



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

8 COM

CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/Report
Paris, 14 April 2014
Original: French

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

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

Eighth Meeting
UNESCO Headquarters, Paris
18-19 December 2013

FINAL REPORT

Item 1 of the provisional agenda - Opening of the meeting

1. The eighth meeting of the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (hereinafter, “the Committee”) established by the 1999 Second Protocol to the Hague Convention of 1954 for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (hereinafter, “the 1999 Second Protocol”) was held at UNESCO Headquarters on 18 and 19 December 2013. The meeting was attended by the twelve States Members of the Committee (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Cambodia, Croatia, El Salvador, Egypt, Georgia, Greece, Japan, Mali and Netherlands). In addition, 17 States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol that were not Committee members, eight High Contracting Parties to the Hague Convention of 1954 that were not party to the 1999 Second Protocol, three other Member States of UNESCO, one intergovernmental organization, three non-governmental organizations and two experts attended as observers. The list of participants and the working documents of the meeting are available at the following web address:

[Meetings of the Committee for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict](#)
2. **The Assistant Director-General for Culture**, Mr Bandarin, opened the meeting and, in his address, he congratulated the new members of the Committee and highlighted the main items on the Committee agenda.

Item 2 of the provisional agenda – Election of the Bureau

3. The Delegation of **Mali** nominated Mr Benjamin Goes (Belgium) as Chairperson of the Committee. This candidacy was supported by **El Salvador**. No other nominations were made. Mr Benjamin Goes was therefore elected by acclamation and reappointed.
4. Following his election, **the Chairperson** proceeded with the election of the four Vice-Chairpersons and the Rapporteur needed to complete the Bureau. The Chairperson said that the election should be informed by the rules governing Committee membership in order to ensure that there was an equitable geographical distribution within the Bureau.
5. The Delegation of **Egypt** proposed the Delegation of **Mali** as Vice-Chairperson; the Delegation of **Japan** proposed the Delegation of **Cambodia** as Vice-Chairperson; the Delegation of **Cambodia** proposed the Delegation of **El Salvador** as Rapporteur; the Delegation of **Armenia** put forward its own candidacy as Vice-Chairperson; the Delegation of **Mali** proposed the Delegation of **Egypt** as Vice-Chairperson; and the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** put forward its own candidacy as Vice-Chairperson. The proposals by Mali and Egypt were also supported by Belgium.
6. **The Chairperson** then said that there were five candidates for the four vacancies as Vice-Chairperson and that an agreement must therefore be reached on nominating only four candidates. The Chairperson also said that, in addition to equitable geographical distribution, **the Committee** should bear in mind the need to ensure a balance between States that had already been members of the Bureau and States that were standing for the first time, so that the newly elected Bureau would provide a balanced mix of experience and renewal. While agreeing with the remarks made by the Chairperson, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** said that it was important that the Committee should bear in mind the need for equitable geographical distribution when electing its Bureau.
7. Since it had been impossible to reach a consensus, **the Chairperson** decided to suspend the meeting to launch informal discussions with Electoral Group II States (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia and Georgia) Members of the Committee and to discuss whether those States might agree to propose only one State from their group – either Armenia or Azerbaijan.
8. Given the lack of any immediate agreement with the Electoral Group II States Members of the Committee, **the Chairperson** decided to propose implementation of Rule 32 of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure, namely the adoption of a procedural motion to adjourn the

debate on the item under discussion, i.e. the election of the Bureau. The Committee accepted his proposal and the election of the Committee Bureau was adjourned, pending an agreement among Electoral Group II States Members of the Committee.

9. At the end of the first day of the meeting, despite the failure to reach an immediate consensus between the Electoral Group II States Members of the Committee, **the Chairperson** proposed to proceed with the election of Bureau members around which a consensus had emerged. Consequently, El Salvador was elected as Rapporteur and Cambodia, Egypt and Mali were elected as Vice-Chairpersons.
10. On the second day of the meeting, following informal discussions between **the Chairperson** and Electoral Group II States Members of the Committee, an agreement was reached between Armenia, Azerbaijan, Croatia and Georgia on the election of the fourth Vice-Chairperson. Under the agreement, the Electoral Group II States Members decided to nominate Azerbaijan to be the Vice-Chairperson for 2014, on the understanding that Electoral Group II States would nominate and support Armenia as the candidate to be Vice-Chairperson of the Bureau for 2015. Following this agreement, the Electoral Group II States proposed that the Committee elect Azerbaijan as Vice-Chairperson and thus complete the Bureau. The Committee approved the proposal.
11. **The Chairperson** also promised to forward any documents submitted to the Committee Bureau to Members of the Committee who were not Bureau Members.

Item 3 of the provisional agenda – adoption of the agenda

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/1

12. **The Chairperson** turned to the adoption of the agenda, for which he proposed an amendment to the running order. **The Committee** had no objection.
13. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 1** was adopted as amended.

Agenda item 4 – Report of the Secretariat on its activities

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/INF.2

14. Referring to the written report (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/INF.2) that had been made available to Committee members and to the statements made at the Tenth Meeting of the High Contracting Parties and at the Fifth Meeting of States Parties, **the Secretariat** gave an oral update to take account of the activities that it had conducted since the written report had been finalized (5 December 2013). In that regard, the Secretariat referred in particular to the military training seminar that had been held in Austria in December 2013 and to its ongoing collaboration with MINUSMA and with the Belgian Interdepartmental Commission for Humanitarian Law to organize an international conference in Brussels in December 2013.
15. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** then took the floor to stress the very positive nature of the cooperation between MINUSMA and UNESCO.
16. **The Chairperson** proposed that the written report on the Secretariat's activities be updated to include the items that the Secretariat had mentioned in its oral update. The Committee endorsed the proposal.

Agenda item 5 – The protection of cultural property in occupied territory

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/7

17. **The Chairperson** requested that the Secretariat introduce the item. The Secretariat outlined the background to the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/7) that had been submitted to the Committee, explained its structure and introduced the draft decision that had been drawn up.

18. After that introduction, **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion with a point-by-point analysis of the working document and called on Committee members to make comments.
19. Turning to Section 4 (Special Protection) of Part II (Implementation Mechanisms under the Hague Convention, the Regulations for its Execution and the Second Protocol), the Delegation of **the Netherlands** wondered whether there was any point in discussing special protection in connection with a mechanism that was likely to become obsolete, given that cultural property was in any case listed in the Register of Cultural Property under Special Protection. The Delegation of **Mexico**, which was attending as an observer, raised the same point. **The Secretariat** explained that the word “obsolete” had been used because no application for special protection had been submitted since 1978. Following a discussion, the Committee decided to delete the sentence referring to the likely obsolescence of the system of special protection from paragraph 32 of the working document.
20. Turning to Section 6 (International cooperation in case of serious violation) of Part II (Implementation Mechanisms under the Hague Convention, the Regulations for its Execution and the Second Protocol), the Delegation of **Armenia** considered that a reference to a “threat to international peace and security” should be included in paragraph 45 of the working document, in order to facilitate referral to the United Nations Security Council in the event of serious violation of the provisions of the 1999 Second Protocol.
21. The Delegation of **Egypt**, supported by the Delegation of **Greece**, noted that the current wording of paragraph 45 of the document was an example of positive law, inasmuch as a threat to international peace and security was not a prerequisite for a referral to the United Nations Security Council.
22. The Delegation of **Armenia** then said that it would be preferable to refer more generally to the relevant United Nations bodies rather than specifically to the United Nations Security Council.
23. There was no consensus, however, on the proposal by the Delegation of **Armenia**. A majority of Committee members opined that serious violations of international law might be referred only to the Security Council and, exceptionally, to the United Nations General Assembly. In that connection, the Delegation of **Mali** stressed that it was essential to retain a reference to the role of the Security Council.
24. Following a discussion of the case for referring to the role of the United Nations Security Council in the event of serious violations, the Delegation of **El Salvador** proposed making a verbatim reference to Article 31 of the Second Protocol, to which paragraph 45 referred. However, **the Chairperson** said that the proposal was inappropriate, insofar as the purpose of the working document was to strengthen the 1999 Second Protocol by including examples of its implementation. Following this clarification, the Committee, with the exception of Armenia, decided to keep the specific reference to the United Nations Security Council but to reword paragraph 45 of the document in order to underline its illustrative nature. The Delegation of **Armenia**, however, said that the reference to the United Nations Security Council should not be included because, if it were, then reference must be made to all United Nations bodies that could intervene in cases of serious violations of the 1999 Second Protocol. Armenia then offered to settle for a reference to all competent bodies of the United Nations. The Delegation of **Belgium** stressed that there seemed to be a consensus in the Committee on the need to refer to the United Nations Security Council as an example of the relevant United Nations bodies to which States Parties could refer in the event of serious violations of the 1999 Second Protocol.
25. Committee members endorsed that approach and decided to reword paragraph 45 of the working document to state that in case of serious violations of the Second Protocol of 1999:

“[...]States Parties may refer the matter to the competent United Nations bodies (for example, the Security Council, the General Assembly, etc.) to cease such serious violations..”

26. Turning to Part III of the document, originally entitled “Key Actors”, the Committee chose to use the title “Stakeholders”. The Committee also agreed to change the title of the first heading, initially entitled “United Nations Security Council (Application of the Hague Convention by armed forces of UN Member States in the event of military action being taken in implementation of the UN Charter (Resolution I of the 1954 Hague Intergovernmental Conference))” in order to ensure that the working document reflected the Committee’s discussion of paragraph 45. To that end, the Delegation of **Egypt**, supported by members of the Committee including the Delegation of **Armenia** and the Delegation of **Mali**, proposed the following title: “The competent bodies of the United Nations (Application of the Hague Convention by armed forces of United Nations Member States in the event of military action being taken in implementation of the United Nations Charter (Resolution I of the 1954 Hague Intergovernmental Conference))”.
27. Turning to procedure in the application of the 1954 Hague Convention by United Nations Member States in the event of military action being taken under the Charter of the United Nations, the Delegation of **Armenia** suggested supplementing the references in the working document with a reference to Security Council resolution 1483 of 22 May 2003. To comply with this request, **the Secretariat** drafted the following additional paragraph, which was approved by the Committee:
- “On 22 May 2003, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1483, which, among other things, decided “that all Member States shall take appropriate steps to facilitate the safe return to Iraqi institutions of Iraqi cultural property and other items of archaeological, historical, cultural, rare scientific, and religious importance illegally removed from the Iraq National Museum, the National Library, and other locations in Iraq since the adoption of resolution 661 (1990) of 6 August 1990, including by establishing a prohibition on trade in or transfer of such items and items with respect to which reasonable suspicion exists that they have been illegally removed, and calls upon the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Interpol, and other international organizations, as appropriate, to assist in the implementation of this paragraph”.
28. In the same vein, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** proposed a reference, in addition to the procedure mentioned in the working document, to United Nations Security Council resolution 2100 of 25 April 2013, establishing MINUSMA. To comply with that request, **the Secretariat** also drafted the following additional paragraph, which was approved by the Committee:
- “On 25 April 2013, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 2100, establishing the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), which decided, among other things, that part of MINUSMA’s mandate is “[t]o assist the transitional authorities of Mali, as necessary and feasible, in protecting from attack the cultural and historical sites in Mali, in collaboration with UNESCO”.
29. Turning to Section 3, “Meeting of the Parties”, of Part III, which had been newly entitled “Stakeholders”, the Committee discussed Article 27 (1) (g) of the Second Protocol and its interpretation. The Delegation of **Canada** (Observer) stressed that it was important for the Committee to avoid making “vague comments”, especially when Committee members were discussing the draft decision. **The representative of the Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs**, too, stressed that caution was needed as far as interpretation was concerned and that, pursuant to Article 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969, interpretation was the prerogative of the States Parties to the treaty instrument, which in the present instance was the 1999 Second Protocol. **Committee members including Greece, Mali and El Salvador** endorsed the interpretation of Article 27 (1) (g) proposed in the working document and considered that the article did in fact authorize the Meeting of the Parties to assign to the Committee functions that were not expressly granted to it.

30. Committee members made no other comments on the working document on the “protection of cultural property in occupied territory”, which they unanimously agreed was of “good quality”. The Committee approved the conclusions contained in the document. In order to ensure that the content of the working document was fully reflected in the conclusions, **the Chairperson** suggested inserting an addition and stressed the need to refer to Article 36(1) of the 1999 Second Protocol and to Article 36(2) thereof, with regard to “Conciliation in absence of Protecting Powers”. The Committee endorsed the proposal and the following text was therefore added to the conclusions:

“ In the absence of Protecting Powers, under Article 36(1) of the Second Protocol, the Director-General may lend good offices or act by any other form of conciliation or mediation, with a view to settling the disagreement, and Article 36(2) of the Second Protocol gives to the Chairperson of the Committee the possibility, at the invitation of the Director-General or one Party to the conflict, of proposing to the Parties to the conflict a meeting of their representatives, particularly those responsible for protection of the cultural property.”.

31. After the general discussion, the Committee discussed the draft decision. In that regard, they discussed, among other things, the role of the Director-General and her ability to draw the attention of the competent bodies of the United Nations to the issue of protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict when drafting their resolutions. They also discussed the content of the working document that the Secretariat must submit to the Committee at its ninth meeting. During the discussion, the Delegation of **Armenia** enquired as to the legal basis on which the Director-General was authorized to draw the attention of the competent bodies of the United Nations to the protection of cultural property in armed conflict. **The Secretariat** explained that the legal basis was to be found in the UNESCO Constitution. Similarly, the Delegation of **El Salvador** wondered how the Committee would be kept informed of any representations made by the Director-General of UNESCO to the competent bodies of the United Nations. The Secretariat said that, should the executive head take any such action, it would be mentioned in the Secretariat’s report on its activities. The Delegation of **Armenia** also enquired about the type of document that the Secretariat would submit to the Committee at its ninth meeting, with regard to the decision that was to be adopted. **The Secretariat** said that it would be a Secretariat document. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** then enquired about the legal basis for the field missions that the Secretariat would be submitting to the Committee at its ninth meeting in order to monitor the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. **The Secretariat** replied that the Constitution of UNESCO and Article 33 of the 1999 Second Protocol (technical assistance) provided the legal basis for such field missions.
32. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 7** was adopted, as amended.

Agenda item 6 – Consideration of requests for the granting of enhanced protection

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/8

33. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document on the consideration of requests for the granting of enhanced protection (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/8), **the Chairperson** suggested that the Committee might first consider the three requests for enhanced protection that had been submitted by the Delegation of **Belgium**. The Committee agreed to do so.
34. **The Chairperson** invited the Belgian delegation to speak on the cultural property for which Belgium was requesting enhanced protection.
35. The Delegation of **Belgium** made a short statement on the applications and the three cultural properties concerned, namely: Victor Horta’s house and workshop, the Neolithic flint mines at Spiennes and the Plantin-Moretus house-workshops-museum complex.

36. Following that statement, the Delegation of **Belgium** vacated its seat on the Committee and **the Chairperson** also decided, in order to avoid any conflict of interest, to withdraw temporarily from the Chair and, in accordance with the Committee's Rules of Procedure, requested the Delegation of **Cambodia**, as Vice-Chairperson, to take the Chair for the general discussion and for the adoption of any decision to place the cultural property submitted by Belgium on the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection.
37. During the general discussion, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** requested clarification of the extent to which Belgian criminal law complied with the provisions of Chapter IV of the Second Protocol, including those relating to the jurisdiction of the Belgian courts. The Delegation of **Belgium** provided the requested information, firstly by explaining the scope of the Belgian courts' jurisdiction over breaches of the 1999 Second Protocol and, secondly, the provisions of Belgian criminal law criminalizing breaches of the 1999 Second Protocol.
38. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** asked whether Victor Horta's house and workshop corresponded to the same cultural property that had been included in the World Heritage List. The Delegation of **Belgium** explained that the "Major Town Houses of the Architect Victor Horta" were on the World Heritage List and that insofar as the "House and workshop of Victor Horta" was one of the four Major Town Houses included in the World Heritage List, it was indeed the same cultural property.
39. With regard to the Plantin-Moretus house-workshops-museum complex, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** also asked whether an application was also being made to list the Plantin Archives as movable property on the List of cultural property under enhanced protection. The Delegation of **Belgium** replied that a request for enhanced protection for the Plantin Archives had been submitted for two reasons: firstly, as fittings and fixtures, they were integral parts of the Plantin-Moretus house-workshops-museum complex, which had been included in the World Heritage List; and, secondly, the archives were also specifically listed as movable property in the "Memory of the World" register. **The representative of the World Heritage Centre**, who was in attendance, endorsed **Belgium's** explanation of the Plantin Archives' inclusion in the World Heritage List despite being movable property. In that connection, she stated the basic principle according to which only immovable property might be included in the World Heritage List. However, under the "Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention", movable property, too, might be included in the World Heritage List when it was a fixture of immovable property that had been nominated for inclusion, and insofar as the said movable property was an integral part of the same. That held true for the Plantin Archives. Following those discussions, **the Committee** decided that the information provided by the Belgian delegation should be included as a new paragraph 114 in the Secretariat's working document, to read as follows:

"Furthermore, the cultural property was included in the World Heritage List in 2005 on the occasion of the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Decision 29 COM 8 B.36) (Annex 3 C/18 of the request), and the archives were also registered as part of the Memory of the World in 2001."
40. After that general discussion, **the Acting Chairperson** suggested proceeding with the adoption of the three decisions to include the Belgian cultural properties in the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection and said that the decision on the Plantin-Moretus house-workshops-museum complex should reflect the Committee's discussion of the Plantin Archives.
41. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decisions **8.COM 8.1** and **8.COM 8.2** were adopted, as drafted. Decision **8.COM 8.3** was adopted as amended.
42. After the Committee had adopted the decisions on the Belgian cultural property, **the Acting Chairperson** invited Mr Benjamin Goes to resume the Chair. The Delegation of **Belgium**, too, returned to its seat on the Committee.
43. After the three Belgian cultural properties had been included in the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection, the Committee examined the cultural property submitted by

Azerbaijan for inclusion in the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection: the Walled City of Baku, including the Shirvanshahs' Palace and Maiden Tower; and the Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape.

44. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** made a short statement on the applications and the two cultural properties concerned. The Delegation then left the room to avoid influencing the discussion or the Committee's decision.
45. After that statement, the Delegation of **Armenia** asked the Secretariat how the buffer zone for cultural property occupying such a vast land base could be determined without having seen maps of the cultural property beforehand and how one could be sure that the cultural property submitted by the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** was not used or would not be used for military purposes.
46. Referring to the buffer zone and the cultural property maps submitted by the Delegation of **Azerbaijan**, the Secretariat said that the applications submitted by Azerbaijan, which included the said maps, had been sent to the States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol electronically and within the time limits. Referring more specifically to the buffer zone, the Secretariat said that it was for the Committee to judge what was or was not a buffer zone within the meaning of the 1999 Second Protocol and that, consequently, only the States Parties could assess that concept.
47. In reply to Armenia's questions concerning the non-military use of the cultural property, the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** said that the Walled City of Baku and the Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape had never been used for military purposes. In addition, the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** pointed out that, pursuant to Article 10 (c) of the Second Protocol, a declaration of non-military use had been signed by the Azerbaijani Minister of Defence in respect of the two cultural properties for which enhanced protection was being requested.
48. Alongside the issues raised by the Delegation of **Armenia**, the Delegation of **the Netherlands** enquired about Azerbaijani criminal legislation and its compliance with Chapter IV of the 1999 Second Protocol. After thanking the Secretariat for the technical assistance that it had provided in that regard, the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** explained the provisions that had been adopted to criminalize breaches of the 1999 Second Protocol and to establish the jurisdiction of Azerbaijani courts in such cases.
49. The Delegation of **Belgium** said that the name of the cultural property, the "Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape", must be changed if it were to be placed on the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection. It suggested "Gobustan Archaeological site", in order to ensure that the name fully reflected the substance of **Azerbaijan's** application for enhanced protection. The Committee endorsed the suggestion.
50. After now discussions, the Committee adopted the two decisions to place both Azerbaijani cultural properties on the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection. In that regard and in order to reflect the discussion, the cultural property located in Gobustan was listed under the name "archaeological site of Gobustan". Committee members stated, moreover that the inclusion of the Walled City of Baku, including the Shirvanshahs' Palace and the Maiden Tower, was valid within the limits of the property's inclusion in the World Heritage List.
51. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decisions **8.COM 8.4** and **8.COM 8.5** were adopted, as amended, following which the Delegation of **Azerbaijan** resumed its seat on the Committee.

Agenda item 7 – Studies on the evaluation of criteria of Articles 10 (a) and 10 (b) of the Second Protocol

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/2

52. After the Secretariat had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/2), the Chairperson requested the Director of ICOMOS to outline the study under preparation.

53. At the end of that statement, **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion by asking Committee members whether they wished to include any specific additional items in the ICOMOS study.
54. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** said that it would be interesting to consider the extent to which the protection provided for cultural property under the Hague Convention of 1954 was likely to influence the methodology used to monitor compliance with criteria 10 (a) and 10 (b) of the 1999 Second Protocol for the granting of enhanced protection.
55. The Delegation of **Georgia** enquired about the approach taken in the ICOMOS study to the criteria contained in Article 10 (c) and, more specifically, the notion of “immediate surroundings”. The Chairperson pointed out that the ICOMOS study related solely to Articles 10 (a) and 10 (b) of the 1999 Second Protocol and not to Article 10 (c).
56. The Delegation of **Belgium** stressed that, with regard to the criterion under Article 10 (a) (“the greatest importance for humanity”), it was essential that ICOMOS focus its study on the methodology used to assess that criterion when the cultural property under consideration was not included in the World Heritage List.
57. In view of the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 2** was adopted, as drafted.

Agenda item 8 – Progress report on the development of synergies between the 1999 Second Protocol and the World Heritage Convention

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

58. After the Secretariat had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/3), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
59. Committee members considered that some additional items should be included in the working document so that it would fully reflect the decision that was to be adopted. In that regard, the Delegation of **Belgium**, supported by the members of the Committee, suggested that for activities involving the World Heritage Centre, it was appropriate that, at the request of the World Heritage Centre, specific items relating to enhanced protection could be added to the periodic report questionnaire, in particular a field relating to the effective conservation of any properties that a State had placed on the List of Cultural Property under Enhanced Protection. Similarly, the Committee considered that it was appropriate for the working document to highlight the need for continued coordination when examining and granting requests for international assistance or other types of assistance under the 1999 Second Protocol and the 1972 Convention, in order to enhance synergies.
60. During the discussions, it emerged that **the Committee** considered that the emphasis on partnerships between the Committee and the organizations mentioned in Article 27 (3) of the 1999 Second Protocol must be highlighted in order to achieve synergy with all stakeholders involved in the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. Referring more specifically to the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Committee considered that partnership to be fundamental, particularly since Article 53 of the First Additional Protocol of 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 focused specifically on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict.
61. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 3** was adopted by the Committee, as amended.

Agenda item 9 – Report on the use of the financial assistance granted to El Salvador from the Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/4

62. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/4), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.

63. The Delegation of **El Salvador** thanked the Committee for the financial assistance that it had been granted. The third phase, which had been undertaken to raise awareness of local people living near cultural property, including through workshops and the marking of cultural property with the Blue Shield emblem, had been implemented successfully.
64. Decision **8.COM 4** was adopted by the Committee, as drafted.

Agenda item 10 – Report on the use of the financial assistance granted to Mali from the Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/5

65. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/5), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
66. The Delegation of **Mali** thanked the Committee for the financial assistance that it had been granted. The assistance had made it possible to secure Malian museums and provide *in situ* protection for endangered cultural property.
67. **The Committee** considered that it was unnecessary to state in the working document that it was apparent from the technical and financial report submitted by the Malian authorities that they intended to submit a request for financial assistance for enhanced protection for cultural property. Accordingly, paragraph 48 of the working document was deleted.
68. Decision **8.COM 5** was adopted by the Committee, as drafted.

Agenda item 11 – Form for the tentative list for cultural property that may be submitted for the granting of enhanced protection

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/6

69. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/6), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
70. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** suggested that the Annex to the decision should include a reference to the relevant provisions of the 1999 Second Protocol in order to make it easier for States Parties to the 1999 Second Protocol to understand the form.
71. The Delegation of **Belgium** suggested that answers to the questionnaire should, where necessary, include “N/A”. Belgium also pointed out that the reference to “inventories” in the form was particularly vague.
72. The form was amended to reflect the comments made during the discussion.
73. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 6** was adopted by the Committee, as amended.

Agenda item 12 – Consideration of national reports on the implementation of the 1999 Second Protocol

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/9

74. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/9), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
75. The Committee discussed the working document.
76. During the discussion of the decision, **the Chairperson**, supported by the Committee and by the Delegation of **El Salvador** in particular, suggested that an additional paragraph be inserted to read as follows:

“Invites the Bureau to begin reflecting upon the issue of national reports, including the follow-up/monitoring of cultural property under enhanced protection, and the format of the summary document submitted to the Committee.”

77. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 9** was adopted, as amended.

Agenda item 13 – Report on the status of the implementation of the fundraising strategy for the Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/10

78. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/10), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
79. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** stressed that the Netherlands was a major contributor to the Fund for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and that it was crucial for other States to take similar action in order to ensure the sustainability of the international aid system.
80. The Delegation of **Mali** supported the comments by the Netherlands, while highlighting the concrete achievements that the Fund had made possible and the financial assistance that had been granted at a crucial point of the crisis in Mali.
81. During the discussions on the adoption of the decision, it emerged that the Committee considered that the wording should be more “direct” in encouraging the Parties and other potential donors to contribute to the Fund.
82. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 10** was adopted, as amended.

Agenda item 14 – Amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Committee: (i) Written submission of questions to be included in the provisional agenda of the Committee, and (ii) Timing of the election of the Committee’s Bureau

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/11

83. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/11), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
84. With regard to the amendments to the Rules relating to the written submission of questions for inclusion in the agenda of the Committee, the Delegation of **Egypt** enquired about the notification procedure. **The Secretariat** replied that e-mail was a possible means of notification.
85. In that connection, the Delegation of **Armenia** suggested that the Secretariat e-mail an acknowledgment of receipt to the delegations of the States concerned in order to avoid any technical communication problems.
86. With regard to the amendments to the Rules on the timing of the election of the Bureau, **the Chairperson** said that the purpose of the amendment, under which the election of the Bureau would be moved to the end of each ordinary session of the Committee, was *inter alia* to enable the outgoing Chairperson to compile to record of the Committee meeting at which the new Bureau was elected. Experience had shown that the procedure could be particularly difficult for a Chairperson elected at the beginning of an ordinary session.
87. However, **several members of the Committee**, including the Delegation of **Armenia**, noted that under the proposed amendment, the current Bureau would sit for two consecutive ordinary Committee meetings. Such a situation was unacceptable.
88. The Committee therefore decided that it would be better to request the Bureau to examine further the timing of the election and, if necessary, draft amendments to Chapter VII of the Committee’s Rules of Procedure.
89. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 11** was adopted, as amended.

Agenda item 15 – Creation of a distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/12

90. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/12), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
91. During the discussion, the Delegation of **Georgia** stressed that it was important that the Bureau focus on the terms of use of the distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection.
92. The Delegation of **Armenia** then wondered whether it would be more appropriate to use the same distinctive emblem as that established under the Hague Convention of 1954 for cultural property under special protection (a blue shield repeated three times). **The Secretariat** explained that unless the Hague Convention of 1954 was amended, the suggestion would not be feasible legally because the relevant provisions of the Convention required the distinctive emblem to be used only for cultural property under special protection. A blue shield repeated three times might therefore be used as a distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection only if that property had previously been included in the Register of Cultural Property under special protection.
93. The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that, in view of the decision that was to be adopted, the Bureau was required to submit a proposal for a distinctive emblem to the Committee at its ninth meeting. As part of that process, Egypt stressed that it was essential to involve the military, which was in the front line in the conduct of hostilities, in designing the distinctive emblem.
94. **Committee members** stressed that the design of the distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection should be based on the distinctive Blue Shield emblem.
95. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 12** was adopted, as drafted.
96. Following the adoption of Decision **8.COM 12** and in accordance with the Committee's Rules of Procedure, the Delegation of **Austria** (Observer) endorsed Egypt's comments and stressed that national governments, especially their ministries of foreign affairs and defence, should be consulted on the design of the distinctive emblem for cultural property under enhanced protection.

Agenda item 16 – Miscellaneous

97. **The Chairperson** opened the general discussion and asked Committee members whether they wished to raise any other matters.
98. The Delegation of **Armenia** drew the Committee's attention to the need for the French version of Decision **8.COM 2** on the protection of cultural property in occupied territory to correspond exactly to the English version. In that regard, Armenia pointed out that in the French version of Decision **8.COM 2**, the reference to the concluding paragraphs was incorrect and, secondly, the word "channel" had been incorrectly translated as "*voie diplomatique*".

Agenda item 17 – Relations between UNESCO and NGOs

99. To introduce the agenda item on relations between UNESCO and NGOs, **the Chairperson** called on Mr Francesco Bandarin, **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, who spoke, among other things, of the importance of cooperation between UNESCO and NGOs.
100. The Delegation of **the Netherlands** highlighted the role of NGOs in the protection of cultural property during armed conflict, especially as they could provide information on the state of cultural heritage in conflict-torn regions. For information and with reference to the cultural

heritage situation in Syria, the Netherlands informed the Committee that the Council of the European Union had adopted Regulation 1332/2013 on “restrictive measures in view of the situation in Syria.”

101. The Delegation of **Mali**, concurring with the comments made by the Netherlands, said that in some cases, NGOs, by f their very nature, were the only agencies that could gain access to particularly sensitive combat zones.
102. The Delegation of **the Syrian Arab Republic** (Observer) stressed the need to promote cooperation among NGOs, UNESCO and the States Parties, in view of the role played by NGOs in the protection of cultural heritage, and regretted that the safety of their members was often in jeopardy in conflict areas, such as in Syria.
103. An NGO raised the issue of NGO accreditation with UNESCO.

Agenda item 18 – Audit of the working methods of cultural conventions

Document CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/13

104. After **the Secretariat** had introduced the working document (CLT-13/8.COM/CONF.203/13), **the Chairperson** opened the general discussion.
105. **Committee members** discussed the working document and approved it in its entirety.
106. Given the consensus that had emerged within the Committee, Decision **8.COM 13** was adopted, as drafted.

Agenda item 19 – Closure of the meeting

107. **The Chairperson** thanked Committee members for placing their trust in him once again in his last term of office. He also thanked the Bureau, the Committee, UNESCO Member States, observers and the UNESCO Secretariat, and declared the eighth ordinary meeting of the Committee closed.
108. After the meeting, **the Chairperson** immediately convened a meeting of the Bureau in order to set the date for the next Bureau meeting. It was decided that the meeting would be held sometime around May 2014.