-regional workshop on the management of sites. This event will address critical questions on the link between conservation and sustainable development.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** note que la crédibilité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial est la base de la *Convention*. Les biens inscrits sur la Liste devraient être limités. La préparation du dossier d'inscription est importante mais l'attention doit aussi porter sur la valeur du bien. Elle insiste sur la nécessité d'un soutien pour les biens situés en Afrique et sur l'importance du programme du patrimoine mondial en Afrique.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** acknowledged the Government of Australia for its leadership in developing the Strategic Action Plan. The Delegation supported the fine

aspirations of the document, but stressed the importance for the World Heritage Committee to act accordingly to these aspirations. Furthermore, the Committee should take decisions which do not question its credibility. It further noted that the adoption of this Plan could mark the start for a change towards Committee Decisions to ensure that the statements of the Plan are truly implemented.

The Delegation of **Thailand** congratulated the Government of Australia for the well developed Strategic Action Plan and noted that through this document World Heritage might have a better future. It noted that the Plan will ensure the conservation of sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List and of those to become World Heritage properties in the future.

IUCN congratulated the Government of Australia on the document and welcomed all newly elected Member States to the World Heritage Committee. On behalf of all Advisory Bodies, it confirmed their joining the development of an implementation action plan. It noted that the development of the Strategic Action Plan was a rich, thorough and long process which has resulted in clear goals. It further stated that it will be important from now on to link in a consistent way the Strategic Action Plan with the results of the External Auditors Report and other documents important to the future of the *Convention*. It stressed that it is important that the Committee speaks the language of the Strategic Action Plan and ensures its goals are reflected in its actions and Decisions. Considering its importance for the future of the *World Heritage Convention*, it was of the view that the Strategic Action Plan now needs to be translated into concrete implementation steps, a process which the Advisory Bodies are fully willing to support.

Dr. Greg Terrill who led the work of the Strategic Action Plan expressed his thanks to all States Parties for the rich input in the document which reflects the interest of all States Parties into the Future of the *Convention*. It noted that equitable geographic distribution is an important issue which needs future reflection and that the afternoon session (e.g., Agenda Item 8) might be a good time to continue the discussion. He further noted that the language of Goal 5 could be changed to 'the Committee strengthens its ability to address policy and strategy issues'. He further noted that the connection between the World Heritage family and the broader civil society is important and that the implementation plan is the right place to look into how this can be realized. He concluded by noting that there was clearly a broad support for the document but that from an overall point of view it should be seen as an ongoing process.

The **Rapporteur** announced that two amendments to the draft Decision were received from the Delegations of Canada and Mexico respectively. The Delegation of Canada proposed to amend paragraph 4 so it could reflect the requirements for the development of a draft implementation plan. The Delegation of Mexico proposed to include a new paragraph which had been sent to the Secretariat in advance. There were no objections to the two proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Hungary** proposed to include an expression of thanks to Dr. Terrill and the Working Group for their leadership in developing the Strategic Action Plan in the draft Decision.

The Draft Resolution **18 GA 11** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** concluded that it was a productive morning session and reminded that the Director-General had launched the opening of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention* at the opening session of this General Assembly.

The **Secretariat** provided an overview of the preparations on the 40th anniversary celebrations. It indicated that Document WHC-11/18.GA/INF.11 outlines a list of activities to be implemented between the launch of the anniversary on the previous day until the closing event as proposed by the Government of Japan. In contrast with the 30th anniversary of the *Convention*, it was noted that an effort was made to include all regions of the world in the celebrations. The Secretariat received a letter from Bulgaria on new initiatives during 2012. A special logo for the celebration year was launched the previous day. A variety of new activities would be prepared throughout the year, subject to availability of extra-budgetary funds. It informed that the Advisory Bodies have their own calendar of events and that the closing event would be held in Japan.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its thanks to the Secretariat for the overview and noted that a grand celebration is clearly foreseen. It was further stressed that all celebration activities should be funded on extra-budgetary funds, not from the World Heritage Fund.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that only extra-budgetary funds would be used for the celebrations and that a minimum of staff would travel to the respective celebration initiatives.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** émet le désir de soumettre une proposition pour la mise en place d'un prix pour le patrimoine africain. Elle fait remarquer qu'aucun prix sur le patrimoine africain n'existe à ce jour, en dépit de nombreux autres prix existants au sein de l'UNESCO. Elle propose la mise en place d'un prix sur la préservation du patrimoine pour le continent africain exclusivement.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 11 of the Agenda.

The **Secretariat** informed that the meeting would resume at 3 p.m. until 7 p.m. It further informed that all "old" Committee Members should attend meetings until the end of the session, as their mandate ends at the end of the General Assembly.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 8 November 2011

FOURTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. M. Pablo César GROUX

The **Chairperson** of the General Assembly opened the fourth meeting by inviting the Delegations that were elected to the World Heritage Committee to take the floor.

The Delegation of **Qatar** acknowledged for the votes and indicated that it was in its intention to become an active member of the Committee. It further highlighted that it believed in the expertise of the World Heritage Committee and proposed to host the World Heritage Committee in 2013 in Qatar.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** remercie l'Assemblée générale pour son élection et félicite les autres nouveaux membres élus au Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle s'engage à mettre en œuvre la *Convention* de 1972 et remercie de l'occasion qui lui est donnée pour l'enracinement d'une Liste du patrimoine mondial représentative, équilibrée et crédible. Elle se dit convaincue que le patrimoine mondial est un bien humain commun qui constitue une nostalgie de l'avenir.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** congratulated the Chairperson on his appointment and acknowledged for the votes to become a Committee Member in this important period of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*. It considered its election as an important opportunity to work towards a credible and balanced List.

The Delegation of **Serbia** thanked for the votes to become a World Heritage Committee Member for the first time and declared that it is deeply devoted to the values of UNESCO and the *World Heritage Convention*. It added that it intended to contribute significantly to this important institution.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie l'Assemblée générale pour son élection au Comité. Elle dit mesurer à sa juste valeur la confiance placée dans son pays. Elle indique qu'elle fera tout pour renforcer la *Convention* et ne ménagera aucun effort. Elle indique qu'elle est à la disposition de la *Convention* et de tous ses Etats parties.

The Delegation of **Germany** was proud and honored to be back to the World Heritage Committee after 14 years. It indicated that it considered the vote as a vote of confidence, but also a vote of tolerance to respect the different points of view. It declared that 200 experts are available in Germany. It added that its country has over 100 years of conservation experience and counts two UNESCO Chairs for World Heritage namely in Aachen and Cottbus. It stated that it focuses on sustainability and the maintenance of World Heritage properties in a living environment. In a spirit of partnership it offered help to those who may wish to seek it. It concluded by supporting the Strategic Action Plan and indicating that it was ready to work on the recommendations on how to put the Strategic Action Plan into action.

The Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the votes. It stressed that it considered its election all the more important in a time when it faces a number of important challenges. It confirmed that it was driven to contribute significantly to the World Heritage Committee and invited all States Parties to participate in the closing event of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention* which would take place in Japan at the end of 2012.

ITEM 8 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST: EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THE PACT INITIATIVE

Documents: *WHC-11/18.GA/8*
 WHC-11/18.GA/INF.8

Draft Resolution: **18 GA 8**

The **Chairperson** introduced Item 8 and invited the External Auditor Mr. Migaud to present the evaluation of the *Global Strategy* and the PACT Initiative.

M. **Migaud**, Premier Président de la Cour des Comptes, Auditeur externe de l'UNESCO, informe l'Assemblée générale des résultats du rapport sur la Stratégie globale et l'initiative PACT. Il décrit les principales recommandations du rapport et les risques auxquels la *Convention* doit faire face au moment de son 40e anniversaire (2012). *[La présentation de M. Migaud se trouve en Annexe II du présent document]*

The **Chairperson** introduced the debate of the General Assembly and announced that there would be a first debate about the Global Strategy and a second one on PACT.

The Delegation of **Egypt** raised a point of order requesting that the volumes in the head sets be raised. It objected to the fact that the speaking time was reduced to three minutes despite the fact that the General Assembly was ahead of its Agenda.

The **Chairperson** indicated that he decided to limit the speaking time in order to respect the time constraints of the External Auditor.

- **Débat sur la Stratégie Globale**

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the External Auditors for their valuable remarks and questioned whether the observations made were addressed to countries which lack resources or to those which lack capacities.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** indique que ce rapport n'apporte rien de nouveau au Comité. Elle souligne que certains paragraphes sont contradictoires et remarque que le mandat des Organisations consultatives n'a pas été abordé. Selon elle, il ne s'agit pas seulement de présenter les biens à inscrire, qu'ils soient en série ou transfrontaliers. Il s'agit plutôt de la crédibilité, de la capacité de préserver les biens, capacité qui n'est pas limitée au nombre de sites inscrits. Elle conclut en remarquant que le dispositif actuel privilégie les Etats parties sans privilégier les biens. Elle propose d'adopter un autre mécanisme pour limiter la Liste du patrimoine mondial et demande davantage de détails.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** partage beaucoup d'éléments de cette analyse. Elle remarque que les objectifs d'équilibre et de représentativité de la Liste du patrimoine mondial sont perçus non seulement comme des objectifs géopolitiques mais aussi en termes de capacités. Elle indique que beaucoup d'Etats parties possèdent des biens de Valeur universelle exceptionnelle mais, faute de capacités et de financements, ils ne peuvent pas constituer de dossiers de propositions d'inscriptions. L'ambition consistant à avoir une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée et représentative est selon elle l'expression même de la générosité de cette *Convention*, mais s'avère être réducteur et simplificateur.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** juge que l'évaluation est indispensable. Elle indique que les lacunes identifiées sont parfois sérieuses et représentent des problèmes récurrents. Elle considère les moyens financiers et humains insuffisants et souhaite qu'à l'occasion du 40^e

anniversaire de la *Convention*, les Etats parties reviennent aux fondamentaux de la *Convention*. Sans mettre en œuvre ces fondamentaux, les Etats parties risquent de mettre la *Convention* tout simplement en péril.

La Délégation de la Belgique poursuit en énumérant ses trois priorités : la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle, la conservation et l'expertise. Les Organisations consultatives doivent éclairer la *Convention* et indiquer si la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle existe ou non. La conservation est un engagement et une responsabilité assumés par les Etats parties. L'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial s'accompagne d'un système de gestion et de conservation efficace. Les experts doivent retrouver leur rôle, malgré la politisation, car ce sont eux qui possèdent la mémoire institutionnelle de la *Convention*. Elle conclut en souhaitant la publicité des débats et un meilleur suivi des recommandations adoptées.

The Delegation of **Sweden** thanked for the rich and interesting report which will contribute to the further development of the *Global Strategy* which had so far only limited success. It noted that there is a clear need for a revised strategy as there are currently differing understandings in parts. The strategy needs to be clearly defined as a first step and address the current imbalances. It was of the view that capacity-building was where the true imbalance is to be found. It further noted that the encouragement to slow down the pace and limit the number of nominations seemed to have no effect. It further noted an urgent need for capacity-building within States Parties and recommended to give priority to the clear definition of a revised strategy first. It stressed the fact that it was important to make use of knowledge for defining this strategy. It commended the results of the External Auditors' report which would also feed the later discussions on the Future of the *Convention*. The next step would be to prioritise the External Auditors' recommendations and look at their financial implications.

The Delegation of **Estonia** thanked the External Auditors for their straight-forward report and highlighted that the *Convention* is not about numbers, but about conservation, capacity-building and credibility. It noted that the current focus is on inscription rather than conservation, which it believed to be the real raison d'être of the *Convention*. Therefore conservation and monitoring should be restored as the priorities of the implementation of the *Convention*. It therefore supported the Draft Resolution proposed by the Delegation of Belgium. It further noted that the concept of Outstanding Universal Value has been too often disregarded for geopolitical reasons. In order to enable all countries to properly build their capacities the Delegation of Estonia announced it was planning to make a voluntary contribution to the World Heritage Fund. It further noted the exemplary upstream process which allows for coordination between States Parties and Advisory Bodies ahead of nominations. It further demanded that no nomination should be adopted by the World Heritage Committee with conditions attached to it, as it only leads to an unnecessary increase in the workload of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est d'un avis contraire à celui de la Délégation de l'Egypte. En effet, elle indique que le rapport démontre de dangereux écarts avec les fondamentaux et dénonce l'échec de la Stratégie globale et de sa mise en œuvre. Son objectif n'a pas été atteint et on peut même constater une tendance inverse, ce qui suscite une série de questions. La *Convention* est un instrument de coopération internationale et le garant de sa crédibilité est la conservation. Elle doit donc revenir à son objectif principal qui est la Liste du patrimoine mondial, à travers la conservation, le suivi et l'assistance internationale qui doivent être améliorés. Selon la Délégation de la Suisse, la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril doit être réhabilitée. Il convient aussi de renforcer les capacités à tous les niveaux et d'éviter que des inscriptions conditionnelles soient décidées. En effet, ces inscriptions sous condition(s) déclenchent rapidement des difficultés. Il faudrait aussi développer le dialogue entre les Organisations consultatives et les Etats parties. Le rôle des Organisations consultatives consiste à apporter un soutien aux Etats parties. La Délégation de la Suisse

soutient le Projet de Résolution de la Délégation de la Belgique et dépose un projet d'amendement à ce Projet de Résolution.

The Delegation of **Italy** thanked the Auditors for their report and stated that the outcomes are of high importance. The report brought to light the many failures of the *Global Strategy* and the near loss of the credibility. It was of the view that once the credibility would be lost it would be very difficult to build it up again. It expressed its concern that politics had entered the World Heritage Committee and called for a way forward to guarantee the independence of assessments of sites and preserve the scientific dimension of the *Convention*. It therefore supported the Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Belgium. It also reminded that the main responsibility for the success of the *Global Strategy* lies with the States Parties, and in particular the Committee members.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Auditors for their report which comes in a key time to assess the strength and weaknesses of the *Convention*. It took the recommendations of the External Auditors very seriously and believed that unfortunately too much priority had been given to new properties. It raised the concern that the non-representation of certain States Parties is due to their lack of capacities to put together nomination dossiers and not in an inability to prove the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** concurred with the External Auditors and commended their clear language. It expressed its state of shock regarding the outcomes of the report and called to consider this report as an alarm bell to signal that the *World Heritage Convention* is seriously off track. This report is to be considered as a catalyst to raise the attention. If its recommendations are not addressed, the consequences could be very detrimental to the *Convention*. It stated that it has long called for the restoration of conservation as the main issue. After 30 years of inscriptions it deemed that now has come the time to address conservation issues. It noted however that it is only if the States Parties have the will to make conservation the priority that it would happen.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Belgium and requested further reviews of the implementation of the *Global Strategy*. It believed this would support a more effective, balanced, credible and representative List.

The Delegation of **Austria** welcomed the observations in the External Auditors' report and pointed out three issues. The first one concerned the need to stick to the regulations on technical requirements for inscriptions. Secondly, it was of the view that there should be more transparency in considering one of the 5C's, namely "Community". This would help the local ownership of properties to better understand the concept of World Heritage. There may be no good recognition of World Heritage without sound support from the local level. Thirdly, conservation should be reintroduced as a matter of highest priority.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** évoque la course aux inscriptions et dénonce la géopolitisation. Elle indique que ceci amène à entreprendre de nouveaux dossiers d'inscription au détriment de la capacité de conservation des Etats parties. Elle est d'avis que les sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril augmenteront. Il est donc nécessaire de ralentir le rythme des inscriptions et de se pencher davantage sur la conservation des biens figurant déjà sur la Liste ainsi que sur la prise en compte des difficultés financières et de gestion. Elle conclut en partageant ses vues avec la Délégation de la Belgique.

The Delegation of **Zimbabwe** commended the report and the way it presented the issues in a holistic way. It noted that it outlines the weaknesses of States Parties to the *Convention* and the geo-politicization of the Committee in its past two or three sessions without any doubt. It stressed that this was not what the *Global Strategy* said as the approach should be purely scientific. It outlined the fact that the Advisory Bodies were not seeking a wide

geographical positioning of experts and that this should be rectified. If these issues are not properly addressed it will be business as usual.

The Delegation of **Chile** stated that the best way to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the *Convention* was to look into its future, the results of the External Auditors' report providing an excellent opportunity for this. It highlighted the clear need for a more scientific approach, although it admitted that it was more difficult for the cultural values. It underlined the importance of a qualitative representation of properties with Outstanding Universal Value. It called to inscribe only those properties that are clearly exceptional. It did not agree with the External Auditors on the evaluation of the Preparatory International Assistance which in its view is very important. Also, Preparatory International Assistance may be considered successful even if it does not lead to the inscription of a property, as the inscription of a property is not an end in itself. The Delegation of Chile recalled that the credibility is also built up through conservation and that the 5C's have to be understood in an organic way.

The Delegation of **Slovenia** welcomed the External Auditors' report which it deemed based on well developed indicators. It highlighted that the equitable representation and regional balance was often understood differently. It further highlighted two issues: Firstly, the collision of decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee and the scientific criteria put forward by the Advisory Bodies. Also one should also prohibit the submission of inscriptions by States Parties while represented at the Committee. Full support should be given to the Advisory Bodies. Secondly, the Delegation of Slovenia highlighted the increasing workload of the World Heritage Centre as a result of the continuous growth of the World Heritage List. Thus it called for further commitments of States Parties in terms of extra-budgetary resources as the implementation of the Convention is more and more dependent on these resources.

The Delegation of **Denmark** thanked the External Auditors for the clear evaluation report, underlining the many challenges in the years to come. It also drew attention that there was a high number of recommendations in the report, some of which were of a technical nature, while others seemed more complicated to implement. Noting that the *Convention* should remain a standard-setting instrument thus the need to focus more on conservation, the Delegation of Denmark called for a careful prioritization of the External Auditors' recommendations as a key to success for the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** commended the excellent recommendations of the External Auditors' report and supported the comments made by the Delegation of Zimbabwe. It noted that the word 'balanced' was often not understood in the same way. In the past Committee sessions, one could witness the non-observance of the *Operational Guidelines*, diplomats drafting Statements of Outstanding Universal Value, assessing a World Heritage site by stating that they had visited it recently and found it 'beautiful'. It recalled that the Committee is sovereign as a decision-making body, but called for its decisions to be based on arguments that are scientifically founded. It was of the view that the Committee only disagrees when the Advisory Bodies claim that the nominated property does not have the Outstanding Universal Value, not when the Advisory Bodies recommend the inscription. Therefore decisions of the World Heritage Committee should be based on the assessment of the Outstanding Universal Value and nothing else. The Delegation of Saint Lucia stated that the solution should be to provide help before submitting the nomination to the Committee in order to avoid frustration and waste of time and resources. It considered that these issues were already addressed in part in the pilot upstream projects.

The **Chairperson** stated that the Assembly saluted the words of the Delegation of Saint Lucia.

La Délégation du **Niger** note qu'il devrait y avoir plus d'engagement en faveur de la conservation et du renforcement des capacités de la part des Etats parties. Elle note qu'il existe certainement une volonté de conservation mais que les moyens manquent.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the External Auditors on their report and stated that it is consistent with the conclusions of the Working Group on the Future of the *Convention*. The External Auditors report should feed implementation planning for the *Global Strategy*, which it believed to be critical. It informed that it would also help not to repeat the mistakes of the past and support strong implementation as there has never been a plan to make the *Global Strategy* happen.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient les recommandations du rapport des Auditeurs externes. Elle considère que ces recommandations forment un ensemble de connaissances empiriques. Elle demande de quel équilibre il s'agit lorsqu'on parle d'une Liste plus équilibrée. Elle met l'accent sur l'importance des capacités pour la conservation et la mise en valeur. Elle souligne le fait que la perspective d'inscription attire comme un astre. Enfin, elle demande la définition exacte de la crédibilité car sa définition varie d'une convention à l'autre. La Délégation de la France s'associe à la Délégation de la Belgique et est d'accord pour revenir aux fondamentaux de la *Convention*. Elle insiste sur les moyens techniques et sur la place accordée à l'expertise des Organisations consultatives qui sont les bases de la *Convention*. Cela n'est pas synonyme de suivisme selon elle, mais c'est la seule garantie de la réputation de cette *Convention*.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** highlighted the importance of credibility and sustainability and stated that the Outstanding Universal Value should be paramount for the inscription of a property on the World Heritage List, otherwise credibility is undermined. It also addressed the issue of regional representation, reminding the General Assembly that the Pacific Islands Region, apart from Australia and New Zealand, is underrepresented. However it believed inscription should never be at the expense of the Outstanding Universal Value or conservation. It also supported the inscription of natural sites. The outcomes of the External Auditors' report should contribute to the implementation for the Strategic Action plan and it requested input.

The Delegation of **Norway** noted the divergence of the Committee's Decisions and the evaluations of the Advisory Bodies, the apparent consensus on the credibility of the *Convention*, conservation considered as a second priority, the lack of community involvement, as well as the absence of coordination between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It therefore supported the Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Belgium and requested to be one of its co-sponsors.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that the Advisory Bodies should be able to play their full role. It was mindful that recommendations from previous audit reports have not always been followed nor implemented. It gave 1997 as an example of this. It agreed with the Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Belgium and insisted that it should be strengthened. It concluded by stressing that the General Assembly should decide now how the recommendations of the External Auditors' report should be implemented. It believed that now is the time for action to ensure that States Parties could celebrate the 50th anniversary of the *Convention* in a decade's time.

The Delegation of **Germany** extended its compliments to the External Auditor, and also to the General Assembly for requesting the report on '*The Evaluation of the Global Strategy and the PACT Initiative*'. It noted that in the last 15-20 years most of these issues have been discussed, also remarking that some parts of the report were perhaps lacking considering the time that it took to write. It added that this remark was not meant to play down the findings of the External Auditors but rather to suggest looking at the common experience in order to recognize flaws, weaknesses and solutions. It acknowledged that there were some practical

obstacles such as those for the inscription of sites in remote regions unrepresented on the List. The Delegation of Germany emphasized the importance of the Outstanding Universal Value as a guiding principle. It addressed the need to create connections between the *World Heritage Convention* and other conventions of the Culture Sector, in particular the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (2003) and the Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage (2001). It cautioned against the politicization of the *Convention* as diplomats speak where experts should speak. Referring to the Periodic Reporting exercise it underlined the importance of the process, noting that although it may incur a loss of pride for States Parties it should be accorded close attention. It also drew attention to the fact that it is co-sponsor of the Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Belgium and advised follow-up and implementation.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** apporte son soutien aux recommandations du rapport. Toutefois, elle mentionne qu'il serait judicieux de définir la notion de crédibilité et de simplifier les concepts de référence comme la « Valeur universelle exceptionnelle ». Selon elle, il pourrait y avoir deux phases : l'une probatoire, laissée à l'appréciation des Etats parties ; tandis que l'autre porterait sur la conservation avec l'assistance technique requise. La Délégation met l'accent sur la mise en place indispensable d'un mécanisme de dialogue avec les Organisations consultatives. Enfin, elle suggère qu'une liste géographique d'experts soit mise à la disposition des Etats parties.

La Délégation du **Cameroun** met l'accent sur le renforcement des capacités des Etats parties les moins représentés dans la Liste, notamment en ce qui concerne les paysages culturels. Elle souhaite éviter d'avoir un trop grand nombre de biens culturels et juge que la distinction entre les biens culturels et les biens naturels est trop arbitraire.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted the challenge of adding original comments but indicated that it would try. It congratulated the External Auditor for the report. It then highlighted the fact that it was an *External Auditor* who was observing the World Heritage processes and professed its concurrence with the conclusions. It also expressed agreement with the remarks of the Delegations of Belgium, Saint Lucia and Côte d'Ivoire. It emphasized the need for a focus on Outstanding Universal Value in nomination processes and expressed concern that this was not always the case. It mentioned the worrying trend of divergence with the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and again referred to the focus on Outstanding Universal Value and conservation which in its view are being lost in favour of new inscriptions. It evoked the challenge of implementing the recommendations of the report, noting that further study of these recommendations was not a necessity, and like the Delegation of the United Kingdom, the Delegation of Canada believed that it was time to act. It stated that the prospect of further debates in the future should not prevent immediate implementation of the recommendations and noted that achieving this by the next session of the World Heritage Committee would be a big step forward.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its appreciation of the External Auditors' report. It stressed the importance of the *Global Strategy* and underlined the need for a credible and balanced List. It expressed support for the Delegations of Switzerland and Sweden and stressed the expertise needed for the work of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, and the World Heritage Centre. It remarked that there was an implied code of conduct, stating that there should be recognition and respect for the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, who should function in a complementary rather than competitive manner. It stressed that the Committee is first and foremost a technical committee and that the role of the Advisory Bodies and the Committee are enshrined in the *Operational Guidelines*. It suggested a review of the role of Advisory Bodies in the future and expressed its support for the remarks of the Delegation of Saint Lucia regarding the upstream process.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** a salué la clarté ainsi que la précision du document réalisé par le Commissaire aux comptes. Elle a mentionné que la responsabilité de l'UNESCO vis-à-vis de la crédibilité de la *Convention* était citée dans le document. La Délégation s'est exprimée en faveur d'une coordination nécessaire entre les Etats parties et les organisations consultatives, et notamment plus adaptée aux besoins des pays comme les Etats insulaires. Elle a recommandé de poursuivre l'examen d'évaluation et de renforcer le projet de décision en la matière.

The Delegation of **Kenya** spoke of the two sites on its territory that were inscribed this year. It noted that inscription was just the beginning of the work, the real effort being in the conservation of sites. It referred to issues such as the conservation of historic urban centres in the face of development pressure, funding, cases of transboundary nominations where the Outstanding Universal Value depends on cross-border cooperation. Another question raised by the Delegation concerned communities and how to deal with the many expectations for immediate change that often result from inscription on the World Heritage List. It also referred to issues of understanding and awareness of the significance of World Heritage properties, questions of ownership, conservation policy and strategic issues, partnerships and cross-border issues.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the External Auditors for the evaluation which, it noted, gave an idea of the current situation and future perspectives. It urged that World Heritage should remain an inclusive process. It noted the challenges ahead for a balanced representative List as well as the need for commitment to capacity-building. It stressed the need to step-up efforts rather than slow down. The Delegation of India also stressed the need for transparency and inclusiveness of evaluations. It called for more technical rigour in order to ensure the assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** se rallie aux critiques constructives des Etats parties en espérant un suivi des recommandations. Elle met l'accent sur l'importance de la conservation et souhaite redonner la parole aux experts techniques. Elle désire qu'un remède soit trouvé aux déséquilibres et prône le recours à l'assistance préparatoire pour mieux préparer les listes indicatives. Elle fait également part de l'importance du suivi afin d'éviter la dégradation des biens inscrits, ainsi que d'avoir des relations transparentes entre les Etats parties et les Organisations consultatives.

L'**Auditeur externe** remercie les Etats parties de leurs commentaires. En soulignant son regard extérieur dû à la fonction qu'il occupe, il précise que tout ne se résume pas aux moyens financiers. Suite à l'identification des faiblesses et des écarts entre les principes et la réalité, il invite l'Assemblée générale à tirer les enseignements du rapport.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** met l'accent sur l'importance de la crédibilité de la *Convention* qu'il qualifie de point sensible. Elle souligne les efforts réalisés par les pays du sud en matière de conservation et indique que l'Afrique, mal représentée, mérite davantage de mobilisation afin de conserver son patrimoine.

L'**Auditeur externe** fait part de l'importance de consacrer des moyens à la conservation des biens.

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

ICOMOS commended the outstanding work of the External Auditors. It recalled that the *World Heritage Convention* was adopted in response to conservation threats, when the international community felt it incumbent upon the States Parties to participate in the protection of properties. It called for a focus on nominated sites rather than new inscriptions. It acknowledged that the *Global Strategy* had failed. It stated that the measures taken in

1999 and 2005 which are reflected in the *Operational Guidelines* had not produced the expected results. It noted that the Advisory Bodies wished to engage in dialogue with the States Parties in order to develop capacity-building. It also stressed that nomination and conservation were the core of the *Convention*. ICOMOS expressed the hope that the results of the audit report would help to avoid future misunderstandings. It voiced the need to follow the Committees' rules, but also commented that the Committee does not follow its own rules. It noted that the General Assembly had requested the audit report and therefore hoped that it would follow its recommendations. ICOMOS emphasized that the authority of the *Convention* is at stake, but expressed confidence that a solution could be found.

- **Débat sur l'Initiative PACTe**

La Délégation du **Sénégal** mentionne l'importance de cette Initiative. Quant aux préoccupations soulevées, elle souligne qu'il faut donner une chance aux Etats parties, compte tenu des différences existant selon les zones géographiques. Elle pose la question de savoir combien coûte le suivi d'un site, tout en demandant à comparer les dépenses de fonctionnement lors des premières inscriptions de sites avec celles du présent, au moment où presque 1.000 sites sont inscrits.

The Delegation of **Canada** remarked that, as in the case of the *Global Strategy*, it was impressed with the work carried out on PACT. It expressed surprise at the low return on investments and agreed that management should be strengthened while noting the importance of awareness-raising. The Delegation then called for a systematic professional strategic approach.

The Delegation of **Estonia** directed a question to the Secretariat. It referred to the response of the Director-General to the external audit report, in which the Director-General took note of the recommendations of the external audit report and said that they would be implemented in as far as this was practicable. The Delegation asked what the main obstacle for their implementation could be.

The Director of the World Heritage Centre noted that although the External Auditors can make recommendations they cannot force States Parties or the World Heritage Committee to act upon them. Referring to the question raised by the Delegation of Estonia pertaining to the response of the Director-General to the external audit, he noted that the response meant that the implementation of the recommendations depended on the extent of resources and ability of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** noted that the External Auditors and the other Delegates had raised significant issues and expressed its understanding of the Director-General's response to the audit report. The Delegation noted that progress to be made on the recommendations by the External Auditors' report should be aligned with the Future of the *World Heritage Convention*.

La Délégation du **Mexique** met l'accent sur les lacunes en matière de renforcement des capacités. Elle fait part de sa grande préoccupation concernant l'audit de l'Initiative PACTe. Elle apporte son soutien au projet de Résolution proposé par la Délégation de la Belgique. Elle indique que les ressources collectées doivent servir au patrimoine mondial.

L'**Auditeur externe** souligne que la charge de travail du Centre du patrimoine mondial et des Organisations consultatives s'est accrue plus que proportionnellement au nombre des biens inscrits. Il indique que dans les années 2000, le coût global de gestion d'un site était de 25,000 USD ; alors qu'en 2010, il s'élevait à 53,000 USD. Il fait également part de la complexité accrue de la gestion des sites.

La Délégation de la **France** met l'accent sur les conclusions préoccupantes du rapport d'évaluation de l'Initiative PACTe, notamment sur la traçabilité insuffisante des fonds levés; sur l'utilisation de l'emblème du patrimoine mondial à des fins ayant peu de liens avec la *Convention*; et sur le manque d'efficacité de cette Initiative (ratio financier : un dollar investi rapporterait à peine plus d'un dollar récolté). Elle conclut en soulignant l'importance des partenariats et appelle à veiller à l'efficacité et à la crédibilité de la *Convention*.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the distinguished Delegates for the comments and the rich and full discussion on the recommendations on the *Global Strategy*. He expressed the need to strive to implement the recommendations to whatever extent possible. He noted that the response of the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly was necessary, and that the role of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies is to support the work of the Committee and the Assembly. The Director noted that many States Parties had brought up the need to implement the Strategic Action Plan. He noted that the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies should examine the necessary measures and formulate an implementation plan. He advised that starting from the 36th session a report should be developed every two years. Referring to the comments on the upstream process the Director thanked the States Parties. He noted that the process was in an experimental stage of pilot projects. He indicated that one should wait to see how things would develop and what the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies, and the States Parties could do to contribute to the process and ensure that sites meriting inscription make it on to the List.

Commenting on the remarks of the Delegation of Colombia regarding the upstream process and the Tentative Lists, the Director said that it is foreseen to prioritize sites with strong chances of inscription with the collaboration of States Parties. The Director assured that supporting capacity-building represents a strong component of the work of the Centre and stated the intention of using Category 2 Centres and training facilities to deliver this support. With regard to PACT, the Director remarked that comments were comparatively few. He remarked that some of the observations made in the External Auditors' report were harsh. He noted that the programme was started as an innovative Initiative by the World Heritage Centre in 2002. He added that it was a path-breaking project and in this sense that lessons were learned from practice over the course of time. He noted that the strategy was adapted to the 2007 framework. He continued adding that it was not just proactive, but also receptive and opportunistic. The Director remarked that such partnerships do not guarantee success and that it is not an easy project.

The Director went on to comment that the PACT programme had only one regular staff member and is supported by extra-budgetary funds. He noted the need to develop a unit devoted to PACT. The Director also remarked that the External Auditors had not mentioned the in-kind benefits of the programme such as media coverage and visibility. Referring to the remark by the Delegation of France regarding the lack of financial efficiency of the Initiative he added that he found the return rate of one dollar yielding one-dollar a positive 100% return on investment. The Director expressed his agreement with the comments on the need for traceability of funds and noted that procedural improvement was necessary, also mentioning the possible use of electronic tools for tracing funds. He then addressed the issue of the World Heritage emblem and noted that there had been many comments on this topic but that in fact it was not such an important issue as there had only been a couple of cases of misuse. He added that in those cases the use was withdrawn and stressed the fact that these matters were under the responsibility of the Office of Legal Affairs. The Director concluded by stating that the Secretariat deserves some credit for the programme which has brought some positive results and that processes will continue to be improved.

Le **Rapporteur** donne lecture des projets de Résolutions et amendements soumis respectivement par les Délégations de la Belgique et de la Suisse.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** note une contradiction, au paragraphe 4, entre les deux projets de Résolutions proposés : l'un propose la création d'un groupe de travail ouvert ; tandis que l'autre soumet les amendements à l'examen de la 36^e session du Comité. D'autre part, la Délégation suggère d'organiser plusieurs réunions d'experts pour réviser cette stratégie. Elle regrette que les amendements n'aient pas été soumis en avance et déclare ne pas pouvoir les adopter en l'état.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne le consensus qui s'est exprimé autour des recommandations du rapport des Auditeurs externes et indique que les Etats parties doivent se prononcer sur la manière de les mettre en œuvre. Elle met l'accent sur la nécessité d'établir un groupe de travail ouvert dès la 36^e session du Comité.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that a Working Group would be a modality and not a substitute. It questioned what a Working Group could achieve. It suggested that it would allow an open-ended participation rather than a specific mandate or terms of reference. It noted that the open-ended Working Group would meet in Paris without the benefit of the experts of the *Convention*. It asked how this work would be done and why it had to be done so fast. The Delegation noted that after years of the preparation of the Strategic Action Plan such changes were to be made in a couple of months, and that this method would be preempting the advice of the Advisory Bodies. The Delegation also regretted that these amendments were introduced late in the General Assembly. It added that the terms of reference were unclear and urged more introspection, calm and careful consideration of the issues.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** mentionne l'importance de réfléchir et de prendre son temps avant toute mise en œuvre des recommandations du rapport des Auditeurs externes. Elle suggère de porter cette question à l'ordre du jour de la prochaine Assemblée générale et d'organiser des réunions d'experts entre temps. La Délégation pose la question de la date de révision du Règlement intérieur du Comité.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated its disagreement with the simultaneous introduction of two amendments and expressed the need for clear terms of reference, commenting that more time was needed.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** a mis l'accent sur un processus de mise en œuvre devenu impératif. Elle a mentionné ne pas être contre la création d'un groupe ouvert, ni être opposée à l'élaboration d'un document préparé par le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle déclare qu'une amélioration des accords de partenariats avec le secteur privé est nécessaire.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** souligne la nécessité de réfléchir à une cohérence à la fois méthodologique, organisationnelle et opérationnelle. Elle mentionne que les Organisations consultatives doivent participer au processus de mise en œuvre et qu'il n'y a donc pas d'urgence en la matière. Elle se prononce en faveur d'un groupe de travail ouvert avec un mandat précis.

The Delegation of **Denmark** recalled that it is co-sponsor of the Draft Resolution submitted by the Delegation of Belgium. It stated that the recommendations of the external audit report should be urgently prioritized, noting that some recommendations were complex while others were more technical.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its support on the comments of the Delegations of Egypt, India and other delegates, cautioning for time to be taken, suggesting a working group be formed and the amendments carefully examined.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that the two proposals share priority but expressed preference for the proposal submitted by the Delegation of Belgium. It noted the need for

proper consideration by the States Parties. It remarked that there was some confusion relating to the *Global Strategy* and the Future of the *Convention* process and reiterated its preference for the proposal submitted by the Delegation of Belgium.

La Délégation du **Mexique** annonce être co-auteur du projet de Résolution soumis par la Délégation de la Belgique. Elle signale que la proposition de la Délégation de la Suisse a également ses mérites car tous les Etats parties à la *Convention* doivent être parties prenantes. Elle se prononce en faveur d'un groupe de travail ouvert.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** expressed its agreement with the comment of the Delegation of Mexico. It affirmed the need to adopt a draft Resolution and implement the recommendations. It expressed surprise at the need for more time, noted that the recommendations were submitted to the Committee six months ago. It commented that although things should not be rushed, there should not be any delay either. It suggested that time could be extended until tomorrow but that in any case a Resolution should be adopted.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** cautioned that delays could result in inaction and emphasized the need for considering this as a degree of urgency to start the process. It noted that open-ended Working Groups had been used in the past with success in supporting the Committee and the General Assembly. It evoked the need to ensure the successful future of the *Convention* and commented that much strategy could be considered immediately. The Delegation added that an open-ended Working Group would not work in competition with the General Assembly or the Committee but in fact would help it to move forward.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated its agreement with the Delegation of Egypt. It expressed the belief that there was a contradiction between the respective proposals of the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland and that this contradiction should be resolved. It referred to The Delegation of Australia's comments, stating the need to begin the process on the Future of the *Convention*. It stated its agreement with most of the recommendations of the External Auditors, expressing the will to continue on the path set.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne que le rapport n'est pas nouveau puisqu'il a déjà été présenté au Comité. Elle suggère une mise en œuvre des recommandations sans précipitation et indique que le mandat du groupe de travail est précisé dans les amendements proposés. Elle ne veut pas de structure parallèle et prône une logique institutionnelle. Elle déclare qu'il n'existe pas de contradiction entre les amendements proposés et que l'on peut les associer.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated its support for the proposal of the Delegation of Mexico to combine the amendments, as well as those of the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Saint Lucia to take immediate action.

La Délégation de l'**Italie** apporte son soutien aux deux projets de Résolution en mentionnant qu'ils peuvent être associés. Elle mentionne que la création d'un groupe de travail est une idée excellente et que le mandat de ce groupe est défini dans le rapport des Auditeurs externes.

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its full understanding for the need to carefully consider the amendments. It noted that this is a critical phase in the life of the *Convention* and expressed strong support for the comments of the Delegations of the United Kingdom and Saint Lucia, noting that it did not consider that a lengthy phase of discussions would be beneficial, but rather supported the idea of wedding the two amendments for a decision the following day.

La Délégation du **Honduras** se prononce en faveur d'une proposition conjointe et unique, en mentionnant l'importance d'agir aujourd'hui.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated its agreement with the Delegation of Canada. It expressed its support for the draft Resolution and emphasized the urgency of making a prioritized list as the Working Group would need a document based on such a list.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déclare qu'il faut agir et qu'elle va travailler avec la Délégation de la Belgique.

La Délégation de la **Colombie** se prononce également en faveur d'une proposition conjointe et unique.

Le **Président** annonce que cette proposition unique et conjointe devra être présentée le lendemain après-midi.

The Delegation of the **Dominican Republic** thanked the External Auditors, congratulated them on the work done and urged for immediate action.

THIRD DAY – Wednesday, 9 November 2011

FIFTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. M. Pablo César GROUX

ITEM 8 GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST: EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THE PACT INITIATIVE (*Continuation*)

The **Chairperson** resumed work on Item 8, pending from the previous day. He explained that the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland took on their respective Draft Resolutions and achieved consensus on a common Draft Resolution in order to submit it to the General Assembly.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** informe s'être réunie avec les Délégations de l'Italie, du Danemark et du Royaume-Uni pour présenter un projet de résolution qui tienne compte du projet proposé par la Délégation de la Suisse et du projet soutenu par vingt Etats parties

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique être satisfaite des propositions telles que présentées le jour même. Elle note qu'il existe un consensus entre les Délégations de la Suisse et de la Belgique qui répond a nécessité d'impliquer tous les Etats parties dans ce processus. Elle conclut en demandant l'appui de toute l'Assemblée générale.

The **Rapporteur** gave a brief synthesis of the Draft Resolution namely that:

Paragraph 1 was unchanged. Paragraph 2 was amended by the Delegation of **Canada**, which amended the first part of the sentence to read 'Endorses the recommendations of the independent evaluation by UNESCO's External Auditor'. There were no other changes in this paragraph. Paragraph 3 was unchanged.

She indicated that changes applied to all paragraphs after Paragraph 4. The Rapporteur read the wording of the amendments twice.

The **Chairperson** invited discussions from the General Assembly on Draft Resolution 18 GA 18. 8.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the preceding day the General Assembly adopted the first three paragraphs, and stopped in order to allow the mesh in the amendment to Paragraphs 4 and 5 as proposed by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland. It indicated that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada came after and asked whether one needed to open the discussions on Paragraph 2 again. Also, with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada to Paragraph 2, it noted that there was now a contradiction with Paragraph 4 proposed by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland.

The **Chairperson** asked for an explanation of this contradiction.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that Paragraph 2 'endorses the recommendations of the independent evaluation', while Paragraph 4 just asks the States Parties to 'take into consideration these recommendations'. Thus in its view one could not approve and thereafter recommend to take into consideration.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that it was its understanding that the two co-sponsors of the Draft Resolution were asked to meet and return with a new mutually agreed Draft Resolution. Thus this meant that nothing had been adopted so far. Secondly, it believed that Paragraph 2 was addressed to UNESCO and the statutory organs of the *Convention* while Paragraph 4 was addressed to the States Parties. It explained that this was why the difference was between 'approve' and 'invite'.

The Delegation of **Brazil** shared the understanding expressed by the Delegation of Egypt, namely that the proponents of the amendment were requested to propose a merged version of the amendments. The Delegation of Brazil was of the view that the Draft Resolution without the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada helped in taking the external audit report into consideration. It did not see the need to endorse the external evaluation as it believed that what was being called for was for States Parties to form a working group, discuss the amendment and take everything into consideration one by one. It concluded by saying that States Parties should stick to the original wording noting the results of the external audit report.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** ne voit pas de contradiction entre le paragraphe 2 et le paragraphe 4. Selon elle, il s'agit dans un premier temps d'approuver la proposition. Elle indique que c'est parce qu'on l'approuve que l'on demande de la prendre en considération

The Delegation of **Austria** just made a minor comment to paragraph 8. 'The World Heritage Centre *and* UNESCO', indicating that the World Heritage Centre is a part of UNESCO.

The Delegation of **Canada** after listening to the interventions made thought that it would be helpful to clarify the reasons for the proposed amendment. It stated that the amendment was produced after the Draft Resolution was submitted by the Delegations of Switzerland and Belgium. It further indicated that the Draft Resolution had been distributed to everyone. In its view there was still an opportunity to amend the text displayed on the screen, on the basis of the amendment made. It agreed with the Delegation of Côte d'Ivoire that there was no contradiction between Paragraphs 2 and 4. The logic behind was that in the session of the preceding day (8 November 2011), over 30 interventions were made, which unanimously praised the External Auditor and his team for the work carried out. The interventions recognized the quality and seriousness of the recommendations and the need to take action. The Director-General had referenced some of the points raised by the External Auditor in her opening remarks. The Delegation of Canada confirmed that it was not sufficient to say 'we noted this'. This was the reason for the suggested wording on the screen and therefore it encouraged the General Assembly to endorse the recommendations made by the External Auditor.

The Delegation of **Mexico** made two comments, namely that it agreed with what was already expressed by the Delegation of Saint Lucia, in that it was agreed yesterday that the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland would come up with a consensus text particularly regarding the Working Group. It wondered whether this Working Group would be open-ended. It also asked whether the General Assembly would have to ask for a report of this Working Group to be submitted to the next Committee session. It supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada to give more strength to the wording in Paragraph 2. It wished to draw the General Assembly's attention to the fact that this wording was normally used by UNESCO in relation to External Audits. It asked whether usually statutory organs endorsed recommendations made by External Auditors. It noted the recommendations, however following the debate of the previous day it felt that endorsing them seemed more appropriate. It agreed with the Delegations of Côte d'Ivoire and Canada that it did not see a contradiction between Paragraphs 2 and 4. As stated by the Delegation of St Lucia Paragraph 2 speaks to UNESCO and Paragraph 4 to the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with Canada that it is necessary to endorse the recommendations of the External Auditors. It supported what was expressed by the Delegations of Saint Lucia and Mexico and was of the view that the Draft Resolution is an excellent marriage between the two previous resolutions submitted by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked if the General Assembly could request UNESCO, or if the General Assembly could invite UNESCO. Instead of writing 'implement', it should take the recommendations into consideration. It was of the opinion that some recommendations cannot be implemented immediately by UNESCO therefore the Draft Resolution should invite to implement.

The Delegation of **Japan** appreciated the current Draft Resolution and thought that it was a good marriage of the two ideas. It stated that it would like to propose a marginal change in the document, in Paragraph 6c, on the distribution of responsibilities between States Parties and the World Heritage Centre. It proposed to insert the General Assembly after the States Parties and before the World Heritage Committee. It explained that this was because the content of the recommendations made by the External Auditors include a wide variety of comments, which sometimes restricts the sovereign rights of States Parties.

The Delegation of **Albania** supported the amendment of the Delegation of Canada and thought that the debate clearly indicated that the recommendations were fully supported by the States Parties; therefore it was of the view that there was a need to endorse them in order to proceed with their implementation.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** s'interroge sur le travail et sur le processus en cours. Elle demande s'il s'agit d'examiner le texte entier ou paragraphe par paragraphe. En l'état actuel, elle note que le paragraphe 2 par exemple, avec l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Canada, approuve le rapport de l'Auditeur externe. Elle soutient que cela n'était pas le cas hier. Dans le rapport d'audit, il est demandé d'examiner les candidatures pour l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine à venir et sur la Liste actuelle. L'Auditeur externe le dit dans son texte. Elle indique que si l'Assemblée générale approuve toutes les recommandations, il ne sera pas la peine selon elle de créer ce groupe de travail. Elle reste sur sa position d'examiner le texte paragraphe par paragraphe et dit ne pas pouvoir pas approuver le texte en sa totalité. En l'état, elle souhaite rester sur le paragraphe 2.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that one needs to endorse the recommendations as this would allow the Working Group to look at how they can be implemented. If States Parties are asked to look at the World Heritage List, it does not mean they are going to revise it and delete sites from the List, it is just a recommendation to take stock of what they have, and where they are going. It will be up to the Working Group to decide how the implementation can go forward. At this stage, it believed that it was the adoption of the Draft Resolution that was needed. It was of the opinion that it would not be accepted that the Working Group would look at the recommendations and select which ones to adopt or not. There was a clear majority of States Parties who were fully in agreement with the recommendations. It reaffirmed the need for a decision to be taken on Paragraph 2 before one would move forward. It stressed that it could not accept the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil. It confirmed that the General Assembly could request UNESCO as this was done before. The request would be addressed to the Director-General or the World Heritage Centre. States Parties would have to examine the implementation of the recommendations and not just take them into account. The recommendations need to be endorsed at this level by the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the General Assembly should examine the paragraphs one by one in order to move forward.

The **Secretariat** stated that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have been called upon to support the work of this open-ended Working Group, which will be done. However he wished to have clarity on how this Working Group would function, how it would operate as in Paragraph 7 there was a recommendation that the Working Group should meet. Thus he wished to know how this meeting would take place as there was no funding. He asked whether any State Party would offer to fund it. He concluded by saying that he needed clarifications or else it would be difficult to proceed.

The Delegation of **Mexico** what was going to say what was said by the Delegation of Egypt as well as what the Chairman said.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient la vision de la Délégation du Canada soutenue par plusieurs Etats parties. Il s'agit selon elle d'entériner les recommandations et de confier un mandat

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** indique que la dernière proposition de la présidence rend ce qu'il voulait dire caduque, donc elle n'a plus rien à exprimer.

The **Chairperson** made the following summary:

No amendment was proposed to to Paragraph 1. Paragraph 1 was adopted.

Paragraph 2 – was adopted as amended by the Delegation of Canada

Paragraph 3 – was adopted

Paragraph 4 – was adopted as amended jointly by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland.

Paragraph 5 is proposed by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland with suggestions from other States Parties.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** se demande si l'on ne pourrait pas obtenir davantage d'informations, clarifier la méthode de travail et identifier les sources de financements.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** indique que l'Assemblée générale a l'habitude lorsqu'il y a des questions importantes à discuter de créer des groupes de travail. Elle poursuit en affirmant que c'est dans la même philosophie qu'il est proposé de créer ce Groupe de travail. Quant à sa mise en œuvre, il semble essentiel qu'il y ait des réflexions à présenter lors de la prochaine session du Comité. C'est pour cette raison qu'elle demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial et aux Organisations consultatives de préparer un document de travail. Pratiquement, il existe plusieurs options ou possibilités que certains Etats parties devraient appuyer par des financements extra budgétaires. Elle indique que la Délégation de la Suisse envisage cela par exemple. Elle conclut en constatant qu'il est peut-être un peu tôt à ce stade de savoir où et quand cela aura lieu la réunion du Groupe de travail. Le Centre doit faire des efforts car c'est une priorité de l'Assemblée générale.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** juge qu'il est très important de tenir une réunion du Groupe de travail avant la 36^e session du Comité et estime nécessaire d'avoir un document préparé pour le début de l'année 2012. Elle se dit est prête à apporter son appui financier. Elle conclut en recommandant de ne pas prendre de décision qui lie les mains des Etats parties, afin de garder la situation assez flexible, sachant qu'il existe des possibilités d'aide.

The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed an amendment to Paragraph 5 stating that everyone listened to the External Auditor's report yesterday. It believed there was a need to have experts to assist and evaluate such recommendations and proposed adding 'decide to establish an open-ended Working Group of experts'. He suggested also adding 'from extra budgetary funds'.

The **Chairperson** stated that Paragraph 5 as proposed by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland and amended by the Delegation of Egypt was before the General Assembly for consideration.

The Delegation of **Mexico** expressed doubts about including the reference to experts only, as it is an open ended Working Group. As the name indicates it would be open to all States Parties of the *Convention*. Participating States Parties in the Working Group would decide which experts would attend. It mentioned that usually States Parties send their experts. It concluded by saying that the text as amended now suggested the participation of only experts. Thus it wished to know the reasons of the Delegation of Egypt for proposing this amendment.

The Delegation of **Egypt** referred to the External Auditors' report which insisted on the need to have experts taking part in the work of the Committee and the General Assembly. It insisted on the geopolitical issues regarding the work of the World Heritage Committee and what was discussed in the corridors. It was of the opinion that it would be good to express these wishes and to put them as it is to insist on a Working Group composed of experts which would not mean that it would not be open to the Delegations. It insisted that at least one of the Delegates should be an expert.

La Délégation de l'**Albanie** craint que si le groupe de travail est un groupe d'experts, il ne soit composé que d'experts. Elle est d'avis que le Groupe de travail doit effectivement être composé d'experts en large partie, mais que l'Assemblée ne devrait pas indiquer cette mention dans la Résolution car ce serait limitatif. Quant au financement, elle est d'accord avec la Délégation de la Belgique, le Centre doit faire un effort ; c'est une priorité.

La Délégation de la **France** se dit toujours attentive aux différentes interventions. Elle est d'accord avec la Délégation de la Belgique. Le Groupe de travail devrait être élargi selon elle, pour prendre en compte des experts. Par conséquent, elle souhaite conserver les termes « groupe de travail ouvert ». Elle conclut en affirmant partager les points de vue des Délégations de la Belgique et de l'Albanie, à savoir que le Centre doit être associé et faire un effort dans ce sens.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique que la qualité d'experts pour pouvoir participer au Groupe de travail lui paraît superflue. A propos de la question extrabudgétaire, elle est d'avis que l'Assemblée générale ne devrait pas se fixer de limites pour la réussite de cet exercice.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** propose la formulation suivante : « un groupe de travail ouvert, comprenant des experts ».

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested an alternative approach in relation to representation on the Working Group, namely the involvement of experts. It also wished to know who would fund it. States Parties should submit written suggestions for the implementation of this plan, for a report to be done by the World Heritage Centre to be submitted to the Committee session in 2012 in Saint-Petersburg for an open ended Working Group to meet at the Committee. It indicated that this would save the need for persons to travel to Paris outside of the Committee session and therefore spend extra budgetary funds.

The Delegation of **India** asked for clarification regarding the Terms of Reference of the Working Group. If the presentation of the report was expected to be before the 19th session of the General Assembly, the World Heritage Committee would have met twice by this time. It asked whether the Working Group would meet up to the first meeting of the Committee or also between the first and the second. It further questioned about who would present the report to the Committee and whether it would be the role of the World Heritage Centre or that of the Working Group?

The Delegation of **Italy** supported the Delegations of France and Albania. It was of the view that limiting the Working Group to only experts would be restrictive. It indicated that it could accept the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Côte d'Ivoire. It also stressed that funding should come from extra budgetary sources and that the World Heritage Centre should also take part in this funding.

La Délégation du **Mali** abonde dans le sens de la Délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire et dit ne plus avoir besoin de prendre la parole.

The Delegation of **Estonia** enquired about UNESCO practices for open-ended Working Groups and Expert Meetings which represent two different working methods. For Expert Meetings, experts are invited in their personal capacities, while for open-ended Working Groups, participation is represented by whoever can attend. The two entities are different.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Côte d'Ivoire and the interventions of the Delegations of Albania and France. It indicated that it had great difficulty with the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia, as this work in its view could be done by written submission. Thereafter the Working Group would present its results to the Committee. However this would exclude others to participate. It wished it to be an entity created by the General Assembly which would report back to the General Assembly. It expressed its disappointment on the Working Group on the Future of the *Convention*, as nothing of its results was presented in this General Assembly session. Also this was not discussed either during the 35th Committee session and other meetings. Thus it deplored that it was just a reference in a Committee Decision and was not brought back to the Committee for a discussion. It concluded by expressing its preference for the text as it is with amendments.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** tient à souligner que depuis la dernière Assemblée générale, c'est un fait que ce genre de Groupe de travail est destiné aux experts. Elle approuve les recommandations de l'Auditeur externe et demande combien de fois le terme « expert » y est mentionné. Elle indique qu'en l'espèce ici, il s'agit d'un groupe de travail ouvert. Elle souhaite laisser les experts accomplir leur travail et est d'avis qu'ensuite puis les politiques interviendront. Elle conclut en insistant sur le fait qu'elle souhaite que le Groupe de travail soit un groupe de travail d'experts.

La Délégation de l'**Albanie** souhaite laisser les Etats parties à la *Convention* être libres de choisir qui doit participer. Elle est d'avis qu'au sein du Comité, il ne doit pas y avoir que des experts. Elle soutient le paragraphe tel qu'amendé par la Délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique que de toute façon ce sont les Etats parties qui décident de qui participe aux groupes de travail. Par conséquent elle dit ne pas comprendre pas pourquoi l'Assemblée générale continue à en discuter.

The Delegation of **Italy**, supported by the Delegation of **Belgium**, wished to remove the sentence 'financed by extra budgetary funds'

The **Secretariat** enquired about where the budget would come from. It indicated that the World Heritage Fund was already planned for the next two years; the Regular Programme had clear expected results and activities defined which would be approved during the Plenary of the General Conference. It stressed that no budget had been set aside to convene an open-ended Working Group. It informed that the World Heritage Centre would do its work with the Advisory Bodies to develop the background documentation and working documents; It questioned on who would attend this Working Group, finance the participation and interpretation costs.

The Delegation of **India** enquired again about the tenure of the Working Group, how many meetings would be convened and where funding would come from. It expressed that it felt uncomfortable with this.

The Delegation of **Colombia** agreed with the Director of the World Heritage Centre that the international community was going through tough financial times. It added that it was therefore necessary to have a combination of extra budgetary and regular programme funds. It concluded by saying that it could not support deleting this mention completely.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that it understood that the co-sponsors as well as others, were ready to help and provide extra budgetary funds, but as it was a priority for the General Assembly and the States Parties, the Centre should also give its part. Perhaps the formulation could be 'including experts and financed mostly from extra budgetary funds'. It was of the view that this would be a good compromise.

The **Director of the Centre** indicated the Centre would do its part which represented a cost.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that as one is facing budgetary constraints and is exclusively dependent on obtaining extra budgetary funds. It added that human resources from the Centre would have a cost. Therefore it insisted on funding from extra budgetary sources.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that it did not understand how these meetings would be organized. It agreed with the Delegation of India regarding the tenure of the Working Group. It questioned on whether one was referring to the 36th or the 37th session of the Committee. It wished to obtain a deadline.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** dit espérer pouvoir répondre à certaines questions. Certaines réponses sont entre les mains du Comité. Elle recommande de garder à l'esprit que l'Assemblée générale est réunie pour mettre en œuvre des recommandations qui sont le fruit d'un travail de plus de 15 ans. Elle constate que chacun des Etats parties a sa part de responsabilité dans cet exercice. Par conséquent cet exercice doit s'inscrire dans le cadre des travaux sur l'Avenir de la *Convention* et ceux du 40e anniversaire de la *Convention*. Selon elle, le Centre du patrimoine mondial aurait pu prévoir que des fonds seraient nécessaires pour effectuer ce travail. Elle recommande de rester ouvert et indique que son pays est prêt à financer ce Groupe de travail. Elle conclut en indiquant que si les travaux de ce Groupe de travail sont terminés lors de la prochaine session du Comité, c'est tant mieux et qu'il convient par conséquent de rester flexible et ouvert.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that it was content with the amendment and that the financing would be principally from extra budgetary funds. It insisted on the representation of different geographic regions and on including experts from these different geographic regions to be financed mostly by extra budgetary funds. It stressed that discussions should be representative and valuable to all regions and that if one wishes to progress, the Working Group should be open to all States Parties.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** fully endorsed the proposal made by the Delegation of Belgium and if funding represents an issue, it indicated that the Netherlands would make a contribution to this Working Group.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** partage les considérations exprimées par la Délégation de la Belgique. En s'adressant à la Délégation de l'Egypte, elle indique que si le Groupe de travail est ouvert, il est ouvert et par conséquent les Etats parties pourront y envoyer des experts, mais que si les ambassadeurs ont envie d'y participer, ils pourront aussi le faire. Le Groupe de travail doit donc être ouvert. Elle ajoute qu'il est évident que des Etats parties sont prêts à

apporter des fonds extrabudgétaires. Elle confirme que tout le monde souhaite avoir des résultats après 15 ans de discussions.

The Delegation of **India** stated that among all meetings taking place at UNESCO premises, this one is the most optimistic one. It stressed that the point was not whether the budget would be cut but by how much it would be. The Centre would have a difficult responsibility. It expressed its satisfaction about the extent and participation in the General Assembly, as more than 170 countries were participating. This was due to the large numbers of Member States participating in the General Conference. It mentioned that there were still countries without Delegations and questioned whether those from afar were lesser States Parties than others. It asked whether decisions were going to be taken only by some States Parties. It was satisfied to see that there were Delegations that would finance, but wondered up to which amount. It stressed that certainly the World Heritage Centre would be less capable to finance. It continued saying that if there are meetings gathering 180 representatives from States Parties, a lot of resources would be required for translation and documentation. It needed to know what could be done before the General Assembly would get to how one is going to do it. It was of the view that the suggestion from the Delegation of Australia. Was good. It believed that information could be sent out and feedback received by the General Assembly of States Parties. This should be mandated by States Parties to the *Convention*. It did not see why the World Heritage Centre should do this. The Working Group would be costly. It wished to be realistic that change is needed but that one should prioritize the work not done over the years. It concluded by confirming that the World Heritage Centre had been working with the Decisions and recommendations over the years.

The **Chairperson** stated that one should not become shackled with pessimism. The External Auditors' report focuses on main priorities. He believed one should now give priority to the Working Group, as it is the right time to focus.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed with what was said by the Delegation of India. The Delegation of Australia made a good suggestion, but it also agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia when it mentioned the terms 'upon availability of extra budgetary funds

The Delegation of **Kenya** was interested in the mechanics of Paragraph 5 which is depending on the amount of external funding. It indicated that including experts sounded like an afterthought.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** supported the Chairperson and stressed that one had to keep on working despite of what was currently happening. It stated that the Delegation of Brazil agreed to host a meeting on protecting and promoting museum collections and that no conditions were placed on that. It wished the Working Group to come up with recommendations that one would be able to consider.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** dit ne pas pouvoir accepter l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Kenya. Elle tient encore à ce que le Groupe de travail soit composé d'experts et que les différentes régions y soient bien représentées. Elle tient aussi à l'amendement qu'elle a proposé. Elle indique qu'il convient d'être réaliste, aussi lorsque le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial indique qu'il n'existe pas de fonds pour financer ce Groupe de travail, il convient de se limiter et de se concentrer sur les fonds extra budgétaires.

The Delegation of **Italy** stated that as it was a priority for the World Heritage Committee. It stressed that this kind of Working Group was usually financed by the Regular Programme instead of by extra budgetary funds. It believed UNESCO would not go through bankruptcy for a Working Group. It supported the Delegations of Switzerland, Belgium and Saint Lucia.

The Delegation of the **United Kingdom** supported the Delegations of Switzerland and Belgium. It considered the Working Group as important for moving forward before the next Committee session, therefore it could not agree with the Delegation of Australia. It believed that the Working Group would not take decisions but make recommendations to the Committee. The Working Group would establish its own working methods within reasonable parameters. With the offer of extra budgetary funding, the World Heritage Centre would provide resources for documents, mainly staff. It agreed in conclusion with the amendment made by the Delegation of Kenya and insisted on the need to move on to the rest of the Resolution.

The Assistant Director-General for Culture stated that the debate was a little convoluted. He insisted that there was a process ongoing now about the 'Future of the *Convention*'. This process includes meetings which are scheduled. He questioned on how would this be harmonized with the new Working Group? He was of the view that it would not be good to have two parallel processes. Therefore he recommended that some form of harmonization be considered.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that logic could be found after adopting the Paragraph.

The Delegation of **Canada** referred to the issue of extra budgetary funding. It wished to know the way in which the General Assembly could help the Centre in making difficult decisions. It added that some issues would fall by the wayside and internal reallocation become possible but that the General Assembly would have to support the World Heritage Centre in achieving this. Following on from the Assistant Director-General for Culture's comments, it believed that harmonization had to be explored to make this process a possibility.

The Delegation of **Cuba** stated that it supported the Delegations of Saint Lucia, Belgium and Switzerland.

La Délégation de la **France** fait une remarque à propos du texte français et propose de reformuler de la manière suivante « comprenant notamment des experts ».

La Délégation du **Cameroun** est d'avis que le débat tourne autour de ce qui fera la qualité du Groupe de travail et de la représentation en son sein. Elle est d'avis que comme le Groupe de travail comprendra des représentants désignés par les Etat parties, le bon sens voudrait que ce soit des experts.

The Delegation of **Albania** stated that it supported the Chairperson and the Delegation of Saint Lucia regarding prioritization. It mentioned that on the previous day 33 States Parties took the floor to support the recommendation and that the Assembly just adopted a Paragraph on noting the report. It believed that this indicated that it was a priority. It did not think that it should be specified that the Working Group should be made up of experts.

The Delegation of **Mexico** joined the consensus on the need to move forward. It understood the concern of the Secretariat, but considered this issue as a matter of priority for the *World Heritage Convention*. It noted that language could be complex and preferred the simpler text of the proposal made by the Delegations of Belgium and Switzerland. It understood the concern of the Delegation of Egypt with regard to the experts. It indicated that it would join the consensus regarding the text but only on substance as one needed to move ahead.

The Delegation of **Austria** agreed with the Delegations of Switzerland, Italy, Belgium and the United Kingdom that it was time to act. It stressed that it would try to get a financial allocation from Austrian authorities to this end.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souhaite récapituler ceux des Etats parties qui veulent soutenir financièrement le Groupe de travail. Elle demande à savoir où la réunion du Groupe de travail se tiendra. Enfin, elle demande si des Etats parties ont déjà été identifiés pour accueillir cette réunion et quelles suites l'Assemblée générale souhaiterait donner à ces recommandations et réflexions.

The **Chairperson** tried to define the priority for establishing a Working Group. He stressed that the budget is not the concern of the General Assembly and wished to make sure that the report of the External Auditors would receive the priority it deserved.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** exprime le souci formulé dans le rapport des Auditeurs externes, à savoir de laisser la parole aux experts. Si la réunion du Groupe de travail a lieu à Paris, ce seront surtout des diplomates et si c'est dans un Etat partie, la représentativité des régions risque de ne pas être excellente. D'autre part, elle dit tenir à sa proposition d'amendement et à celle formulée par la Délégation du Kenya. Elle conclut en affirmant que mentionner les experts dans la Résolution représente un atout de plus pour ce Groupe de travail.

The Delegation of **Barbados** stated that the General Assembly debated yesterday and a Decision had to be made today. Concerns were expressed and would go in the Chairperson's oral report. The General Assembly should move ahead or a request would have to be made by the Delegation of Barbados for it to be put to a vote. It pointed out that several States Parties had indicated they would support the programme.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** agreed with the Delegation of Barbados. It confirmed that it listened to the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Egypt and invited the Chairperson to conclude.

The Delegation of **Malaysia** suggested that the General Assembly looks at matters of agreement as a way of moving forward – high priority, extra-budgetary funds, deadlines, experts to attend should be made by each States Parties. It believed that it was just the details that needed to be worked out by the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** submitted paragraph 5 for approval by the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the Secretariat should read the Paragraph to be adopted.

The **Rapporteur** read the paragraph as amended.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that experts from different geographic regions should be added and that it would oppose if it were not added.

La Délégation de la **France** demande à nouveau la lecture du paragraphe comportant un amendement, car elle indique que plusieurs Etats parties sont situés dans un angle mort de la salle qui ne permet pas de bien voir le texte amendé sur l'écran.

The **Rapporteur** read the Paragraph as amended again.

La Délégation de **Côte d'Ivoire** retire sa demande de parole.

Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

Concernant le paragraphe 6, la Délégation du **Mali** exprime une remarque de forme. Elle propose d'inverser la formulation de manière à ce que le paragraphe se termine par « document de travail ».

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** indique qu'elle n'accepte pas le sous-paragraphe 6. A. Elle accepte les sous-paragraphe 6. B et 6.C.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** souhaite apporter une précision. Elle indique que le nouveau projet de Résolution reprend les objectifs déjà proposés dans la proposition de sa Délégation de la veille. L'idée était selon elle de demander au Centre de préparer avec les Organisations consultatives un document de travail destiné à préparer la discussion du Groupe de travail. Le Centre et les Organisations consultatives devront aider à identifier les recommandations du rapport d'audit les plus urgentes et les plus faciles à mettre en œuvre en fonction des priorités données par les discussions. A propos du paragraphe 6, elle indique que le document préciserait en fonction des recommandations dans quels cas ces recommandations dépendront des Etats membres, du Comité, du Centre, etc. Elle souligne que de nombreux acteurs sont impliqués dans la mise en œuvre et qu'il convient par conséquent de clarifier la responsabilité des uns et des autres.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** revient sur la déclaration de la Délégation du Mali et précise que l'on peut intervertir les éléments « date » et la fin de la phrase. Elle se dit d'accord avec la Délégation de la Belgique

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souhaite revenir sur le sous-paragraphe 6 qu'elle dit ne pas pouvoir accepter.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** stated that it was up to the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies to advise how they could proceed with the recommendations, and what would be easier to start with. The order of priority could be changed. It stated that this Paragraph was necessary and if there was an opposition among the General Assembly then it should move to a vote.

The **Chairperson** invited the General Assembly to look at the proposal on the screen.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** revient sur ce qu'elle vient de dire et propose de voter sur ce sous-paragraphe.

La Délégation de **Côte d'Ivoire** indique que le nom de la Côte d'Ivoire ne se traduit pas. D'autre part, elle insiste sur le fait qu'un groupe de travail doit disposer d'une liste de recommandations sur lesquelles travailler. Elle considère important et nécessaire de se prononcer sur ce point.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** est d'avis que la liste de priorités est un point de départ et un point d'appui. Elle rappelle que la veille ces trois points avaient obtenu un large soutien.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if the problem lied in the prioritization or in the list of recommendations. It deemed important to keep Point A.

La Délégation de l'**Algérie** se dit tout à fait d'accord avec la Délégation de la Côte d'Ivoire et propose une autre formulation du sous-paragraphe 6 A. Il s'agit d'indiquer qu'une liste de recommandations non limitative soit soumise à l'appréciation du Groupe de travail.

La Délégation de la **Tunisie** indique que le document préparé pour le 1^{er} février 2012 ne sera pas un document contraignant mais un document de travail.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the Delegation of Saint Lucia. And indicated that recommendations have already been made and therefore there is no need for more. As there is only one Delegation objecting it is time to move on.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** encourage le Président à adopter ce paragraphe tel que libellé, puisque le consensus existe déjà.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed to take the Paragraph as it was before as it goes with the reflections on the Future of the *Convention*. It agreed that there should vote if there was an objection.

La Délégation de la **France** apprécie les idées de la Délégation de l'Algérie mais juge qu'il conviendrait, comme l'ont exprimé de nombreux Etats parties, d'adopter le sous-paragraphe tel que rédigé à l'écran.

The Delegation of **Denmark** stated that the priority list should be kept.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** dit pouvoir accepter l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Algérie mais indique qu'elle ne peut pas accepter ce sous-paragraphe. Elle affirme que si de nombreux Etats parties ne s'expriment pas, cela ne signifie pas qu'ils acceptent ce texte. Elle souligne que si certains Etats parties souhaitent voter, qu'elle est prête pour un vote.

La Délégation de la **Serbie** remercie et se dit d'accord sur le principe d'un vote.

The **Chairperson** put Paragraph 6 to a vote by show of hands.

Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended

Paragraph 7 and Paragraph 8 were adopted as amended.

Regarding paragraph 9, the Delegation of **Barbados** stated that the recommendations by the External Auditors did not only refer to the States Parties, but also to the World Heritage Centre. Therefore the Working Group would not be the only body to report on the matter. It thought that it would not be wise to narrow the report to include only the work executed by this Working Group.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** asked about the work of the Committee. The process would involve more than just the Working group. A full report of work achieved should be given by everyone involved with the subject and not just the Working Group.

La Délégation de la **Belgique** soutient les propos exprimés par les Délégations de la Barbade et de Sainte Lucie. Elle considère que la proposition de la Délégation de l'Egypte est limitative.

The Delegation of **Gambia** stated that the modification would have to do with the work of the Working Group.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie les Délégations de la Barbade, de Sainte-Lucie et de la Belgique. Elle recommande de maintenir le texte du paragraphe 9 en l'état, par souci d'efficacité.

The Delegation of **Jamaica** endorsed the recommendations made by the Delegations of Barbados and Saint Lucia.

Paragraph 9 was adopted as amended.

The Draft Resolution **18 GA 8** was adopted as amended.

ITEM 12. CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

Document: WHC-11/18.GA/12

The Delegation of **Brazil** wished to request advice on the insertion of an Agenda Item for the 19th General Assembly. It proposed the revision of *The Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly* to assess the way the Committee could have an equitable geographical balance. It added that this proposal was to be adopted before the elections of the Committee and that it should take effect immediately.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** endorsed the proposal, stating that it announced after the last election round that this request would be made.

The Delegation of **Colombia, Cuba, Tunisia and Jamaica** also supported the initiative.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for clarification as two years were spent discussing this and a carefully crafted compromise was reached. It wished to know if the intention was to discuss for one hour in the 19th General Assembly and then change the *Rules of Procedure* on this important matter.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reassured the Delegations, indicating that this item did not need experts, as it is completely procedural. It insisted that there was no need to open a debate on this issue during this session of the General Assembly. It just insisted that it had the right to ask for something to go on the Agenda of the 19th session of the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that the Agenda Item to be added would be 'amendment to the *Rules of Procedure*'.

The **Chairperson** wished to take into account the results of the Kondo Working Group and all the discussions during the following two years.

The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Chairperson for the good work.

The **Chairperson** thanked the General Assembly for the trust invested in him. He reiterated his commitment to cultural and natural heritage and appreciated the professionalism, skills and capacities of the General Assembly, which should come out in concrete actions in the States Parties. He acknowledged all those who made the work possible.

The **Secretariat** thanked the Chairperson for his able leadership of the Assembly, the Rapporteur who made the work easy. It congratulated the newly elected Members of the Committee. The Secretariat reiterated its commitment to work closely towards the next Committee session. It thought that the high number of States Parties assembled reflected a high level of interest in the *Convention*. It congratulated the staff and displayed the 40th Anniversary logo and the website on the screen.

The Delegation of **Saint Lucia** requested one thought for Mr. Ariel Gonzalez from Argentina who passed away recently.

The **Chairperson** declared the 18th General Assembly officially closed.

The meeting rose at 7 pm

ANNEX I

Address by Irina Bokova, Director-General of UNESCO on the occasion of the 18th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the World Heritage Convention

Excellencies,

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me first welcome you today.

I see a lot of enthusiasm in this room, which is a very good sign.

Allow me to begin by congratulating Excellency Ms. Eleonora Mitrofanova for her election in July as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. I know she will be here very soon.

I have come this morning with a message of vibrant enthusiasm and also, I must say, of some concern.

Topping more than 1300 participants, the last session of the World Heritage Committee was a tremendous success.

This confirmed a widespread support and interest in this Programme and Convention. The number of World Heritage sites stands today at 936.

But we know that World Heritage is not about numbers. It is about credibility and quality.

All of us here are deeply committed to preserving the credibility of the process of inscribing sites on the World Heritage List.

We must be equally committed to ensuring the sustainable management of each site once it has been inscribed.

World Heritage must be more than a 'label' – it is a commitment and a responsibility over the long term that must engage each State.

I know that several of you are concerned, if not worried, about these issues.

I must say I share your concerns.

Credibility and reputation are extremely precious assets. They are also fragile.

They take time to build and they can never be taken for granted – because they can erode so quickly.

Immediately after the last session of the World Heritage Committee, I convened the consultative organs of the Convention to consider ways to ensure the credibility of the List over the long-term.

In the course of this Session, you will be faced also with this question.

The new members of the World Heritage Committee carry a heavy responsibility, especially now, on this eve of the 40th anniversary of the Convention.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

World Heritage has been caught in the spotlight of recent events.

This is to be expected -- as heritage stands at the crossroads of climate change, social transformations and processes of conflict or reconciliation between peoples.

Heritage carries high stakes – for the identity and belonging of peoples, for the sustainable economic and social development of communities.

Last year, World Heritage was taken to a new level, when six countries of Latin America, in what I call a historic decision, made a joint application to inscribe the Inca Trail -- Qhapaq Ñan – on the World Heritage List.

I wish to thank them.

With this, they remind us all of the power of heritage to bring together peoples and cultures. World Heritage Sites have also been hit hard by natural disasters in Pakistan, Thailand and Cambodia.

At this very moment, the Mohenjo-Daro in Pakistan is threatened by the flooding. The World Heritage Site of Joya de Cerén in El Salvador suffered terrible damage from the recent tropical storm.

The seismic popular movements of the Arab Spring left World Heritage heavily exposed. In Libya, I immediately contacted the Secretary General of NATO and all parties involved in the conflict, directly and through the media. I asked them to ensure the protection of the World heritage sites. I reminded all parties their obligations under the 1954 Hague Convention.

For the moment, the Sites in Libya seem to have been untouched by fighting. On 21 October, just recently, I convened the first meeting of experts to assess the situation and to decide on measures to be taken.

We must remain ever vigilant, because we know that archeological sites are vulnerable to pillaging and theft, to the illicit trafficking of cultural goods. These can disappear in hours – but it can take years, if not centuries, for their restitution.

In Egypt and in Tunisia, we saw societies mobilizing, often spontaneously, to protect their heritage, to safeguard what they value most. They have sent a message to us.

This is a message about the inextricable link between cultural and natural heritage and the local communities that live with them and that make them live. This is an appeal to our responsibility.

Local communities are an integral part of the life of a World Heritage Site. They are essential for their preservation. There can be no sustainable management without the support and engagement of local authorities. There can be no preservation without the knowledge and expertise of indigenous peoples. All of these local actors must be at the heart of our action for World Heritage in the 21st century and at the heart of our vision of sustainable development.

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Le Patrimoine mondial, dans sa dimension naturelle et culturelle, s'est installé au cœur de l'agenda du développement durable.

Cette prise de conscience s'est vérifiée au Sommet des Objectifs du Millénaire pour le développement. Elle a fait l'objet d'une résolution à l'Assemblée générale des Nations Unies. Cette reconnaissance accrue du lien entre culture et développement est une étape majeure dans le plaidoyer de l'UNESCO.

Le sommet de Rio + 20, l'année prochaine, nous donne l'opportunité de franchir une nouvelle étape. J'entends encore trop souvent, dans mes entretiens bilatéraux ou dans les médias, une opposition artificielle entre la préservation du patrimoine et l'impératif du développement. Cette tension artificielle ne correspond à aucune réalité.

Les communautés locales le savent mieux que personne : le patrimoine est une source d'identité, de dignité, de reconnaissance sociale – mais c'est aussi une source d'emploi, de tourisme, de commerce, un moteur de développement durable.

Le Patrimoine n'est pas un luxe. C'est un capital d'avenir. C'est le fondement solide sans lequel rien de durable ne peut être construit. Négliger le Patrimoine, se couper de ses racines, c'est forcément se briser les ailes. C'est un élément central que nous avons mis au cœur de notre réponse au séisme en Haïti par exemple. Ce message, nous devons le marteler plus fortement que jamais. Nous devons le marteler tous ensemble, y compris avec nos partenaires privés, qui sont au cœur de cette action.

Mesdames et Messieurs.

Nous allons fêter, l'année prochaine, le 40^{ème} anniversaire de la Convention de 1972. Cette année doit être une année de renouveau pour le Patrimoine mondial. Cet anniversaire tombe la même année que la conférence décisive de Rio + 20. C'est le moment ou jamais de mettre en valeur le rôle du Patrimoine et des acteurs locaux dans le développement durable. Ce doit être une année de réflexion, certes, mais surtout de mobilisation, pour faire entrer la Convention dans le 21^{ème} siècle.

La préservation du Patrimoine n'est pas la même en 2012 et en 1972.

Pendant toutes ces années, et encore tout récemment, l'UNESCO a encouragé des dizaines de groupes de travail sur le financement, la gestion des sites, les candidatures.

Toutes ces réflexions, le moment est venu de les traduire en programmes concrets. Il existe des modèles innovants de partenariats entre secteur privé, autorités nationales et niveau local. Il existe des modèles innovants de financement pour la gestion durable des sites. Il y a des propositions fortes pour améliorer l'accompagnement des candidatures, en particulier celles des pays faiblement représentés.

Pourquoi ne pas profiter de cet anniversaire pour les diffuser largement ? Les idées sont là, l'envie d'avancer existe aussi. Pourquoi attendre ? Nous avons un potentiel formidable, c'est à nous d'en tirer le meilleur. Cet anniversaire est l'opportunité rêvée.

Une cérémonie d'ouverture aura lieu le 30 janvier 2012 au Siège de l'UNESCO avec la participation de Herbie Hancock, légende vivante du jazz, Ambassadeur de bonne volonté de l'UNESCO. Un grand événement de clôture sera organisé par le Gouvernement japonais du 6 au 8 novembre 2012 à Kyoto. De nombreux événements — ateliers, conférences, réunions d'experts et forums de jeunes — sont déjà prévus. Je le dis ici très clairement : il en faut beaucoup plus ! Des concerts, Des publications Des expositions itinérantes, Des voyages, des interviews, des programmes.

Cette année, nous devons nous fixer une obligation de résultat : démontrer que le Patrimoine joue ce rôle crucial dans la vie collective.

Les jeunes doivent être aux premières loges, et nous devons faire l'impossible pour les mobiliser, dans les écoles, à travers notre programme d'éducation au patrimoine mondial. L'avenir de la Convention est entre leurs mains.

Les projets d'inscriptions conjointes, comme celui du Chemin de l'Inca dont je viens de parler, sont des accélérateurs de concertation entre les Etats. Ce sont des antidotes à la lecture nationaliste du patrimoine. Je souhaite qu'il y en ait de plus en plus.

Si nous voulons que la Convention soit aussi forte dans 40 ans qu'elle l'est aujourd'hui, nous devons l'adapter au monde en perpétuel changement.

Un anniversaire, c'est aussi l'occasion de se faire des cadeaux, et nous vous avons préparé un petit kit spécialement pour cette occasion.

Vous allez tous en recevoir un exemplaire, et dans cet esprit de partage et de confiance dans l'avenir, je suis très heureuse de lancer officiellement les cérémonies de célébration du 40^{ème} anniversaire de la Convention de 1972.

Je vous remercie.

**ANNEX II - Présentation par M. Migaud, Premier Président de la Cour des Comptes,
du Rapport sur la Stratégie globale et l'initiative
PACT**

Version SAE- 4 novembre 2011

**ASSEMBLEE GENERALE DES ETATS PARTIES A LA
CONVENTION DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL DE L'UNESCO**

Mardi 8 novembre 2011

Salle XII – 15h30 – Point n° 8

Présentation des rapports d'évaluation sur la stratégie globale de la liste du
patrimoine mondial et de l'initiative PACTe

(M./Mme) le/la Président(e),

Mesdames et Messieurs les Ambassadeurs

Mesdames et Messieurs les Délégués,

Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je vous remercie de m'avoir invité à vous présenter, en application de l'article 12 alinéa 12.6 du règlement financier de l'UNESCO, les conclusions des deux rapports d'évaluation de « la stratégie globale pour une liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée, représentative et crédible » et de « l'initiative de partenariat pour la conservation », autrement appelée PACTe.

Je suis accompagné à cette tribune de M. Hervé-Adrien METZGER, directeur de l'audit externe de l'UNESCO. Il a succédé à M. Georges CAPDEBOSCQ qui a quitté ses fonctions en mai dernier après avoir notamment dirigé et finalisé les audits dont je vais vous rendre compte maintenant.

Je voudrais adresser à l'assemblée générale des Etats parties à la convention du patrimoine mondial des remerciements tout à fait spéciaux. La Cour des comptes est particulièrement honorée de la marque de confiance que vous lui avez montrée en lui demandant, en supplément à son mandat statutaire d'auditeur externe de l'UNESCO, de conduire cette évaluation externe de très grand intérêt.

Le comité du patrimoine mondial a adopté le cahier des charges de cette évaluation lors de sa 34^{ème} session tenue à Brasilia.

*

*

*

2

Bien évidemment les deux volets de cette évaluation sont étroitement liés. Depuis la convention de 1972, la protection du patrimoine mondial est un objectif majeur de l'UNESCO. Elle a conduit au classement de près de 1 000 sites de catégories de plus en plus diversifiées. Le succès de la liste est tel que le classement devient aujourd'hui un enjeu majeur. Le risque est donc grand que la protection et la conservation deviennent des objectifs secondaires une fois le classement décidé.

*

*

*

Notre évaluation de la stratégie globale, premier volet de ce travail, a été replacée dans le cadre plus large de la convention de 1972.

J'évoquerai, en premier lieu, les difficultés que pose l'absence de définition précise des objectifs de la stratégie, sachant que les

termes et les concepts de « représentativité, d'équilibre et de crédibilité » n'ont jamais été définis par le comité du patrimoine mondial.

Faute d'avoir repris formellement les définitions possibles proposées par les experts dans les orientations pour la mise en œuvre de la convention, on constate des divergences d'interprétation des critères. Il en résulte des contestations, parfois fondées sur une approche plus géopolitique que patrimoniale, qui conduit à faire oublier que la « valeur universelle exceptionnelle » reste la condition-clé de l'inscription d'un bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial.

Cette situation est entretenue par l'absence d'indicateurs de résultats objectifs. Les comptes rendus statistiques présentés à chaque session, fondés sur des critères simplificateurs - tels le nombre de biens par zones patrimoniales mondiales - offrent une vision réductrice et biaisée des résultats qualitatifs de la liste. Ces

outils ne s'appuient sur aucun critère scientifique. Le découpage en cinq grandes zones patrimoniales n'est pas pertinent au regard des critères culturels comme naturels. Le bilan par nombre de biens est simplificateur.

Désormais, la quasi-totalité des Etats membres de l'UNESCO a ratifié la convention du patrimoine mondial et les critères d'inscription ont été largement diversifiés. Mais malgré une progression relative significative depuis quinze ans, la représentation du patrimoine naturel demeure assez faible. Cela peut s'expliquer par deux ensembles de causes :

- d'une part, nombre d'Etats manquent d'administration spécialisée en ce domaine ;
- d'autre part, les Etats parties peuvent parfois éprouver des réticences à demander une inscription de biens naturels qui pourrait contrarier le développement économique des régions concernées.

Par ailleurs, la décision de Cairns-Suzhou, qui avait autorisé chaque Etat à présenter deux propositions par session à condition que l'une d'elle porte sur un bien naturel, a été vidée de son effectivité. En effet, la décision prise ensuite à Christchurch en 2007 a laissé les Etats libres de décider de la nature des biens proposés.

Il apparaît enfin bien difficile d'évaluer l'équilibre géographique des inscriptions, tant le zonage actuel paraît arbitraire et éloigné tant des réalités physiques naturelles que des cohérences culturelles.

L'évolution de la liste et ce qu'elle est aujourd'hui ne sont pas sans risques. Nous en voyons au moins trois, majeurs.

Tout d'abord, le risque lié à une extension potentiellement illimitée de la liste du fait de l'extension de critères d'inscription mal définis. Ce risque, c'est celui d'une possible dérive par

rapport au critère fondateur de la convention de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Il en résulte une complexité des dossiers à laquelle le centre du patrimoine mondial, comme les organisations consultatives, ne peuvent faire face sans difficultés, notamment financières.

Le second risque est celui de voir des critères de décision plus géopolitiques que scientifiques affaiblir la crédibilité de la liste. Nous avons constaté par exemple que les décisions du comité du patrimoine mondial s'écartaient de plus en plus fréquemment des avis scientifiques des organisations consultatives, et que les décisions rendues étaient, tendanciellement, plus favorables aux Etats représentés au sein du Comité.

Lorsque certains biens, considérés comme dépourvus de valeur universelle exceptionnelle au dire des organisations consultatives, sont néanmoins inscrits « à titre provisoire », le risque est grand de

voir le caractère universel de la valeur exceptionnelle requise perdre de sa portée.

La priorité accordée aux nouvelles inscriptions, l'extension sans limite du nombre de sites inscrits (bientôt 1 000, sans doute 2 000 en 2045 au rythme actuel), reste le principal sujet de préoccupation. Le troisième risque majeur est bien que cette extension devienne une fin en soi, au détriment de l'objectif, pourtant central de la convention de 1972, qu'est la conservation des biens.

Les rapports périodiques dressent régulièrement des tableaux préoccupants. La pression anthropique, mais aussi les effets des changements climatiques associés à l'absence de mesures de protection adaptées, en sont les causes connues ou vraisemblables. Il est préoccupant de constater que le nombre de biens dont la mauvaise conservation ou la dégradation est régulièrement signalée reste sans commune mesure avec le très

faible nombre de biens inscrits sur la liste des biens en péril. Le fait que cette déclaration de péril requière l'accord de l'Etat partie concerné renforce notre appréciation du contexte ambigu évoqué précédemment.

La crédibilité et l'efficacité de la convention sont, de notre point de vue, conditionnées par la question du suivi des biens dès leur inscription. Des mesures incitatives pourraient être envisagées, telles l'inscription pour une durée limitée, renouvelable après confirmation, par les organisations consultatives, du maintien de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, ou le retrait des inscriptions lorsque cette valeur universelle a disparu.

Mais la clé de ces questions reste toutefois les financements disponibles, qui sont insuffisants et contingents. Soumettre la conservation, pourtant le principal objectif de la convention, à des contributions volontaires fait de l'atteinte de cet objectif une entreprise aléatoire.

Aujourd'hui, 70 % des moyens de la conservation sont financés par des contributions volontaires. La conservation reste donc encore le parent pauvre de la stratégie en dépit des pistes de financement explorées lors de la 34^{ème} session du comité du patrimoine mondial. Alimenter des financements stabilisés, hiérarchiser les priorités des actions de conservations réactives, planifier les besoins pour les biens inscrits sur la liste en péril ... autant de voies que votre comité devrait sans doute explorer plus avant.

Au total, nous avons émis 25 recommandations en conclusion à ce premier volet de l'évaluation. Je ne vais pas les détailler ici. Elles sont intégralement reprises dans le rapport de synthèse distribué. Nous accueillerons volontiers les questions que ces recommandations appelleraient de votre part.

Devant l'ampleur et la gravité des dangers nouveaux qui menace les biens protégés, la convention de 1972 affirme « qu'il incombe

à la collectivité internationale toute entière de participer à la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel de valeur universelle exceptionnelle ». Elle entend mettre en place un système efficace, scientifique et moderne de protection collective.

La stratégie globale a contribué incontestablement à accroître la notoriété de la convention de 1972.

Pourtant, alors que le seuil des 900 biens inscrits a été dépassé, il reste indispensable de réfléchir à l'avenir de la convention. La stratégie globale a conduit, *de facto*, à donner la priorité à la quête de la représentativité, au détriment du suivi et de l'assistance à la préservation des biens, s'écartant ainsi de la lettre comme de l'esprit de la convention.

Aujourd'hui, des biens de très grande valeur disparaissent dans l'indifférence de la communauté internationale. Nombre de biens inscrits se dégradent, et les mécanismes comme les financements

manquent, pour des actions concrètes de conservation ou de restauration.

A l'approche du 40^{ème} anniversaire de la Convention, il paraît donc absolument nécessaire que les Etats parties s'interrogent sur la viabilité de la poursuite de la stratégie globale de la liste et sur la compatibilité des évolutions en cours avec les objectifs mêmes de la convention.

*

* *

Ces dernières observations m'offrent une transition pour vous exposer les grandes lignes de l'évaluation de l'initiative PACTe.

Cette évaluation nous a conduit à étudier les conditions de mise en oeuvre de l'initiative par les services de l'Organisation, notamment le centre du patrimoine mondial, et à analyser 33 des 59 partenariats.

Je formulerais deux observations préliminaires.

Tout d'abord, le comité du patrimoine mondial avait accueilli, en juin 2002, l'initiative de partenariat du patrimoine mondial dite « IPPM » sur une base expérimentale et « comme un moyen de parvenir à une approche plus systématique des partenariats » ; le cadre réglementaire a été ensuite tracé définitivement en juillet 2005, IPPM devenant PACTe.

Dix ans après, la portée de l'initiative reste encore très limitée. Fin 2010, 59 partenariats avaient été conclus. 35 d'entre eux ne comportaient pas d'engagements financiers au profit de l'UNESCO. Mais pour prendre la mesure des moyens drainés au profit de la conservation du patrimoine mondial, il faut rappeler que PACTe n'a réuni qu'un peu plus de quatre millions de dollars des Etats-Unis en six années d'existence.

Ma seconde observation liminaire porte sur la faiblesse générale de la tenue des dossiers de partenariat par le centre du patrimoine mondial. Cela ne remet en rien en cause la bonne volonté des équipes du centre. Mais cette lacune fait obstacle à la traçabilité des ressources collectées. La tenue insuffisante des dossiers contrarie le suivi comme l'évaluation des partenariats, et partant, de l'initiative elle-même.

Nos premières observations de fond concernent, en effet, le mode de gestion adopté par le centre du patrimoine mondial. Contrairement aux objectifs affichés en 2002, l'approche adoptée à ce jour reste bien peu systématique.

Quelles que soient les lacunes du manuel administratif de l'UNESCO dans le domaine des relations avec le secteur privé, il demeure que les principes fondamentaux du cadre réglementaire adopté pour PACTe en 2005 ne peuvent être tenus pour servis de façon optimale. Plusieurs accords restent rédigés de façon vague

et confuse. Les clauses d'obligations redditionnelles et de mesure des résultats sont souvent imprécises.

Une des causes en est certainement que le centre du patrimoine mondial n'a pas correctement défini le dimensionnement, les profils de compétence et le positionnement de l'équipe PACTe. Sans même parler de l'expertise des organisations consultatives, qui n'est jamais sollicitée, la coordination avec les spécialistes de programme du centre du patrimoine mondial et avec les autres secteurs et services de l'Organisation, souffre d'importantes lacunes.

Faute d'avoir, avant la fin de l'année 2010, mis en place des moyens et une organisation efficaces, le centre du patrimoine mondial est resté jusque là dans une attitude passive à l'égard des partenaires potentiels. L'initiative vient généralement jusqu'à présent du secteur privé. Cela explique sans doute que nous n'ayons généralement pas trouvé, dans les dossiers évalués, de

trace d'analyse de la situation, du potentiel et de la stratégie des partenaires, ni d'une analyse coût/avantages du partenariat envisagé puis conclu.

Comme les partenariats proposés par les entreprises ne sont pas généralement ceux auxquels l'Organisation pourrait attacher le plus d'importance, il existe un risque d'accumulation de petits projets à faible impact, dont la mise en place est aussi coûteuse pour l'UNESCO que celle de plus grands projets.

Certes plusieurs partenariats, notamment avec des entreprises de presse ou des médias, font mieux connaître la convention et contribuent ainsi à l'un de ses objectifs stratégiques. L'objectif de « sensibiliser au patrimoine mondial » en vue de sa conservation est toutefois souvent une clause de style des partenariats et les résultats concrets restent souvent extrêmement modestes.

L'initiative reste globalement peu connue, y compris au sein de l'UNESCO. Les conditions de l'utilisation de l'emblème de la Convention sont souvent imprécises voire critiquables. Les partenariats examinés montrent rarement une étude précise de la compatibilité de l'utilisation de l'emblème avec les règles et principes de l'Organisation. Les conditions d'utilisation et les obligations redditionnelles des utilisateurs de l'emblème ne sont pas généralement précisées, la procédure restant largement informelle. Il en résulte un risque d'image pour l'Organisation et une incertitude quant à l'impact obtenu par la concession de l'usage de l'emblème.

Dans l'ensemble, bien qu'il figure dans des partenariats importants, le renforcement des capacités reste moins recherché que l'objectif de visibilité. Mais peu d'actions de développement de partenariat aux niveaux local et régional ont été identifiées dans les partenariats évalués.

Les contributions collectées, pourtant faibles, servent plus souvent à financer les charges courantes du centre du patrimoine mondial que des actions de conservation. Sur deux dollars collectés par les partenariats, un est utilisé à financer les dépenses de personnel du centre du patrimoine mondial.

Au total, si quelques-uns des partenariats évalués dans l'échantillon retenu peuvent recevoir une appréciation globalement positive, leur proportion n'est pas suffisamment significative pour qu'une telle appréciation soit étendue à l'ensemble des partenariats.

Aujourd'hui, l'initiative PACTe reste bien en deçà des ambitions tracées en 2002 pour des partenariats innovants.

En gardant à l'esprit le niveau, en général, relativement modeste des partenariats conclus jusqu'à présent sous l'égide de PACTe,

l'évaluation d'un échantillon significatif fait ressortir un triple risque :

- un risque de dégradation du partenariat pour la conservation par la recherche prioritaire de financements pour le fonctionnement du centre du patrimoine mondial ;
- un risque de banalisation de l'emblème de la convention et du logo de l'UNESCO par une utilisation surtout commerciale ;
- un risque de perte de sens si la recherche de la visibilité devait l'emporter durablement sur le souci de la conservation.

Cette évaluation a donc montré le besoin de réfléchir à adopter une plus grande rigueur et un plus grand professionnalisme dans la gestion des partenariats et de mieux prendre en compte, y compris au niveau de l'Organisation, des impératifs déontologiques et stratégiques aujourd'hui mal intégrés à cette gestion.

*
* *

Avant d'en finir, je voudrais remercier toutes les personnes qui ont contribué à permettre la réalisation de ces deux volets de l'évaluation globale souhaitée par l'assemblée générale des Etats parties. J'adresse, en particulier, mes remerciements au directeur, à la directrice adjointe et aux personnels du centre du patrimoine mondial, aux personnels des secteurs de la culture, des relations extérieures et de l'information du public, du bureau de la planification stratégique, du bureau de la gestion financière et du bureau de la gestion des ressources humaines de l'UNESCO.

*

* *

M./Mme le/la Président(e), Mesdames et Messieurs, je vous remercie de votre attention et répondrai volontiers à vos questions.

ANNEX III

Position of the Delegation of Norway on Item 10 Report on the activities of the World Heritage related category 2 centres

Noting that Norway hosts a category 2 centre, it has read the report of the activities of the category 2 centres, as well as the report from the Bahrain meeting with great interest. Since Norway was the first country to sign an agreement with UNESCO's World Heritage Centre for the establishment of a centre, Norway also has the longest experience of being host for such a centre. Based on that experience, Norway had some reflections which they wished to share with the General Assembly.

Such centres may have sub-regional, regional or international (global) relevance. The geographical relevance for the individual centre, however, is specified in the agreement adopted by the general conference. Such centres have activities which must fall within the overall strategy and programmes of UNESCO. The activities of the individual centre, however, are specified in the agreement adopted by the general conference. The geographical relevance and the type of activities vary.

Now, after category 2 centres have been put on the agenda of many meetings and consultations with different mandates – from network meetings to the World Heritage Committee, Norway sees that a growing number of decisions are taken that have consequences for the category 2 centres. These decisions may provide better guidance for certain centres, but they may also give centres directions for activities which do not correspond clearly to those expressed in the agreement. To the view of Norway, decisions of a general nature must be followed-up according to the relevance to the individual centre. This is essential. One centre may be a high level knowledge institution, another a centre basically established from scratch which has facilitation as its main task.

Norway wants to underline, that the host countries are not necessarily present or have voting rights in the meetings taking these decisions. Furthermore, the network and networking between centres is being strengthened. As a consequence, more time and resources are used for this purpose, leaving less time for the original tasks defined in the agreement. Even though there clearly is a need for information and in some instances coordination, it may jeopardize resources available to implement the priority tasks of the individual centre.

Therefore Norway notes with concern these developments and we would like to use this opportunity to propose to organize a meeting between the World Heritage Centre and category 2 centre host countries during the next committee meeting – including State Parties planning to or considering establishing a category 2 centres or institute. This may bring us further in our reflections concerning the function and most effective use of these centres.

