

World Heritage

30 COM

Distribution limited

WHC-06/30.COM/INF.19

Paris, 25 April 2007

Original : English/French

**UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL SCIENTIFIC
AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION**

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Thirtieth session

**Vilnius, Lithuania
8 – 16 July 2006**

SUMMARY RECORD

OPENING CEREMONY

SATURDAY 8 JULY 2006

06.00 p.m. - 06.50 p.m.

ITEM 1 INAUGURAL CEREMONY

The 30th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by His Excellency the President of Lithuania, Mr. Valdas Adamkus, on 8 July 2006 at the Lithuanian National Opera and Ballet Theatre. The President welcomed Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, Dr Musa bin Jaafar bin Hassan, President of the UNESCO General Conference, Mr Zhang Xinsheng, Chairperson of the UNESCO's Executive Board, Mrs Françoise Rivière, Assistant Director-General of UNESCO Culture Sector, Mrs Ina Marčiulionytė, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Committee Members, Ministers and Ambassadors, and all observers. The 21 members of the World Heritage Committee participated in the session: Benin, Canada, Chile, Cuba, India, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Spain, Republic of Korea, Tunisia and the United States of America. A full list of participants is included in Annex I to this document.

The following States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* which are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Comores, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, the Republic of Serbia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania.

H.E. Mr. Esfandja Rahim Mashae, Second Vice President of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Director of the Centre for Iranian Cultural Heritage was present as an observer.

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

Statements were made by the personalities attending the opening session, a summary of which follows below. The full text of each statement is reproduced at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006> .

His Excellency the President of Lithuania, Mr. Valdas Adamkus, began his address by welcoming the participants to the Committee session, and spoke of the importance of international cooperation to preserve heritage. He pointed out that international cooperation was key in helping countries face problems in preserving their heritage, stating that solutions must be found to the constant dilemma of accommodating business and investment needs to heritage protection requirements, and finding a direct road to sustainable development.

Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, pointed out in his address that synergy between UNESCO's conventions (particularly the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Heritage, and the 2005 Convention for Cultural Expressions) should be extended. He also spoke of the restructuring of the Culture Sector at UNESCO to support greater synergy.

Dr Musa bin Jaafar bin Hassan, President of the UNESCO General Conference, complimented the Lithuanian people on discovering and safeguarding culture treasures in their country, and emphasized the importance of fostering cultural diversity among civilizations.

Mr Zhang Xinsheng, Chairperson of UNESCO's Executive Board spoke of the significance of the establishment of the African World Heritage Fund, supporting the Convention on Biological Diversity and spoke of Lithuania as a crossroads of meeting and exchange.

Ms Ina Marčiulionytė, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, expressed her gratitude to be celebrating 30 years of achievements of the *Convention*, and emphasized that its application was not only confined to inscribing sites on the World Heritage List, but included, in particular, their conservation.

The session was followed by a performance of *Carmen* by the Lithuanian National Ballet.

The meeting rose at 6:50 p.m.

FIRST DAY – SUNDAY, 9 JULY 2006

FIRST MEETING

09.00 a.m. - 01.00 p.m

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document : *WHC-06/30.COM/INF.1*

The first meeting of the 30th session was opened by **Ms. Ina Marciulionyte, Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee**, on 9 July 2006 in Vilnius, Lithuania. The Chairperson welcomed Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO, and gave him the floor.

In his address, **Mr Koïchiro Matsuura, Director-General of UNESCO**, thanked the host country and congratulated it on its preparation of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee and its warm hospitality. The full text of the address is found at the following web address:

ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Documents : *WHC-06/30.COM/2.Rev*

WHC-06/30.COM/INF.2

Decision : **30 COM 2 Rev.**

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had met twice to prepare the work of the Committee and that some proposals to change the provisional agenda had been presented. With the assistance of the Legal Adviser, the Bureau had discussed the issues relating to the separation of Serbia and Montenegro. The question of climate change had also been raised. The Secretariat would be introducing the proposed amendments to the provisional agenda in due course.

She then introduced agenda item 2, concerning requests for observer status received in accordance with Rule 8.3 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the Committee, and asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre if any new requests had been presented since the relevant document had been issued.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that no supplementary requests for observer status had been submitted.

The 21 members of the Committee, namely Benin, Canada, Chile, Cuba, India, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lithuania, Madagascar, Mauritius, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Spain, Republic of Korea, Tunisia and United States of America, participated in the session.

62 (according to the draft Participants List) States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* who are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Central African Republic, Comores, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Holy See, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Italy, Jordan, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Poland, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, the Republic of Serbia, Slovakia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania.

The Permanent Observer Mission of Palestine to UNESCO also attended the session as an observer.

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

The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that the current procedure for requesting observer status was inappropriate. It should be changed, and requests for observer status should be received at the latest three months prior to the Committee session in order to be studied and approved by the Chairperson and the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the proposal made by the Delegation of Israel be discussed by the working group. She also appealed to observers to restrict the size of their delegations for reasons of space in the meeting room.

She declared Decision **30 COM 2** adopted and took it that the Committee wished to endorse part II of the document concerning requests for observer status.

It was so agreed.

ITEM 3

ITEM 3A ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/3A.Rev

Decision : **30 COM 3A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, presenting the provisional agenda, said that there was a proposal to split item 11.C in order to reach two separate decisions, Decision **11.C1** on the progress report on the implementation of the recommendations of the Periodic Report for the Arab States and Decision **11.C2** concerning the progress report on the protection of the Palestinian cultural and natural heritage.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **India**, the **Secretariat** said that the results-based management outcomes would be included in the discussion of item 12.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 3A** adopted as amended.

ITEM 3B ADOPTION OF THE TIMETABLE

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/3B.Rev

Decision : **30 COM 3B**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the timetable and, following a request by the Delegation of the **Netherlands** to defer consideration of items 6 and 15, proposed to move item 15 to after the discussion of item 8B concerning nominations and to find an arrangement to move item 6.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to the deferral of item 15, but proposed to keep item 6 on the agenda for discussion the same morning.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested that item 6 be approved in principle only, with no financial implications.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** insisted that more time should be allowed to enable delegates to study the relevant documents, which had only recently been received.

The Delegation of **India**, while appreciating the Delegation of the Netherlands' concerns, endorsed the proposal made by the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the proposal to keep item 6 for discussion the same day.

Before closing item 3B, the **Chairperson** recalled that the Spanish speakers had been asked to indicate the language in which they would like to be recorded the first time they took the floor. She also requested all delegations to keep courtesies to a minimum because of time constraints. Finally, she invited the Committee to attend a brief presentation on the implementation of the Youth Programme in Lithuania, Estonia and Latvia.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 3B** adopted as amended.

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 29TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (DURBAN, 2005)

Documents : *WHC-06/30.COM/4*
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.4

Decision : **30 COM 4**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur of the 30th session for him to present the report of Mr. Ariel Gonzalez, Rapporteur of the 29th session of the Committee, who was unable to attend the current session in Vilnius because of another professional commitment.

The **Rapporteur** presented the report of the Rapporteur of the 29th session, underscoring how the reports of the World Heritage Committee had gradually become “authoritative doctrine” in the field of the international protection of natural and cultural heritage and emphasizing that the report of the 29th session, with more than 200 decisions adopted, was a clear example of that trend. It was a development that generated a higher degree of expectation about the work of the Committee and hence a clear need for more time and resources to be invested in its meetings.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 4** adopted.

**ITEM 5 REPORT OF THE RAPPOREUR OF THE 15TH SESSION OF
GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE *WORLD
HERITAGE CONVENTION* (UNESCO, 2005)**

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/5

Decision : **30 COM 5**

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur of the 15th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* to present his report.

The **Rapporteur** presented the report of the 15th session of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*. Among the decisions the General Assembly was called upon to take, was the renewal of the 12 outgoing members of the Committee. In adopting the *Declaration for the Conservation of Historic Urban Landscapes* comprising a series of principles concerning the issue of the inclusion of contemporary architecture in and around historic centres, the General Assembly invited States Parties to integrate it into their urban policies.

Through a Resolution, the General Assembly once again gave its support to the creation of an African World Heritage Fund. Finally, the credibility of the World Heritage List was also raised in view of the continual increase in the number of properties inscribed and the consequent challenge this posed with regard to monitoring, given that the quality of the List is largely based upon the guarantee of adequate conservation and management of the properties.

The full text of his statement is reproduced at the following Web address:
<http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked all States Parties that had supported its candidature and stated that, during its term of office on the Committee, it would be mainly guided by two priorities, one being to assist States Parties that were underrepresented on the World Heritage List in preparing nomination files, and the other to share its experience in the conservation of cultural properties, for example in the management of voluntary participation by the private sector in that field.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 5** adopted.

**ITEM 6 REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS
ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

Documents : *WHC-06/30.COM/6*
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.6A
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.6B
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.6C

Decision : **30 COM 6**

The **Chairperson** invited the Director of the World Heritage Centre to present the report on the activities of the World Heritage Centre and the implementation of the decisions of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** briefly presented the report, highlighting salient points. He particularly drew the Committee's attention to the new fellowship established and to the consolidation of work with other conventions.

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the work done and stressed the need to undertake a thorough discussion on manuals. With regard, in particular, to the Nature Strategy, it wished to ask three questions. First, it wished to know whether the resources allocated would be transferred from other activities. The second question concerned the roles of the States Parties, of the World Heritage Centre, and of the Advisory Bodies. Thirdly, it wished to know if the overall investments intended for the protection of sites would be increased or would remain the same.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the Nature Strategy had been developed in order to give more focused attention to issues related to natural properties. He also specified that no budgetary request had been made to implement the strategy and that the World Heritage Centre by no means wished to work on its own on the matter, but, on the contrary, would continue to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies, the concerned States Parties and other partners. He concluded by saying that the investments to support the programme would come from extra budgetary funds.

The Delegation of **Japan** recalled the successful launch of the African World Heritage Fund and expressed support for that new initiative.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted with appreciation the work accomplished by the World Heritage Centre, observing, however, that considerable efforts were still needed to achieve a more balanced World Heritage List. Achieving such balance was one of the main issues and it should be asked what the constraints were.

The Delegation of **Benin** supported the proposal for the preparation of manuals, especially for nomination files, conservation and the management of properties, by the World Heritage Centre. It encouraged the Centre to create partnerships with the media in all the regions.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the World Heritage Centre for a very rich and satisfactory report. With regard to training, it encouraged the World Heritage Centre to give priority to the regional specificities of the properties.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed appreciation for having been elected to the Committee and wished to make some comments on the World Heritage emblem. In particular it asked if any decision concerning the use of the emblem had been taken.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** warmly welcomed the new strategy for natural heritage and requested that consideration be given to examining items 6 and 12 together to discuss results-based management.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his Deputy Director for the new strategy on natural heritage. Referring to the decision taken to integrate procedures and rules for establishing new partnerships into the *Operational Guidelines*, it sought explanations concerning the recently established partnership with Jet Tours. By way of more general comment, it asked if there were criteria for establishing new partnerships.

The Delegation of **Israel** also congratulated the World Heritage Centre for the presentation made. Referring to the relevant working document, it asked how the cooperation presented in paragraph 28 could have been continued. It also wondered about the connection between UNEP's database and the World Heritage Centre's database.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the Assistant Director-General for Culture might wish to reply on the use of the emblem. As to the question raised by the Delegation of **India**, he explained that Jet Tours was a serious tour operator, and that the initiative was a new and experimental one of relevance to World Heritage, since it could not be ignored that tourism had a significant impact on the inscribed properties.

The **Deputy Directory of the World Heritage Centre** added that the primary propose of the Biodiversity Liaison Group was to ensure more coordination between the different biodiversity-related conventions. He also specified that the World Heritage Committee took many decisions that were linked to other conventions and that UNEP had developed a new website on issue-based modules to bring those decisions together and provide guidance on implementation to States Parties.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that a side-event on tourism at World Heritage sites would take place on Tuesday evening.

The **Assistant Director-General of UNESCO for Culture** explained the new rules concerning the graphic chart and the modalities for the use of the UNESCO logo. She indicated that it would be advisable that the UNESCO logo be associated with the use of the World Heritage logo. However, detailed modalities should always be set so as to harmonise the rules of the Organization with those of the World Heritage.

The Delegation of **India** thanked the Director of the World Heritage Centre for his answers, but still considered that in future more careful consideration should be given to establishing partnerships. In any case, when the time comes to renew the contract with Jet Tours the decision should be taken by the Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that the contract with Jet Tours was for three years, one of which had already elapsed.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked about the state of registration of the World Heritage logo.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that action on that matter had been taken and the logo was now registered with WIPO.

The Delegation of **Spain** read out a joint European Union statement, in which the European Union Member States that were parties to the *1972 Convention* stressed *inter alia* that new nominations required immediate action by the Committee and the World Heritage Centre, for instance by securing, from the first stage of their submission, an expert opinion concerning the universal value of the site, the frequency of its typology or its potential to be included in a transnational nomination. Another proposal concerned the setting of benchmarks for sites to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The statement included recommendations for a better relation between periodic reporting and the state of conservation. A re-examination of the working methods of the Advisory Bodies and their roles relevant to those of the World Heritage Centre and of the Committee was also requested.

The **Vice-President of Iran** emphasized Iran's deep commitment to the concept of common world heritage and congratulated the conference members in their efforts. He announced the establishment by Iran, of a special Fund in UNESCO for conservation, protection and restoration of common cultural heritage for Iran's neighbouring countries. He ended by expressing his hope that one day the Committee might meet in Iran and thanked the Committee members.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the adoption of the Decision **30 COM 6** should be suspended until later in the session on account of its complex implications.

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

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/7A
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Corr
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add.Rev

Decisions : **30 COM 7A.1 to 7A.34**

The **Threats analysis by the Advisory Bodies** was presented by **ICOMOS** who had performed the analysis in order to determine whether developmental threats to cultural and mixed sites on the World Heritage List were increasing. The analysis covered 1570 reported threats at 614 sites. The main findings showed that developmental threats are indeed increasing, with the two main threats being management deficiencies and development. The proposed solutions of ICOMOS included: focus resources to support adequate management, seek specific data on possible threats from the time of the site's inscription, and address natural disaster preparedness.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its interest in IUCN's presentation, and wondered how to conserve the heritage without at the same time hindering development. It suggested that a reflection be undertaken as to how the countries of the South might conserve their rich heritage and ensure that the cultural deficit from which they suffer is not an additional threat. This reflection should be initiated by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the threats reports provided a good synthesis of the data, but that it would have liked to have received the documents earlier; the ICOMOS document contained a good deal of data and figures and was easy to follow. IUCN might usefully have dwelt on outside forces, such as climate change – the Delegation noted that it did not believe Kilimanjaro was suffering from local problems, but from problems generated beyond national boundaries and that such issues needing action were beyond the Delegation's control.

The Delegation of **Cuba**, referring to the ICOMOS presentation, sought some clarification about the figures given as it found them rather inconsistent.

After having thanked the Advisory Bodies for their presentations, the Delegation of **Morocco**, indicated that the Arab States region had few natural properties. It wondered why and wished to have information on the threats that affected the natural properties of the region. It also questioned the way in which the threats were managed in relation to the development needs of the local communities.

The Delegation of **Benin** took note with satisfaction of IUCN's presentation and indicated that Africa required continual support. It wondered how the Committee could combat climate change, which had global causes, not particularly linked to world

heritage. This was an issue that was beyond the competence of the World Heritage Committee and which should be submitted to the United Nations.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the report, emphasizing that it would provide matter for in-depth discussion. It noted that the ICOMOS findings were not presented on a percentage basis. It was also concerned about the confusion between means and ends – management plans were not an end, but a means – and considered it important to keep that distinction in mind. Threats to authenticity needed to be identified before inscription, and that should feed into the tentative listing process. Regarding natural heritage issues, there was a need to identify not only benchmarks but also minimum thresholds for change. The Delegation wondered about the nature of the process for removing a site from the List of World Heritage in Danger for sites that had been on that List for over five years, specifically considering the economic context of each country.

ICOMOS clarified the confusion over figures raised by the Delegation of Cuba. It added that there was a need for sustainable development initiatives within sites to address many of the threats identified, noting that that issue was related to the resource manuals discussed earlier that morning.

IUCN presented three points. The first was that it was important to link World Heritage with local development needs; some examples existed, such as the Drakensberg in South Africa. Secondly, the issue of external threats, as highlighted earlier by the Delegation of Kenya, was a real challenge for the World Heritage Committee. IUCN wanted to ensure that there was effective cooperation and partnership for those cross-boundary issues. Thirdly, regarding means and ends, IUCN noted that it was important to identify threats, but in the end what mattered most was finding and applying practical solutions. Finally, IUCN stated that the whole issue was a work in progress and it looked forward to working with ICOMOS to move the process forward.

ITEM 7

ITEM 7.1 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/7.1

Decision : **30 COM 7.1**

The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** gave a presentation on the impacts of climate change on World Heritage, addressing main issues such as: the already visible impacts of climate change, the difference between mitigation and adaptation, and communication and awareness. Four categories of action were proposed as solutions to this problem: preventive, corrective, knowledge sharing, and legal action.

The Delegation of **India** welcomed the report, indicating that it had contributed to the workshop and was particularly interested in legal issues. It wondered in particular what

would happen if a site lost its outstanding universal value permanently on account of climate change. The concept of sharing good practices was a good one. India had adopted the necessary technologies to combat climate change, using cheap indigenous technologies, and announced that it would be willing to share those with other States Parties. It would like to see additional points in the draft Decision focusing on legal implications.

The Delegation of **Norway** noted the importance of the issue for Norway, and wished to see the World Heritage Committee play a proactive role in the matter. It noted that the strategy had several good elements and accepted it as a provisional document only, requiring refinement over time. It suggested that the World Heritage Committee should not enter into the background of climate change, but rather focus on the impact of climate change on World Heritage sites. It was important for the momentum to be kept up and for the issue to be dealt with proactively, not only by the World Heritage Committee, but by all States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, and for it to be addressed at the next General Assembly of the States Parties. Norway proposed the following addition to the draft Decision: “Requests the World Heritage Centre to prepare a policy document on the impacts of Climate Change on World Heritage properties in 2007 for the General Assembly of the States Parties, a draft of which should be presented to the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee”. It also proposed to add at the end of the draft Decision: “linkages with other multilateral tools on Climate Change”.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it was pleased that the topic was being discussed by the World Heritage Committee, and that it was important to adopt a dual approach when dealing with climate change, focusing on both the national and global levels. With reference to Chapter II.C of Document *WHC-06/30.COM/7.1*, concerning Strategy and Corrective Actions, the Delegation stressed the importance of vulnerability analyses, but noted that that would represent an immense workload for every site, and suggested that the text be tempered by “to the extent possible”. The Delegation wondered if pilot sites had been identified and recommended that a balance be struck between natural and cultural sites. It supported the Delegation of Norway’s draft proposal, in particular regarding proposed linkages with other United Nations and multilateral bodies. It shared the concerns voiced by India about how to consider de-listing processes due to climate change.

The Delegation of **Israel**, observing that adaptation and mitigation matters were difficult issues, said that it wished to address local adaptation, as there was already global, regional and national experience providing models for changes to ecosystems driven by climate change. The Delegation proposed that the World Heritage Committee request that States Parties apply Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) recommendations to their World Heritage, and to develop specific adaptation measures, with benchmarks, for their implementation, and offered text for addition to the draft Decision. It also supported the Delegation of Norway’s proposal to bring the issue to the General Assembly. Finally, the Delegation suggested that reference to the Kyoto Protocol be made in paragraph 44 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Benin** recalled that World Heritage sites were not isolated but integrated into a changing environment, and it was impossible for UNESCO alone to combat this effect. It called for cooperation within the United Nations. It supported the idea of discussing the subject during the next General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention*, but thought it necessary to go beyond that.

The Delegation of **Peru** considered this a most important issue for World Heritage sites. Climate change represented a major threat, notably for the World Heritage site of Huascarán. It considered that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger was not a solution, as the causes of this threat were planetary, and the properties would remain on that List for decades. It considered another option, (emergency plan) which should be discussed during the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention*.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it was pleased to have participated in the experts meeting held in Paris in March 2006. It expressed its strong support for the World Heritage and Climate Change strategy, as well as for the Delegation of Norway's amendment to bring the issue to the 2007 General Assembly. The Delegation stated that it would propose an addition to the draft Decision that would address the petitions that had previously been brought to the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the report, and expressed its appreciation of the assistance provided by the Observer Delegation of the United Kingdom. It likewise expressed its concern that within the global picture, the local picture should not be forgotten. One issue raised was the use of World Heritage to eradicate poverty. Locally induced climate changes too should not be forgotten. Both local and international aspects must be considered and in that context consideration should be given to making World Heritage sites sustainable. That issue should be a major component of site manager training. ICCROM and others could address that challenge.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it had been fortunate to participate in the expert meeting, and thanked the United Kingdom Government for its support for the meeting. The Delegation endorsed the strategy, supported the Delegation of Norway's proposal, and agreed with the Delegation of United States of America that the decision must address the earlier petitions received by the World Heritage Committee. The Delegation endorsed paragraphs 1-10, and had some minor wording changes to propose for the sake of consistency. It also raised some questions about paragraphs 11 and 12. It wondered if the process of de-listing had been discussed elsewhere, and referred to previous attempts to deal with the issue (in particular Kakadu, and *Operational Guidelines* discussions). The Delegation wished to see more clarity about the purpose of the newly proposed workshop.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted in relation to paragraph 11 that at the March meeting of experts there had been representatives from climate change conventions and related programmes. They had pointed out that it was the first time the issue had focused on World Heritage, and had suggested feedback by the various stakeholders into their

respective reporting processes, noting that ICOMOS had been approached to provide some information in the 2007 assessment by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The World Heritage Centre noted, regarding the workshop on legal issues, that the document on page 58, section C, referred to implications for the *World Heritage Convention*; they had not really been addressed by the experts and perhaps required further discussion, for example in regard to loss of outstanding universal value.

The Observer Delegation from the **Climate Justice Programme** explained that it had worked with 37 other organizations to submit petitions, and reminded the World Heritage Committee that the previous year they had saluted the efforts to conserve sites, but had warned that they might be futile in the face of climate change. The report was a good one, but did nothing to address root causes, such as reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The process should be made more transparent, and consideration given to the modifications to the decision suggested by the United States of America.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** sought clarification in regard to the Delegation of Norway's amendment and wondered if it implied an additional workshop. It supported this amendment, but warned that delegations must have adequate time to comment on documents prepared by the World Heritage Committee and that that should be recognized in the decision.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** noted that it had been privileged to help facilitate the March expert meeting, and was pleased at the high quality of the proposals that had emerged from it, congratulating all those that had participated. It further expressed support for the Norwegian proposal.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that the additional 2006 petition be mentioned in paragraph 3.

The **World Heritage Centre** specified that the petitions being discussed were one and the same.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested the insertion of new text such that the revised decision requested that the Director of the World Heritage Centre lead the implementation of the global-level actions of the strategy.

The Delegation of **Israel** added that, further to its earlier intervention, it sought the insertion of additional text encouraging all delegations to apply Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and other available projections of climate change impacts to their World Heritage properties, and where relevant include them in their proposals, together with a timetable and legal and financial support mechanisms to assure their implementation.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether funds were available for the Director of the World Heritage Centre to lead the process of implementation of global strategy actions.

The **World Heritage Centre** warned that what was being requested was a major task and that, unless resources were made available, it would be impossible to implement.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with the World Heritage Centre's concern, and proposed additional text related to outstanding universal value and integrity, along with changes to paragraph 10.

The Delegation of **Norway** repeated its proposal to replace paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **India** proposed to add "including through the organizing of a workshop involving relevant Climate Change experts and site managers, and other conservation experts". In paragraph 10, it proposed a reference to the importance of support for developing countries.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed a new paragraph 13.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated its concern with regard to the proposal made by the Delegation of the United States of America, and wished to see the proposed amendment in written form before giving its opinion.

The Delegation of **Chile** suggested that the proposed amendment should read "taking into consideration" instead of "based on" in order to allow for more flexibility.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the Delegation of Chile's suggestion met its concerns.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** expressed concern about duplication of processes, with suggestions for discussions at the next World Heritage Committee meeting, at the World Heritage General Assembly of States Parties and yet again at a workshop. The Delegation asked if a decision on an additional workshop could not be deferred until the following year.

The Delegation of **India** noted that benefit would be derived from the holding of a meeting of experts with regional representation for the production of a document.

The Delegation of **Canada** shared the concern expressed by the Observer Delegation of Australia, noting the accumulation of processes, with talk of another workshop to be held fairly soon, which might prove logistically difficult.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that if the Delegation of Netherlands' draft amendment calling for the preparation of a policy document were adopted, then there would be a need for consultation with regional experts, allowing for broader considerations to be discussed, and concluded that one consultation could be carried out early in the year, followed by a document which would be taken to the 31st session in 2007 and subsequently to the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Norway** noted that the World Heritage Centre needed to ascertain how best to develop such a policy document. An expert or working group might be more appropriate than a meeting with a large group. The Delegation noted that the World Heritage Centre could work on the details.

The **Chairperson** said that the draft Decision as amended would be circulated in due course.

ITEM 7.2 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/7.2

Decision : **30 COM 7.2**

Following the presentation of the item by the **World Heritage Centre**, the Delegation of **Japan** noted that the report referred to the relationship between UNESCO and UNDIR and asked if UNESCO had an initiative for disaster prevention in general and what policy direction was in place.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked to see the slide showing an increase in the number of disasters, and inquired whether that corresponded to an actual increase of damage caused to World Heritage properties or to an increase in the number of properties.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated that it was generally satisfied with the strategy, and that it needed to be considered in the context of the whole United Nations system. It was concerned about the large number of objectives (41) and noted that it was important to prioritize, failing which no progress might be made. Ideally, the issue should be considered together with climate change, but for the time being it would be best to keep it separate, as climate change required particular attention.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged the importance of the document and noted that there was a need for the different bodies to work together. It also requested clarifications on the definition of disasters and whether it also included armed conflicts, which were particularly relevant to the Africa region.

The Delegation of **India**, noting that UNESCO was not one of the main actors in the context of disaster relief, wondered why there were no requests for emergency assistance to be considered at the present meeting, suggesting that that was perhaps due to the very limited funds available. The Delegation suggested that there might be a need to develop a system whereby World Heritage Centre costs were built into the regular UNESCO budget, freeing up more funds for emergency assistance.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with previous comments, notably that the number of objectives was very large, and there should be a focus on what was important. It reminded the Committee that UNESCO had a role in emergency

assistance, an example being its work on tsunami preparedness. The World Heritage Centre could not do everything. The Delegation questioned the amount of USD 50,000 for the production of a manual as requested in the draft Decision, and expressed concern over piecemeal decisions eating away at the World Heritage Centre budget. It reiterated concerns expressed by the Delegation of Kenya and, recalling the climate change discussion calling for the production of a manual, suggested that it should perhaps be combined with the proposal under discussion.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, expressing its appreciation of the report, said that the involvement of other global players might be called for, and accordingly proposed an amendment to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** while welcoming the document, pointed out an inconsistency in regard to cumulative processes such as climate change, which might consequently not be considered a disaster. It commented on the fact that many disasters involved both nature and culture – citing Vesuvius as originally a disaster, and now a World Heritage site. Activities needed to mitigate such threats might in fact erode the outstanding universal value of a site. Research institutes should have been considered among the targets of the strategy, with a view to implementing its provisions. The last point made regarded strengthening disaster preparedness for World Heritage sites at all levels – but impact statements were already accepted tools, and that should be indicated in paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to reserve discussion of paragraph 9 of the draft Decision (allocation of USD 50,000) until item 15 (Budget Execution). It noted that document *WHC-06/30.COM/7.2* gave indications for the rational use of emergency funds but, given the introduction of the distinction between ascertained danger and potential danger, wondered who would be responsible for decision-making regarding these threats. It emphasized that communication should be very clear between the States Parties and the World Heritage Centre.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that the concept of an ascertained and potential threat was already in the *Operational Guidelines*, and that the present strategy was precisely an attempt to clarify, for the benefit of the States Parties, the operational implications of that distinction. With respect to the question raised by the Delegation of Japan, it added that UNESCO's Science Sector had a focal point that liaised with the United Nations Centre for Disaster Reduction, but stressed that more efforts were needed to mainstream disaster risk reduction within the entire Organization. In reply to the point made by the Delegation of Lithuania, the World Heritage Centre clarified that the graph indicated the number of registered disasters in general and did not relate to the number of World Heritage properties. It noted the concerns over the many objectives, and recognized that there could be some prioritization. With respect to the observations made by the Delegations of Norway and Israel, it noted that, while not all disasters were related to climate change, the latter could cause major disasters or be an underlying factor leading to disasters. On the question asked by the Delegation of Kenya, the World Heritage Centre explained that a disaster was difficult to define, and the United Nations standard definition could include armed conflict. The concept should be dealt with within the

context of the document. It noted that traditional knowledge was valuable and that a meeting was being organized in Davos in 2006 on those matters. On the issue raised by the Delegation of India, the World Heritage Centre acknowledged that funds were very limited to provide an adequate response to the needs originating from disasters, but pointed out that most emergency assistance requests were not discussed by the Committee as they could be approved by the Chairperson directly for an amount up to USD 75,000, as had been the case for the World Heritage property of Prambanan, in Indonesia, recently affected by an earthquake.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the tentative list sites should also be included under the work being discussed.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that the *World Heritage Convention* was intended for cooperative conservation and international assistance for inscribed sites and not for tentative list sites.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the words “and coordinate with other UNESCO mechanisms” be added to the Delegation of Kenya’s proposal for modification of paragraph 3.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, referring to the wording in paragraph 1, “takes note of and endorses the strategy”, questioned what was being endorsed, expressing concern over the many actions proposed – some being specific and measurable, and others not.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that it was supposed to be a strategic document, addressed to a vast partner audience, and did not imply that all the proposed actions were to be implemented by World Heritage Centre within a given timeframe.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that, without belabouring the issue, it was still not clear about what was being endorsed.

The Delegation of **India** expressed sympathy for the Delegation of United States of America’s position, noting that the report was too voluminous to be a strategy paper, and should be more narrowly focused; it would be willing to endorse its “broad parameters” if necessary.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that the World Heritage Committee might simply “take note of” the report.

ICCROM agreed with need for prioritization, and would request that it take place over the next 12 months.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

01.00 – 02.00 pm **REPORT ON THE AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE FUND**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced Mr Rapulane Mogototoane of the Development Bank of Southern Africa (DBSA). DBSA had been closely involved in the Task Team that had undertaken the feasibility study about the development of the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF).

After briefly recalling the evolution of the concept of the AWHF from the 2002 Periodic Reporting exercise on Africa, its endorsement by the Sixth Ordinary Session of the Assembly of Heads of State of the African Union in Sudan, January 2006, to its launch on 5 May 2006 at Maropeng, part of the Fossil Hominid Sites of Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, Kromdraai, and Environs World Heritage property (Republic of South Africa), **Mr Mogototoane** thanked the States Parties that had so generously contributed to the feasibility study (India, China, Netherlands, and Israel). He observed that the Republic of South Africa had contributed 20 million rand (approximately USD3.3 million) to the capitalization of the endowment and that the contributions of other African countries in particular were eagerly awaited. That was vitally important: it was relatively easy to set up a fund but if it was not capitalized, it would fail. The Fund was housed at and administered by DBSA. Concluding, Mr Mogototoane recalled Decision **29 COM 11.C2** and said that the greatest immediate challenge was to capitalize the Fund through contributions by African countries and other States Parties to the *Convention*.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa**, speaking on behalf of the Africa Group at UNESCO, thanked the World Heritage Centre and States Parties that had so actively encouraged the creation of the AWHF. It encouraged other States Parties to do so in the interests of World Heritage conservation. However, it was deeply disappointed that the progress report was being discussed during the lunch period and outside formal business. It thanked those delegations that had stayed.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said he took note of that comment but observed that all members of the Committee were represented in the room, as were many other countries.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** welcomed the inauguration of the Fund, which was an important African initiative that would make a significant contribution to the representation of the World Heritage List. The Government of the Republic of Korea was in the process of allocating a contribution to the Fund within the budget for the coming year.

The Delegation of **India** said that it had been privileged to attend the launch of the Fund in May 2006, and that it represented an important moment for the international

community. India fully supported that African initiative to highlight Africa's contribution to civilization and was proud to announce a contribution of USD50, 000 to the Fund.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its thanks to all countries, institutions and individuals that had helped make a dream come true. However, the intellectual and financial liberation that that represented came with a challenge. Africa would be judged on its ability to manage the Fund. It believed it would meet that challenge, just as it had with the Africa 2009 programme. The Delegation could foresee similar funds in other regions of the world and called on the international community to support the AWHF.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it was pleased with the progress towards establishing the AWHF and announced an initial contribution of 200,000 euros.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled that it had supported the concept of the AWHF from the outset both morally and financially. It believed it was important for Africa to take responsibility for its heritage. The Government of Norway was actively considering providing resources to the AWHF and it hoped to see other countries – including African countries – do so. Indeed, Norway's contribution would be contingent on contributions coming from other African countries.

The Delegation of **Benin** voiced its regret that the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee had not given greater significance to this important event. However, it recalled that « those who had stayed are our friends » and it was appropriate to thank all the friends of Africa. It continued, indicating that this Fund was the first step towards a rebirth of Africa, beginning with Africa itself. It added that contributions could be made in the form of expertise, not only financial, and this should be extended to all the African diaspora.

Replying to the statement by South Africa on behalf of the Africa Group, the **Chairperson** of the World Heritage Committee explained that she accorded the AWHF the utmost importance but had asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to chair that particular session in view of his close involvement in the development of the Fund. She apologized for any misunderstanding that had arisen.

The Delegation of **Spain** reminded the assembly that it stood by Africa's side and that it had supported the proposed Fund in Durban. Although it could not yet make an announcement, it confirmed that its support would find tangible expression.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it had been proud to be part of the initiative, which touched not only on financial issues but also on human resources and values. It would continue to support the Fund.

After having underlined the considerable importance of the Fund, the Delegation of **Tunisia** recalled that it was an initiative of the United Nations Solidarity Fund, for all peoples and not only for Africa.

The Delegation of **Morocco** emphasized that, although it belonged to another electoral group, it had « its roots in Africa and its branches that rustled in the winds of the World », citing a famous Moroccan poet. It recalled the existence of Priority Africa in UNESCO and that World Heritage gave high visibility to the Organization. In dealing with African heritage, the Committee would have greater visibility. However, it regretted that it was not in a position to make a concrete contribution at this time.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed support for the Fund and recalled its solidarity with Africa, although it could not make any concrete contribution for the time being.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** congratulated all those who had been associated with the development and launch of the Fund. It was an important initiative to save Africa's World Heritage. The Delegation would be making a contribution to the Fund.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted the intervention of the Delegation of Norway and confirmed that it would support the Fund financially but could not yet announce the precise figure.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** extended its congratulations to those who had developed the Fund. The United States of America was a firm supporter of Africa. It had contributed USD54 million to projects in the Congo Basin and was currently involved in technical cooperation with Gabon. It expressed its gratitude to the United Nations Foundation for the substantial assistance it had provided Africa. The AWHF represented a significant step forward and the Delegation would report back to its Government with great positivism and enthusiasm.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** was very pleased with the creation of this Fund and thanked the creators and the States Parties who had indicated their interest. African States should be the first to contribute to this Fund, but it was unable to indicate the amount of Madagascar's contribution for the time being.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** extended its congratulations to those who had supported that excellent initiative. It hoped to see similar funds created in other regions and said that it was considering contributing to the AWHF.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** observed that it had participated in the process that led to the creation of the Fund. A mechanism to enable African countries to contribute to the Fund was currently being worked out and the United Republic of Tanzania would make its financial contribution at an appropriate time.

The Observer Delegation of **China** observed that the AWHF was a fund for all humanity and that China would continue to support it.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** recalled that it had already provided support during the last Executive Board of UNESCO and reiterated its support, but was not in a position to

mention an amount. It also recalled that Italy collaborated with the World Heritage Centre in several African programmes, notably in capacity building and very specific bilateral projects.

The Observer Delegation of **Algeria** was satisfied with the launching of the Fund and thanked all the States Parties. It recalled that the Fund was a vehicle for sustainable development and that it would make an announcement at a later date.

ICCROM warmly welcomed the initiative and recalled that it had been involved in the preparation of the associated ten-year action plan. ICCROM was not a funding agency but a technical body that had long been closely involved with African experts and institutions such as the Ecole du patrimoine africain (EPA) in Cotonou, Benin and the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa (CHDA) in Mombasa, Kenya, and through programmes such as Africa 2009. Its experience had demonstrated that perhaps the most critical issue facing African heritage conservation was capacity building. That should be borne firmly in mind in developing the Fund.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its thanks to all States Parties that had pledged immediate or future contributions to strengthen the Fund. The Fund would continue to work with partners and foundations around the world, such as the Nordic World Heritage Foundation, and with the World Heritage Centre. Continuing, it said that the Board of Trustees would ensure accountability to stakeholders and it was pleased to announce that the Auditor-General of the Republic of South Africa had consented to audit the Fund.

The Observer Delegation of **Burkina Faso** expressed its pleasure and thanked the States Parties who had supported the Fund and those that would do so in the future.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** welcomed the creation of the AWHF and noted that the Second Conference of Intellectuals from Africa and the Diaspora would take place in Salvador, Bahia, Brazil, from 12 to 14 July 2006.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** extended its congratulations on the creation of the AWHF and noted that it represented a significant step forward for greater cooperation with Africa.

The Observer Delegation of **Gabon** supported the Fund and made a promise of a contribution.

The Observer Delegation of **Mali** was very satisfied with the Fund and underlined its importance for heritage, but also for international cooperation.

In concluding the meeting, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked States Parties for their support for the Fund, emphasizing that it was a very important initiative which UNESCO would continue to support.

SECOND MEETING

03.00 pm - 06.30 pm

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 7.2 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continued)

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/7.2

Decision : **30 COM 7.2**

Resuming consideration of draft Decision **30 COM 7.2**, the **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider paragraph 3.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** referred to its earlier comments on the need to ensure the involvement of all global actors in the field of risk preparedness and proposed amending the last phrase of paragraph 3 to read: "... and calls for various global actors for disaster reduction to give more consideration to the impact of disasters on cultural and natural heritages when designing their strategic goals and plans".

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that paragraph 3 currently referred to "recommended actions". However, those recommendations had not yet been made. It recalled the comments it had made on the draft of paragraph 1 and, with the agreement of the **Chairperson**, suggested revising paragraph 1 thus: "Takes note of and endorses the objectives of the Strategy for Reducing Risks at World Heritage properties and requests that the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies work together to prioritize the proposed actions contained in the Strategy".

The Delegation of **Norway** supported and seconded that proposal.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee agreed to the proposal.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** re-read its proposed amendment to paragraph 3.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** reiterated its difficulties with the fact that the paragraph referred to implementing recommendations but that none had in fact been made. As paragraph 1 now requested prioritization, paragraph 3 was somewhat premature. It might therefore be wise to revise the drafting so that it referred to the promotion of objectives rather than the implementation of actions.

The **World Heritage Centre** suggested drafting changes, agreed to by the Delegations of the **United States of America** and the **Netherlands**, to paragraph 3, which would now read:

“Calls upon States Parties to the *Convention* and various global actors for disaster reduction to give more consideration to the impacts of disasters on cultural and natural heritage when designing their strategic goals and plans;”

Responding to the **Chairperson**'s invitation to comment on paragraph 4, the Delegation of **Israel** suggested inserting a reference to the need to integrate concern for World Heritage into documentation programmes as well as into wider national disaster reduction plans.

The **Chairperson** said that she took it that that was acceptable.

Responding to the **Chairperson**'s question as to whether the Committee wished to leave paragraph 9 open given the possible financial implications, the Delegations of **Benin** and **India** said it could not be adopted yet.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7.2** adopted subject to a review of paragraph 9.

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

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/7A
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add.Rev

Decisions : **30 COM 7A.1 to 7A.34**

In opening the item, the **Chairperson** recalled a proposal to rotate the order in which reports on the state of conservation (SOC) of properties in the different regions were considered. If they were always taken alphabetically, there was a risk of not giving a fair amount of time to regions low down in the alphabet. As a result, consideration of item 7A would begin with natural heritage properties in Latin America and the Caribbean. Continuing, she noted almost 100% success in receiving SOC reports from the States Parties. However, many had been late, with one arriving as late as 30 June. That made it difficult for the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to evaluate those reports.

She then invited general comments on the SOC documents.

The Delegation of **Canada** considered that the new standard format for SOC reporting was a significant improvement but identified the following as areas where further work was necessary: a statement on outstanding universal value; the establishment of benchmarks related to outstanding universal value; clarity about what the benchmarks

were, who was to establish them and the timeframe identified for meeting them – whether it would be open-ended or time sensitive and leading to possible de-listing.

The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **Israel** concurred. The Delegation of **Israel** also considered that the Committee might wish to try to establish criteria for distinguishing between sites that were ‘good but deteriorating’ and those that were ‘bad but improving’.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the work of the World Heritage Centre in preparing the documentation but noted some inappropriate uses of language such as ‘allegedly’ and ‘mediocre’ and requested the Secretariat be more judicious in the future. It also noted that for some sites no missions had taken place for many years, and asked how the state of conservation of those properties could properly be assessed under such circumstances.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** joined others in commending the World Heritage Centre on the documentation. It noted that some sites had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger for many years, involving numerous missions, and that that imposed a heavy financial burden on the World Heritage Fund. It wondered whether in such cases the financial cost of the missions should be met by the State Party concerned.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** noted with pleasure the efforts undertaken by the World Heritage Centre, notably with regard to the visits and verification of the integrity of the sites, both natural and cultural. However, in reading the report it remarked upon the properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger that received praise for the efforts made by the States Parties concerned but which remained on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation therefore noted a certain disharmony between the comments and the judgement and wished for more coherence.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the spirit of the Delegation of Lithuania’s intervention but noted that, as some of the States Parties in question found it difficult to fully fund the management of the sites in question, it was not realistic to shift the burden in that way. However, the Committee might wish to consider preventing new nominations being brought forward in such cases pending rectification of the problems at the sites in question.

The Delegation of **India** recalled that that issue had arisen at the 29th session and that the consensus had been that by imposing such sanctions the Committee would effectively be constituting itself as a court. There was nothing in the *Convention* that permitted punitive actions of that sort.

The **Chairperson** said that she did not wish to pursue that line of discussion, closed general comments on State of conservation and invited the World Heritage Centre to present the sites for review under item 7A.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N196)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a Spanish-language report had been received by the State Party on 30 June 2006. The lateness of the report had made it difficult to provide a full and concerted analysis of the property's state of conservation in time. The report provided information on progress achieved against 10 broad conservation benchmarks first set out following an IUCN mission to the property in 1995. Subsequent missions and State Party reports had revealed a degree of progress towards reaching those benchmarks on the one hand, but also some slippage on the other. The latest State Party report was the most positive to date.

In its decision **28 COM 15A.13**, the World Heritage Committee had identified five of the 10 benchmarks as priorities whose achievement would lead to removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger, barring unforeseen developments. The State Party report provided information on the achievement of those five benchmarks, and in general reported that progress was being made, although ongoing work remained to be done. The report noted that: (i) the removal and indemnization of remaining squatters having occupied the core zone of the property was complete; (ii) dead wood harvesting resolutions had been cancelled (as already reported in the SOC reports presented at the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee); (iii) there were operational checkpoints in critical areas helping to control unauthorized activities (however IUCN reported continued important illegal logging); (iv) inter-institutional coordination remained weak.

The State Party report contained little information related to the fifth benchmark, on the dissemination of information on the environmental management plans in the Sico Paulaya valley. The property was one of nine that were participating in the World Heritage Centre management effectiveness project and positive impacts from the project were recorded in the State Party report.

IUCN noted that progress had been positive in addressing the benchmarks identified by the 1995 UNESCO/IUCN mission. It believed there was a positive likelihood of removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger in the near future. That should be assessed by the mission, which had been kindly invited by the State Party. Specific issues the mission should address include clarification of the level of management capacity within the park as well as the effectiveness of measures to control illegal logging.

A revised draft Decision **30 COM 7A.15 Rev** taking account of the information provided by the State Party had been circulated in the room.

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

The Delegation of **India** noted that one of the difficulties faced by the Committee when a site was really in danger was opposition by the State Party concerned. That stemmed in part from the fact that, once a site had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in

Danger, it was extremely difficult to remove it. Río Plátano had been on it for 10 years. It believed that there was a need for a comprehensive review of all the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Turning to the revised draft Decision, it noted that the text commended the State Party for the significant progress it had achieved in meeting several of the benchmarks set for its removal from the Danger List. Could the Committee therefore remove the site in the current year with the clear message that if the remaining benchmarks were not achieved by the 31st session, the site would be re-inscribed on it? That would set a good example.

The **Chairperson** noted that suggestion.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that, as some of the benchmarks had been achieved, the decision should make clear which ones remained to be met. That could only be helpful for the State Party.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that five benchmarks for the State Party had been adopted by the 28th session of the Committee in Suzhou. No specific timeframe had been set, but the IUCN mission which had decided the benchmarks, had considered they could be met within a year. The latest information from the State Party indicated that some of them had now been met but the lateness of the report had meant it had not been possible to verify that through a mission.

Recalling the comments of the Delegations of India and Canada, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested that it would be appropriate to organize a meeting on the question of benchmarks and de-listing.

IUCN commented that it was important to give clear advice to States Parties through benchmarks. The main unresolved issue in the case under review related to benchmark C on unauthorized activities in the buffer zone. It would be important to clarify the matter through a mission and it was possible that the site could be removed from the Danger List at the Committee's 31st session.

The Delegation of **India** said that in that case the draft Decision should include a paragraph specifying which benchmark remained to be achieved and that, if that happened before the 31st session of the Committee, the site would be withdrawn from the Danger List.

The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that only two of the five benchmarks had been fully achieved.

The Delegation of **Norway** endorsed the procedure outlined by the Delegation of India and suggested it could and should be applied in other cases.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the draft Decision paragraph by paragraph, noting that paragraphs 1 and 2 were approved unchanged.

The Delegation of **Benin** returned to paragraph 3 and noted a contradiction with paragraph 4: how could the Advisory Body congratulate the State Party when it regretted the late reception of the report for study?

The Delegation of **Israel** reiterated that the final sentence of paragraph 3 was inconsistent with paragraph 4.

Responding to the **Chairperson**'s question about the thoroughness of the review, the **World Heritage Centre** explained that, while it and IUCN had reviewed the information provided by the State Party on 30 June, it had not been possible to gather corroborative evidence.

The Delegation of **Norway** thought that presented no contradiction.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to clarify its preceding remark by highlighting the following incoherence: in its report, IUCN emphasized that it had not had time to carry out a thorough analysis of the site. On what basis therefore had it made its report? The Delegation questioned the working methods but did not wish to insist further.

The **Chairperson** noted a consensus in the room on that point.

The Delegation of **India** observed that the situation was becoming more complicated – contrary to earlier information it appeared that three benchmarks had not yet been fully met. That demonstrated the need to spell out benchmarks.

IUCN clarified that, while benchmark C was the main outstanding issue, benchmarks D and E had not yet been met in full.

The **Chairperson** said there was a need to list them in the decision

The Delegation of **India** commented that the decision would need to specify which parts of D and E remained unmet.

IUCN explained that that could only be clarified through a mission.

The **Chairperson** observed that the Committee was in an uncomfortable position because the State Party's report had been submitted so late.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it was important to go back to method – the decision should spell out which benchmarks remained to be achieved and set a timeline for doing so.

In seeking to accommodate those proposals, the **Chairperson** suggested that references to benchmarks C, D and E should be inserted into the decision and the deadline of 2007 be set for achieving them.

It was so agreed.

The Delegation of **Benin** underlined that the State Party stated that it had corrected different points that the Advisory Body had not had the time to verify. It therefore wished that it be clearly stipulated that it concerned a declaration made by the State Party.

In response to a request for clarification on behalf of the **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee**, the Delegation of **Benin** indicated that the Advisory Body could only confirm whether a State Party had achieved the benchmarks fixed after having carried out a mission to the site. In this present case, the Advisory Body had not had the time to carry out the mission, therefore it was necessary to indicate in the document that it concerned a declaration by the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** suggested adding text to paragraph 4 indicating that benchmarks A and B had been met.

The Delegation of **Kenya** observed that the issue would recur but there was a need to move on. It agreed with Benin. The decision should say that the report of the State Party had been late but the Committee also needed to acknowledge its responsibility by discussing the property. It seemed strange to commend a State Party for meeting only some benchmarks.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested amending paragraph 4 to the effect that the Committee noted that the State Party had reported that it had achieved benchmarks A and B.

The **Chairperson** said that seemed to meet the various concerns that had been expressed.

The Delegation of **Cuba** agreed with the Delegation of Benin and emphasized that IUCN was still waiting for confirmation. It should be clearly established why the property was on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the benchmarks which had been met should be clearly stated, as well as those benchmarks which had not been achieved.

The **Chairperson**, summarizing the debate, said that the way forward seemed to be to list the benchmarks achieved, specify which remained to be achieved and set a deadline of 2007 for doing so.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.15** adopted as amended.

AFRICA

Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park (Central African Republic) (N 475)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the State Party had not submitted a report in response to the decision of the Committee at its 29th session.

However, as explained in the working document, the World Heritage Centre had provided the State Party with financial assistance from the budget line dedicated to World Heritage properties in danger, to permit the State Party to continue vital anti-poaching activities, pending the start of the next phase of the ECOFAC programme. The third ECOFAC phase, which had ended in 2004, had invested substantially in strengthening anti-poaching activities in the property to begin addressing that major threat. The delay of the start of the fourth phase, now not expected before 2007, meant there was a danger that that positive trend would be reversed.

In the framework of the assistance from the World Heritage Fund, the State Party had submitted a progress report as well as the final report of the wildlife survey carried out in 2005. The final results of the survey indicated a dramatic decline in most wildlife species within the property, including the loss of approximately 95 % of the elephant population, now estimated at fewer than 500 animals. However, the report noted that remaining populations could still recover if poaching could be brought under control.

Unfortunately, the UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission, planned for June 2006, had again been cancelled, following an attack on the Gordill Park base on 3 June 2006, in which three park staff had been killed. With the start of the rainy season in July, the mission would now have to be postponed to early 2007.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that the security situation had meant it had been difficult to undertake missions to that – and other – areas. In such circumstances, it asked whether the need for missions could be circumvented by the use of remote sensing, perhaps not for animal counting but possibly for monitoring habitat changes.

IUCN observed that remote sensing could be an important adjunct to but not a substitute for other monitoring mechanisms. It took the view that there was no substitute for on-the-ground assessment, particularly for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Benin** emphasized that this type of difficult situation was a frequent occurrence and did not reflect a negative attitude on the part of the State Party. The problem of poaching was a regional one. If the State Party had not submitted a report, there was a Permanent Delegation of the State Party in UNESCO. It therefore invited the World Heritage Centre to contact the Permanent Delegation in the future. It also wished to propose an amendment to paragraph 8 regarding the « high level meeting » which was in fact a policy meeting and invited the Director-General of UNESCO to facilitate this meeting. It also wished to propose a modification to paragraph 7.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft Decision paragraph by paragraph, noting that paragraphs 1 to 6 were agreed upon without comment.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for clarification from the State Party on the justification for continuing financial support in the absence of SOC reports. It was important to give the Committee information about how the money already given had been used before more was invested.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to respond to the question of the Delegation of Israel regarding the recommended funding: the request for funding would assist towards continuing work already undertaken concerning anti-poaching activities, work which deserved encouragement.

The **Chairperson** asked if the State Party was present.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the time lapse between phases III and IV of ECOFAC risked causing a breakdown in anti-poaching activities. Limited financial support had therefore been provided to prevent that happening and confirmed that it had received reports on the use of those funds. The lack of information was restricted to the follow-up to Decision **29 COM 7A.1**.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked for this information to be incorporated into paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether the Advisory Body had confirmed that the outstanding universal value for which the site had been inscribed on the World Heritage List was still intact since its inscription on the Danger List. If it had not, it should do at the 31st session and similar paragraphs should be added to all other draft Decisions for danger-listed sites.

The **Chairperson** suggested that paragraph 7 could remain un-amended and that India's proposal should be incorporated into paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Benin** repeated its proposals for amendments to paragraphs 7 and 8.

In response to a question by the **Chairperson**, the **Representative of the Director-General** indicated that this would be acceptable.

The **Chairperson** recalled the suggestion to insert a sentence about the need to verify whether the outstanding universal value of the site had been maintained, and noted that paragraph 10 was accepted as drafted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the situation facing the site was a disaster situation. If it was, the Committee should perhaps ask itself whether it could ever consider abandoning it – surely in such circumstances the Committee, as the international community, had a responsibility to keep the site going.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.1** adopted as amended.

Comoé National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227)

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the 27th session in 2003, following the outbreak of conflict in the country and the loss of control by the State Party of parts of the property. A monitoring mission had been requested by the Committee at that time but UNESCO and IUCN had been unable to organize it because of the prevailing insecurity. However, the mission had finally taken place from 10 to 23 June 2006.

IUCN noted the following key issues arising from the mission. First, the mission had confirmed that the State Party controlled only 35% of the property. The area was effectively divided into three zones. The first zone, covering 20% of the property, was managed by the park authority. The second zone, immediately to the north, covered 15% of the property and was under the control of the United Nations peacekeeping force. The remainder of the property was under the control of rebel forces. The mission had met with representatives from each of the three zones. Second, the outstanding universal value for which the property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List was still present. Third, poaching continued to be a major threat within the property, as did illegal exploitation, particularly for agriculture. Those problems were affected by increasing human populations around the park. The mission had noted the need to develop projects which supported alternative livelihoods for local communities, to reduce dependency on the resources of the park. There were a number of interesting projects in the Tai National Park which might provide useful models for that. Fourth, most of the basic park infrastructure and equipment had been destroyed and re-building of those essential management services was a priority. Fifth, it was important to consolidate the management in the south of the park, with particular emphasis on controlling poaching and working with local communities. Sixth, a joint patrol mechanism for the entire park should be established with the assistance of the United Nations peacekeeping force. Seventh, the mission had developed a number of recommendations and proposed an action plan with timelines.

The implementation of the recommendations of the mission and the Action Plan would require increased international support. Projects such as the 2002 European Union project, which was signed but not implemented, should be fully supported.

A revised draft Decision **30 COM 7A.2 Rev** was distributed in the room, reflecting the findings of the mission.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to read through the draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Benin** thought that in paragraph 4 « continues to have control of ...only... » gave to understand that this situation was the fault of the State Party. It appeared to be a reproach.

The **Chairperson** said that appeared to be a problem with the French version only.

The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered whether paragraph 6(c), to “*Set up an integrated and effective management structure for the entire property*” was realistic given the prevailing circumstances.

IUCN agreed that to do so would be challenging and asked if the State Party could be invited to comment.

The **Chairperson** suggested adding “when the situation allows” to the draft.

The Delegation of **India** commented that, as the whole park had been inscribed on the World Heritage List, it would be difficult to moderate the language. As such, it believed the benchmark had to stay. Until an effective management system was in place for the whole of the park, it could not be taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** commended the intervention of the Delegation of India. The existence of an integrated management plan was a requirement for all sites put forward for inscription. The Committee should apply standards consistently and bear the current case in mind during future discussions on inscription.

Returning to the question, the Delegation of **India** commented that the draft Decision was very clear and, while it could live with compromise, in the present case it did not solve the problem.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that benchmarks were intended to help the State Party but agreed that the site was not yet ready to be taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** indicated a contradiction between the fact that the State Party only controlled a third of the property and the recommendations made. These resembled virtual recommendations. Logically, the recommendations should be reviewed.

The Delegation of **Benin** underlined that it concerned recommendations over a five-year period and not for immediate implementation, and it hoped that the situation would evolve over time.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee was planning for the future, not just tomorrow.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed to amend paragraph 6(b)(iii) to request a framework for the entire property, rather than a management structure.

The Delegation of **Chile** pointed out that paragraph 6(a) was not feasible in the current situation and suggested deleting “as a matter of urgency”.

IUCN noted some similarities with paragraph 6(c) – it was effectively a target to work towards, as had been agreed with the State Party.

In paragraph 10, referring to the mention « address the issues related to the outcomes and recommendations... », the Delegation of **Morocco** asked whether the State Party had taken any action. It felt that the tone was somewhat inappropriate in French. Further, it supported the interventions of the Delegations of India and Benin, emphasizing that with only a third of the Park being under the control of the State Party, it was not possible to fully apply the recommendations in the short-term.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked if the Committee would consider moving the reporting date back to 2008, especially since a mission had only just taken place, the State Party would not formally receive notification of the Committee's decision until September and the report on SOC was due on 1 February.

The **Chairperson** sympathized with the spirit of that intervention but recalled that for properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, there was an obligation to review the SOC annually.

The Delegation of **Benin** supported the Delegation of Canada in its proposal to postpone, on an exceptional basis, the date of the report until February 2008, which would be more realistic given the special situation.

The **Chairperson** observed that it was imperative to follow procedures.

The Delegation of **India** wondered whether there was scope for putting the review date back to 2008 on an exceptional basis. Referring to paragraph 11, it also asked whether it was legally possible for the Committee to call for action by the United Nations.

The Delegation of **Morocco** requested that, in paragraph 10, « respond » be replaced and also requested that the words « involve the United Nations... » and « Request the international community... » be deleted or replaced.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to address those points and to consider postponing the review date on an exceptional basis.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed, in French, the words « take into account » instead of « respond ».

The Delegation of **Mauritius** observed that it would also be important to redraft paragraph 10 for consistency.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** suggested amending the draft Decision to make it clear that the review date had been deferred on an exceptional basis.

The **Legal Adviser** referred the Committee to paragraph 190 of the *Operational Guidelines* which obliged the Committee to review the SOC of sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, there was no obligation on States Parties to submit reports

on an annual basis. As such, the Committee could legitimately review the SOC of a property on the basis of information provided by IUCN.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, supported by the Delegation of the **Netherlands**, expressed concern about the proposed change of date: annual reports were requested for the purpose of permitting the Committee to make an informed decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** withdrew its proposal.

The Delegation of **Benin** said it had a problem with paragraph 11 of the draft Decision. It was not within the Committee's mandate « to involve the United Nations ». However, it had no problem with the content given the example of the MONUC that already patrolled in the DRC parks.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party had specifically requested the assistance of the United Nations, and confirmed the points made by the Delegation of Benin, that the World Heritage Centre had worked directly with the United Nations (MONUC) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Therefore a precedent did exist.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** suggested modifying the request, asking the Director-General to call on the United Nations for assistance.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested inserting the name of the United Nations peacekeeping force in the country.

The **World Heritage Centre** specified that the name of United Nations force in Côte d'Ivoire was the United Nations in Côte d'Ivoire (ONUCI).

The Delegation of **Spain** said it had no objections to paragraph 11 and drew a parallel with Kosovo, where the KFOR already protected parks and sites. The Committee could request the United Nations to have its peacekeeping forces active in Côte d'Ivoire assisting the State Party in patrolling the site.

The Delegation of **Kenya** was satisfied with paragraph 11 as modified and asked if the State Party could be invited to comment.

The Observer Delegation of the **Côte d'Ivoire** clarified the situation: Thanks to the solidarity and assistance received, the Côte d'Ivoire was no longer in a critical state. The country gave great importance to the preservation of its heritage. The Delegation welcomed the creation of the African World Heritage Fund and the attention that the African group enjoyed in the Committee. The Côte d'Ivoire thanked the Committee for sending a mission to the country last June; it agreed with the conclusions of the mission and adopted the recommendations; the State Party was doing its utmost to rapidly remove the Park from the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, the country needed funding, notably through extrabudgetary sources from the Committee. The Delegation finally requested clarification with regard to paragraph 6 of the draft Decision which

called for the creation of a new management structure for the Park, whilst, in accordance with Ivorian law, the management of protected areas had a suitable institutional framework.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to review the remaining paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Israel** and the Delegation of **Morocco** asked for clarifications about the term “international community” in paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **India** suggested amending the wording of paragraph 12 to introduce the notion of donor support.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.2** adopted as amended.

Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d’Ivoire/Guinea) (N155/257)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that reports had been received from the States Parties of Côte d’Ivoire and Guinea in March. Côte d’Ivoire had stated that the property was still under control of rebel forces, while Guinea had reported ongoing degradation on its side of the property. The World Heritage Centre also noted that the mining company “Société des Minerais de Fer de Guinée” had re-activated its activities in the enclave which had been excluded from the property in 1993. The President of the company had visited the World Heritage Centre in April 2006 and had given assurances that no mining was planned within the property. In view of the reports received, and in particular in view of the restarting of activities in the mining enclave, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN proposed to organize a monitoring mission to the property.

IUCN noted previous decisions of the Committee relating to mining in natural World Heritage sites and the “No-Go” commitments by the International Council for Minerals and Metals (ICMM) and Shell not to mine within World Heritage properties. It stressed that in its view those decisions were applicable to Mount Nimba. IUCN also noted the importance of the mission reviewing outstanding issues relating to boundary demarcation.

The Delegation of **India** asked if the State Party concerned had been consulted on the draft Decision, and if there were any comments from IUCN regarding the outstanding universal value of the site: whether it had been reviewed, and if it had been determined to exist.

IUCN stated it was difficult to make an assessment without undertaking a mission to the site, but that there were signs of extreme threats to the property.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the draft Decision had not been discussed with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested that the difficulties with the mining activities and the issues relating to benchmarks be cited clearly in the decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that no benchmarks had been defined, as was indicated in the working document. They would be defined during the proposed mission.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed to amend paragraph 6 of the draft Decision, indicating that, as Guinea had already done, the State Party of the Côte d'Ivoire should invite a monitoring mission.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from the State Party and suggested deleting the wording in question as the State Party had invited a mission to the site.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested adding time frames in addition to the need to determine benchmarks discussed previously.

The **Rapporteur** read out paragraph 6 again for clarification.

The **Chairperson** declared **Decision 30 COM 7A.3 adopted** as amended.

Garamba National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 136)

The **World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that at its 29th session it had requested that the presence of the northern white rhino at the property be confirmed in order to guide a decision on a possible removal of Garamba National Park from the World Heritage List.

An aerial survey of key mammal species, including the northern white rhino, had been undertaken from 16 to 31 March. The survey had been followed by a joint UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission from 30 March 30 to 7 April 2006. The survey had confirmed the presence of rhinos in the property, but had been able to locate only 2 individuals, 1 male and 1 female. However, no recent rhino carcasses or poaching camps had been located, which was a clear indication that for the moment poaching had been brought under control. It noted that even during a detailed aerial survey, it was possible to overlook certain individual animals. That had been demonstrated since the survey, as two other individual animals had been sighted, one male on 23 April and one sub-adult on 17 May. However, it was clear that the remaining number of white rhino was extremely small.

According to the experts of the African Rhino Specialist Group, it was currently impossible to say that the remaining population in the property was viable or not. On the basis of the recommendations of the African Rhino Specialist Group, the mission therefore recommended continuing the aerial and ground survey work with a view to determining the number of animals left and organizing a workshop with all stakeholders

to discuss management options for the remaining population. A second aerial survey was currently ongoing and the workshop was planned in September.

The further results of the March survey had actually been more positive than expected by the mission team. The survey had counted 3,839 elephants, 8,145 buffalo, 292 hippo and 70 individuals of the endemic Congo giraffe. Although those figures marked a net decline compared to the 2004 census, they were more positive than the results obtained in the August 2005 survey.

The most significant result of the survey, however, was the fact that no recent poaching camps had been found inside the property. In all previous surveys, recent poaching camps, and even active camps, had been spotted inside the property. The mission had noted that, since the signature of a management agreement between ICCN and the African Parks Foundation, a Dutch-based conservation NGO, in September 2005 and the start of its activities in the field in November 2005, the situation in the property had improved considerably. However, the security in the region remained a primary concern. Since January, there had been frequent incursions of rebels of the Uganda Lord's Resistance Army, and even reported military actions by the Ugandan army on the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to track them down. The mission felt that, given the instability in the region, it was currently impossible to propose clear benchmarks for a removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission had developed recommendations to further improve the state of conservation of the property and they were included in the draft Decision.

The World Heritage Centre added that, with generous funding from the Government of Italy, it was supporting the activities implemented by ICCN and the African Parks Foundation to rehabilitate the property. Finally, it reported that it had started discussions with the Permanent Delegation of Sudan to UNESCO, in order to try to identify ways to better control poaching originating from Sudanese territory.

IUCN noted that the situation with the northern white rhino population was critical and that urgent measures were required. Options would be discussed at a workshop in Kinshasa in September involving the State Party and specialists from the IUCN Rhino Specialist Group. The mission had noted the positive developments within the property, particularly the strengthening of the capacity of staff within Garamba with the support of the African Parks Foundation. The issue of whether the property should be de-listed had been discussed at length at the 2005 World Heritage Committee session and the suggestion had been made that it should be considered a case of "no rhino, no World Heritage site".

IUCN noted that the outstanding universal value of the property was not only based on the presence of the northern white rhino, reflected in the fact that the property was inscribed under two natural criteria, (iii) and (iv). The property protected other key mammal species, including the endemic Congolese giraffe and important populations of African elephants. Together with the Manovo Gounda St Floris National Park in the Central African Republic, Garamba was the last stronghold in the region of a number of

species characteristic of the Sudano-Guinean eco-region. IUCN considered that the Committee decision should take that into account. It further noted that there remained uncertainties regarding the exact population of northern white rhino and they remained to be clarified.

The Observer Delegation of the **Democratic Republic of the Congo** stated that the situation in the five Congolese properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger had evolved and among the five properties, Garamba National Park could meet all the conditions enabling it to be removed from this List. There were now four rhinos, instead of two; MONUC jointly ensured security with the regular army to halt poaching; for the first time a private foundation ensured the management of the site; the European Union and the World Bank also provided assistance. The removal of this property from the Danger List would be an encouragement for the State Party.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the outstanding universal value of the site was evidently still present.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, noting that the expert had explained that the property had important species such as elephants, giraffes, and others, questioned whether the presence of those species alone was enough to justify the property's outstanding universal value. That was a recurring issue, and the question was whether the presence of the northern white rhino was indeed essential to the outstanding universal value of the property.

IUCN responded that that was a good point and had also been discussed at length at the previous session of the Committee. It had already been noted that the presence of the white rhino was important but that the site was also inscribed under other values. If the herd was completely lost, the property would still have outstanding universal value, but it of course hoped that the situation would not come to that.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested dropping paragraph 13 altogether, as the subject had come up in discussions the previous year and there did not seem to be a reason to review it on an annual basis.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the United States of America, as the situation the previous year had been more precarious and it was now much more reassuring.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the Delegations of the United States of America and India about removing the paragraph but wished to follow up questions concerning improved security and the private foundation mentioned earlier. If IUCN agreed, the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation also pointed out that the site had attracted attention and funding because of its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. If the site was no longer considered to be in danger, would it still get help? In addition, concerning the Congolese giraffe, it had heard reports of the rediscovery of that extinct species, and requested comments on the matter.

The Delegations of **Benin** and **Tunisia** agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America to delete paragraph 13.

The Delegation of **Canada** supported the proposal to delete paragraph 13 and called attention to item 11G, referring to work to be done on the statement of outstanding universal value, because the drafting of paragraph 13 emerged from the fact that there was no clear statement concerning outstanding universal value.

IUCN noted that the property was still under severe threats and considered there was no question of taking the site off the List of World Heritage in Danger. The situation was still critical, including with regard to the northern white rhino. It also repeated that the notion of outstanding universal value for the site was not only related to the presence of the rhino in the property. It therefore also supported the removal of paragraph 13 from the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** provided a clarification regarding the earlier query concerning the Congolese giraffe, explaining that there was possibly confusion between the okapi, also known as the forest giraffe, which had recently been rediscovered in the Virunga National park. The Congolese giraffe was a distinct subspecies of giraffe now endemic to the Garamba National Park.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that paragraph 6 should be more clearly stated as a benchmark for corrective actions.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed, following the comments of the State Party, that the paragraph should be reworded.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that circumstances in the property changed so quickly that it was difficult to set benchmarks. In response to the Delegation of Israel, the latest mission had taken place in April 2006 and the World Heritage Centre judged that the changes were insignificant.

The Delegation of **Chile** referred to paragraph 6 of the draft Decision which resembled more a resolution of the United Nations Security Council than a decision of the World Heritage Committee, and suggested deleting or completely recasting that paragraph.

The **Chairperson** stated that paragraph 6 could not be deleted as that would essentially delete the results of the mission, and deferred to the World Heritage Centre for comments.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that the paragraph contained the recommendations of the monitoring mission, and should therefore not be deleted. Although there were improvements in general in the property, the situation around it had not improved significantly. The paragraph had been included as that information needed to be taken into consideration.

The Delegation of **India** said that the advice of the Delegation of Canada should be taken, namely to add benchmarks to the text. The Delegation also expressed agreement with the Delegation of Chile, namely that paragraph 6, subparagraphs (c), (d) and (h) could be deleted, with the rest unchanged.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with India, and further suggested deleting subparagraph (b), expressing the view that the Committee had no place recommending that the Government replace one brigade with another.

The **Chairperson** requested that the changes proposed by the Delegations of Canada and India be read out by the Rapporteur.

The **World Heritage Centre** provided clarification about subparagraph (c), stating that the park authorities, and in particular the guard forces, had difficulty in controlling poaching as they had to face well-equipped and armed bands of poachers. Subparagraph (d) referred to MONUC, the United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, whose mandate included disarmament. The request that MONUC should organize a disarmament campaign in the region was therefore relevant. Subparagraph (h) was included because of the ageing guard force, which had not been renewed for a long time.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it had no wish to amend paragraph 6, as it contained necessary actions to protect the site.

The Delegation of **Chile** drew attention to the consensus that seemed to have been achieved concerning the deletion of certain paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that, like the Delegation of the Netherlands, it had no concerns about the wording of paragraph 6. An explanation could be included on why such recommendations were necessary.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed that the subparagraphs in question did not necessarily have to be deleted, also stating that there was a precedent for the military to be involved in safeguarding a site, since Yellowstone had been protected by the United States army for 44 years.

The Delegation of **Chile** concurred with the Delegation of Spain.

The Delegation of **Spain** proposed to include in all subparagraphs a reference to preservation and conservation of outstanding universal value.

The **Chairperson** and the Delegation of the **Netherlands** pointed out that such a reference was already included in the statement at the beginning of paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **India** proposed adding one phrase: “in the interests of conservation”.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested that the phrasing of paragraph 6 should begin not with the word “Urges” but rather “Asks” or “Instructs”.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, supported by the Delegation of **Morocco**, proposed to include in paragraph 9 « Request the Director-General... ».

The Delegation of **Benin** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Kenya concerning paragraph 8.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to replace “Urges” with “Requests”.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** proposed that paragraph 9 be modified, requesting that the Director-General facilitate the meeting in question.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30COM 7A.4** adopted as amended.

Salonga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 280)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, as mentioned in the working document, there had recently been a number of well-documented cases of poaching, involving commanders of the army of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and increased clashes between park guards and soldiers involved in poaching. Two park guards had been killed in such incidents since November 2005.

Given those recent developments, and the fact that no monitoring mission had actually been sent to the property since its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre were proposing the organizing of such a mission before the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee.

No further new information had been received since the preparation of the working document.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed replacing the word « develop » by the word « elaborate » in paragraph 6 in the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** stated that missions were dispatched to develop recommendations rather than implement them.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated that the problem with paragraph 5 was one of clarity, as the Committee was endorsing the recommendations of a report of whose content it was unaware. It requested the World Heritage Centre to clarify the nature of the report and its recommendations.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that an explanation on the report was given on page 19 of the working document, in paragraph 3. It explained that that recent study by WWF

included a management review of the park and particular recommendations towards possible improvements.

The Delegation of **India** said that the difficulty voiced by the Delegation of Canada existed because there were no defined benchmarks, leading to ambiguity that did not exist elsewhere.

The **World Heritage Centre** pointed out that, as there had so far been no mission to the site, it had not been possible to develop benchmarks.

IUCN concurred and said that the report was useful but did not provide benchmarks, just recommendations.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested that paragraph 6 ask that the mission provide benchmarks as part of the recommendations for the next meeting of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed support for the Delegation of Canada's suggestion and requested that the mission should also review the outstanding universal value of the property.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested that that should be standard practice and that common standards should be set for such missions.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.5** adopted as amended.

Kahuzi-Biega National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 137)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that from 3 to 23 March a UNESCO monitoring mission had visited the property together with Virunga National Park. The mission had noted positive developments in the highland sector of the park, where the security situation had improved considerably since the last violent clashes in 2005. Gorilla numbers in that sector had increased since the previous census. The mission had also noted clear political support from the national government and the provincial and local authorities and improved cooperation with the local communities. The situation in the lowlands, however, remained precarious, as a result of the ongoing insecurity due to the presence of various armed groups. Those groups were using the park as a base and were involved in illegal mining and large-scale poaching. Ongoing military operations against armed groups in the area by the army of the Democratic Republic of the Congo with the support of the United Nations mission in the country were actually aggravating the situation, as they resulted in the militias seeking refuge in the interior of the park. Park authorities controlled only 15% of the extent of the property. With virtually no data available on the inaccessible lowland sector, it was currently very difficult to assess to which extent the values for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List

had been affected. It was therefore important to undertake a survey of key species in the lowland sector as soon as the security situation allowed.

The mission had developed, together with the park authorities and the conservation NGO working at the property, an emergency action plan, which would receive funding through the second phase of the Centre's programme for the World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with support from the Government of Belgium.

The mission had noted that, given the instability in the region, it was currently impossible to propose clear benchmarks for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission had developed recommendations to further improve the state of conservation of the property and they were included in the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Benin** remarked that the report mentioned the involvement of soldiers of the regular armed forces in poaching activities, whilst this fact was not reflected in the decision. It requested clarification from the World Heritage Centre.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that similar situations existed in other properties of the State Party. MONUC and the armed forces try to dislodge the armed groups, resulting in a withdrawal of these forces to the World Heritage properties. Moreover, it should be noted that excellent collaboration between the armed forces and ICCN existed.

The Delegation of **Benin** then remarked that in this case there was no need to mention « destructive activities ».

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested clarification of paragraph 4(d) concerning an information campaign communicating support from the government at the highest political level in order to avoid political misuse of the property during the election campaign. The delegation would like to know if such political misuse took place all the time in the country.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that elections were to be held in July and August 2006. On the one hand, there was clear commitment for the protection of the site, but on the other hand, a letter from the land registry disputed the boundaries of the Park. Clearly that was an issue of concern.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that by the time the report was distributed, the election would have taken place. As that sort of thing happened everywhere, maybe a general statement could be added calling on the highest authority.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the English wording was not clear. The Decision should be worded to the effect that all political parties should support conservation and not misuse.

The Delegation of **Morocco** drew the attention of the Committee to the formulation in paragraph d) of the draft Decision: « ...in order to avoid any political misuse of the Park during the election campaign ». In questioning what would be « a good political use », it proposed the deletion of this paragraph.

The **Chairperson** suggested deleting the paragraph entirely.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** proposed not to delete the paragraph entirely but to place a full stop after the word “Park”.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the discussions had revealed a sad situation and suggested that encouragement should be given to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.6** adopted as amended.

Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 63)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that from 3 to 23 March a UNESCO monitoring mission had visited the property together with Kahuzi-Biega National Park. The mission had noted that the park was still used as a base for various armed groups and, as a result, there were also several military positions located within the property. Currently there were 12,000 soldiers deployed inside and in the immediate vicinity of the property. The presence of those armed elements was resulting in poaching and other forms of exploitation of the natural resources of the park, in particular charcoal production. A recent study by WWF estimated that one million bags of charcoal were produced every year in the park. The World Heritage Centre pointed out that the Nyaleke military training camp, which was situated inside the park, remained a serious problem. In 2005, the Ministry of Defence had decided to use that facility as a training camp for militias to be re-integrated within the unified army. 4,200 soldiers were being trained in that facility. In April 2006 the Minister of Defence had agreed to relocate the camp but so far that had not been done. In a meeting on 22 May, the Permanent Delegate of the Netherlands had informed the World Heritage Centre that the Minister of Defence had assured the Netherlands Ambassador in Kinshasa that the camp would be closed down on 5 July, the scheduled date to end the training process. The World Heritage Centre was currently trying to confirm that that happened.

The World Heritage Centre noted that the other major threat to the property was encroachment by local populations, but that there had been substantial progress in addressing that issue. Of the 160,000 people that were estimated to have settled in the park during the period of conflict, 70,000 had already been evacuated. Those evacuations were not done by force but through a participatory negotiation process involving all stakeholders and relevant authorities.

The World Heritage Centre also informed the Committee that on 4 July it had received a preliminary report of a new aerial survey that had been undertaken in June in the central

sector of the park. The results were encouraging and showed stabilization and even a small increase of certain key species. Those results followed the recent re-discovery of okapi and bongo on the site during a WWF-led expedition in the Semlike area. Those data showed that all key species were still present in the property.

The mission had also developed with the park authorities and the conservation NGO working at the property an emergency action plan, which would receive funding through the second phase of the Centre's programme for the World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with support from the Government of Belgium. The mission noted that, given the instability in the region, it was currently impossible to propose clear benchmarks for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission had developed recommendations to further improve the state of conservation of the property, and they were included in the draft Decision

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it was rather embarrassing that the Nyaleke camp was situated inside the park, although at its border. Obviously the goal of the *Convention* was to protect the property, but a balance had to be struck because the aim was also to help the peace process. The Delegation further underlined the importance the Netherlands attached to the army reunification process. It expressed satisfaction with the commitment made by the Government to close the camp as soon as the reunification was completed and hoped that that commitment would be upheld after the elections.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that subparagraph 4(d) be deleted for consistency.

The Delegation of **Kenya** added that, for the sake of consistency, a request for benchmarks should also be added.

The Delegation of **Morocco** requested clarification regarding the activities of the « Committee to Save Virunga » (CSV). It also noted that the decisions concerning the DRC properties were all very similar and asked whether the situation was really identical in these properties.

With regard to the CSV, the **World Heritage Centre** explained that the monitoring of illegal activities by military personnel was carried out by the CSV. Concerning the similarity between the decisions for the DRC properties, it indicated that a single mission had visited these sites and that the decisions were formulated in accordance with its recommendations.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that, in paragraph 4(b), placing a comma after “illegal activity” would remove the ambiguity. It also requested a clearer formulation of the phrase “gorilla tourism”.

The **World Heritage Centre** agreed that the wording could be clarified but emphasized the importance of mentioning such tourism, which was on the increase again.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed that the tourism was important for the local communities and that it must be retained in the text.

The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed that it was important but said that it should be formulated differently, perhaps more generally, to say “develop strategy to share profits to help cooperation with local communities”. The Delegation wondered what was meant by the phrase “rejuvenate Park staff” in subparagraph (h).

The Delegation of **Mauritius** said that it should be verified that the gorillas were not an endangered species and that perhaps the text should be deleted.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that the gorillas were an endangered species, but that the tourism did not harm them.

The Delegation of **Israel** drew attention to the use of the words “conservation of the property” in paragraph 5 but “rehabilitation of the property” in paragraph 7.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that “conservation of the property” could be used in both paragraphs.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to clarify the wording of the text.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.7** adopted as amended.

Okapi Wildlife Reserve (Democratic Republic of the Congo) (N 718)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that from 12 to 23 May a UNESCO monitoring mission had visited the property. The findings and recommendations of that mission were not included in the working document.

The mission had identified three types of immediate threats to the values of the property: poaching of large mammals, especially elephants, illegal mining inside the property and uncontrolled migration into the reserve, in particular along the RN4 road which crossed the property.

As mentioned in previous reports, large-scale poaching was one of the major challenges for the conservation of the property. The mission had noted that, thanks to the emergency funding provided by UNESCO from the World Heritage Fund in 2005, park authorities had been able to identify networks of poachers and ivory and bush meat traffickers active in and around the reserve. The results of those investigations showed a clear implication of certain members of the armed forces and the police.

Through joint operations of the park authorities with the army it had been possible for park staff to regain control over 80% of the reserve. It would be necessary to maintain

those efforts in the future. It would also be important to organize a new survey of flagship species to determine exactly what their status was.

Illegal mining was another serious problem. Most mining sites in the property were under the control of traditional chiefs, and certain military were also involved, making evacuation of the mining sites extremely problematic, as the traditional chiefs were inciting the local populations against the park authorities. In 2005, 16 major mining sites had been identified in the property, 11 of which had been closed down since. The protected area would clearly need strong political support from the national and provincial authorities to be able to close all mining in the property.

The Ituri region had also been experiencing immigration from the densely populated highlands of Kivu. That was a special challenge for the reserve because at the time of its creation, villages which existed along the road crossing the reserve had been allowed to stay. Uncontrolled immigration into those villages would increase the demand for land for agriculture and other natural resources. The management authority had responded to the challenge by trying to negotiate the establishment of agricultural zones around the villages, to limit the clearing of forest for agriculture. A pilot scheme to control immigration had also been set up, using a permit system to allow transit, temporary visits or permanent residency in the reserve. With the planned road rehabilitation it was expected that road traffic would increase significantly, as would immigration.

The mission had further identified two issues that were likely to have an impact on the property in the near future, in particular the rehabilitation of the RN4 road crossing the reserve, with funding from the World Bank, and illegal logging and deforestation in the forest to the east of the property, but advancing towards the property.

The mission also had developed with the park authorities and the conservation NGO working at the property an emergency action plan, which would receive funding through the second phase of the Centre's programme for the Democratic Republic of the Congo's World Heritage properties, with support from the Government of Belgium. The mission had noted that, given the instability in the region, it was currently impossible to propose clear benchmarks for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission had developed recommendations to further improve the state of conservation of the property, and they were included in the revised draft Decision *30 COM 7A.8 Rev*, which had been distributed in the room.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested clarifications about the elephants in the reserve, and whether someone actually owned them. It pointed out that some people advocated privatizing elephants as that could be effective in protecting them.

IUCN explained that in the countries of southern Africa in particular, there were more private reserves where elephants were bred and then transported elsewhere, although that was not the case in Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked if it was necessary to identify, in paragraph 4, who was doing the poaching, finding the word “reportedly” inappropriate in that kind of document unless those involved were very well known, e.g. persons convicted in court.

The Delegation of **India** stated that such poaching was a problem around the world, and cited a tiger reserve in India where all the tigers were lost to poaching. The Delegation felt it was appropriate to identify those responsible for the poaching, as applying pressure could help solve the problem.

The **World Heritage Centre** replied that the individual members of the police and armed forces involved in poaching had been identified through an investigation which had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Canada** agreed to withdraw the proposal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested saying, instead of “reportedly”, “could involve” or something similar.

The Delegation of **Kuwait**, referring to subparagraph 6(d), asked if the trust fund was applicable just to that property, or to all properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The **World Heritage Centre** specified that that commitment had been made by the Democratic Republic of the Congo during the 2004 conference on Heritage in Danger in that country, hosted by UNESCO. It confirmed that it was applicable to all sites in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Delegation of **India** said that it should perhaps be mentioned in all cases.

The **Chairperson** concurred with that suggestion.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** proposed changing paragraph 6(b), adding “necessary measures to close down and to prevent mining operations”.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.8** adopted as amended.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N9)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that from 10 to 17 May a joint UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission had visited the property. The findings and recommendations of the mission were not included in the working document.

The mission had been impressed by the level of commitment by the State Party, and in particular the Amhara Regional Government, to address the threats to the property. Significant progress had been made in improving the management of the property since

the last UNESCO/IUCN mission in 2001. The mission had carefully studied progress towards the benchmarks that had been set by the Committee at its 25th session. Significant progress had been made in addressing benchmark 1, the requested re-alignment of the park's boundary to exclude villages along it; benchmark 2, extension of the park to include Mesareya and Lemalimo wildlife reserves, and benchmark 4, the effective conservation of a larger population of *Walia ibex* and Ethiopian wolf within the park.

The mission had noted that the realignment of the park boundary and extension in the field had been achieved through a participatory process involving a long consultation process with all stakeholders. That thorough process could be considered a best practice example for the *Convention*. However, it was important to legalize the new boundaries through a re-gazetting of the park, in order to achieve the first and second benchmarks fully.

With the current extension, a larger population of *Walia ibex* was already included within the newly proposed boundaries of the park. However, 75 % of the Ethiopian wolf population in the Simien Mountains remained outside the park. To include them and fully achieve the fourth benchmark, a further extension towards the Silki Yared – Kiddis Yared Mountains and the Ras Dejen mountains was necessary. Park authorities had confirmed that that extension was already planned and could be achieved in one year if the necessary funding was available.

The mission had concluded that the third benchmark, asking for a significant and sustainable reduction of people living inside the core area had not been achieved and did not seem achievable in the medium term. The mission had therefore proposed to focus on reducing the impacts of local communities on the property, rather than their relocation outside the park. Main impacts were related to the use of natural resources, in particular livestock grazing and agriculture. Grazing was the most serious issue. A 1996 survey had estimated that 85% of the park (before the extension) was overgrazed or heavily overgrazed, leaving only 15 % in natural condition. Livestock was in direct competition with the *Walia ibex* for grazing and was also affecting small rodent populations, the major food source for the Ethiopian wolf.

The mission believed that, as part of the planned revision of the draft management plan, it would be crucial to establish a clear strategy on how to address that threat and reduce its impact, by establishing zones based on ecological criteria where no grazing was allowed and zones where grazing was regulated and progressively phased out.

To further limit the impact of the local communities, it was also proposed to prepare a strategy to develop alternative livelihoods for the communities living inside and in the immediate vicinity of the property. The current work on identifying alternative livelihood options, funded partly through International Assistance from the World Heritage Fund would provide input for that purpose.

The mission had further looked at a number of other critical issues such as the road going through the property, a newly planned road in the vicinity of the proposed extension, the newly constructed lodge and the risk of disease transmission from livestock, as well as the preparation of the management plan and tourism planning in the region, and had provided specific recommendations on those issues, which would be included in the mission report.

The mission recommended retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and proposed four revised benchmarks based on the mentioned findings. The proposed new benchmarks were included in the revised draft Decision. They had been discussed by the mission team with the protected area authority and were considered achievable in one or two years. However, it would be important for the State Party to be able to secure outside funding to implement the strategies and the management plan. The revised draft Decision therefore called on donor agencies to support that work.

IUCN commended the positive progress made by the State Party. It noted that changes to the boundary would result in improved conservation efforts, particularly for the flagship species of the property. There was a particular need to ensure that boundary adjustments better allow for the protection of the Ethiopian wolf, as the majority of the population lived outside the property at present. As those boundary changes were significant, a re-nomination of the property would be required.

The Delegation of **Israel** inquired how changing the boundaries would affect the outstanding universal value of the property, and if the property could be removed from the Danger List.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that outstanding universal value was based on the landscape and on the presence of two species: the Ethiopian wolf and the *Walia ibex*. The boundaries were being changed to conserve a larger population of those key species within the property and thus preserve the outstanding universal value of the property. It reiterated that the values were still threatened and that the property should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated its belief in meeting benchmarks. While appreciating that the site had been on the List of World Heritage in Danger for ten years and that there continued to be serious problems at the property, there were also significant improvements, including the boundary changes and the presence of the *Walia ibex*, and it asked if it the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation supported removal as an encouragement to the State Party to make the smaller changes that remained to be made. The Delegation asked if the State Party could explain its plans for the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** said that it was only a financial problem that prevented the State Party from taking action quickly, and confirmed that Ethiopia would be greatly encouraged if the property were removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **World Heritage Centre** replied that it considered that a great deal of progress had been made, but that the benchmarks had not yet been met. There had been progress on benchmarks 1 and 2, in that negotiating limits with local communities had been achieved, but they were not yet legalized. Benchmark 4 had not yet been fully met, in particular with regard to the Ethiopian wolf. Benchmark 3 had not been met at all and a reformulation was proposed. If financial means were available, the revised benchmarks could be achieved in one or two years but it was recommended that the property should remain on the Danger List for now.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed support for the Delegation of Kenya's views, stating that the goal of the *World Heritage Convention* was protection, not beautification, and that the World Heritage Committee should be more forthcoming in the case under review.

The Delegation of **India** stated that the revised benchmarks were clearly new, and recommended taking the site off of the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to give a positive signal to a continent with so many sites on the Danger List. The Delegation pointed out that the World Heritage Committee could take the property off the Danger List at the current session and put it back on the Danger List again later on if necessary.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that it was not in favour of taking the property off of the List of World Heritage in Danger, as the World Heritage Committee had seen in the past that removing a property from the Danger List too soon gave a bad signal rather than a good one. The Delegation supported the draft Decision, commenting that after all benchmarks were met, the site could be taken off the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it was pleased with the progress made by the State Party, but still considered the situation too fragile. Concerns about road construction remained, some issues in that connection were not clear, but there was a real danger concerning the values of the site. It expressed support for the suggestion of the Delegation of Lithuania.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the recent mission to the site had looked into the road issue. The road through the property had little traffic and was manageable, but a new road was currently planned to go through the proposed extension. The authorities had ensured the mission that that project would be reconsidered. The mission had prepared specific recommendations on those issues, and they would be included in the mission report. The extension was the most important issue for the survival of the species on the site.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** took note of the progress achieved and the considerable efforts of the State Party, in spite of the modest means available. Faced with the depressingly long list of properties in danger and in agreement with the Delegations of India, Kenya and Israel, it proposed to remove this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to consider its re-inscription in a year's time should the conditions not be met.

The Delegation of **Benin** said it was disconcerted: on the one hand the State Party was undertaking considerable efforts despite major financial difficulties. The Committee stuck to its principles and mechanisms, but could it guarantee to the State Party the means by which to accomplish its task? On the other hand, the Committee could favour the mechanism whereby a property was removed from the Danger List « on the condition that..... ». A similar case had already occurred in 2005. This could inspire the State Party to increase its efforts and for the final removal of the property from the Danger List.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the discussion would resume at a subsequent meeting.

The meeting rose at 06:30 p.m.

SECOND DAY – MONDAY 10 JULY 2006

THIRD MEETING

09.00 a.m. - 01.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

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

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/7A
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add.Rev

Decisions : 30 COM 7A.1 to 7A.34

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had looked into facilitating and expediting the work of the Committee and had specifically suggested that draft Decisions should not be reviewed paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that a number of critical issues had been discussed on processes and criteria in a cooperative atmosphere. It was disappointed that the BBC had presented a report that morning on climate change which had not correctly reflected the debates, in particular as the Committee had not yet taken a decision. It requested that all media reports be as accurate as possible.

The **Chairperson** appealed to all delegations and observers to ensure that the press was not misinformed, as that would undermine the credibility of the Committee.

AFRICA (continued)

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9)

The **World Heritage Centre** provided further information on Simien National Park and the mission carried out in May 2006 which had reviewed the benchmarks. While significant progress was reported in addressing two of the four benchmarks for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the question of the inclusion of a significant population of Ethiopian wolves within the national park, as requested in benchmark 4, remained unresolved. The proposed revised benchmarks 1 and 2 basically included what remained to be done to achieve former benchmarks 1, 2 and 4.

Furthermore, former benchmark 3 had not been achieved and did not seem achievable in the near future. To accommodate the State Party, the mission had suggested replacing that benchmark by the revised benchmarks 3 and 4, which were thought to be achievable in one to two years. The mission had clearly concluded that the outstanding universal value of the property remained threatened.

IUCN observed that the benchmarks had been discussed, that progress on a number of them had been achieved and that the general trend was positive. However, the conditions for removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger were not fully met.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the professional inputs and recommendations by the Advisory Body and the World Heritage Centre and referred to the *Operational Guidelines*, which differentiated between major and less important operations, as well as ascertained and potential dangers. What was important was to understand the specific situation; it was willing to take the property off the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed an amendment to paragraph 9 of the draft Decision, adding “once removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger” after “requests”. It commended the State Party on the positive efforts made but noted that World Heritage processes would be at stake if the site were to be taken off the Danger List at the current stage. The Committee needed to adhere to the achievement of set benchmarks for removals and to international standards.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that its comments of the previous day were strengthened by the presentations from the Secretariat, specifically on items (a) and (b), and that removal from the Danger List could only be considered if the benchmarks were reached.

The Delegation of **India** inquired how to handle the Delegation of the United States’ amendment concerning an extension. It requested information from the State Party on two points: would it agree to keeping the site on the Danger List until the conditions for removal stated by the Netherlands were met and would the State Party attract further funding if the site remained on the Danger List?

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** informed the Committee that it had obtained funding from both the World Heritage Fund and other sources and that its Government would be happy with a removal from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated that the Committee faced a difficult situation and that laws and regulations were made for guidance; instead of a static position a more flexible approach was needed to achieve progress.

The **Chairperson** proposed an informal working group to develop a consensus on the matter

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** disagreed with the establishment of an informal working group as those matters called for discussion in the Committee, noting that similar issues might come up in respect of other sites.

After having thanked all the speakers and the Secretariat for the information provided, the Delegation of **Benin** indicated that the present situation was very awkward, as 90% of the benchmarks had been achieved. Benchmark No. 3 concerned a law that had been voted but which had not yet entered into force. It recalled that the State Party concerned had made important efforts and counted on the confidence of the Committee. At this stage, it proposed that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger on the condition that the State Party respected the commitments that it had undertaken to date. To the contrary, the Delegation indicated that it would simply mean the re-inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session, making the State Party responsible for its actions, as stipulated in Article 4 of the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that the Bureau had decided on an informal consultation outside the Committee room in order to move ahead.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** acknowledged that decision but stated that the case under discussion had implications for other cases.

The **Chairperson** requested the informal group to discuss those matters.

Aïr and Ténéré Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a report had been received from the State Party on 23 March 2006 which unfortunately provided little new information and did not refer to the benchmarks set by the Committee at its 29th session. According to the information at its disposal there had been few changes since the 2005 mission. It pointed out that a USD 9 million UNDP/GEF project had been approved the previous year, which was expected to improve the management of the property and the wider Biosphere Reserve.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.10** adopted.

The **Chairperson** noted that the properties in Tunisia would also be discussed in the informal group.

Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that the report on the property and the relevant draft Decision were included in document *WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add*. It added that the State Party report of March 2006 had mentioned significant progress regarding the recommendations of the 2005 UNESCO/IUCN monitoring mission. A multi-stakeholder

workshop had been organized in April 2006, to prepare a two-year action plan in order to achieve the benchmarks for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, set by the Committee at its 29th session. UNESCO and IUCN had both participated in the workshop.

IUCN informed the Committee that the multi-stakeholder workshop held in the park had addressed the recommendations of the 2005 mission. Key issues raised in the workshop included the excellent work by the State Party in addressing the benchmarks identified by the Committee. In particular, good progress had been made in addressing the control of invasive plants, in particular *Salvinia molesta*. The management of the park was improving and cattle grazing had been effectively controlled and removed from most of the park. A clear Action Plan had been developed by the Workshop proposing a two-year schedule for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The key issue that needed to be addressed was the need to ensure adequate funds to ensure that the Plan could be effectively implemented. It concluded that the property could soon be deleted from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted the excellent results achieved, with 90% of the benchmarks reached, and that removal would be possible soon. It asked for the opinion of the State Party concerning the removal.

The Observer Delegation of **Senegal** stated that it was a privilege to be invited to complement the Secretariat report. It informed the Committee that the invasive species problem was now almost entirely under control. Furthermore, it confirmed that the ornithological value was intact and that in ornithological terms, the Park had never been in a better state. However, it voiced its concern vis-à-vis the potential epidemic of avian influenza that necessitated a global combat. It added that the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger would be a strong encouragement to Senegal in its combat and in achieving its remaining targets.

The Delegation of **Morocco** noted that the exceptional efforts of the State Party were encouraging in view of the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It recalled that almost all the benchmarks had been achieved and urged the State Party to continue to make headway.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its sympathy with the comments made but requested a consistent approach.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the case differed from others in terms of process, as major benchmarks had been met, specifically with regard to invasive species. Only the Action Plan remained to be fully implemented. It asked IUCN if the outstanding universal value of the property was still under threat.

IUCN agreed that major threats had been addressed, that the State Party was aware of future threats such as avian influenza and that the two-year deadline was an outcome of

the workshop. The outstanding universal value of the property was no longer acutely threatened.

The Delegation of **Benin** stated its dilemma as to the decision to take. It indicated that if the State Party requested assistance, then there would be a case to consider the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It added that a distinction should be made between the case of Simien National Park (Ethiopia) and that of Djoudj (Senegal).

The **Chairperson** noted that there was agreement in the Committee for removal.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with Canada, specifically that major threats were addressed, and endorsed IUCN's comments that the State Party was aware of future threats and that the two-year deadline derived from the workshop. Its feeling was that it could be taken off the Danger List.

In response to a request by the **Chairperson** as to whether there were any objections, the Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **Israel** agreed to removal from the List, noting differences with other case.

The **Chairperson** suggested amending paragraph 9 of the draft Decision **30 COM 7A.11** to the effect that the property would be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.11** adopted as amended.

ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338)

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that a report had been received from the State Party on 31 March 2006 showing progress towards reaching three of the benchmarks set by the Committee at its 29th session. So far, no results of a comprehensive wildlife survey, requested in benchmark 4, had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Japan** underlined that the authorities had provided a good response in implementing the conditions for removal, which should be considered. However, those conditions should be clearly stated.

IUCN noted that positive steps had been undertaken and peace reigned in the region, but that it was too early for the property to be removed from the Danger List.

After having listened to the preceding speakers, the Delegation of **Tunisia** proposed the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Kenya** underscored that time was a factor and that, if the conditions indicated on page 46 were met by the authorities, the Delegation would concur with the Delegation of Japan. Furthermore it noted that appropriate changes might be made to the *Operational Guidelines* in due course.

The Delegation of **Morocco** stated that consideration should be given to the greatly improved conditions, notably as regards security which benefitted ecotourism. It considered IUCN's presentation very encouraging with regard to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that a biodiversity survey was still needed and that, once completed, a full analysis would make it possible to evaluate the status of the outstanding universal value of the property. The case could not be compared to the previous one.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it was necessary to await the outcome of the survey and that there would be no other way to obtain the necessary information to allow for a decision on a possible removal.

The Delegation of **Spain** indicated that the ongoing debate would have an impact on subsequent discussions, and that the issue therefore required further consideration. The Advisory Bodies should state which benchmarks must be met, in order to facilitate the Committee's choice and avoid double standards. Finally, it supported the comments by the Delegation of Norway, urging clarification of the benchmarks.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the site had been before the Committee for years and acknowledged the great efforts made by the Government of India. It concurred with the Delegation of Norway's suggestion to wait for the survey.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.13** adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Everglades National Park (United States of America) (N 76)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a report had been submitted by the State Party on February 3, 2006, indicating progress made in the restoration and conservation of the Everglades National Park. The State Party had also proposed a set of detailed benchmarks to guide a decision by the Committee on a possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Those benchmarks had been discussed with IUCN during a mission to the property from 25 to 27 April.

IUCN recognized the enormous challenges faced by the State Party in improving the state of conservation of the Everglades, including urban encroachment on the eastern boundary of the park and major water pollution challenges arising from agriculture in the

upper catchment areas of the Everglades. It noted the serious and effective steps taken by the State Party in tackling those problems. They included the implementation of the largest ecosystem restoration programme on earth. The mission noted that excellent progress was being made but that the Everglades was likely to remain endangered in the immediate future. It had worked closely with the State Party to develop a series of benchmarks which were set out in the working document. They were ecologically based and would allow the Committee to assess improvements in the ecological status and trends towards recovery of the Everglades.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether it would take 30 to 40 years to implement those benchmarks and whether they were considered major or minor.

IUCN noted that the programme involved a long-term restoration effort including the recovery of endangered species and an action programme on land acquisition. The consultative process of defining the benchmarks had been excellent and made it possible to assess improvements and priorities for both ecological and process benchmarks.

The Delegation of **Morocco** requested information concerning the timetable. It recalled that the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1993, and wished to be informed on the the present situation.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that the restoration project was a milestone and that there was full commitment to the project, including financial provision of billions of dollars. The benchmark development process could be considered best practice.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** noted that, compared to other sites, progress on the property under consideration was encouraging, and commended the involvement of NGOs.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft Decision **30 COM 7A.14**.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested amending paragraph 3 of the draft Decision with the addition of “huge investments”.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** thanked the Delegation of the United States of America for its intervention. It supported maintaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger for the time being.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested that the Delegation of the United States of America be included in the informal working group on benchmarks.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.14** adopted.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN (continued)

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

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that actions taken by the State Party included the limitation of the number of visitors; prosecution measures to stop the robbery of materials, the restoration of the major public building and structural works to avoid collapse of the most damaged buildings were still pending implementation. However, no alternative road had been traced for Road A-16 and weak implementation of the Management Plan should be noted.

ICOMOS said that it was a major restoration exercise and that danger-listing was welcome. However, little action had been taken.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether there were any comments from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Chile** indicated that the northern area of the property had suffered an earthquake of 8-plus on the Richter scale, with considerable damage done to the surrounding towns, but without physical effect on the saltpeter works. As a result, the Chilean Government had allocated resources to the area and had therefore had to decrease the resources allocated to the property. As to military exercises, they occurred only in the buffer zone and the Army had agreed to stop its activities in the short term. A buffer zone was to be delineated with boundaries acceptable to everybody. Finally, the Delegation said that it would submit a proposal to the World Heritage Centre to fund all its activities. It agreed that the property should be maintained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that its concerns had been met by the reply by the Delegation of Chile.

The Delegation of **Benin** informed that its concerns had also been met by the reply of the Delegation of Chile. However, it added that the draft Decision should reflect the fact that the State Party had not secured funding to implement its activities.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Benin to specify its amendment.

The Delegation of **Benin** specified that it was important to fund an emergency plan and other activities.

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a Plan had been developed for the maintenance of mining sites all over the country.

The Delegation of **Chile** confirmed that comment, adding that Chile was also in the process of elaborating a proposal with the national enterprise Codelco which would soon

be re-submitted. It further added that it would request international assistance for the emergency plan.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.31** adopted.

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the Commission for the relocation of farmers was still working on the regulation of the Law No. 28261 and that USD 30,000 for emergency works on the enlargement of drainage No. 13 had been allocated. The ground water level was under control, but implementation of the Management Plan was slow.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the addition of the words “and for their sustainable development” to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that the site had been discussed many times since 1986. It was unclear as to what exactly needed to be done, whether the benchmarks were related to the threats and why the site had originally been included in the List of World Heritage in Danger, as well as what needed to be done to take it off the list.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it was one of the most important sites of its kind and that it was threatened by a number of factors including climate change resulting in disintegration of the walls of the buildings. It added that it is one of the most fragile sites and taking it off the danger list might send the wrong message.

ICOMOS noted that, since inscription, a number of problems had been addressed but others remained, including the removal of illegal inhabitants and stabilization as well as conservation works at the buildings.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it was a complex situation and that assurances by the Advisory Bodies were needed that the problems were being properly addressed or whether another 20 years were needed; it wondered whether adequate advice had been given.

The Delegation of **India** noted that there were differences in the wording of decisions on natural and cultural properties and that IUCN should clearly state whether the outstanding universal value of the property was retained and the benchmarks defined.

ICOMOS confirmed that the outstanding universal value was not at stake; however, no detailed timeframe had been set to stabilize the buildings and no missions went on a regular basis.

The Delegation of **Morocco** thanked ICOMOS for the important information that it had provided regarding the timeframe. It added that even if three benchmarks had already

been attained and that the fourth benchmark was being dealt with, it was important to establish an exact timeframe. It thought it incredible that the property had been on the List of World Heritage in Danger since its inscription without knowing how much time it would take before its removal.

The Delegation of **Chile** requested the floor be given to the concerned State Party, Peru.

The Delegation of **Peru** assured the Committee that the outstanding universal value of the property had not been modified since its inscription in 1986 because of the earthen structures, the dry climate of the area and the absence of extreme environmental conditions. It added that the State Party had made good progress towards the conservation of the property and the laws which had been passed had helped towards its conservation. It informed the Committee that it had also launched a project to transfer the illegal farmers into the buffer zone and demolish a number of inappropriate buildings. It could report a success story in the previous year, when it had succeeded in bringing the ground water level under control and would now focus on the property itself.

The Delegation of **Japan** wondered whether the problems of structural reinforcement could be tackled, observing that in Asia extensive experience had been gained on that global problem.

The **World Heritage Centre** proposed a joint UNESCO-ICCROM-ICOMOS mission to the property to review the situation and to organize an international working group on the conservation of earthen structures.

The **Chairperson** welcomed that helpful proposal.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted mistakes in the working document, pointing out that the correct term for earthen structures was adobe. It further underlined that the site had been on the Danger List for 20 years, and it expressed its surprise that no mission had been sent.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed an amendment to paragraph 5, adding the words “and those that continue”.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested an additional amendment to paragraph 5 and submitted text to the Rapporteur.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed surprise that no mission had been sent to the site and asked to be informed if that was the case for other danger-listed sites.

ICCROM specified that many missions had been carried out to Chan Chan and that ICCROM had been working on the site management plan. Detailed information had been collected over the years, but it should be noted that it was a large, fragile and complex site and that additional training should be carried out.

The **World Heritage Centre** observed that the missions in question were not official monitoring missions and that there had been no formal ICCROM reports received.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.32** adopted as amended.

Coro and its Port (Venezuela) (C 658)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of serious deterioration of materials and structures, deterioration of architectural and urban coherence, issues relating to the integrity of the property and lack of adequate management, planning and conservation mechanisms. The problems were compounded by constant rainfall.

ICOMOS stated that a timeframe for meeting benchmarks and putting in place structures was needed and that the management plan would need some time as consultations with stakeholders would be carried out.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated that paragraph 5 of the draft Decision was weak and that another point should be added. The work on the benchmarks should be clearly specified.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed that paragraph 6 should replace paragraph 2.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.33** adopted as amended.

AFRICA (continued)

Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report before the Committee detailing the actions undertaken so far by the State Party to address the action plan drawn up by the Committee at its 28th session, in particular in regard to the following: (1) establishing a legal framework for cultural heritage protection; (2) creating a buffer zone; (3) evaluating a management plan; (4) carrying out works to eliminate threats to the earthen structures.

It informed the Committee that, with regard to the buffer zone, once finalized it would be presented to the Committee for approval in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*. The State Party had completed the management plan and would soon transmit it to the Centre following its appropriate approval at the national level. The report further highlighted the results of a World Heritage Centre technical mission of experts undertaken in February 2006 to assist the State Party in that regard, including support for the property under International Assistance made available by the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. Finally, the report proposed that the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS undertake a mission to evaluate progress in the implementation of the

action plan and make a recommendation to the Committee to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to report thereon to the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

ICOMOS explained that extensive progress had been made on a wide variety of building works, and there had also been successes concerning legislation for protection of the site. The Advisory Body was optimistic that the benchmarks defined for the site could be reached in a reasonable time, indicating that the property could soon be taken off the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** pointed out that the property had been inscribed on the Danger List for a long time. The Delegation was aware that work with CRATerre was under way, but did not know if a mission had been completed, and wished to be informed when the relevant work would be done so that the site did not stay on the Danger List indefinitely.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the draft Decision included a request for a time frame.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** expressed its concern that the property had been on the Danger List for 20 years, and, although some benchmarks had been addressed, two-thirds of them remained unmet. The Delegation requested a response from the State Party stating when the benchmarks would be addressed.

The Delegation of **Benin** informed that the national legal framework governed the cultural heritage and that the work foreseen in the framework of corrective measures would be completed by 6 January 2007.

The Delegation of **Morocco** underlined the importance of the timeframe for the corrective measures and stated that since it was a 2006-2007 timeframe, why was it requested that at least half the activities be completed before 2007?

ICOMOS replied that at least half of those issues had been addressed under benchmark (c), further stating that it was a large site with a great number of buildings. When the benchmarks had been set they had been reasonable, and achieving stability in half of the structures was a significant goal. If half was preserved and legislation and management systems were addressed, it could be considered that great progress had been made.

The Delegation of **Benin** confirmed the information provided by the World Heritage Centre, and hoped that the law would be voted by the next Parliament. Adding that the designation of the buffer zone was underway, and that important and urgent work was being undertaken, it wished that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger next year.

The **Chairperson** declared draft Decision **30 COM 7A.16** adopted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that, regarding the decision just adopted, the Delegation of Canada had proposed to submit new language for the text, but the new wording had not been shown to the Committee; that should be borne in mind for future reference.

At the invitation of the **Chairperson**, the **Rapporteur** read out the revised text.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Delegation of the United States of America that it was not appropriate to adopt a revised decision without the Committee having seen the language.

Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and Ruins of Songo Mnara (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 144)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that it had no new information concerning the property. It drew attention to the support provided by the Government of Norway amounting to USD 201,390 for “Emergency Conservation of Kilwa Kisiwani and Songo Mnara” in September 2005. The support would enable the State Party to make progress in addressing the benchmarks for concrete measures for the site, namely: (a) updating the statement of outstanding universal value and (b) effectively implementing the management plan.

The World Heritage Centre also drew attention to the substantial documentation received by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS that highlighted the State Party’s strategic framework for properties improvement. However, those reports, particularly the management plan, fell short in providing information on how the plan was to be implemented.

ICOMOS stated that there was a need to increase the scope of the management plan in terms of what was inscribed on the World Heritage List; for example, the town was also included in the List. The property had been inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger for the deterioration of the ruins, and clear guidelines needed to be given, as well as a timeline for implementation.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that a great deal of financial support had been provided by the Governments of France, Japan and the United Republic of Tanzania. It sought the point of view of the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** expressed its gratitude for the support provided by the many donors. The State Party had submitted a report in good faith and agreed in principle with the draft Decision, but questioned the necessity of the term “with great concern” in paragraph 4. The State Party had no intention of requesting that the property be taken off of the Danger List.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether the State Party could clarify the point made by ICOMOS about boundaries: earlier in the discussion, the Delegation of the United States of America had said that if a site was on the Danger List, the boundaries should not be extended. It also asked if it was possible to have a clarification concerning the management plan because it was not in accord with the guidelines.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** responded to the Delegation of India that even before the site had been inscribed on the Danger List, there had been a proposal to extend it, and that the State Party had no doubt foreseen how that would be managed.

The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested deleting the phrase “with great concern” from paragraph 4 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.15** adopted as amended.

Following a suggestion by the **Chairperson** to leave the discussion regarding Tipasa (Algeria) pending, the Delegations of **India** and **Spain** expressed the view that the Committee should proceed to examine the sites in the scheduled order.

ARAB STATES

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the site and mentioned the new elements which it had received, including the letter of 20 June 2006 from the Minister of Culture confirming all the commitments undertaken orally during the reactive monitoring mission, and presenting a timetable for the implementation of these commitments:

- preparation of the protection and presentation plan which will confirm the final boundaries of the property and those of the buffer zone;
- rehousing of the families installed in the site by 30 September 2006;
- development of the fishing port;
- carrying out the cadastral survey and report of the maps showing the exact position of the fencing delimiting the inscribed sectors (the maps received gave no indication of a buffer zone) ;
- establishment of a management plan for the site by the new Office for the Management and Exploitation of Cultural Properties (Sep. 2006-Feb.2007).

Another letter from the Delegation of Algeria was transmitted that day to the World Heritage Centre reiterating these commitments, and specifying – with regard to the absence of a buffer zone – that Algerian legislation foresaw a protected area of 200 metres around inscribed properties. A map was attached, indicating three protected areas, which were areas that were already urbanised or agricultural. Furthermore, the Centre

added that the boundaries of this buffer zone and the regulation of authorized uses should be clearly specified.

ICOMOS stated that, regarding the boundaries, the benchmark was for the delimitation of the boundaries, including a large-scale clarification of boundaries. The Advisory Body was confident that the benchmarks could be reached within a reasonable period of time.

The Delegation of **Morocco** noted that after examination of the dossier and in the light of the documents presented by the World Heritage Centre, all the recommendations put forward had been satisfied. The March 2006 mission clearly concluded so and recommended the removal of the site from the Danger List. The Delegation moreover added that the State Party had undertaken very firm commitments and consequently the Delegation thought that there was no reason to retain the property on the Danger List. The Delegation wished to hear what the experts who participated in the mission had to say, as well as the State Party.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** expressed the view that the main thrust of the decision regarding Tipasa was whether the State Party made a strong commitment to the points under paragraph 4. The decision demonstrated the financial commitment made by Algeria, evidence of its overall commitment, and there were also letters from the Government stating it wished the property to be removed from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated that it was important for the State Party to demonstrate its commitment; but it was usually agreed that it was not enough for the State Party to be willing. There must also be results. The Committee should be as consistent as possible and not expect results in certain cases but not others. The Delegation requested information from the State Party about the demands being met. The Everglades in the United States of America was an example: the State Party was a Committee member and, while it had committed a great deal of money to the protection of the property, the property remained on the Danger List.

ICOMOS stated that the benchmarks were clearly defined in the text, and that the boundaries, buffer zone and management plan must be considered. There had also been a proposal for a three-tier buffer zone which looked satisfactory, but the process for buffer zones had to be respected.

The Delegation of **India** disagreed and said it would take the matter up in the Bureau. It pointed out that the letter received that day from the Algerian authorities gave the impression that a benchmark had been met, and wondered why ICOMOS was so rigid in its judgment. The Delegation requested that the State Party comment.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** joined the Delegation of India in favour of the removal of the property from the Danger List. It added that most of the corrective measures requested had now been met in view of the information presented, and that the criteria established by the *Convention* for removal from the Danger List had been respected.

The Delegation of **Spain** said there was some confusion. If indeed the requirements under the five benchmarks had been met to some extent, as it appeared, the draft Decision was not coherent. The Delegation wanted to hear from the experts about the issue of withdrawal of the site from Danger List.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** commended the State Party for the excellent measures it had taken to preserve the site, in terms of both financial support and significant legal action. The Delegation requested clarification about new information given to the Advisory Body the day before and that morning, and asked to hear the new decision based on the new information.

The Observer Delegation of **Algéria** declared that in conformity with the promise made last year during the 29th session of the Committee in Durban, its Government had implemented and undertaken financial, human, technical and other measures and mobilised all the necessary resources in order to conform with the recommendations of Durban. It therefore wished that the property be removed from the Danger List and was ready to provide additional technical information to Committee members if required.

The Delegation of **Benin** referred to page 9 of the report of the joint mission that visited the country and observed the radical reversal of the situation at the site. Consequently, the Delegation proposed the removal of the property from the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the State Party deserved warm congratulations for its financial and political commitment, but there were other States Parties that had also given strong commitments, so what it came down to was the question of benchmarks, specifying what they were and whether they were being met. It further agreed with Spain and others that the current decision did not reflect the latest information. It was not comfortable with the situation, and the Committee needed to make it clear whether success was measured by intentions or by benchmarks. It recommended deferring the decision and engaging in a discussion to clarify matters.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed support for the comments made by the Delegations of Norway and the United States of America, but agreed with the Delegation of Benin that there had been a great deal of progress and it was an extremely important site. It proposed that paragraph 4 be amended to the effect that it was appreciated that the State Party was making strong commitments, in order to reflect the mood of the Committee, and that paragraph 5 be removed as soon as the benchmark requirements were met. That would reflect progress, but also be in compliance with the time frame and other aspects.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** congratulated the State Party (Algeria) for its commitments and measures undertaken for the conservation of the site and proposed its removal.

The Delegation of **Cuba** expressed support for the withdrawal of the site from the Danger List given the results in meeting the benchmarks recorded in the document provided.

The **Chairperson** said that, failing a consensus, she proposed to follow the suggestion of the Delegation of the United States of America that the Committee have an informal discussion at the lunch break to clarify points concerning the benchmarks.

The Delegation of **India** requested an answer from the Secretariat to its earlier question.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the written report had been prepared several months in advance, whilst additional information was not received until very recently.

The Delegation of **Peru** expressed support for the withdrawal of the site from the Danger List if the commitments for the required measures had been made by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Chile** noted that, in the light of new information received, there was an inconsistency in the draft Decision. It supported the withdrawal of the site from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed discomfort with the situation, as its understanding of decision making was that it should not be based on last-minute information provided to the Committee. The Delegation also agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of the Netherlands to amend the decision.

The Delegation of **Norway** agreed with the Delegations of Lithuania and the Netherlands, and also suggested holding a meeting at the lunch break to decide on the principle behind making a decision, because Algeria had made great progress but had not met all the requirements. The Delegation was of the opinion that the State Party would need one more year to take action, following which it should be possible to take the property off the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Morocco** reiterated its request to the Chairperson of the Committee to give the floor to the expert present in the room and concluded that everyone was in agreement that what had been requested had been implemented. It questioned the possible censure by the Committee, as the letters were received at the last minute.

Following a brief exchange of views, in which the Delegations of the **Netherlands**, **Israel** and **India** took part, the **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished to continue with the debate in plenary rather than hold informal discussions.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it was not clear what was being said in paragraph 4 of the draft Decision, nor was the information provided by the Advisory Body. The question remained whether there was or was not a management plan. The Delegation was also puzzled about the benchmarks and whether or not they had been achieved.

ICOMOS welcomed the initiatives by the State Party and gave a few facts on the following points: the delimitation had been completed; there was a defined procedure for

relocation and the relocation was to take effect in September 2006; and the management plan timetable was set for September 2006 to February 2007.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** cited a paragraph recalling the commitments of the State Party and which were contained in the letter of 20 June 2006 addressed to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Japan** said it was regrettable to receive information at the last moment, but now felt reassured by ICOMOS that the benchmarks had been met. It was not therefore a matter of principle, and the Committee could take a decision immediately.

The Delegation of **Norway** said it appeared ICOMOS had said the opposite, namely that all the benchmarks had not been met.

ICOMOS specified that a timetable had been set, but there was no management plan in place.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it was clear that a great deal had been achieved, but there was some aggressive language in the decision. The Delegation pointed out that the Committee met to hold discussions and make decisions; if taking a site off the Danger List were merely a question of meeting benchmarks the Committee could make such decisions by e-mail. While some action remained to be taken by the State Party, the Delegation recognized that it had done its best up until the last minute. The Delegation was in favour of removing the site from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it was very clear that the State Party had made enormous progress. However, consistency was necessary, and it must be recognized that the case was similar to that of the Everglades. The Delegation expressed full confidence that, if the remaining work was done, the site could be removed from the Danger List at the next session of the Committee.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** also expressed the opinion that it could be taken off the Danger List the following year if the required action was taken. Regarding last-minute information, there was a formal rule about a six-week deadline for the reception of a document. The Delegation asked if the State Party could accept the compromise.

The **Chairperson** specified that the rule concerning last-minute information applied to nominations and factual errors.

The Delegation of **India** said in response to the Delegation of Canada's statement about the Everglades that in that case the State Party had not asked for the property to be removed from the Danger List. In the Asia and Pacific and Arab regions, it was considered to be a stigma to be on the Danger List for a long time. The Delegation requested the experts concerned to give their view about whether the site should be removed from the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked again if the State Party concerned could accept the compromise proposed.

The **Chairperson** said that the Delegation of Algeria had replied that it could not accept this compromise.

The expert, having participated in the reactive monitoring mission, explained that the mission had had free access to the property for six days and added that the site was not threatened, notably as:

- there was no illegal population installed at the site, only 71 persons who worked there as guardians and managers;
- the authorities had formally undertaken to carry out all the work requested in or around October 2007.

He further added that the cadastral survey as well as the safeguarding plan of the site were completed.

The Delegation of **India** moved for a vote to remove the site from the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it should be taken into account that when, as India had said, the State Party had not requested that the Everglades be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, it was because the understanding of the State Party was that the benchmarks had to be achieved before a site was removed from the List. If the State Party had known that the Committee was more flexible, it might have done otherwise. It considered the Delegation of the Netherlands' proposal to be a good one because it recognized work done, which was very important. However, the Committee seemed to be saying that a site could be removed from the List on the basis of commitment alone, and the Committee must clarify that.

The Delegation of the Republic of **Korea** congratulated the State Party for the progress achieved and noted that there were still tasks to accomplish for the good management of the site. In this regard, the proposal of the Delegation of the Netherlands appeared sound. However, the Delegation was in favour of the removal of the site from the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** stated that, according to procedure, the Committee should close the debate and proceed to a vote.

The **Legal Adviser**, citing Rule 25.1 of the Committee's *Rules of Procedure*, explained the voting procedure. When an amendment to a proposal was moved, the amendment was to be voted on first. If there were more than one amendment, the less substantive one should be voted on first. According to Rule 37, a two-thirds majority was required for it to be accepted. A two-thirds majority was to be calculated in terms of two-thirds of members present and voting. Members abstaining were regarded as not voting.

The **Chairperson** put to the vote the amendment to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The result of the vote was 13 in favour, 7 against, with 1 abstention.

The **Chairperson** announced that the amendment was not adopted, having failed to obtain the required two-thirds majority.

After an exchange of views on what constituted the required majority, in which the **World Heritage Centre**, the **Chairperson**, the Delegations of **Kenya, India** and **Japan** and the **Legal Adviser** took part, the **Chairperson** suggested that the matter should be deferred to the Legal Adviser in consultation with the Director of the Office of International Standards and Legal Affairs.

It was so agreed.

After a brief discussion, the **Chairperson** took it that the Committee wished to proceed with its agenda.

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any amendments to the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the important points concerning the state of conservation of the property. Following the November expert mission, the conclusions of the report were most encouraging.

The Delegation of **Morocco** requested additional information regarding the timetable adopted for the necessary corrective measures and explanations from the State Party.

In response to the question of the Delegation of Morocco, the **World Heritage Centre** added that the corrective measures were outlined during the 2005 mission, that the timetable for the implementation of these measures was to be proposed by the State Party, that the work for lowering the water level would take three years, and no time table had yet been proposed concerning the archaeological aspects.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.19** adopted.

OTHER BUSINESS

The **Chairperson** introduced the presentation by young participants of the Baltic Youth festival.

The full text of their statement is reproduced at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2006>.

The Delegation of **Morocco** reverted to the preceding discussions concerning the state of conservation of Simien (Ethiopia) and noted that an informal working group had been set up for the Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) but this had not been the case for the Simien site. It wished that the case of Ichkeul be also discussed in plenary session for the sake of fairness.

The **Chairperson** clarified that it would be discussed in plenary meeting.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

FOURTH MEETING

03.00 p.m. - 07.15 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

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

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/7A
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Corr
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add.Rev
Decisions : 30 COM 7A.1 to 7A.34

ARAB STATES

Ashur (Qal'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C 1130)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its report on the state of conservation of the site, specifying that it had been informed by the Iraqi authorities that the construction of a dam had been abandoned. However, in view of the situation in Iraq, it was more prudent to retain the site on the Danger List.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.20** adopted.

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its report on the conservation of the site, indicating that the main problems causing the inscription of the site on the Danger List still existed. Furthermore, two storms had caused serious damage to the buildings which were already badly deteriorated. On the other hand, several conservation programmes were underway, notably for the mosque.

ICOMOS also presented its report on the site. They addressed the need to manage the town and its social situation. ICOMOS strongly supported the proposal of a mission to work on a rehabilitation plan.

The Delegation of **Morocco** recalled the long period between the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and its inscription on the List of World Heritage in

Danger and asked ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to provide fuller information on the figure of 40% of houses substituted by concrete buildings mentioned in the report.

ICOMOS said that part of the proposed draft Decision asked for a mission and that would be essential to address the problems that had been identified.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.21** adopted.

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (Site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 Rev.)

The Delegation of **Morocco** announced that a negotiation to resolve the matter in a consensual manner was underway and asked the Committee to report upon the decision once the negotiations were completed.

Debate on this point was therefore postponed.

Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its report on the site, first stating that progress had been made on its conservation: the construction of a road near the site had been halted and an alternative route found. With a great funding from Italy and Switzerland, the conservation of the minaret was underway. However, the World Heritage Centre recommended leaving it on the Danger list.

The Delegation of **Israel** complimented the World Heritage Centre and all the actors involved in the conservation works on the property. It also asked that the management plan for the minaret and the one for the archaeological site be merged.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.22** adopted.

Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Afghanistan) (C 208 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that thanks to over USD 3 million in funding received from the Government of Japan, major conservation projects were underway. For example, the dangerous task of demining the site and its surroundings, and the implementation of a master plan for conservation were being carried out. The World Heritage Centre recommended sending a joint WHC/ICOMOS mission to the site to define benchmarks in order to remove the site from the Danger List.

ICOMOS noted that this is a clear example of how good results concerning the conservation of a site could be achieved.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Secretariat for the presentation and reminded the Committee that the Buddha had stood as a symbol of culture diversity where they were for centuries before being blown out. The Delegation of India wished to pay tribute to the World Heritage Centre and all the good work achieved in difficult conditions concerning this property and was very grateful to the Government of Japan.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** proposed to add a paragraph before paragraph 3 in the draft Decision, urging the state party to enhance the awareness of the stake holders and increase general understanding of the site among the local population.

The **Chairperson** agreed and submitted the text to the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.23** adopted as amended.

Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) (C 241)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the improvements that had been made at the site, most notably the integration of a management plan and building guidelines. Moreover, traffic regulations were in place and excavation and restoration projects were underway. However, some illegal construction was still occurring in the site's core zone, and the World Heritage Centre felt that some monitoring would still be needed.

ICOMOS welcomed the huge amount of work achieved, in particular the management plan that could be used as a model for other properties.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.24** adopted and congratulated the state party for the site's removal from the Danger List.

Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 1208)

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it could not yet propose to take it off the Danger List, although much progress had been made. Through archaeological excavations, the site may be more extensive than before. A comprehensive management plan has begun, yet benchmarks will be set after the new dossier has been received, hopefully by next year.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if there was any training course organized concerning this property.

ICCROM answered that no request was put forward to that extent.

The **World Heritage Centre** specified that there are two funds-in-trust to deal with the issues concerning this property: one Japanese and one Italian and that both deal with training at different levels.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed that the issue of training be included in the decision text.

The **Chairperson** proposed to postpone the provisional adoption of the decision until the text was ready and to wait and set benchmarks.

The Delegation of **Canada** indicated there was a typo error in paragraph 6 and asked who defines the benchmarks in paragraph 5, for sites to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed the amendment to the draft Decision concerning the implementation of a coordination program through donor assistance.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.25** adopted as amended.

Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121)

The **World Heritage Centre** began its presentation by stating that an enormous amount of progress has been made. The first two of three volumes of the management plan had been received, and it was very comprehensive. A mission was sent and reported that the Outstanding Universal Value was still very intact. The integration of a new management system was asked for the site, and hopefully by next year the site could be taken off the Danger List.

ICOMOS strongly commended the work done by the State Party, and particularly the involvement of stake holders. It considered that the OUV of the property and the management plan should be connected, something which the State Party was in the process of doing.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and the State Party concerned on all the work accomplished and requested that the floor be given to the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** described the work achieved in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS. On behalf of the State Party, it wished to assure the Committee of its continued commitment and to thank it for exploring the possibility of removing the Kathmandu Valley from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the statement made by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Morocco** added its voice to the views of the Delegations of India and Kenya and congratulated the State Party. It expressed perplexity regarding paragraph 5 of the draft Decision which, in its opinion, was superfluous. The Delegation requested that the revised draft decisions be distributed in the room in a timely fashion.

The **Chairperson** observed that the relevant document containing the revised decision had been distributed to the Committee the day before.

She declared Decision **30 COM 7A.26** adopted.

Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) (C 171-172)

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the site had made a great deal of progress and hopefully that the next year it could be taken off the Danger List. In November 2005, a mission had been sent. Management plans had also been received, though not all the benchmarks set the year before had been met. The site had been transferred from the federal to the regional authority, which could benefit the site.

The Delegation of **Spain**, referring to page 98 of the French version of the report presented by the World Heritage Centre, asked ICOMOS to state whether in its opinion the State Party would be in a position to undertake the protective measures for the demolished hydraulic works requested in the draft Decision.

ICOMOS noted that the reason for the problems referred to on page 96 of the English version of the document was lack of maintenance. A combination of good management and careful maintenance would resolve those problems.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether the state party had agreed to the benchmarks set in paragraph 8.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party did not have any objection.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.27** adopted.

Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C 722)

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the reason for the delay of the report had been due to a delay in the mission. The purpose of the mission was to identify what needed to be done to remove the site from the Danger List. Despite a management plan having been created, it had not been implemented. The mission also identified several benchmarks which the national authorities had agreed to.

ICOMOS stressed that the site was stated as the iconic cultural landscape. It also strongly supported the benchmarks which had been set out.

The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its appreciation of the fact that a mission had been sent to the property and its satisfaction with the result of the mission.

The Delegation of **India** proposed some style modifications to the language of the draft Decision in paragraphs 3, 4 and 5.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the site constituted one of the most extraordinary landscapes and for such a site special care should be taken and all possible efforts made to maintain it.

The **Chairperson** endorsed the statement made by the Delegation of Kenya.

ICOMOS said that it was absolutely crucial not to fossilize that kind of living landscape and that a way to sustain it should be found.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that the floor be given to the State Party concerned.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the amendments to the draft Decision be read out before giving the floor to the State Party.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Morocco**, referring to paragraph 6 of the draft Decision, recalled that the goal was to make it possible for the local communities to continue living within the area of the property and pursue their traditional activities linked to rice culture.

The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** thanked Japan for its generous financial support for conservation and expressed gratitude for the expertise made available by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said that it had no problems with the amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.28** adopted as amended.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and Maiden Tower (Azerbaijan) (C 958)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a second mission by the University of Minnesota had been carried out in June 2006 under the contract with UNESCO to advance the inventory project. Furthermore, the World Bank had announced a tender for a project to prepare the management plan for the World Heritage property of Baku with the deadline of 31 March 2006 and the selection process was in the final phase.

The World Heritage Centre noted that the Minister for Culture had sent a letter dated 9 July 2006 indicating that a new institution was now in charge of the site, the newly created Ministry for Culture and Tourism. Furthermore, a State programme for the preservation of cultural heritage and a programme for technical support for the tourism strategy had been prepared. The inventory work had started in June 2006 with UNESCO support and was continuing with the assistance of the Ministry for Culture. It was expected that the research would be completed in September and results provided in November 2006. The tender for the management plan by the cultural heritage support project had had a successful outcome and the works would start in a few days.

ICOMOS appreciated the invitation by the State Party to address the threats to the site and recognized the need for the creation of a management plan and supported collaboration between stakeholders.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** fully recognized the importance and also the difficulty of achieving the conservation of an historic city and complimented the efforts made to that end by the State Party and the World Heritage Centre. However, it proposed an amendment to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision, specifically concerning Scientific Committees.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that for that kind of site sustainable development was the key to conservation.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party concerned.

The Observer Delegation of **Azerbaijan**, represented by the Minister of Culture, confirmed that its Government had started fulfilling the benchmarks and announced that new documents were to be submitted in October. The Minister concluded by assuring the Committee that he would do his best to secure the removal of Baku from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended the university networking activities, which it considered should be mentioned in the decision, and also supported the amendment put forward by the Delegation of the Republic of Korea.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it was grateful of the Minister's commitment but that on page 99 of the English version, draft Decision number 4 in paragraph 2, was worded in a contradictory manner.

The **World Heritage Centre** recognized that at the time of the drafting of the Decision, the political situation in the State Party concerned had been somewhat uncertain, and that the implementation of the necessary works had therefore not been assured. However, the intervention of the Minister of Culture reassured the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it wished to hear the State Party before the draft Decision was amended.

The Delegation of **India** requested clarifications of the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Azerbaijan**, represented by the Minister of Culture, confirmed the comments by the World Heritage Centre and informed the Committee that the Ministry of Culture was now in charge.

The Delegation of **India** said that, having heard what was stated by the Minister of Culture, it was of the view that paragraph 4 should have stood as it was.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.29** adopted.

Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of a new letter from the Ministry for Construction and Transport of North-Rhine Westphalia dated 9 June 2006 explaining the protection measures on the left bank including visual protection of the Cathedral and Romanesque churches of the city centre; reporting that the final decision on the re-design of the Deutz area would be known in late June; and confirming that a buffer zone could be developed on the right bank of the Rhine. A further letter from the Lord Mayor of Cologne dated 5 July 2006 informed the World Heritage Centre that no final decision on the re-design (originally planned for 13 June 2006) had been taken yet and that a real-estate study had been commissioned to assess the economic feasibility of the three proposals. He confirmed that a buffer zone would be designed on the right bank of the Rhine, including a maximum height limit of 60 m for all new buildings.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked that the floor be given to the State Party concerned.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that it did not understand why ICOMOS wished to keep Cologne on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also reminded the Committee that Cologne was inscribed as a monument and not as a landscape. It concluded by stating that it wished the proposed amendment to the draft Decision to be adopted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recapitulated the issues.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the benchmarks had been set, and restated what other measures had been taken.

ICOMOS said it had considered the proposed buffer zone, but did not find it satisfactory.

The Delegation of **Kenya** pointed out that the State Party had made every effort to take action in compliance with the Committee's requirements. It therefore invited the Committee to take into account the good will shown by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Japan** joined the Delegation of Kenya in appreciating the significant efforts made by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the main outcome of the debate following the oral presentation of the report appeared to be the buffer zone on the left bank of the river and the boundaries on the right bank. Its own understanding was that the main issue was in fact the visual integrity of the property after the construction of the high-rise buildings rather than the historical perspective of the boundaries mentioned in the ICOMOS report. It asked the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to clarify.

The Delegation of **Norway** commended the State Party for its efforts in implementing the recommendations of the Committee and joined the Delegation of Canada in seeking clarification from the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that there were two different issues, one relating to the visual integrity of the property as pointed out by the Delegation of Canada, and another relating to the lack of a buffer zone at the time of the inscription of the property.

ICOMOS recalled the procedure for approval of buffer zones.

The Delegation of **India** recalled the issues of visual integrity of the property and its buffer zone. It further recalled the very instructive debate that had taken place during the morning meeting on the matter of benchmarks and stressed how important it was not to have two different standards for different properties facing the same issues. It accordingly suggested that the property should be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** asked if there was a consensus on the proposal to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, recalling the heated debate on the property at the Committee's 28th session in Suzhou and again at its 29th session in Durban, asked for clarification of whether the definition of a buffer zone needed a formal and separate decision by the Committee.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the definition of the buffer zone was proposed by the State Party and that it would then be for the Committee to approve it under the item Nominations.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that in its opinion paragraph 4 of the draft Decision answered the question raised by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **Norway** seconded the intervention made by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **India** stated that paragraph 4 of the draft Decision had very clear wording and should be approved; retaining the property on the Danger List would then no longer be justified.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** pointed out that the removal of the property from the Danger List could be approved only after a clear definition of the buffer zone.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that during the morning's debate on the examination of state of conservation reports relating to natural properties the issue of the prior definition of the buffer zone had not been mentioned, and it therefore stressed the risk of lack of consistency in the Committee's decisions. It consequently proposed an amendment to paragraph 7 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** recalled that, according to the *Operational Guidelines*, the issue of a buffer zone was not automatically related to that of the removal of a property from the Danger List. It then submitted a draft amendment to paragraph 7 of the draft Decision to the Committee for consideration.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Rapporteur should work on the different draft amendments proposed and report back to the Committee for further consideration of the draft Decision.

Simien (Ethiopia) (N 9) (continued)

The Delegation of **Benin** recalled the stormy discussions of the morning. It appeared that the State Party accepted that the property remain on the List of World Heritage in Danger, but requested that the different organizations provide their assistance. In this spirit of consensus, the African group adhered to the position of the State Party.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that it had received a note from the Delegation of Benin which, together with a group of members of the Committee that had held discussions on Simien, proposed new language for the decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya** reminded the Committee that it had spoken very strongly on that issue, and had been involved in the discussion, and in a spirit of consensus supported the proposal of the working group on Simien National Park.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.9** adopted.

Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 Rev.) (continued)

The Rapporteur said that the only formal amendment to the decision on Cologne Cathedral related to paragraph 8, replacing “retain” by “remove”.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed to keep the last paragraphs of the decision as per the original draft.

The Delegation of **Morocco** supported the decision to remove this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, as it considered that the requests made at Durban had been fulfilled, and congratulated the State Party.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.30** adopted as amended.

Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8)

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had received a letter from the State Party dated 2 February 2006, noting considerable progress in the regeneration of the Ichkeul ecosystem and requesting that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Following that request, a joint UNESCO/IUCN mission had been organized from 31 May to 2 June 2006 to review progress towards the benchmarks set by the Committee at its 27th session.

IUCN noted the excellent progress made by the State Party in improving the state of conservation of the property and in addressing the identified benchmarks. Key points observed by the mission included a significant increase in the direct inflow of water to the lake ecosystem and a major reduction in the level of water salinity, the recovery of the former beds of pondweed and rushes, leading to increases in the population of wintering birds, monitoring of an extremely high standard and an assurance by the relevant water authorities in Tunisia to provide Ichkeul with fresh water and to recognize Ichkeul as a net consumer of water. The mission had found, however, that not all of the benchmarks had been met and noted the need to develop an integrated and autonomous management structure and to finalize and adopt the management plan.

The Delegation of **Morocco** announced that it had read the mission report, and cited a paragraph in which it was mentioned that the situation had improved to such an extent that the site was unrecognizable from five years ago. It therefore surmised that the first phase was a success and questioned why, in the light of these achievements, the site should be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN noted that it had addressed the concerns relating to the property previously and that the State Party was to be commended for its work, but that critical benchmarks remained to be met.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** requested further information about the outcome of the May 2006 mission, and about the water inflow into the park.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed to give the floor to the State Party, as in the case for Germany.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** informed that it had done its utmost, both technically and financially. The birds had returned, the ecological situation had been re-established and the first phase of rehabilitation was achieved. The second phase was a long-term one, and constituted a community development plan, a development and management plan including all concerned institutions. It was a long-haul undertaking. The Delegation confirmed its commitment towards the restoration of the water in the Park and to elaborate a sustainable development plan.

The Delegation of **Spain** inquired about the remaining benchmarks, whether the ongoing non-compliance with those benchmarks would affect the outstanding universal value of the property, and what the State Party could do to resolve the outstanding issues.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the State Party had explained that the benchmarks had been met, and that a process was taking place to ensure they were completed, whereas IUCN claimed the contrary. There was also the issue of the volume of water flow into the park, and India requested that Tunisia clarify that issue. If benchmarks had been met, that should be reflected in the draft Decision; the State Party needed to know what exactly remained to be done.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** informed that the State had undertaken to consider Ichkeul as a net consumer of water. Two hundred million cubic metres have been channelled each year for four years. Furthermore, the State Party has implemented an investigative and research policy for an eventual autonomous structure. It considered that the principal benchmarks had been attained, adding that contrary to the popular idea that development is detrimental to conservation, the authorities considered that the preservation of the property lay in its development.

IUCN noted the points raised, in particular regarding benchmarks, such as water flow, which had been achieved to a significant extent. In regard to the effectiveness of management there had been good progress, but considerable work still needed to be done. With regard to outstanding universal value, the situation had improved significantly over the previous five years, but the site had not yet recovered the values at the time of inscription.

The Delegation of **Norway** congratulated the State Party for the good work done on the site, but noted that IUCN benchmarks and targets set earlier had still not all been reached. It suggested that the draft Decision be maintained, encouraging the State Party to make a last effort to fulfil the requirements before the property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Benin** recalled that two benchmarks had been requested: the establishment of a management structure and the completion of the management plan. This signified that the state of conservation had improved and it asked about the situation regarding the administrative and financial matters.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** commended the State Party of Tunisia for its excellent work in managing the site. Having listened very carefully to the discussion, and referring back to debates and decisions on other sites that day, the Delegation recommended that the site be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger on grounds of the progress reported by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it had listened carefully to the discussion and was satisfied that a great deal of work had been done, but noted that some requirements had not yet been fully met. Referring to paragraph 9 of the draft Decision, it said it had no doubt that the State Party would indeed fulfil the remaining obligations. It was not convinced that the remaining benchmarks would not have a serious effect on the outstanding universal value of the property, but nevertheless supported its removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that the draft Decision be amended and the process revised. It suggested that the property be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger on a conditional basis, and that the report requested from the State Party of Tunisia before the next session would be required specifically to address the outstanding issues, which in its view were not benchmarks, but rather processes.

The **Rapporteur** proposed that paragraph 7 be modified, along with paragraphs 8 and 12, adding a new paragraph 13.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the recommendations of the Rapporteur, and believed that there had been substantial progress. It supported the removal of the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the statements by the Delegation of the United States of America and the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.12** adopted as amended.

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193) (continued)

The Delegation of **India** seconded the proposal of the Delegation of Morocco to reformulate the draft Decision in a similar way as the decision on Ichkeul National Park.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the Committee had already had a long debate on the issue and proposed to refer to the Legal Adviser to obtain the necessary information on the voting procedures.

The Delegation of **India** requested that the Legal Adviser should specify whether 13 votes were sufficient to pass the amendment proposed, given the fact that two thirds of 20 – the number of members present and voting – was 13.2.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the Rules were quite clear on that subject: Rule 36 of the *Rules of Procedure* required a two-thirds majority and 13 was less than the required majority of 13.2.

The **Chairperson** requested the Legal Adviser to respond to the question raised about the required majority.

The **Legal Adviser** noted that the question concerned the issue of fractions of votes and replied that, in the United Nations system, the practice consisted of counting a fraction as an entire vote. Therefore, in the case under consideration, a two-thirds majority would be reached with 14 votes.

Following a request by the Delegation of **India** to the Chairperson to announce the results of the vote, the **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to present the final results.

The **World Heritage Centre** announced that 13 were in favour of the amendment, 7 were against and there was 1 abstention. Therefore, the amendment was rejected.

The **Chairperson** then proposed to vote on the second amendment presented by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

Following a request for clarification by the Delegation of **Benin**, the **Chairperson** and the **World Heritage Centre** replied that, as the Legal Adviser had explained, a two-thirds majority consisted of 14 votes, whereas only 13 had been recorded in favour of the amendment.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** pointed out that, before taking the vote, the Committee ought to have sought clarification from the Legal Adviser as to whether a two-thirds majority was required on the issue.

The **Legal Adviser** drew attention to Rule 37 of the *Rules of Procedure*, which stipulated that votes on matters covered by the *Convention* needed to be taken by a two-thirds majority. He further pointed out that Rule 38 required a simple majority to decide if a particular matter was covered by the provisions of the *Convention*. It was therefore up to the Committee to first characterize the issue.

The Delegation of **India** recalled that it had raised that issue and that that should therefore have been done before voting on the amendment. The Committee had accordingly not been allowed to exercise its right to decide whether or not the issue was

covered by the provisions of the *Convention*. The Delegation therefore moved a vote on that issue.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed an adjournment of the debate on the issue to allow for further informal consultations, if the Committee was not considered to be in the process of voting.

After consultation, the **Chairperson** suggested adjourning the debate.

The Delegation of **India** objected, stating that the voting process had started.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, speaking on a point of order, said that it was the second time it had been pressed into a vote, the first time having been at the 29th session. According to its reading of the *Rules of Procedure* and the *Convention*, the issue was clear: in Article 11.4 of the *Convention* the Committee was given the duty to establish the List of World Heritage in Danger, so how could a matter relating to removing a property from that List be considered not to be covered by the provisions of the *Convention*? It was wrong to bend the rules in that way.

The Delegation of **India** expressed regret that the Delegation of the Netherlands felt it was being pressed into voting, but said that the vote merely followed the conclusions of the Legal Adviser, and, as the Committee had now started voting, it had to proceed.

The **Legal Adviser** noted that it was possible to take a point of order as long as voting had not started.

Following a request for further clarification by the Delegation of **Morocco**, the **World Heritage Centre** repeated its explanation on how it had arrived at the result of the vote.

The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the Committee was working under a great deal of pressure and called for a dispassionate debate. More time might be needed to arrive at a consensus decision and it might be helpful to take a break. The Committee should also bear in mind that it was discussing a matter that was very important for the State Party concerned.

The Delegation of **Peru** said that it had agreed in all good faith to vote that morning without a full understanding of the rules; it suggested that a vote be taken again now that the information was clearer.

The Delegation of **Japan**, supported by the Delegation of the **Netherlands**, expressed the view that the issue under discussion was clearly a matter covered by the *Convention* and consequently a two-thirds majority was needed.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the proposal by the Delegations of the United States of America and Kenya to adjourn the debate on the issue to allow for further consultations.

The **Chairperson** suggested adjourning the debate.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it was ready to adjourn the debate but recalled that a vote had been taken and that, in its opinion, the amendment had been rejected.

The Delegation of **Morocco** observed that the Committee members had become increasingly animated during the ongoing debate, and had lost from view the aim of the discussions. It recommended that the Committee proceed by similitude and equity, and suggested that the property be removed from the Danger List, but on condition, citing the assurances of the Delegation of the State Party concerned.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished the debate to be adjourned pending further consultations.

It was so agreed.

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

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/7.1

Decision : **30 COM 7.1**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the revised draft Decision **30 COM 7.1**. She gave the floor to the Delegation of Peru for an additional amendment.

The Delegation of **Peru** proposed an amendment to the draft Decision in regard to climate change.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if there was agreement on the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed doubts as to whether the proposed amendment was needed as it felt that the requested work was already covered by the strategy developed by the expert meeting. It also proposed to delete paragraph 8, which it believed was redundant in view of paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that projections were for the future but that adaptations were relevant to that, as the adaptations needed to be based on the projections. It also proposed to make reference to the Kyoto Protocol in paragraph 44 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** repeated its view that paragraph 8 was redundant as paragraph 5 already took note of the strategy.

The Delegations of **Israel** and **Peru** agreed with the deletion.

In response to a query by the Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** about the wording of paragraph 8, the **Chairperson** noted that paragraph 8 was to be deleted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to change the language of the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Peru and replace “alternatives” by “alternatives to inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed with the proposed change.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that, in paragraph 13, the Committee was requesting the preparation of a policy paper, which seemed similar to the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** reiterated its original proposal not to include the proposed amendment.

The **Rapporteur** suggested adding a new subparagraph to paragraph 13 to cover the point raised in the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Peru.

The Delegation of **Peru** agreed.

The **Rapporteur**, summing up the amendments to the draft Decision, said that there would be a reference to the Kyoto Protocol between paragraphs 7 and 8, that the old paragraph 8 was deleted and that paragraph 13 would be amended to include considerations on developing an alternative mechanism for the List of World Heritage in Danger for properties affected by climate change.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested the precise wording on the Kyoto Protocol.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the Committee had no mandate to change the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **World Heritage Centre** said there would only be a reference to paragraph 44 of the *Operational Guidelines* in the decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested a specific reference to the Kyoto Protocol.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** specified that paragraph 44 of the *Operational Guidelines* referred to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and that the Kyoto Protocol was covered by that.

The **Rapporteur** reiterated his proposal to refer to paragraph 44 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7.1** adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.

Presentation “*Monitoring and managing for success in Natural World Heritage Properties*” by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN

THIRD DAY – TUESDAY 11 JULY 2006

FIFTH MEETING

09.00 am - 01.00 pm

Chairperson: Netherlands

**ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF
WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continued)**

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

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/7B
WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add

Decisions: **30 COM 7B.1 to 7B.98**

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau had suggested temporarily suspending examination of item 7A and moving directly to item 7B, concerning the examination of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List. After drawing the attention of the Committee to the way in which the various properties had been categorized, she requested the Secretariat to read out the list of properties for which a request had been made to bring them from the “for noting” category (i.e. B) to the “for discussion” category (A).

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that, to date, requests had been received to bring the following sites from the B to the A category:

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon); Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe); Lorentz National Park (Indonesia); Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal); Volcanoes of Kamtchatka (Russian Federation); Iguazu National Park (Brazil); Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia); Pyrenees – Mont Perdu (France / Spain); Aksum (Ethiopia); Rock-Hewn Churches of Lalibela (Ethiopia); Lamu Old Town (Kenya); Island of Mozambique (Mozambique); Qal’at Al Barhain Archaeological Site (Barhain); Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China); Palace and Garden of Schoenbrunn (Austria); Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina); Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia); City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy); Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania); Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland); Maya Site of Copan (Honduras).

The Delegations of the **Republic of Korea** and of the **United States of America** requested, respectively, that the properties of the Canadian Rocky Mountain Park (Canada) and Tyre (Lebanon), be discussed.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested that the property of Bahla Fort (Oman) be also added to the A group of sites to be discussed.

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced item 7B and proceeded to present the first property.

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a mission had been sent to the property in March 2006, and identified serious threats to its heritage values, including invasive species, immigration, over-fishing, uncontrolled tourism, understaffing and lack of implementation capacity. Discussions had been held with the representative from the State Party in the previous two days on corrective measures to be taken in order to avoid possible danger listing, and they were reflected in the draft Decision presented to the Committee.

IUCN stressed that the proposed recommendations had been the result of a cooperative effort between the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Body and the State Party.

The **Rapporteur**, upon request from the Chairperson, read out two amendments to the proposed draft Decision submitted by the Delegation of **Chile**, respectively to paragraphs 2 and 8, and pointed to a minor spelling mistake to be corrected in paragraph 9.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.29** adopted as amended.

Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 260)

Following a brief introduction by the **World Heritage Centre**, and noting that there was consensus in the room on the draft proposed, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.30** adopted.

Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property, referring in particular to the threats deriving from hydroelectric dam projects, pressure to re-open an illegally constructed road and the continuing urban and agricultural expansion.

The **Rapporteur** presented an amendment submitted by the Delegation of Canada, concerning paragraph 7 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked if the date of 1 October 2006, indicated in the draft Decision as the deadline for submitting a report on the impact of the proposed hydroelectric projects, was feasible for the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** informed the Committee that the date of 1 December, which had been agreed with the State Party of Argentina, would have been preferable.

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** fully acknowledged the situation and added that Argentina had a 70-kilometre border with its neighbouring country. It would like to have more time to produce a comprehensive report, make substantial progress in the situation, and allow the extremely positive joint UNESCO/IUCN mission to be carried out.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.31** adopted as amended.

AFRICA

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the preliminary results of a wildlife survey undertaken in May 2006 pointed to a serious decline in the population of large mammals. In addition, a road upgrading project was posing a threat to the integrity of the property.

IUCN added that two roads were being constructed along the boundaries of the Park, thus facilitating access and possibly poaching activities.

At the request of the Chairperson, the **Rapporteur** read out an amendment proposed by Israel concerning two paragraphs of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Benin** had no objection to the amendment but proposed that a few minutes be granted to the State Party because flagrant contradictions existed between the reports submitted by the State Party and IUCN.

The Observer Delegation of **Senegal** was aware of the threats that endangered the property and indicated that it was at the initiative of its country that the inventory was being presently undertaken. It added that the two roads were not located in the Park area and wished a mission to be sent as soon as the modalities have been discussed

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.1** adopted.

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that the main problems concerning the property were related to the development of a new lodge, poor tourism management, a growing population of resident pastoralists, immigration and encroachment. A joint mission was proposed in the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment proposed by Israel, concerning paragraph 7 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting that it had been twenty years since the previous mission had been carried out to the property, and having read the report prepared by the Secretariat on the various factors affecting the value of the site of Ngorongoro Conservation Area, said that the State Party concerned might wish to provide the Committee with its own perspective and updated information.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** said it was surprised that the report prepared by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN had drawn its information from sources other than the State Party, and disagreed with its conclusions. With reference to the issues raised in the report, the Observer Delegation noted that the encroachment to the property had been resolved in the course of the current year by the national authorities; the forest destruction had been halted thanks to the establishment of a zoning system, while soil erosion had never been a problem at Ngorongoro. Concerning the high number of tourists and the adoption of sustainable practices for the management of the property, the State Party had taken a number of substantial actions in close consultation with the local community of the Masai by establishing a local Pastoral Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Saint Lucia** reminded other observer delegations that they had the right to request the floor during the examination of the state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, without necessarily waiting for a Committee member to solicit their views.

The Delegation of **Benin** noted that the State Party had provided some information and that the draft amendment already proposed a mission, therefore this mission could verify the information in situ.

IUCN explained that, in order to obtain an objective and independent picture of the situation, it was necessary to draw information from a variety of sources.

Having heard the information provided by the State Party, the Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the current draft Decision did not reflect the reality on the ground.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that paragraph 4 of the current draft Decision simply referred to reports that had been received by the Secretariat and IUCN, while paragraph 5

requested a mission to verify the situation at the property. It therefore suggested that the text could remain as it was.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** referred to paragraph 7 and requested that those who made proposals should also proffer advice and solutions.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed that the mention «with great concern» be deleted in paragraph 4 to allow the proposed mission to evaluate the situation.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.2** adopted.

Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that recent reports pointed to a deterioration of the state of conservation of the property, owing in particular to declining financial resources, poaching, the granting of licences for mineral prospecting, and the proposed construction of a dam.

IUCN further noted that the concession to foreign companies of more than fifty per cent of the hunting licences had a negative impact on local socio-economic context and posed a potential threat to the faunal population.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting that very serious allegations had been made in the report, including the involvement of government officials in illegal poaching activities, in the absence of a mission to the property, asked that the State Party be allowed to speak.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** denied that any government officials were involved in poaching operations at the property and reiterated that the information provided in the report did not correspond to the truth. It also invited the Chairperson to visit the site and verify the situation personally.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.3** adopted.

Dja Faunal Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

The **World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to the report contained in the working document and to the revised draft Decision **30 COM 7B.4 Rev.**

IUCN explained that a mission had been sent to the property in June 2006. The mission report had not been finalized yet and therefore could not be circulated. Preliminary findings of the mission indicated that the outstanding universal value of the property would not be compromised. Despite the considerable efforts of the State Party, however, serious risks still affected the property, including the non-formal adoption of the management plan, industrial activities and mining pressure.

The Delegation of **Morocco** made an observation regarding the draft Decision and proposed replacing the word « request » by the word « invite » in paragraph 5. It insisted on the fact that the Committee cannot « request » a State Party and that there was a diplomatic language to respect, to which the Delegation of Morocco was very attached.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.4** adopted. She invited the Committee to examine the state of conservation of properties included in the B category, “not for discussion”.

Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 Rev.)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B. 5** adopted without discussion.

Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B. 6** adopted without discussion.

Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B. 7** adopted without discussion.

Mosi-oa-Tunya /Victoria Falls (Zambia/Zimbabwe) (N 509)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that no new information was available on the property apart from what was already contained in the report.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands referring to paragraphs 5 and 6 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting that some efforts had been made in the past for the conservation of the property, including the organizing of a workshop in 2002, asked what concrete support could be provided to the two States Parties concerned.

The **World Heritage Centre** commented that the authorities of Zimbabwe had submitted a report confirming the issues affecting the heritage values of the property, while no information had been received from the State Party of Zambia.

The Delegation of **Benin** asked that the amendment be reread. It then added that paragraph 6 of the amendment was unnecessary.

The Delegation of **India** noted that if danger listing was considered, then it would be necessary at the same time to establish the benchmarks for the possible removal of the property from that list.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed to withdraw its second amendment concerning paragraph 6 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.8** adopted as amended.

ARAB STATES

Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed the information provided in the report concerning ongoing threats to the property related to potential oil spills, the starting of new oil explorations to the north of the site and the non-implementation of a special law for its protection.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada referring to paragraph 9 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B. 9** adopted as amended.

Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)

Noting that the issues of concern for the property included the declining population of the Arabian Oryx, the proposed development of a tourist lodge and provisions in the current management plan to conditionally permit mining activities, the **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee of recent reports alleging that an oil prospecting licence had been issued to the Occidental Petroleum company inside the Sanctuary.

IUCN confirmed that the current management plan did not exclude oil and gas exploration and potentially even exploitation, and reiterated its position that similar activities were not acceptable within natural World Heritage properties.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the **Rapporteur** said that he had received no amendments to the proposed draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Morocco** asked whether, following reception of the report submitted by the State Party, a discussion had been held with the State Party.

IUCN informed the Committee that the report containing information on the oil prospecting concession had been received only three days earlier, and that no consultation had been possible.

The Delegation of **Morocco** referred to discussions that were held the previous day concerning the possibility of account being taken, by the Committee, of new information received. It further questioned the pertinence of the words « notes with serious concern... » (in paragraph 5 of the draft Decision) whilst the report had been received three days earlier and its conclusions had already been included in the draft Decision, and this without any discussion with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kuwait**, supporting the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Morocco, requested that the State Party be allowed to intervene, so as to clarify the situation.

The Delegation of **India** submitted an amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft Decision, to accommodate the concerns expressed by previous speakers.

The Observer Delegation of **Oman** informed the Committee that what had been authorized was in fact nothing more than some initial research, noting that there was no reason for concern about the conservation of the property.

IUCN emphasized the need for the Committee to be fair and consistent in its positions, noting that in the past a different stand had been taken by the Committee in a similar situation for the site of Lake Baikal.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** supported the interventions of the Delegations of Morocco and Kuwait. It thought that paragraph 5 seemed premature and that it was preferable to request the State Party to follow up on the report.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.10** adopted as amended.

ASIA/PACIFIC

Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)

The **World Heritage Centre** reported on the mission that had taken place in April 2006, which had examined the potential impacts of the proposed hydro-power and dam developments in the absence of clear boundaries and of an EIA statement. According to the mission, one additional problem was the suggested reduction of the area of the property, with implications for possible mining operations. By a letter received by the World Heritage Centre on 7 July 2006 in response to the report of the mission, the Chinese authorities had stressed that no modification of the boundaries of the property had been approved or even officially proposed, and that no mining operations had been or would be allowed in the future within the property.

IUCN noted that at the time of inscription a recommendation had been made to the State Party by the Committee to consider the extension of the property to adjacent areas. The mission had expressed its concern at the initial suggestion of a reduction of the boundary by up to twenty percent of its present size, and a request for clarification was therefore included in the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested a small amendment to subparagraph 8(d).

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.11** adopted as amended.

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that a joint mission had been dispatched to the site in February-March 2006, which had found serious threats affecting all three components of the serial property. The problems included encroachments, illegal logging, road construction, poaching and loss of biodiversity, as well as institutional and governance issues. No formal response had been received from the State Party to the suggested inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, but a representative of the Indonesian Government was attending the current meeting and might wish to intervene.

IUCN recalled that it had recommended danger listing the property already at the time of inscription, two years earlier, but that the Committee at that time had requested a mission to verify the extent of the threats. Such a mission had now taken place and confirmed, in **IUCN's** opinion, that the property must be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. **IUCN** had not had time to verify the new information contained in the letter sent by the State Party, but it considered that danger listing could also have a beneficial impact, especially in a clear case such as the one under review.

The Delegation of the Republic of **Korea** remarked that it was difficult to remove a property once it was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It wished to hear from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Japan**, noting that the intentions of the State Party with respect to the measures to be taken were crucial for the safeguarding of the property, asked that it be allowed to intervene so as to share with the Committee its sentiment on the proposed decision.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** informed the Committee about a series of steps that had been taken at the property to respond to the concerns expressed by the mission in February 2006. They included the arrest of eleven persons involved in illegal logging, which had now been stopped; the halting of the construction of a road; the establishment of a corridor between two distinct areas of the property; the extension of the protected area by fourteen thousand hectares, as requested by the Committee in 2004; and other initiatives to protect the fauna. It also recalled that problems related to governance and

institutional weaknesses were due mostly to the effect of the tsunami. The Delegation also expressed its regret that none of the financial resources mobilized by the World Heritage Centre in support of the property were directed to address the concerns expressed by the report of the joint mission of February 2006. It further commented that the danger listing of the property at the present stage would be counterproductive and encouraged the Committee to amend the current draft Decision accordingly.

The Delegation of **India** presented an amendment, drafted jointly with the Delegation of Japan, concerning paragraph 7, suggesting that the property should not be danger listed.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting the difficulties that the State Party was facing to protect the property, emphasized the need to identify what support the Committee might offer to complement the State Party's efforts and suggested including an appropriate reference to that in the decision.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** noted that it was premature to put the site on the Danger List after having heard the commitment of the State Party for its conservation. It added that the inscription could have a negative effect and discourage the State Party. It requested the Committee to temporise and wait a year to see how the situation evolved.

The Delegation of **Norway** stressed that danger listing should not be considered a punishment, but rather as a way to raise awareness and financial support. If the Committee saw that the values of a certain property were in danger, then it had the duty to inscribe it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It then asked IUCN to clarify whether it had had the time to verify the information provided by the State Party and what its recommendation was in the light of its findings.

IUCN informed the Committee that it had received the new information only the day before, and could not verify it. It also confirmed that the threats identified during the mission were major and, with reference to the point raised by the Delegation of Kenya, the actions proposed in the draft Decision would be able to address them.

In the light of new information communicated by the State Party, the Delegation of **Benin** wished to give a sign of encouragement to the State Party. It proposed allowing a year for the State Party to improve the conservation of the site, and avoid sanctions.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** expressed its agreement with the position of the Delegation of Kenya, and suggested that a mission be sent to the property to verify the new information.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that at the time of inscription the State Party had given assurances that it would prepare an emergency plan to address the concerns expressed by the Committee. Two years had now passed and such an emergency plan had not been prepared. Should the Committee decide not to danger list the property at the present stage, an emergency plan should be submitted by the State Party well before the deadline of 1 February 2007.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** said it regretted that the funds provided by UNESCO had not contributed to the development of the mentioned emergency plan and other priority issues concerning the safeguarding of the property, and stated that danger listing was premature at this stage.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it was the Committee's mandate to protect the properties inscribed on the List as best it could. With reference to paragraph 180 of the *Operational Guidelines* and Article 11 of the *Convention*, the Delegation stressed that one of the main purposes of danger listing was to assist the State Party in seeking financial resources for the conservation of the threatened property. The Delegation noted that Indonesia had indicated it requires additional financial resources. While Canada believed the property is in danger, it was ready to go along with the proposed amendment, but would like to draw the State Party's attention to that point.

The Delegation of **Chile**, noting that danger listing was interpreted by some States Parties as a punishment, proposed to wait for another year.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, recalling that assistance within the *Convention* was always to be achieved through cooperation, expressed the opinion that the consent of the State Party was essential for danger listing to have any beneficial effect. If the State Party of Indonesia opposed the danger listing of the property at the present stage, the Committee should take that into account.

The Delegation of **Spain** supported the position expressed by the Delegation of Norway. The protection of World Heritage properties was the common responsibility of the international community, and Spain had accordingly provided a contribution of USD600,000 to assist the State Party in the conservation of the property. The Delegation agreed to give another year to the State Party and dispatch another mission in the meantime.

Having heard the amendment proposed by the Delegations of India and Japan, setting a deadline for the accomplishment of certain corrective measures before danger listing, the Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether danger listing would be automatic should the benchmarks not be met.

The **Chairperson** explained that in the case under consideration the Committee would have to re-examine the situation in the light of the report provided by the mission. However, automatic danger listing was possible and it had been done in the past.

IUCN stressed again that the mission which had just visited the property had identified major issues, justifying its danger listing, which, in its opinion, would be beneficial to the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.12** adopted as amended.

Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 30 COM 7B.13 adopted without discussion

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)

The **World Heritage Centre** drew the attention of the Committee to the report contained in the working document and to draft Decision **30 COM 7B.14**.

IUCN recalled that a mission had been sent in 2004, and that the State Party had never responded despite reports raising concerns.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.14** adopted.

Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the issue at stake was the construction, within the core zone of the property, of the Kwonde View Tourist Resort. A decision on legal issues related to the ownership of the land on which the resort had been constructed was expected by October or November 2006.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.15** adopted.

She moved to the examination of the state of conservation of two properties included in the B category, “not for discussion”.

Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N653)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B. 16** adopted without discussion.

Ha Long Bay (Vietnam) (N 672 bis)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B. 17** adopted without discussion.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the case under review was one of the success stories of the *Convention*, thanks also to the personal involvement of the Chairperson.

The President of the Russian Federation himself had indeed announced the re-routing of the Trans-Siberian oil pipeline, confirming that it would pass at a distance of 400 km from the shores of Lake Baikal. A joint monitoring mission had visited the property in October 2005 and had made a number of other recommendations. On 9 July 2006, the World Heritage Centre had received information from the State Party confirming that a draft decree on the establishment of an Intergovernmental Commission on Baikal had been agreed on, together with another draft decree on approval of the Baikal natural area boundaries.

IUCN expressed its full appreciation for the decisions taken by the President of the Russian Federation, especially taking into account the high risks to which the property would have been exposed, had the initial proposal been implemented.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the case demonstrated how crucial cooperation was to obtaining any significant result, without necessarily inscribing a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the case constituted an example of best practice and suggested compiling similar cases in some form so as to provide a useful tool for learning lessons for the future.

The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party of the Russian Federation, the Committee and IUCN on that important result.

IUCN, responding to the point made by the Delegation of the United States of America, stressed that it had been precisely the threat of danger listing that had made the achievement of such a result possible.

The Delegation of **Peru** reminded the Committee of the importance of any decision it might take and suggested that it proceed on a case-by-case study basis. It also recommended that the Committee should remain cautious in any danger listing actions since the situation depended very much on a country's particular circumstances. Danger listing was a complex undertaking and required a case-by-case assessment that might have the potential to actually weaken protected area systems. In any assessment by the Committee of a site's management system, it should be borne in mind that having a management plan might not be an indicator of threat reduction and the reduction of risks should be evaluated by additional in-depth means.

Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 Rev.)

The Delegation of **India** asked for the State Party's comments on the several threats to the site outlined in the Committee document, including a possible gas pipeline that might be constructed through the site.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** responded first on the results of the Lake Baikal site issue. It reported that the re-routing of the Lake Baikal pipeline to follow an alternative route was clearly a success. It thanked the Committee for its support. Regarding the Golden Mountains of Altai, it explained that the Altai region was of special concern and reported that a letter of inquiry had been sent to the Governor of Altai Province, where the gas pipeline would pass. The project was at the concept stage, and no environmental impact assessment had been carried out. The concept proposal required additional information and study and the relevant detailed documentation would have to be submitted to the Ministry of the Environment.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.19** adopted.

Belovezhskaya Pushcha/Bialowieza Forest (Belarus/Poland) (N 33-627)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.20** adopted without discussion.

Canadian Rocky Mountain Parks (Canada) (N 404 bis)

The **Chairperson** reported that there was no new information on the site and that the Cheviot mine had agreed on compensating measures that would contribute to additional grizzly bear habitat.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** proposed an amendment to the draft Decision recommending that special consideration be given to proposed methods for controlling the mountain pine beetle. It expressed opposition to the artificial control of the beetle.

The Delegation of **Israel** requested Canada to provide any information on the situation at the site.

The Delegation of **Canada** reported that it was working with key site stakeholders, including the mining company, so as to offer alternative habitat for carnivores. It said that the proliferation of the mountain pine beetle was a natural phenomenon. The problem had been caused by several seasons of warm weather causing beetle population explosions and hence the need to control the outbreaks, which was done by natural methods.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it did not support the Delegation of the Republic of Korea's amendment. It was for the State Party to take a decision on the matter.

Following a request by the Delegation of **India**, the Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said it would withdraw the amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.21** adopted.

Nahanni National Park (Canada) (N 24)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.22** adopted without discussion.

Isole Eolie (Aeolian Islands) (Italy) (N 908)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.23** adopted without discussion.

Danube Delta (Romania) (N 588)

The **Rapporteur** read an amendment submitted by the Delegation of the **Netherlands** requesting the States Parties of the Republics of Moldavia, Romania, and Ukraine to submit a detailed report by 1 February 2008 on the state of conservation and the protection of the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.24** adopted as amended.

Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)

The **IUCN** reported no new site information, but several site threats, including illegal salmon fishing, gold mining and pipeline activity. It had been two years since the previous IUCN monitoring mission and no report had been received from the State Party. It requested an amendment to the draft Decision proposing a reactive monitoring mission to take place in February 2007.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the situation was similar to the past situation at Lake Baikal, and whether the model used at Baikal for mitigating the site threat from the oil pipeline could be used in the case under consideration.

IUCN said that the situation at Kamchatka was not the same as at Lake Baikal, but was different for a number of reasons. The Advisory Bodies had carried out many missions and recommended that the Committee define priorities so as to maximize resources or readjust mission budgetary allocations to the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Morocco** asked for clarification regarding the proposed new paragraph 5 and the deadline of 31 January 2008. It suggested extending the deadline for the submission of the state of conservation report of the property so that it might reflect the results of the mission.

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that it had had no response from the State Party to the most recent reactive monitoring mission in 2004. It suggested a mission date for the proposed follow-up mission of 15 March 2007.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished that the mission be a joint UNESCO-IUCN one, and not just a World Heritage Centre mission. It also wished for explanations as to why the State Party always addressed the same reports to the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it was an important site and that the State Party had provided a similar State of Conservation report for the previous two years and wondered if the Representative from the State Party could respond.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said in response that the reports were similar but not the same. The current year's report clarified several issues posed by the Committee. Illegal salmon fishing had decreased, and the gas pipeline and gold mining were outside the World Heritage property. It agreed to a reporting deadline of March 2007.

The Delegation of **Japan** said it had no objection to the amendment. It asked for a list of the missions undertaken by the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to be provided.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked what constituted an official mission and asked for specific clarification on the subject.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that an official mission was undertaken at the request of the State Party. It was preparing a list of all missions which would be submitted to the Committee in one report.

The Delegation of **India** recommended that an official IUCN mission be undertaken, to be scheduled before 15 March 2007 and asked if paragraph 3 could be modified.

The **Chairperson** restated the amendments made and declared Decision **30 COM 7B.25** adopted as amended.

Durmitor National Park (Serbia and Montenegro) (N 100)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.26** could not be examined.

Great Smoky Mountains National Park (United States of America) (N 259)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.27** adopted without discussion.

Yellowstone (United States of America) (N 28)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.28** adopted without discussion.

Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181 bis)

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that though additional buffer zones had been added, the recent logging activity near the site did not leave any room for extension of the buffer zones. New threats to site included fire and damage from road construction.

IUCN recommended an amendment in order to note the threats related to the logging.

The **Rapporteur** read an amendment suggested by the Delegation of the United States and supported by the Delegation of Canada, which called for the deletion of the original paragraphs 5, 6, and 7. The amendment suggested that the amendment to paragraph 5 read that the World Heritage Centre had written to the State Party on NGO concerns, and that paragraph 6 of the amendment say that the State Party would consider boundary changes and would submit a report to the World Heritage Centre.

The Observer Delegation of **Australia** said that it would provide a full response to the concerns on threats.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.32** adopted as amended.

Pyrénées – Mont Perdu (France/Spain) (C/N 773 bis)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.33** adopted without discussion.

Mount Athos (Greece) (C/N 454)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.34** adopted without discussion.

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.35** adopted without discussion.

Colonial City of Santo-Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.94** adopted without discussion.

Maya site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its statement, stating that no information had been submitted by the State Party concerning the construction of an airport within the boundaries of the site. It also stated that no action had been taken to impose any buffer zone.

The **Rapporteur** presented an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Chile which suggested amending paragraphs 4 and 6.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for clarification on the amendment.

The Delegation of **Chile** sought to clarify its amendment.

After a brief discussion, the **Chairperson** suggested suspending the discussion until the documents could be distributed.

Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.96** adopted without discussion.

Archaeological site of Chavin (Peru) (C 330)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.97** adopted without discussion.

Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.98** adopted without discussion.

Lines and geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.99** adopted without discussion.

Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its statement on the property. It had received a letter in June 2006, responding to an earlier letter from the World Heritage Centre. The letter from the State Party stated that it would examine all of the World Heritage Centre's recommendations with a view to undertaking corrective measures on the architectural design as proposed by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, and that that would be done by the Government in cooperation with the Republic of South Africa. The letter also mentioned that the revised design would seriously consider the management plan.

ICOMOS supported in principle the need for a building to store documents. It considered the project to be one that needed to be exemplary, fitting the setting. ICOMOS reviewed the current design and expressed concerns that it would not meet ICOMOS' requirements, suggesting that architects should respect local building traditions. ICOMOS offered to provide additional advice to the State Party if so requested.

The **Rapporteur** read out amendments in regard to a new paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that it could not find the reference to danger listing. Following explanations by the **World Heritage Centre**, it wondered if the decision should be modified in view of the explanation given by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked if the management plan had been completed.

ICOMOS responded in the affirmative.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** asked if the Observer Delegation of South Africa could explain its level of cooperation with Mali.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** was surprised that the State Party was requested to take account of the recommendations of the expert mission of March, and expressed concern as to whether the experts were truly familiar with the traditional architecture of Mali. It considered that it would be better to consult craftsmen.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the mission had been conducted by a specialist in earthen architecture, and by local experts.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that there were two issues to discuss – the first being that of danger listing, and it noted that those issues had been resolved. The second issue related to the construction of the World Heritage Centre. It noted that the purpose of the World Heritage Centre was important, but that it should be redesigned according to the needs of the State Party, and within the limits of available funds.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested clarification relating to the decision of the 29th session, indicating that the Committee had asked the State Party to undertake substantial efforts and not to complete a management plan. These efforts were accomplished. It requested that the State Party take the floor, as well as South Africa.

The Observer Delegation of **Mali** indicated that one of the essential points at Durban was the management plan, which had been completed, and that assistance from technical and financial partners, such as the World Heritage Centre and South Africa was necessary for the implementation of the management plan and to complete the Ahmed Baba Institute.

The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** explained that it supported Mali in restoring the manuscripts of Timbuktu, and that it was giving its technical assistance to Mali only in accordance with the desires of the Government of Mali.

The Delegation of **Morocco** commended the States Parties of South Africa and Mali for their cooperation on this important project for the protection of the written heritage. It emphasized the fact that the establishment of the Ahmed Baba Centre and new infrastructures at the cultural World Heritage sites in general, such as interpretation centres and site museums, highlighted the need for general master plans.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed changes to the draft Decision, re-affirming the decision taken by the 29th session of the Committee to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested that the Rapporteur also use texts submitted to him in French. It indicated that the property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger « on condition that » and added that if these conditions were fulfilled, the Committee had to confirm its decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.36** adopted as amended.

Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.37** adopted without discussion.

Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 Rev.)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.38** adopted without discussion.

Aksum (Ethiopia) (C 12)

The **World Heritage Centre** reported no new information to add on the site.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that one of the problems of the site was the mapping of the core and buffer zones and that no mission on those topics had been convened because the matter was to be addressed in a training program at the site.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that statement and said that a joint mission had been proposed but after a discussion with the Advisory Body it had been concluded that it was not necessary as the training capacity building issue would be addressed in 2006 and 2007 and would deal with the buffer zone and core management questions. The World Heritage Centre also proposed to develop a comprehensive management plan.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that wording be added to the draft Decision for the implementation of a management plan for the site in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that management plans were needed before the construction of the new infrastructure and supported Israel's amendment concerning the management plan.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that there had been four missions by the World Heritage Centre to the site and asked if they were World Heritage Centre missions.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the missions in question had experts as participants, adding that the work at the site was major work to reconstruct the site, to study local situation positioning of the obelisk and to discuss the situation with the State Party and the World Bank team, also operating at the site, and that the missions provided a full assessment and knowledge of the site. At the same time the site management plan was under preparation.

The Chairperson declared Decision **30 COM 7B.39** adopted.

Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)

The **World Heritage Centre**, informing the Committee about the reactive monitoring mission to the site by **ICOMOS** and **ICCROM**, said that the mission report had been transmitted to the State Party. The State Party had replied that it would respond to the report by June 2006.

ICOMOS said it was concerned about a European Union proposal for a project that would fund shelters for the site, noting that site shelters must be reversible and that the proposed project was problematic. The European Union project failed to meet the conditions required for the recommended shelters and ICOMOS sought modification of the project. In order to receive European Union funding the State Party was required to meet certain conditions but with the timeline the European Union had set and given its limited budget the State Party might not be able to meet the conditions.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was concerned about the European Union project and was not in favor. It would like to hear comments from Ethiopia, but noted that no representative from the State Party was in attendance at the time.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the European Union project provided a long list of actions that the State Party needed to undertake. It asked in what way the State Party had prepared the design of the project and if there had been input by UNESCO.

ICOMOS again voiced concern about the project and said the shelter structure exceeded the needs, adding that it had not been involved in the project design and would have wished to be at an earlier stage in its development. It was concerned about the extent of the European Union requirements and the limited budget available to the State Party to meet the requirements.

The Delegation of **India** asked about the European Union response to the problem.

ICOMOS reported that it had had no contact with the European Union.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that it had had contact with the European Union project, that the project needed to be launched now or the funds would be lost, and that World Heritage Centre had recommended changes in the project design so that the shelter would be less intrusive.

The **World Monuments Fund** reconfirmed its offer of USD 1 million for the site if the ICOMOS and UNESCO recommendations were addressed. It added that it hoped that the funds would serve for the study not considered under the European Union grant.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for information about the missions to the site.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained the sequence of the missions and their purpose.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.40** adopted.

Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)

The Delegation of **Mauritius** asked if the State Party could provide information about the buffer zone extension, as there appeared to be some confusion over that matter.

The Delegation of **Kenya** explained that the Government had taken serious note of the World Heritage Committee recommendations, and had stopped further development on the sand dunes through various means, including security measures. It explained that buffer zones would be expanded and that studies were underway, further noting that the new law would facilitate the review and strengthening of the management framework in place. The conservation of the site was a priority. The Delegation pointed out that paragraph 4 of the draft Decision recommended a good deal of infrastructure, and appealed for funding support to that end. It questioned the criticism directed to the State Party regarding governance, noting that many changes had been made in that regard.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested that the State Party prepare a report to confirm all that had been achieved at the site. It also requested that the last part of paragraph 5 of the draft Decision (in bold characters) be deleted.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that paragraph 4 of the draft Decision be modified taking into account the statement by the Delegation of Kenya.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.41** adopted as amended.

Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)

The Delegation of **Norway** commented that UNESCO had been substantially involved in the site. It had not noticed any reference in the report to the role of local authorities and wondered if UNESCO was solely responsible for the work on the site.

The **World Heritage Centre** specified that local authorities had been involved, with the support of the African Development Bank and the Department of Culture.

The Delegation of **Israel** cited the report's warnings of serious threats to the site, and wondered why there were continued delays on restoration work and there was still no management plan.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that in the past there had been isolated activities on the island, and that the objective of the African Development Bank and UNESCO initiative was to harmonize work on the island.

The Delegation of **Kenya** informed the Committee that from recent first-hand experience it could be observed that there was a great deal of good will at the site and that the State Party simply needed encouragement to continue with its work.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.42** adopted.

Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.43** adopted without discussion.

Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.44** adopted without discussion and adjourned the meeting for lunch.

The Observer Delegation of **Saint Lucia**, obliged to leave the Committee session early, wished to make several general comments concerning the functioning and the working methods of the World Heritage Committee. First of all, it emphasized that it was urgent to clarify the procedures concerning missions and the choice of experts commissioned to carry out these missions, as well as the roles of the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the Committee, to avoid all conflict of interest and responsibility.

A mission report should reflect the final and concerted opinion of the members of the mission. It was not normal that a member of a mission disassociated himself and contradicted the mission report being examined by the Committee. It then recalled that the *Guidelines* that entered into force in February 2005 had required a Titanic effort and it did not appear wise to amend them so quickly. Further, it was very pleased that the Committee had managed to rationalise the decisions concerning the properties in danger by using benchmarks, but recalled that these should be based on real and tangible results, and not on promises. It admitted that the discussions of the preceding days had troubled everyone because they had taken a worrying turn, more political than scientific, creating a North/South division within the Committee which could only be destructive for the future of the World Heritage Convention, as well as its Committee. Finally it congratulated the Chairperson of the Committee for the admirable manner in which she conducted the debates.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

SIXTH MEETING

03.00 p.m. – 07.15 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

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

ITEM 7B STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/7B
WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add

Decisions : 30 COM 7B.1 to 7B.98

ARAB STATES

Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that during the last meeting (Durban, 2005), the Committee had expressed its concern regarding the state of conservation of the site of Ksar Ait Ben Haddou and requested the State Party to provide a report on the progress achieved in the conservation and management of the property. The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS undertook a reactive monitoring mission and noted that major improvements had been accomplished, notably in the preparation of a management plan, and which were reflected in the document.

The **Rapporteur** read out two amendments to the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.45** adopted as amended.

Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)

The **World Heritage Centre** continued with paragraph (46) Ancient Thebes and its Necropolis, explaining that the report was not included in the main document but in document WHC-06/30.COM/7B.Add. The World Heritage Centre informed that, at the proposal of the State Party, a mission had taken place to evaluate the present situation in view of the vast development projects. The mission noted that the construction project

for a landing stage in front of the Karnak Temple had been relocated, and that the State Party authorities had undertaken excavations between the Karnak site and the Nile.

The Delegation of **Morocco** expressed concern regarding the question of resettlement of the villagers following the demolition foreseen in the property and requested fuller information from the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Egypt** informed the Committee that the village of Gurnah had been built on top of an archaeological site many years before and many decrees had been issued to demolish the village because it affected the tombs. Unfortunately, the main source of income was the smuggling of objects from the area. A second negative effect arose from local populations using the groundwater. Another village designed by a famous architect had been built and the people would be moved there.

ICOMOS explained that the proposed resettlement had been discussed at previous sessions of the Committee, with relevant decisions taken in 1998 and 2001.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** wished to make an amendment to paragraph 4 of the draft Decision « Urges the State Party to ensure that all architectural designs for new facilities to respect...» and express it in the following manner: « ...are in harmony with the archaeology and the need to respect the outstanding universal value... »

The Delegation of **Canada** expressed support for the proposal made by the Delegation of Tunisia.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.46** adopted as amended.

Medina of Essaouira (formerly Mogador) (Morocco) (C 753 rev)

The **World Heritage Centre** continued with paragraph (47) Medina of Essaouira (formerly Mogador) (Morocco) (C753 rev). The World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS carried out a reactive monitoring mission to verify the progress in the implementation of the decisions of the Committee and to evaluate the state of conservation of the property. According to the mission report, major clearing up and repair work to the Atlantic wall had been undertaken, representing considerable progress. The mission noted that the two projects constructed in the third buffer zone improved the public areas, benefiting both residents and tourists

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed concern about the phrase “full of tourists”, and asked if that implied damage to the site.

The Delegation of **Morocco** thanked the Delegation of Kenya for the question raised regarding the effect of tourism on the site. It informed that the old Jewish quarter bordered the sea wall and that much damage had been noted due to infiltrations. In order to reduce the threats that endangered the site, additional information would be necessary.

Therefore, the State Party has called upon specialists and architects whose task would be to implement the recommendations of the afore-mentioned mission.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed disappointment about the demise of the Jewish quarter because it was an important aspect of the property. It was also concerned about repairs made to the fortified wall, and whether Mogador Island with its important bird populations was protected.

The Delegation of **Morocco** thanked the Delegation of the Netherlands for its question and indicated that Mogador Island was not only of cultural interest but also natural for the species that it contained. National legislation has provided the means to protect the Island. Furthermore, special authorization to visit the Island is necessary.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked if the State Party could confirm that the interventions completed on the site had followed a management plan, and whether a management plan existed. Also, considering that it was difficult for new architects to contextualize their work within a site, it might be appropriate to apply the *Vienna Memorandum* (2005) with new insertions to the site.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that, at present, no management plan existed.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to understand the draft Decision: Paragraph 4 « Commends the State Party », and paragraph 5 « Notes that, although the actions taken... ». What are these actions? Do they concern the management plan?

The **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to provide clarifications.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that this wording was only contained in the French version of the document and that the correct formulation was « measures to be undertaken ».

The Delegation of **Benin** then said that if the English version was better formulated, it would not be necessary to present an amendment.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** said that, like Canada, it wished to know more about the management plan and the company of architects working on the property.

The Delegation of **Morocco** informed that the procedure for the competition was terminated and that it had benefitted from the cooperation of ICOMOS-Morocco. Experts and architects had been identified and there would be no problem for the implementation of the recommendations. With regard to the management plan, even if it did not exist in actual fact, a series of dispositions was in force for the safeguarding and protection of the site.

The Delegation of **Israel** commended Morocco on its identification of Jewish heritage and its approach to the rehabilitation of the area, supporting the Delegation of Canada's suggestion to the amendment.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** emphasized that when the Delegation of the State Party (Morocco) had informed the Committee of the situation of the old Jewish quarter, it was not with regard to a quarter according to its « beliefs », but with regard to the traditional character of the quarter.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested clarification regarding point 6 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.47** adopted as amended.

M'Zab Valley (Algeria) (C 188)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.48** adopted without discussion.

Qal'at al-Bahrein Archaeological Site (Bahrain) (C 1192)

The **World Heritage Centre** continued with paragraph (49) Archaeological Site of Qal'at al-Bahrein (Bahrain) (C 1192), indicating that important progress had been made by the State Party to heed the decision of the Committee at its 29th session and that the construction project for an artificial island, « Northern Star », opposite the property, had been abandoned.

At the invitation of the State Party, an ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission visited Bahrain in late June, to complete the zoning work initiated during the previous mission, and in particular to define the visual corridor destined to protect the site from marine constructions.

A letter from the State Party was received by the World Heritage Centre informing that the adoption of a visual corridor and the abandon or the relocation of the « Northern Star » project would be presented to the Municipal Council in September 2006.

The Delegation of **Morocco** commended the State Party for the progress accomplished. It further suggested a more flexible formulation for paragraphs 7 and 9 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.49** adopted.

Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.50** adopted without discussion.

Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.51** adopted without discussion.

Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

The **World Heritage Centre** continued with paragraph (52.) Tyr (Lebanon) indicating that there was no further information than that contained in the document, except a document in Arabic indicating that the expropriation of land for the future highway had begun.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated it had information suggesting that the proposed changes would affect the Roman aqueduct and the wall of Alexander the Great, and requested more information from the State Party.

ICOMOS stated that, like the Delegation of the United States of America, it had received some information, but no detailed data.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** emphasized that the highway in question crossed through the site. The UNESCO reports recommended surveys to verify whether there were existing archaeological vestiges which risked being damaged by the construction of a highway. Whereas it was almost certain that vestiges did exist, and it would be preferable to request the State Party to proceed with reliable surveys before continuing with the project.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested that paragraph 6 might be reworded to read “and to consider proposals to realign the highway to avoid impacts to the site”.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the Lebanese authorities had carried out surveys and geophysical research. All the results would be included in the archaeological map being elaborated in order to determine the existence of the vestiges.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it was not sure if the proposed amendment covered that issue, but it did not want the highway to affect the site.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the amendment was accepted.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished that paragraph 4 of the draft Decision be modified as follows: « Regrets, however, that the draft decree... »

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed to remove “strongly” before “recommends” and to find clearer wording for “construction freezing”.

The Delegation of **Morocco** noted that there were many positive elements, and that the highway project would take into consideration the technical samplings and surveys to ensure that there were no vestiges. The State Party was committed to a positive procedure for the protection of the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.52** adopted as amended.

Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.53** adopted without discussion.

Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.54** adopted without discussion.

Archaeological site of Volubilis (Morocco) (C 836)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.55** adopted without discussion.

Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)

The **World Heritage Centre** continued with paragraph (56.) Bahla Fort (Oman) (C433), indicating that there was no additional information.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that a progress report had already been undertaken on the Souk Bahla.

The Delegation of **India** stated that, considering the discussions held the same morning, it would be difficult to accept the amendment.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** agreed with India, and said that, after the earlier discussion the amendment should be included elsewhere. The Delegation also asked for more information about Souk Bahla so that the amendment would be clearer.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** wished the State Party to take the floor in order to provide further information that might enlighten the Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Oman** explained that the Bahla Fort had been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger after 15 years of significant work. The government continued to spend substantial resources to maintain the site and the Delegation reassured the Committee that all authorities were working together to implement a management plan including adequate administrative frameworks.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.56** adopted as amended.

ASIA PACIFIC

Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Islamic Republic of Iran) (C 115)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its report on the site, stating the problem of a shopping complex within the site's proximity. The site was supposed to be officially inscribed on the Danger List in February 2006, and on 25 January, a statement was received by the World Heritage Centre from the State Party. The completion of the demolition of the tower of the shopping complex was scheduled for May 2006, as stated in the State Party's letter. However, the work was behind schedule and had still not been completed.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** explained that the situation was not easy because a 19,000 sq m building was concerned and was not protected by the Government, and half a million dollars had been allocated the previous week for the continuation of the demolition. There had been some fear in the town before it had been explained what was going to happen. The Delegation hoped that could be an example not only for the Islamic Republic of Iran but also for the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** on behalf of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.57** adopted.

Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) (C 666)

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it had no new information to add to the state of conservation report.

The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** said that the recommendations of a mission in 2005 had been formulated in close cooperation with the State Party and the various stakeholders.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** said that the mission report focused on tangible features but not on intangible features, which were very significant for many people in connection with that site, as it was the birthplace of Buddha. The impact of tourism did not affect intangible values. Outstanding universal value was intangible as much as tangible. For indigenous communities in particular, intangible values were as important as other values.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.58** adopted.

Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it had no new information to add to the state of conservation report.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked the World Heritage Centre if in making proposals for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, it was mandatory to consult with the State Party. What format would that take in the current year in order to have a response for next year?

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that that was more of a procedural question. The World Heritage Centre would consult with the State Party in writing as it had done for the report of the previous year. Any recommendation made to the Committee would first be discussed with the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commented on the language on page 149, pointing out that the word “mediocre” was undiplomatic. After the “recent work” done, was there still a loss of authenticity?

ICOMOS clarified that what was meant was that there was some loss of authenticity which was not reversible.

The Delegation of **India** asked, with reference to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision, if benchmarks were established for the State Party to avoid inscription on the Danger List. It also noted that there was no management plan, nor had there been one when the property had been inscribed in 2001. The Delegation also suggested removing the last three lines in paragraph 7 about danger listing.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was in favour of keeping the text.

The Delegation of **India** suggested as an alternative the phrase “notes there is some loss”, and said it would still like to see the benchmarks added.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** affirmed that the loss of authenticity of a site should be tackled in its context. It suggested deleting the last three lines of paragraph 7 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked if the three benchmarks had been developed with the State Party, and if it was supportive of them.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that they were not really benchmarks, but rather proposals to the State Party. The mission in April 2006 had worked hard with the State Party to set them. They had been sent to the State Party but there had been no reaction to

them. The proposals had been formulated in consultation with the State Party, which was sympathetic to them.

The Delegation of **Morocco** informed that it was unhappy with the formulation of the draft Decision. For example, for paragraph 3 it suggested : « Noted with concern the non respect of the standards which affect the authenticity... »

The Delegation of **India** noted that the World Heritage Centre had clarified that the proposals were not really benchmarks, but in the absence of a State Party, it could not be ascertained whether it was in agreement or not.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated that, even though the recommendations were not strictly benchmarks, the State Party should begin to take action.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that if the State Party was in agreement they could be called benchmarks, but if not they could equally be called recommendations.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.59** adopted as amended.

Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C642)

The **World Heritage Centre** presented its report on the site, first acknowledging the tragedy of the 27 May 2006 earthquake which hit Java. In order to provide emergency assistance to the State Party, a sum of USD75,000 was approved by UNESCO for quick implementation by the State Party. However, much restoration would still be needed.

The Delegation of **Indonesia** expressed its appreciation to UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee for their immediate response and assistance, and said it was in agreement with the report submitted by the expert. The cost estimate was about USD 15 million, an amount impossible to shoulder alone since there were several disasters to recover from. The Delegation asked for support to launch a campaign to safeguard Prambanan.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** wished to know when the concrete structure had been built and whether practical alternative solutions existed.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the structure had been built in the 1950s to the 1980s but concrete was elastic and moved whereas the masonry could not move flexibly, and if it did move it was deformed and could not revert to its original shape. The renovation work would be extremely costly and complicated, as much study was required to find a way to reinforce it so that it could resist the next earthquake.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it was a terrible situation for so important a site in a country that had witnessed a succession of disasters. An international campaign was needed, like the one in Egypt in the 1960s.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its condolences for the losses suffered as a result of the earthquake and especially the loss of human lives, but also congratulated the State Party for the speed with which it had sought information.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.60** adopted. Then, she invited the Committee to consider decisions for adoption requiring no discussion.

Angkor (Cambodia) (C 668)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.61** adopted without discussion.

Classical Gardens of Suzhou (China) (C 813bis)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.62** adopted without discussion.

Imperial Palaces of the Ming and Qing Dynasties in Beijing and Shengyang, China (C 439bis)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.63** adopted without discussion.

Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodh Gaya (India) (C 1056 rev)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.64** adopted without discussion.

Borobudur Temple Compound (Indonesia) (C 592)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.65** adopted without discussion.

Sacred Sites and Pilgrimage Routes in the Kii Mountain Range (Japan) (C 1142)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.66** adopted without discussion.

Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) (C 870)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.67** adopted without discussion.

Historic monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.68** adopted without discussion.

Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.69** adopted without discussion.

Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz (Uzbekistan) (C 885)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.70** adopted without discussion.

Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.71** adopted without discussion.

EUROPE

Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 544)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the Russian Federation had provided a report with additional information on 8 June 2006. By letter of 9 June 2006, the authorities of the Russian Federation had underlined that they considered that the State Party was fulfilling its obligations concerning the protection of the property and that they objected to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Preparatory works for the restoration had been nearly completed but the main restoration had not yet started.

A new letter of 7 July 2006 from the Russian National Commission for UNESCO stated that the authorities had provided a detailed plan in 2003 and annual reports in the following years. The management of the property was carried out by the State under law 73. The museum reserve was responsible for the monitoring they had undertaken, including tourism management. Furthermore, they invited a mission to the site and requested financing.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that Norway, through its cultural heritage experts, had followed the restoration and had been monitoring the site for 10 years because it was important for the notch log technique which the Russian Federation shared with Norway. The structural system had a trademark in Norway and it therefore felt a moral obligation

to support the safeguarding of the site. The Delegation did not feel that the proposed solution was the right one, as it could harm the site and not respect its integrity. Norway said it had no objection to making it accessible to the public, and not only for religious purposes. It would also like to have the World Heritage Committee discuss the outstanding universal value of such a site. It recommended that the site be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in order to protect it, and encouraged the State Party to take action. The Delegation of Norway added that it would be happy to provide technical support.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** also said it was very concerned about the site, adding that it was always concerned about inscribing sites on the Danger List without the agreement of the State Party.

The Delegation of **India** expressed similar concerns. It would like the Secretariat to make it clear whether subparagraphs 5(a) to 5(e) had been discussed with the State Party and that it was in agreement.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** voiced its disagreement with the conclusions of the mission to the site. It affirmed that substantial progress had been accomplished and wished that the Committee approve another mission before the end of this year, in October 2006, for example, to take note of progress in the implementation and follow up of the recommendations

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the matter had been discussed during the 2002 mission, with an on-site workshop with ICCROM, and wood experts from ICOMOS, and that the State Party had held a follow-up workshop in 2003.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** pointed out that the same situation had prevailed in 2002 when a site had been proposed for the danger listing. The workshop had accordingly been held on the spot in July-August and a detailed restoration plan approved by the experts. Since then the State Party had been working on the plan every year, submitted reports and provided stable financing (almost USD1 million per annum), and had given a detailed report on the site that had been approved by the World Heritage Committee. In 2002 no expert from the World Heritage Centre had been present, which was why the State Party proposed that a mission be dispatched because extensive restoration work had taken place.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that three UNESCO staff members had visited the site in 2002 with the experts. Since 2002 there had been no mission there, but many experts continued to work with the site.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked if the State Party agreed to the site being placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** confirmed that it did not agree to the inscription of the site on the Danger List.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** informed that it felt that the site should not be inscribed on the Danger List and proposed an amendment by deleting paragraph 6.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that there seemed to be a misunderstanding; it understood from the Delegation of Norway that there was concern about the ongoing restoration work that could lead to a loss of authenticity. The Delegation pointed to the need for clarity, and to ascertain whether the work was going on and if it could be destructive. The Committee must trust the State Party if it said there was no problem.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it shared the concerns of the Delegation of Kenya, but had also heard that the work could be harmful to the site.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that there was a debate about the conservation philosophy for the property, stating that there was voluminous documentation in the World Heritage Centre to substantiate that. That was among the reasons why ICOMOS was moving for the danger listing of the site, on the basis of careful analysis of the reports received, and why the situation needed to be clarified.

The Delegation of **India** agreed that there was some confusion arising out of the conflicting reports, but perhaps the Delegation of Norway could provide a paragraph detailing the concerns.

ICOMOS said that subparagraph 5(c) could explain what was needed, an overall restoration concept for the Church of the Transfiguration, which needed a concept, and an overall management plan. That should be done with the accord of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Morocco** requested clarification regarding point 5 of the draft Decision: the difference between “strategic management” and “strategic plan”; and it wished to see the two expressions homogenised. It expressed its agreement with the Delegation of Benin.

The **Chairperson** summarized the debate thus far. While the Delegation of Norway had proposed inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, there appeared to be a majority in favour of first sending a mission as proposed by the Delegation of Benin, the results of which would enable the Committee to consider danger listing in 2007.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated its consensus on sending a mission to the site as proposed by the Delegation of Benin.

The Delegations of **Israel** and **Chile** indicated their assent to the proposal made by the Delegation of Benin.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that the amended draft Decision reflect the Committee's strong encouragement to the State Party to work with the World Heritage Centre on the restoration of the site.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that point 5(c) should become a separate paragraph.

The Delegation of **Norway** confirmed that it was now satisfied with the proposal to send a mission with a view to danger listing in 2007. It believed a good compromise had been reached. Subparagraph 5(c) covered the concerns it had expressed in earlier interventions.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.72** adopted as amended.

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a joint UNESCO/ICOMOS mission to Istanbul had been carried out from 6 to 11 April 2006, in conformity with Decision **29 COM 7C** and upon the request of the Turkish authorities, and in response to further information on continuing threats to the site, specifically, (a) continued degradation of the vernacular architecture within the protected areas (timber houses in the district of Zeyrek and Süleymaniye), the loss of the original urban fabric; (b) questionable quality of repairs and reconstruction of the Roman and Byzantine Walls; (c) uncontrolled development and absence of a World Heritage management plan; (d) lack of coordination between national and municipal authorities, and of organizational relationships between decision-making bodies for the World Heritage conservation at the site; (e) potential impacts of new buildings and development projects on the World Heritage values and integrity of the site, i.e.: the proposed extension project for the Four Seasons Hotel (archaeological remains of part of the Great Palace of the Byzantine Emperors); the new Golden Horn bridge projects on the setting of Süleymaniye Mosque and the wider World Heritage property; the "Dubai Towers", the proposed high-rise development at Hydarpaşa and the Galataport project.

Continuing, it informed the Committee that the State Party had provided the following information on 3 July about the measures taken by the relevant authorities as a follow-up to the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission report: (1) the Metropolitan Municipality of Istanbul had halted the restoration work in "Tekfur Sarayı" and Anemas Dungeon", both part of the Theodosian Land Walls. A Scientific Committee would be established and the restoration project revised under its supervision; (2) all restoration works at the "Historic Areas of Istanbul" would be supervised by the Scientific Committee and subject to the approval of the Regional Conservation Council (Protection Board); (3) in accordance with the Urban Conservation Plan (1/5000°), adopted on 26 January 2005, necessary works were being carried out to evacuate the periphery of the City Walls and improve the landscape of the area, to reduce the settlements in the Historic peninsula, and to prepare comprehensive design projects and local action plans with a view to safeguarding the historical fabrics with its cultural and social characteristics.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that he had received two proposals – from Canada and the Netherlands respectively – for amendments to the draft Decision, and proceeded to read them out.

The **Committee** indicated its assent.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification from the State Party as to whether the loss of the timber houses would require changes to the boundaries.

The Observer Delegation of **Turkey**, as the State Party, said that it attached great importance to the conservation of the Historic City of Istanbul and appreciated the concerns of the Committee and World Heritage Centre. It reiterated its intention to cooperate fully. A new mechanism for financing the protection works had been put in place and it recalled the information provided by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that it would consult the Rapporteur on various points relating to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** noted that the Delegation of Canada had proposed amending paragraph 7 of the draft Decision to insert “Outstanding Universal Value” in the place of World Heritage value.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands but observed that paragraph 6a should now be deleted as it related very strongly to the new paragraph 6 proposed.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the State Party had taken the requested action and halted the restoration work.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.73** adopted as amended.

Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that the State Party report of 30 January 2006 highlighted that the potential impacts of proposed development on the World Heritage site (Tower of London and Westminster) had been taken seriously during all planning applications, in particular for their setting; interpreted the *Vienna Memorandum* (2005) as highlighting that change was inevitable and that the significance of London lay in the fact of constant change and redevelopment, and further pointed out the improvements of living conditions and quality of life.

Continuing, it informed the Committee of a letter from the Department for Culture, Media and Sport dated 27 June 2006 in which: (1) referring to the draft Decision, the State Party assured the Committee of its full cooperation with the proposed monitoring

mission to take place immediately after the Committee. However, the State Party believed it was essential that all organizations and stakeholders with a role to play in the management of the property and in future development plans were able to take part; (2) the State Party confirmed that it expected the final version of the View Management Framework to be published in summer 2006; (3) the State Party set out its understanding that the draft Decision meant that in-danger listing was a future possibility, and that as such any move to put the Tower on the List of World Heritage in Danger before a mission had taken place would be counter-productive.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that he had received proposed amendments from the Delegations of Canada, Mauritius and the United States of America. The first of them, from the Delegation of Canada, proposed modifying paragraph 3 of the draft Decision to focus solely on the Tower of London.

The Delegation of **India** recalled that, when the property had been discussed by the 29th session, it had been accepted that the high-rise buildings would affect the property in its entirety. The proposed amendment was therefore unacceptable.

The Delegation of **Canada** withdrew its proposal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed deleting “Deeply” from the beginning of paragraph 5 and explained to the Delegation of the Netherlands that it believed that in the light of the letter from the State Party, the existing language was too strong.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendment to paragraph 6 it had received from the Delegation of Mauritius, and an alternative proposal from the Delegation of the United States of America.

The Delegation of **India** opposed both proposals.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked the Rapporteur to read out the new paragraph 7.

The **Rapporteur** did so and noted the consequential number changes.

The Delegation of **India** reiterated its opposition to the proposals.

The Delegation of **Norway** observed that it had two concerns. It was imperative that a mission take place as soon as possible and that that urgency be incorporated into the decision. It further urged that the emboldened text be retained in paragraph 6. It was a very serious case and the deadline must be 2007.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** withdrew its proposal but insisted that at future sessions there should be no move to place a property on the danger list in advance of a monitoring mission. To do so was premature.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** withdrew its proposed amendment in the light of the comments by the Delegation of Norway.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the comments made by the Delegation of the United States of America and requested that a reference to the *Vienna Memorandum* (2005) be inserted into paragraph 6.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed serious concerns. It was a serious case which under many circumstances would lead to immediate inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and possible deletion from the World Heritage List. There was no statement of significance or authenticity and it was clear that the proposed construction would affect the views of St Paul's and Tower Bridge, with a risk that they become 'Disneyland-like'. The Committee should not be afraid and should reflect on the line it had adopted with other similar issues, for example Cologne Cathedral.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.74** adopted as amended.

Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that it had received a letter on 16 May 2006 from the Minister of Culture of the State Party inviting the mission to the property in 2007. A second letter from the site manager had been sent on 15 June 2006. The State Party had informed the World Heritage Centre that a new ticket office with a secure sales area had been installed. It had also informed the World Heritage Centre that it was awaiting a loan of USD 80,000 from the World Bank for work on the management plan. That was relevant to the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** said that there had been no proposals for amendment to the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.75** adopted.

City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee about a letter dated 27 June 2006 from the city authorities which reported that: (i) a management plan and master plan for the World Heritage property would be finalized at the beginning of 2007; it would also take into account the proposed extension of Eggenberg; (ii) the contemporary re-design of the Kastner & Öhler department store was considered a necessary development for the city following the logic of continuity; (iii) the criteria for reviewing height of the superstructures, width, material, etc. of the building project would be discussed by the city authorities and international experts (also mission members) at a meeting in September 2006.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment to paragraph 5 proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Spain** asked for clarification from the World Heritage Centre as to why the mission undertaken had not been mentioned in the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that a mission had taken place in 2005 and that no other was foreseen. The city had informed the World Heritage Centre of its intention to host a meeting with international experts in September 2006.

The Delegation of **Norway** asked if the State Party could be invited to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Austria** recalled that it and the department store concerned wished to find a high-quality solution and expressed its wish for an expert mission to advise the next steps.

The **World Heritage Centre** observed that, as it would not be a reactive monitoring mission, it should not be financed from the World Heritage Fund. Furthermore, it did not believe that a mission was necessary – one had taken place in 2005 and clear written advice had been provided.

The Delegation of **Canada** withdrew its proposal on the basis of the information provided.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that it was not the first time that the Committee had had to address problems arising from international competitions. It believed that the Committee should issue a statement and agreed to prepare a draft for the Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.76** adopted as amended.

Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) (C 1156)

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the State Party had provided all Committee members with information published by the City of Dresden under cover of a letter dated 26 June 2006.

The ICOMOS evaluation of the situation and Visual Impact Study (VIS) received on 28 June 2006 stated that the construction of a bridge would place a threat to the cultural landscape of the site. Moreover, the bridge did not respect the legal framework set by European Union concerning noise protection and air protection. The World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that it had learned on 10 July 2006 that the City of Dresden would hold an extraordinary meeting on 19 July 2006 to take final decisions about granting the building concession for the traffic axis of Waldschloesschen Bridge in order to proceed with the construction of the bridge.

Noting the complexity of the case, the **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to read out the amendments that had been submitted.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** regretted that as a result of bad communication or misinformation the Committee had not been aware of the bridge at the time of inscription in 2004. In the light of the conflicting information it had received about what the voters had been told, it wished to hear from the State Party its views on the possibility of danger listing.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred. It appeared to be another case demonstrating the conflict between conservation and development. However, recent case history showed that it was possible to effect change and stop inappropriate construction. The Committee should consider issuing a statement clarifying what could and could not be done.

ICOMOS recalled that the city was planning to make its final decision on 19 July 2006.

Noting that the Committee had to decide that day, the **Chairperson** invited the State Party to take the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** observed that the case of Cologne Cathedral demonstrated the seriousness with which it approached heritage conservation. It regretted that ICOMOS had not presented all relevant information at the time of the original application. The representative of the Mayor of Dresden took the floor to read out a statement saying that the bridge was intended to benefit the city and that ICOMOS had seen no conflict between the proposed bridge and the application. The city was willing to consider introducing measures to restrict heavy traffic on the bridge.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party if it would agree to danger listing.

In reply, the Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that it could not give an answer pending consultations with the relevant authorities.

The Delegation of **Norway** observed that it was a very serious case. Paragraph 6 of the draft Decision clearly stated that the construction of the bridge would “irreversibly damage the values and integrity of the property”. In other words, if the bridge were constructed, the property should no longer be included in the World Heritage List. It proposed adding new text to paragraph 8 of the draft Decision to flag the possibility of deletion from the List if the plans were carried through.

The **Chairperson** invited further comments.

The Delegation of **India** said it had no difficulty with the Delegation of Norway’s proposal if the outstanding universal value was irreversibly lost and sought clarification from ICOMOS as to why the proposed bridge had not been brought to the Committee’s attention at the time of inscription.

ICOMOS said that the idea of a bridge had been discussed at various times since the nineteenth century but had always been dropped because of the impact on the valley. The *Operational Guidelines* required that major construction should be notified during the nomination process – but in the case under consideration, no crystallized plans had existed at the relevant time.

The **Chairperson** invited further comments on possible de-listing.

The Delegation of **Norway** clarified that it had proposed considering de-listing in 2007.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification on Norway's proposal.

The **Chairperson** observed an emerging consensus.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its perplexity vis-à-vis the draft Decision as presented. It further considered that a single reactive monitoring mission would perhaps not be sufficient to form a definite decision as to whether the value of the property would suffer irreversible damage should the bridge project go ahead. On the contrary, a more flexible attitude should be taken to allow the State Party to pursue the reflexion.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the city would make its final decision on 19 July 2006 – there was no time for a mission.

The Delegation of **Japan** shared the concerns that had been expressed but observed that de-listing was a drastic step. It urged due process and prudence.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it had listened with interest to the Mayor's statement. It was clear that the community had a choice to make. But the Committee also had a choice. Paragraph 179 of the *Operational Guidelines* defined potential danger. The Committee had a duty to recognize its responsibility. It supported the proposal of the Delegation of Norway to consider delisting the property in 2007 if the bridge is built.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** sought clarification of what was being proposed in the draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the proposal sought to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to consider, in a prudent manner, deleting it from the World Heritage List at the 31st session if the plans were carried through.

The Delegation of **Norway** indicated its consent.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** expressed its concern regarding the draft Decision and asked whether the consequences entailed by this construction project would affect the value of the property in an irreversible manner and, in the affirmative, to what degree.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it was extremely concerned about the proposed bridge. It noted some contradictions with the Committee's decision on the Tower of London.

The Delegation of **Peru** recalled that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger required the previous agreement of the State Party concerned. It then suggested that the procedure to be followed by the Committee – in the specific case under consideration as well in other similar cases of conflict between development and protection of World Heritage properties – was to give a warning message to the State Party by indicating the possibility of inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should the State Party decide to insist on the execution of the project, bearing in mind the possible deletion of the property from the World Heritage List as an extreme measure. It further said that if that was the perspective inspiring the amendment proposed by Norway, it would certainly support it.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that there were precedents for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger without State Party consent.

The Delegation of **Norway** confirmed its intentions for the benefit of the Delegation of Peru. The issue of the conflict between heritage and economy would undoubtedly recur but the Committee had a clear duty to protect the heritage. The difference between the case under review and London was that, for London, more information was needed. But in the case now before the Committee it was clear that, if the work was carried out, the outstanding universal value would be lost. The State Party had to choose between the bridge and World Heritage status. The Committee had no other option. It had no objections to softening the language provided the intention remained clear.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** recalled that the State Party had demonstrated how the bridge could provide the population with a better possibility of appreciating the value of the property.

The Delegation of **Benin** expressed its agreement that the Committee send a strong unequivocal message to the State Party and the local population who supported the bridge construction and gave its support to Norway's proposal.

The Delegation of **Morocco** requested that the floor be given to Germany with regard to the amendment proposed by Norway.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said it had mixed feelings but could not give a definitive view pending consultation with the relevant parties.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that four properties had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger without State Party consent: Manas in 1992; Sangay in 1992; Ichkeul in 1996; and Simien National Park in 1996.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** said that it would report to the city council on the seriousness of the position.

The Delegation of **Israel** believed that in the light of the comments by the State Party the proposed amendment of the Delegation of Norway should be adopted. There were differences between the case under review and the Tower of London because the Dresden Elbe Valley had been inscribed as a cultural landscape.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with both of those points. The Delegation of Norway's proposal would send out a strong message. If that helped maintain the outstanding universal value the Committee would have achieved its objectives. It also agreed with the Delegation of Tunisia that it would be important for the Committee to have a debate on the tensions between heritage and development.

The Delegation of **Peru** fully supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway which would certainly convey a strong message to the State Party, in a perspective of helping it in resolving the contrast that seemed to exist within the State Party itself between the federal administration and the local community.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its full support for the Delegation of Norway's proposal and its belief that the credibility of the Committee and of the *Convention* were at stake.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** took the floor to state that its previous comments did not imply conflict between the State Party and the City of Dresden. There had simply not been sufficient time for proper consultations with all concerned.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that, although it was a good friend of Germany, it had to be guided by the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*. It therefore supported Norway.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** concurred.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway but agreed with Israel in recalling that the property was inscribed as a cultural landscape and, in that regard, asked ICOMOS to confirm that the property would be wholly compromised under the perspective of cultural landscapes.

The Delegation of **Cuba** stressed that the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Norway mentioned the possibility of removing the property from the World Heritage List as the value of the property would be totally and irremediably compromised and not simply affected should the bridge be constructed. In that connection, it asked ICOMOS or the World Heritage Centre to clarify if they agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway.

The **Chairperson** noted that the ICOMOS position was set out in the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the property had been inscribed as a continuing cultural landscape. The Visual Impact Study undertaken by the State Party made it clear that the bridge would compromise the values for which it had been inscribed.

The **Chairperson** sought confirmation of consensus from the Committee

The Delegation of **Tunisia** affirmed that the pictures of the property showing the visual impact of the bridge were not convincing as they were taken at different seasons in comparison to the property in its present state.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Delegation of Tunisia agreed.

The Delegation of **Japan** also indicated its assent but asked that its concerns about the speed with which the process was moving be recorded.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that its concerns about inscribing a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger be recorded.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.77** adopted as amended.

Mr. Van der Ploeg (Netherlands) took the Chair.

Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg (Russian Federation) (C 540)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the report of the joint UNESCO-ICOMOS mission to St. Petersburg had been sent to the State Party for comments on 26 May 2006. No additional information or comment had been provided by the authorities.

Following the UNESCO-ICOMOS mission, the national authorities had requested International Assistance for the organization of a regional seminar “Scientific and Technical Challenges for the Management and Conservation of Historic Centres of Towns inscribed on the World Heritage List”

ICOMOS confirmed that the reduction by 10 metres of the height of the proposed new Mariinsky Theatre would mean there would be no impact on the cityscape except in the immediate vicinity.

The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments to the draft Decision had been submitted.

The Delegation of **Israel** read out its proposed statement regarding international architectural competitions.

The Delegation of **Benin** asked why paragraph 2 of the draft Decision stated that the Committee «Notes the initiative taken by the State Party to invite the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of 2 to 7 February 2006 » and proposed to modify the paragraph so that the Committee simply took note of the mission undertaken.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed he would amend the text to reflect the fact that the mission had taken place.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.78** adopted as amended.

Old Town of Ávila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the ICOMOS review of its report had come to the same conclusion as the previous year, and stated that the redesign of the Plaza Santa Teresa did not impact negatively on the outstanding universal value. However, the building design and volume were not appropriate.

Detailed maps had been submitted by the State Party but without specific indication of what should be considered as the buffer zone. The draft Decision therefore requested the State Party to provide such a map.

No amendments having been submitted, the **Chairperson** invited contributions from the floor.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked that “carefully” be removed from paragraph 6 of the draft Decision, as it was redundant.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.79** adopted as amended.

Madriu - Perafita - Claror Valley (Andorra) (C 1160)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.80** adopted without discussion.

Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.83** adopted without discussion.

Curonian Spit (Lithuania/Russian Federation) (C 994)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.87** adopted without discussion.

Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.89** adopted without discussion.

Old Town of Segovia and its Aqueduct (Spain) (C 311 Rev.)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.91** adopted without discussion.

Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 Rev.)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.92** adopted without discussion.

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.93** adopted without discussion.

Palace and Gardens of Schönbrunn (Austria) (C 786)

The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the mission of March 2006 had concluded that the Kometgründe project should be revised and advised reducing the height to a maximum of 60m.

The City of Vienna's comments on the joint mission report had been received on 16 June 2006. They confirmed the tower would be reduced by 50% to a maximum height of 60m, offered clarification regarding changes to the land-use plan, and reinforced Vienna's viewpoint in favour of the high-rise concept as a development need of a modern city.

The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment to paragraph 5 proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

Replying to a question from the Delegation of **New Zealand**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that, as the City of Vienna had adopted the high-rise concept in 2002 it wished to include a reference to it in the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.81** adopted as amended.

Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 Rev.)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a mission had taken place from 21 to 24 June 2006 and a mission report had been sent to the World Heritage Centre.

The main findings of the mission were the following: It had found a monumental reversion of values: the original hotel Ruza (architect Ugljen) had been an integral part of the morphology and “townscape” of Mostar. The new hotel put the whole centre of Mostar in its shadow, and presented itself as the new focal point. The mission considered the situation to be a real threat for the city of Mostar.

The mission concluded: that the current hotel construction project was not in compliance with the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* and the integrity and authenticity of the World Heritage property; that the Federal Minister of Physical Planning and the Mayor of Mostar should be encouraged to find a feasible solution for that complex situation, in particular to halt the current project, review the plans and find alternative solutions in line with the principles indicated by Prof. Zlatko Ugljen; that the master plan and the management plan adopted for the World Heritage property of the Old Bridge area of the Old City of Mostar should be fully respected.

That was taken into account in the revised draft Decision.

The Delegation of **India** requested clarification from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled the discussions that had taken place at the time of the property’s inscription. While it had been proposed under two criteria the property had only been inscribed under criterion (vi). As such the central question had to be whether the authenticity of criteria was affected by the building.

The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** expressed its thanks to the mission and informed the Committee that the Mayor had immediately halted further construction at the hotel Ruza. It awaited further guidance from the Committee.

The Delegation of **Morocco** observed that the picture shown was dated May 2006: in this regard it asked how it was possible that a building of four floors could be built in such a short time without UNESCO, which has closely monitored the site over a long period, being aware sooner?

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, while there had been close involvement between the UNESCO Office in Venice and the City of Mostar, it had been unaware of the building prior to the visit by the then UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, for the inscription ceremony, who had immediately informed the World Heritage Centre.

The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia and Herzegovina** explained that the new floor had been added extremely quickly. It expressed its gratitude to Mr Bouchenaki and promised that the issue would be resolved by the City and State Party together.

The **Director General of ICCROM, Mr Bouchenaki**, explained that, while the building had been present for a long period, the inauguration of the bridge in 2004 seemed to have

precipitated a construction boom. He confirmed that he had seen it for the first time in August 2005. On doing so he had immediately contacted the President of the State Party and requested a meeting with the Mayor. That meeting had been followed up with a letter saying that a building of that height was unacceptable and requesting an urgent expert mission.

The **Chairperson** observed that the Committee was clearly concerned about the situation and requested speakers to focus on the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked whether the hotel was within the boundaries of the inscribed site.

The **Director-General of ICCROM, Mr Bouchenaki**, explained that it was not the case.

The Delegation of **India** asked for clarification of the point raised by the Delegation of Israel.

ICOMOS confirmed that the site had been proposed for inscription under more than one criterion and confirmed that issues of authenticity still applied for criterion (vi).

The Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that, in the light of that statement, the Committee's responsibility lay in ensuring the authenticity of the inscribed site, not the area outside it.

The **Chairperson** asked whether it considered that affected the decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it did not.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that the decision be amended to include guidance to prevent such mistakes being replicated in future. It recalled that it was a site that had provoked strong emotions at the time of inscription and it was therefore incumbent on the Committee to do all it could to maintain that unity between the parties.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.82** adopted as amended.

Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that an international expert mission of December 2005 had reviewed a number of issues including the proposed extension to the Viru Hotel.

In June 2006, the World Heritage Centre had received information about the construction of a series of individual houses being planned in the north-western area of the town wall between the streets Suurtüki and Rannamäe, in the vicinity of the core zone of the World Heritage site – and that the State Court had acquitted the construction company RESTOR

of its suit against the Tallinn city authorities concerning the construction rights next to the Margarethe Wall. Yet the planned buildings would obstruct not only part of the 13th century town wall, but also a number of its bastions. That information had subsequently been confirmed by an e-mail on 5 July 2006 from the Estonian National Commission.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its concern about the developments around the town walls.

The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that a mission had taken place in 2005 and that the new information had come from the State Party itself. At the request of the Delegation of **Israel**, it pointed out the precise location of the new houses to the Committee. The new information did not affect the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.84** adopted.

Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541)

The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a joint letter from representatives of several NGOs, local communities and individuals, addressed to the World Heritage Committee members and the Director of the World Heritage Centre had been received at the Centre on 28 June 2006. The NGOs expressed their deep concern about the poor state of conservation of the property, the impact of new developments (high-rise buildings in the buffer zone), losses of archaeological remains and changes to the historic urban fabric.

A second letter of appeal from representatives of several NGOs, local communities and individuals had been received by the World Heritage Centre on 3 July 2006, highlighting concerns about the destruction of the cinema theatre “Lietuva” situated in the core zone. The World Heritage Centre had transmitted that information to the State Party and ICOMOS.

The World Heritage Centre had attended a meeting on 7 July 2006 in Vilnius with a number of NGOs on the state of conservation of Vilnius. The NGOs had sent letters to members of the Committee and to UNESCO requesting danger listing of Vilnius for the following key issues: lack of consultation of the authorities with NGOs and local groups in town planning; skyscraper development, in particular in the “green belt” around the old town; lack of implementation of legal protection and coordination between the different institutions; problems with investors, inappropriate reconstructions, demolishing of buildings and general lack of awareness about World Heritage obligations.

The meeting had taken place in a very constructive atmosphere and the different groups were assured that their concerns would be taken into account by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Morocco** observed that the picture shown during the oral presentation of the report only confirmed the concerns felt by Committee members during their visit to

Vilnius during the present session of the Committee regarding the impact of the tower on the townscape. It further asked at what date the construction of the tower had begun.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that a meeting the previous year had confirmed that the construction had begun in 2003-2004.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.86** adopted.

City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a one-day joint World Heritage Centre – ICOMOS mission to the Villa Saraceno had taken place on 24 June 2006.

The mission had discussed the impacts of the proposed highway on the Villa Saraceno and its landscape with the owner of the premises, the United Kingdom-based Landmark Trust, and with the representatives of Italia Nostra, a national cultural heritage protection NGO that had opposed the project since its inception in the 1970s. The mission had been informed of the current state of implementation of the overall project and of the concerns existing on the impacts on the Villa and its landscape.

The problem could be seen at three levels: (a) the direct impacts on the World Heritage property: the direct impacts had been mitigated by the changes in the location of the highway (now at about 800-900 metres from the borders of the property) and by the lowering of the level of the highway. However, no buffer zone had yet been established to protect the property and its environmental integrity, already exposed to nearby industrial constructions. The mission had been informed that a management plan for all the components of the World Heritage site was being prepared by the regional authorities, but it was not yet in force; (b) the direct impacts on the landscape associated to the Villa: like every Palladian villa in the Veneto Region, the Villa Saraceno had been designed by the architect with a specific association with its landscape. The landscape and the Villa formed one spatial system, linked through a skilful illusionist relationship. The construction of the highway would certainly affect the balance of the historic landscape; (c) the impact on the area located between the two protected hill chains (Monti Berici and Colli Euganei) that characterized the regional landscape. While the plain between the two hill chains was not a protected area, there were several examples of historic villas of different periods, some of which were of great local significance. The new highway would certainly affect the quality of their environment. Therefore it would have been desirable to weigh the merits of the new infrastructure against its cultural and environmental impacts.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that, while the architectural importance of Palladio was undisputed, context was also important. It sought clarification about how the road affected the buffer zones.

ICOMOS stated that the impact was considerable in terms of both the buffer zone and the setting.

The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification on whether that was reflected in the draft Decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** referred the Committee to paragraph 7 which requested the State Party to establish buffer zones for all villas included in the property.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed to make a specific proposal.

Pending that proposal, the **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished to suspend the debate on the item.

Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) (C 31)

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party had provided information on 25 April 2006 indicating that the second stage of works on the management plan had been concluded on 31 March 2006. A further letter, dated 2 June 2006, had pointed out that the draft plan had been presented to the Steering Committee members and discussed at the Steering Committee meeting on 30 May 2006. The national authority had informed the World Heritage Centre that the discussion revealed the need urgently to adopt new methods of work on the project. The national authority had underlined that the priority issue was that of including international experts into the process of producing the plan. The national authority had pointed that all remarks of the Steering Committee would be sent to the author of the management plan.

By a letter dated 28 June 2006, the State Party had requested changing paragraph 5 of the draft Decision to add “elaborated with involvement of the international experts”.

The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment to paragraph 5 proposed by the Delegation of Israel.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** pointed out that paragraph 4 seemed to be at odds with paragraph 3.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the decision responded to the requirements agreed upon at the 29th session of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.88** adopted as amended.

Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120) (continued)

The **Chairperson** reopened the debate on draft Decision regarding the Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 120).

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Kenya** requested confirmation that paragraph 4 prohibited construction in order to avoid ambiguity. If it did not, then an alternative should be found.

The Delegation of **Chile** pointed out that the Government of Honduras had pledged not to build the airport mentioned in the report and in the draft Decision, even if some information received appeared to give evidence of the contrary. It therefore suggested adding the word “possible” in paragraph 4 of the draft Decision, so that it would read “for the Rio Amarillo airport facility’s possible construction”.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** informed the Committee that its National Park Service had sent an expert mission to assist with the site selection and confirmed that that had been the recommended site.

The Delegation of **Kenya** commented that governments sometimes needed backing with strong words.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments he had received.

The Delegation of **Kenya** read out the text of two paragraphs in draft Decision **30 COM 7B.95 Rev.**

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Chile if it agreed with the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **Chile** said it shared the concerns expressed by Kenya but recalled the assurances given by the Government of Honduras about its determination not to build the airport. Even if the representative of the State Party was not present in the room, it invited the Committee to take into account the commitment shown by Honduras and it therefore reiterated its proposal to amend the draft Decision by inserting “possible” before “construction”.

In response to a question by the **Chairperson**, the Delegation of **Kenya** confirmed that it could accept the addition of the word “possible” provided the spirit of the amendment was unaffected.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.95** adopted as amended.

City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (C 712 bis) (continued)

The **Chairperson** re-opened the debate on draft Decision **30 COM 7B.85**.

The **Delegation of Israel** proposed an amendment to paragraph 7 of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.85** adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** noted that that concluded consideration of agenda item 7B.

The meeting rose at 07.15 p.m.

Partnership event: “How tourism can help conservation”.

FOURTH DAY – WEDNESDAY 12 JULY 2006

SEVENTH MEETING

09.00 a.m. - 01.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

(followed by the Netherlands)

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE VICTIMS OF THE BOMBING IN MUMBAI (INDIA)

The **Chairperson** asked all participants to stand in silence in tribute to the memory of the victims of the bombing in Mumbai.

The Committee observed one minute's silence in tribute to the memory of the victims.

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

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

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/7A
WHC-06/30.COM/7A.Add

Decisions: **30 COM 7A.1 to 7A.34**

The **Chairperson** said that the meeting would start with the pending draft Decisions from the documents relating to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (Site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 Rev.) (continued)

The **Chairperson** introduced the item, noting that the revised version of the draft Decision had been agreed upon by all concerned parties. She therefore took it that the decision could be adopted without discussion.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.34** adopted as amended.

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193) (continued)

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the item and explained that an amendment had been prepared by the Delegation of the Netherlands and that it was being presented by the Bureau. She requested the Rapporteur to read it out.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision as amended. The decision reflected the Committee's decision to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger, and to re-inscribe it at the 31st session if the conditions required were not met.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.18** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Norway** expressed its regrets about the process that had resulted in the site's removal and expressed its belief that when benchmarks were set for removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, those benchmarks should be met before removal of the property from the List.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the statement by the Delegation of Norway.

ITEM 8 ESTABLISHMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 20 APRIL 2006 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE *OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES*

Document: WHC-06/30.COM/8A.Rev

Decision: **30 COM 8A**

The **Chairperson** introduced item 8A, referring the Committee to document *WHC-06/30.COM/8A.Rev*.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it considered the Tentative Lists to be a very important exercise and that it was ready to revisit them. It noted that 51 properties on the updated list were from Africa, which demonstrated that the Global Strategy was effective. It now remained to undertake capacity building to ensure that those sites were not inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Africa Fund should be of great assistance in that regard. The Delegation added it was now in a position to announce that the Government of Norway had pledged the amount of 3 million Norwegian crowns (approximately equivalent to USD 500,000) to that fund.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the comments made by the Delegation of Norway, noting the potential for better dialogue for the implementation of the Global Strategy that would help correct shortcomings and allow for the development of national policies.

The **Rapporteur** requested that the name of the country, the name of the site and its number be clearly recorded on the forms submitted.

Referring to draft Decision **30 COM 8A**, he said that further to the recommendations of the Kazan meeting the Committee requested the Secretariat, in consultation with the advisory bodies, to propose an enlarged format to include: (a) an initial evaluation by the Advisory Bodies to guide the States Parties in the preparation of a nomination; (b) an evaluation of the Global Strategy by the Advisory Bodies to inform States Parties of possible comparative analysis in preparation of a statement of Outstanding Universal Value; (c) encouragement to the States Parties to develop feasibility studies and to develop national inventories; (d) encouragement to States Parties without Tentative Lists to develop them.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that it had no difficulty in going along with those recommendations but that Tentative Lists were different from country to country and should reflect the specificities of the country producing them.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the Delegation of Norway's contribution reflected the Norwegian spirit, which was to be commended, and that if strict adherence to the Global Strategy was followed, the statement of Outstanding Universal Value would truly become universal so that the good work could continue.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the Delegation of Norway for its contribution and statements. It stated that the Delegation of Israel's amendment had financial implications for the Advisory Bodies and seemed rather complicated. It asked that the decision not be adopted right away, but asked if it could be printed and studied by the Committee.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Delegation of Canada that the amendment should be studied before being adopted.

The **Chairperson** suggested that draft Decision **30 COM 8A** should be left in abeyance.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: **WHC-06/30.COM/8B**
 WHC-06/30.COM/8B Add
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.4

Decisions: **30 COM 8B.1 to 8B.58**

I. Changes to names of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List

The **Chairperson** introduced item 8B, referring to the letters pointing out factual errors received from Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, France, Gabon, Israel, Morocco, Mauritius and the United Kingdom. The Advisory Bodies would present the sites concerned and focus on the factual errors.

The **World Heritage Centre** drew attention to the working document containing the proposed name changes, and to the relevant draft Decisions. It read out the list of countries and sites which had requested name changes.

The Observer Delegation of **Thailand** said that it wished to make it clear that for draft Decision **30 COM 8B.14** on the list, it was not requesting a name change for Ayutthaya, but rather a correction of a typing error that had been made at the time of inscription.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that that was indeed a matter of factual error and that there was no need to carry it further.

The **Chairperson** announced that it would be removed from the list as it was not a name change.

Subject to that removal, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8B.1** to **30 COM 8B.20** adopted.

II. Examination of nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee would adopt 33 decisions on new nominations during the day and would begin with consideration of the natural and mixed properties in the Arab States. She further noted that the difference between referral and deferral should be clarified and gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it was necessary to keep in mind the difference between “referral” and deferral” which had nothing to do with outstanding universal value. Referral meant that the nomination could be resubmitted and would be transferred for re-examination the following year. If nothing was received from the State Party in the following three years, the dossier would have to be resubmitted again according to the normal cycle. Deferrals would not be resubmitted the following year and would have to be submitted following the normal cycle.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that before the Committee embarked on that important agenda item it wished to ask several questions. Did the site have outstanding universal

value as stated in the *Operational Guidelines*? Either it did or it did not, but there was not enough information. Was there an acceptable management system in place? Was there legislation in place for the protection of the site? Were the integrity and the authenticity of the site in place? These criteria must be met before the site is inscribed. If those criteria were not met then the Committee should opt for referral or deferral. The Delegation of Norway did understand that an inscription on the World Heritage List had incited countries to lobby, but basically inscription would be considered through the examination of the site. The situation had improved but the focus should be on sites. It also stated its respect for the Advisory Bodies, but reaffirmed its right to question them if necessary.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it could be seen from the statement by the World Heritage Centre that referral was a complex issue, and sought more clarification.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it was not a new cycle but was merely a question of re-examination. The World Heritage Centre dealt with the new information in the nomination file.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked again for clarification on the issue of what would happen when a State Party had two different sites, and worried that the State Party would be pushed into a certain cycle.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that if such a situation occurred, where the State Party had two sites and there was a referral, then they would defer to the Suzhou decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it spoke in support of the statements made by the Delegation of Norway and confirmed that the Committee had to ensure that outstanding universal value, integrity, authenticity and legislative protection were in place and that all information should be fully disclosed on the site. If there were a factual error in the nomination dossier, it asked that it be corrected at the time of inscription.

The Delegation of **India** said in support of the statements made by the Delegation of Norway that effectively the Suzhou decision did affect the countries' possibility to nominate new sites in the case of a referral.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the sites that gave the Committee trouble were the sites that did not have buffer zones or management plans. It confirmed that there was a site that had been submitted before and deferred and was now being presented again in a satisfactory manner, and asked whether a decision which had had a referral, meaning that the Committee had not made a decision but would need more information on the site, could it possibly become a deferral then.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that this was indeed correct.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it believed that all members would be guided by this, but that it would not support and unjustified referral and asked that the discussion of prejudging sites be stopped.

The Delegation of **Benin** esteemed that everyone's position had been aired and it was time to halt the discussion.

IUCN described its evaluation procedures, recalling its founding principles that guided the rigorous evaluation process it undertook in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines* in order to reach a recommendation, making full use of its expert network. It enumerated the sites to be examined at the current session and suggested that the date for submission of nomination files be revised to 28 February.

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1 ARAB STATES

A.1.1 New nominations

Property	Toubkal
Id. N°	N 1168
State Party	Morocco
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)(ii)(iv)

IUCN presented the site, specifying that the site did not meet the conditions for integrity and that there was a factual error in the location of the site in the western Atlas and not the eastern. It recognized that basis of the claim by the State Party that this was a World Heritage site, was on the tectonic values of the site. This related perhaps to a difference of understanding of Outstanding Universal Value. It agreed that the property was important for the region but it was not of outstanding universal value as set out in paragraph 52 of the *Operational Guidelines*. **IUCN** added that the site could have potential as a cultural landscape and did not recommend inscribing the site as a natural property.

The Delegation of **India** said that the site presented two kinds of difficulties, one in respect of the type of site, and one in terms of outstanding universal value, and asked, if the site were to be presented in future as a cultural landscape, whether it would have outstanding universal value.

IUCN responded that that would require specific evaluation, and that, as a cultural landscape, it would require an ICOMOS evaluation as well.

The Delegation of **Japan** said that it would have liked to have the State Party's opinion on **IUCN** evaluation, and asked if there was any other information from the State Party regarding inclusion of the site as a cultural landscape?

The Delegation of **Morocco** thanked IUCN for the evaluation and the Delegation of Japan for having requested clarification. The position of the State Party remained unchanged to that contained in document *WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.4* – the site was submitted for its natural values.

The **Chairperson** asked if the State Party would be prepared to reconsider the site as a cultural landscape.

The Delegation of **Morocco** replied in the negative.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it was having difficulty as the State Party was using the former numbering system for natural sites.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the new system would start the following year for sites submitted after 2005.

The Delegation of **Benin** recalled that IUCN judged that the property did not possess outstanding universal value. It indicated that, in principle, a proposal for nomination which was rejected by the Committee could only be resubmitted in exceptional cases. The State Party should take the floor in this regard.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that it was going to cite the same chapter and verse and noted that this highlighted the question of who was doing the comparative analysis.

The Delegation of **India** stated that comparisons should be made within the same zone and that if IUCN considered that the site had no outstanding universal value, but that IUCN had taken into consideration under criterion (iii), yet they visited the site in a bad season, in winter and that they could not compare one zone with another zone. It would like the State Party to confirm that they would not rethink the site's inscription in the future. Furthermore, shouldn't the site be encouraged to try to be inscribed again, and could IUCN say what they thought of this.

IUCN responded that the reactive monitoring mission had visited the site in the winter but that the site had been visited on several occasions at different times of the year, adding that its comparison was with other mountain sites around the world and not in the zone.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** indicated that it had problems in understanding the IUCN evaluation, comprehensible only to the experts of that Advisory Body. It wished for the presence of a « defence lawyer » for the property to be able to debate the matter. It refrained from expressing a definitive opinion, but was not against the decision proposed by IUCN.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.21** adopted.

A.2 ASIA/PACIFIC

A.2.1 New nominations

Property	Sichuan Giant Panda Sanctuary – Wolong, Mt. Siguniang and Jiajin Mountains
Id. N°	N 1213
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

IUCN presented the site and recommended an independent evaluation of the management plans if the site were to be inscribed. It noted that a dam was under construction and that it would flood a small town, but would not have significant impact on the site. It added that the evaluation considered the property mixed and one of the biggest sites in the temperate zone of the world.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it was an obvious case for inscription, congratulated the State Party for the quality of the nomination file, and added that the Panda Sanctuary was a flagship for conservation.

The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the State Party for having persisted in improving the nomination file.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that using a charismatic species to promote preservation was a real expression of outstanding universal value through one species.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested the inscription of this property by acclamation.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.22** adopted.

The Delegation of **China** said that it was delighted with the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List and thanked UNESCO and IUCN.

Property	Transborder Rainforest Heritage of Borneo
Id. N°	N 1197
State Party	Indonesia/Malaysia
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)(ii)(iv)

IUCN presented the site and stated that it considered the site to meet criterion (iv), but that it did not meet the required conditions of integrity and recommended deferral of the nomination until the site did so.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** considered that the site should be inscribed and placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger as well. It sought the opinion of IUCN on the importance of the site.

IUCN confirmed that it was a highly important site but different from Sumatra, and upheld its recommendation.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked whether it was a referral or a deferral, noted the lack of management plans, and said that it wished to know whether or not the State Party demonstrated strong will. He also asked if it was a fragile site.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the Delegation of the Netherlands that the site was special and commented that it could be seen that there were two countries trying to get together management plans. It further commented that the State Party should confirm that no further planting would take place.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** explained that a national taskforce had been established as early as 2001 to put together a management plan and system. It added that legislation was in place and that it had prosecuted illegal logging industries in the area and had issued a ban on oil exploitation in the area. The State Party had signed a Memorandum of Understanding (Indonesia/Malaysia) on illegal timber.

IUCN indicated that its recommendation was not a deferral for lack of outstanding universal value but that the States Parties needed to solve certain issues. It added that the site had potential outstanding universal value but that it did not meet the required conditions of integrity.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** said that it would like to see different recommendations based on the criteria.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** thanked IUCN for having demonstrated the outstanding universal value of the property. It associated itself with the proposal to inscribe this property at the same time on the Danger List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** pointed out that articles 4 to 10 of the *Convention* provided that the duties of protection of World Heritage sites were the responsibility of the State Party and requested the Committee not to inscribe the site for protection.

The Delegation of **Spain** indicated that the case before the Committee was a good example of a trans-boundary property, a concept promoted by the World Heritage Committee. It was an important property whose outstanding universal value was not in question, according to IUCN. The shortcomings presented in the IUCN evaluation were not very different from those in some properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. It supported the proposal by the Delegation of the Netherlands for simultaneous

danger listing as that would be conducive to better monitoring of the protection of the property.

The Delegation of **Norway** agreed that the site was important for two State Parties and indeed for all the State Parties to the *Convention* but pointed to the danger of accepting sites before the criteria were met in the hope that the State Party would be motivated to improve matters. It cautioned that the Committee had listed sites in the past that had taken 20 years to be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** said it was in favour of inscribing the site on the List, given its importance and the statement by the State Party that efforts had been made to solve the problems.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the Delegation of the United States of America and joined other Committee members in recommending referral.

The **Chairperson** concluded that consensus on referral was reached.

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked if IUCN would agree to refer the nomination instead of deferring it, with special regard to the issue of integrity.

IUCN pointed out that the conditions of integrity were not met and that the actions to be taken needed time; referral would therefore be premature and an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be the consequence.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed to keep the draft Decision for deferral or go for danger listing directly; a referral could be a bad start for the site.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from the Committee on referral or deferral.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, seconded by the Delegation of **Canada**, supported the draft Decision proposed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.23** adopted.

A.3 EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

A.3.1 New nominations

Property	Hirkan Forests of Azerbaijan
Id. N°	N 1212
State Party	Azerbaijan
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that inscription should be deferred to allow for a serial trans-national nomination with Iran.

The Delegation of **Benin** asked IUCN to clarify whether the reduced area of the property was in itself a positive or negative fact. It added that, in principle, it supported the idea to envisage a serial transnational nomination with the Islamic Republic of Iran, but recalled that, in this case, such a nomination should be presented with the consent of the two States Parties concerned, in accordance with Article 138 of the *Guidelines*.

IUCN explained that the area was small but that the site had great potential under criterion (iv), and that on the Iranian side the Hirkan Forests were already protected as a National Park.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** said that its authorities had good relations with neighbouring Azerbaijan and that it was ready to prepare a nomination for the Iranian part, but that the nomination from Azerbaijan could be already registered, although it could not make any technical comments.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** referred to page 34 of the relevant document and asked whether the protection was legally binding.

IUCN noted that the map provided in the document was for a serial site, surrounded by a buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Israel** questioned the issue of size and whether the site had outstanding universal value by itself or only if enlarged.

IUCN explained that the question of size stemmed from the conditions of integrity in the *Operational Guidelines* and that the Hirkan Forest in Azerbaijan did not represent the Hirkan Forests that were important in global terms.

The Delegation of **Morocco** returned to the question of the relation between the size of the property for nomination and its value, and in this case asked IUCN if the studies carried out on the property also included the part of the site situated on Iranian territory, and whether that area had also been evaluated. It further asked for clarification as to why criteria (i), (ii) and (iii) had not been retained.

IUCN noted that all experts agreed to move towards a joint nomination which would be a very positive step forward. Attention was drawn to pages 32-33 concerning the criteria.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that, concerning the Islamic Republic of Iran, the site was not yet on the Tentative List and that an inclusion would normally be required one year prior to the presentation of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.24** adopted.

Property	The Great Rift Valley Migration Flyway, the Hula
Id. N°	N 1219
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (ii)(iii)(iv)

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it should not be inscribed as it could not be considered to be of outstanding universal value on its own. The cooperation with other Conventions concerning the phenomenon in question was important and a revised dossier as a serial trans-national nomination was to be encouraged.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that he had received a revised draft Decision from the Delegation of the United States of America, supported by the Delegation of New Zealand, which stated that it recognized the role of migratory species in World Heritage and adopted the principles that the key sites associated with this phenomenon be inscribed on the World Heritage List. The decision recalled that referring to the many decisions concerning the outstanding natural heritage values, and considering the links with other key agreements, noted that the site should be considered as trans-national serial site and should be referred to the 31st session of the Committee in 2007. In light of the decision, it requested that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN, through their network of experts, provide the assistance needed to produce the transnational serial nomination.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that it was an important flyway similar to the western Palaearctic flyway along which there were properties that were included in their own right. It stressed that the first site of a serial nomination needed to possess outstanding universal value in its own right and should be clearly formulated in terms of framework; it would therefore support referral to allow for a trans-national nomination.

The Delegation of **Norway** said it hoped that the State Party would continue with its work. Because the current proposal had no outstanding universal value on its own it would not qualify for inscription, and reconsideration would be required.

The Delegation of **Benin** expressed its perplexity with regard to the draft amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America. In this respect, it recalled that in conformity with the *Guidelines*, the Committee decides the referral of a nomination for inscription when it considers that additional information from the State Party is necessary. In this case, it considered that the possibility of envisaging in the future a serial transnational nomination for inscription, as mentioned in the draft amendment, would require more in-depth studies rather than simple «additional information», especially taking into consideration the fact that the States Parties who might be associated in this project are at present unknown and, in any case, not prepared.

For these reasons, it could not support the draft amendment proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it supported the proposal, as the whole Rift Valley was an important flyway, one of the most spectacular sites of that kind. In East Africa that heritage was shared among nations and its recognition was crucial. It further referred to paragraphs 138 and 139 of the *Operational Guidelines* concerning the consent of States Parties for serial nominations and confirmed that it would be part of such a nomination.

The **Chairperson** asked whether there was agreement with the draft Decision as amended.

The Delegation of **India** referred to the Director of the World Heritage Centre's explanation that referral was by no means a judgement on outstanding universal value and stated that international cooperation was most important. It welcomed the amended draft Decision and said that it was possible to refer while respecting the views of the Advisory Bodies.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that it already worked together with Rift Valley States, in particular for a statement which had been submitted in March 2006.

IUCN noted that it would be preferable if the State Party initiating the project had a property of outstanding universal value and pointed out that on page 49 of the evaluation document the deferred nomination of the Kenya Lakes was presented.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it was intrigued by the concept and that all routes had key areas, but that the case under consideration constituted a new type of site. If the current nomination was not inscribed it could not come back to the Committee.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** observed that a transnational nomination of a migratory flyway in the region could, in general, also involve at least nine Arab States but it stated that at this stage the present situation – and not questions of principle – was not conducive for these States to participate in a similar project.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, referring to the Kenya Lakes, said it was in favour of a trans-national nomination and asked the Delegations of Israel and Kenya to work together.

The Delegation of **Japan** regretted that the Delegation of the United States of America had not proposed the same principle for Malaysia.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that the nomination would take time and it should be re-submitted as a new trans-national one.

In response to a request for clarification by the Delegation of **Canada**, the **Legal Adviser** stated that if the Committee did not inscribe a site such a nomination could not be presented again, except under exceptional circumstances, such as new scientific evidence.

IUCN informed the Committee of past cases such as Ibiza, which had been re-submitted as a completely new nomination.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that, following the legal advice, it proposed deferral, as otherwise there would be problems in the future.

The **Chairperson** suggested taking the Delegation of the United States of America's amendment with the Delegation of Canada suggestion for deferral.

The Delegation of **Norway** agreed to that option.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed to delete the last paragraph and to replace it with: "Notes the nomination statement for a trans-national serial nomination together with Kenya and possibly other countries along the Great Rift Valley and defers the nomination back to the State Party..."

The Delegations of **Kenya** and the **United States of America** agreed.

The Delegation of **Cuba** asked until when the nomination would be deferred.

The **Chairperson** said that deferral meant that the nomination could be re-submitted when it was ready.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.25** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stressed that the strength of the *World Heritage Convention* lay in the spirit of putting aside conflicts for the benefit of humanity and regretted the comments by Tunisia.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** stated that it simply wished to recall that the Arab States were not ready at the present time to associate themselves with the project and that eventually, when conditions permitted, they would do so.

Mr Van der Ploeg (Netherlands) took the Chair.

Property	Dinosaur Ichnite sites of the Iberian Peninsula
Id. N°	N 1204
State Party	Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)(ii)(iii)

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it should be deferred and that a joint nomination with Portugal could be considered.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked about any cultural values.

IUCN said that it was not in a position to talk about cultural values as the nomination was justified only for scientific values.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.26** adopted.

A.3.2 EXTENSION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Property	Kvarken Archipelago (Extension to the “High Coast”)
Id. N°	N 898 Bis
State Party	Finland/Sweden
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that it inscribe the site as an extension to the existing High Coast in Sweden.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.27** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Finland** thanked the Committee for the inscription and highlighted its importance for the local communities.

A.4 LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN

A.4.1 New nominations

Property	Gorgona and Malpelo Islands, Coastal and Oceanic national Marine Parks of Colombia's Eastern Tropical Pacific
Id. N°	N 1216
State Party	Colombia
Criteria proposed by State Party	N (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

IUCN presented the site and its evaluation report and recommended to the Committee that a part of the nomination should be inscribed as a key marine site.

The Delegation of **Chile**, referring to paragraph 3 of the draft Decision, pointed out that there was a contradiction between what had been said by IUCN in the presentation and what was being recommended in the draft Decision with regard to the nomination of Gorgona. In particular, the studies had not been completed and the Committee should consequently allow the State Party to provide more in-depth assessment of the value of the nominated property. It therefore suggested amending the recommendation so as to defer the nomination.

The Delegation of **Israel** stated that it was a crucial site for the Eastern Tropical Pacific.

The Delegation of **Spain** considered that the nominated properties of both Malpelo and Gorgona were part of the same marine corridor and that the recommendation to inscribe Malpelo Island and not to inscribe Gorgona could therefore affect the protection of the corridor as a whole.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the amendment to defer the nomination of Gorgona Island, as proposed by the Delegation of Chile.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested clarification as to whether the case concerned one nomination with only one part inscribed and the other not.

The **Chairperson** said that the consensus was that one part was to be inscribed and the other deferred.

The Observer Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its satisfaction with the inscription of Malpelo Island on the World Heritage List and recalled that its sanctuary had great biological diversity. It further stated that the Malpelo Foundation would closely monitor the conservation of the newly inscribed property, and that more in-depth information on Gorgona would be provided in the future so that the Committee might consider its inscription.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.28** adopted as amended.

B. MIXED PROPERTIES

B.1 AFRICA

B.1.1 Properties deferred, referred back or recommended for non inscription by the World Heritage Committee at previous sessions

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the nomination from Malawi had been withdrawn.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was saddened by that information as it was a site in the Rift Valley.

Property	Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda
Id. N°	N/C 1147 Rev
State Party	Gabon
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (iii)(iv) N (ii)(iv) CL

IUCN presented the site nominated as a mixed property and its evaluation report and recommended that the Committee defer the site which had also been recommended by **ICOMOS** for the cultural values. Both Advisory Bodies also referred to the factual error letter received from the State Party.

The Delegation of **Peru** asked to hear from the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Gabon** stated that it had presented the map in order to indicate the appropriate boundaries, as recommended by **ICOMOS** and requested by the Committee when the nomination was referred by the Committee at its 29th session.

The Delegation of **Benin**, whilst thanking the Advisory Bodies for the remarkable work they accomplished for the Committee, expressed its discomfort with regard to the draft Decision. In recalling the spirit of cooperation that must always inspire the common work of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, the Delegation asked whether the referral of the nomination for inscription would not be sufficient to acquire additional information and more detailed analyses, as mentioned in the evaluation report. It moreover recalled that during discussions on this same nomination for inscription during the 29th session, the possibility of according international assistance to the State Party had been mentioned.

IUCN noted that a good comparative analysis took time, as did the proper preparation of a serial nomination.

ICOMOS said that with another referral similar problems could be encountered as no further mission could be carried out within a short time frame.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed concern about the issue of outstanding universal value as data were available and it was important for the Advisory Bodies to take them into account. For example, the area was included in the **WWF** 200 eco-regions of the world as one of the least disturbed by human footprint and being a refuge for endangered mammals. At the same time the site bore testimony to 400,000 years of human history.

IUCN explained that the classification by **WWF** was based on priorities for conservation not focusing on outstanding universal value. It further referred to the **Garamba** case, and stated that World Heritage should not exclusively focus on one species.

ICOMOS added that progress had been made on legal protection.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether the State Party received international assistance and expressed sympathy with the African region, still under-represented on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it was not satisfied with the answers on the question of outstanding universal value and stated that it was the duty of the Committee to assist the State Party.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its perplexity about the wording of the draft Decision, suggesting that more diplomatic wording should be used.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party had not asked for international assistance but that preparatory assistance had been provided at the time of the first submission of the nomination.

In reply to a question by the Delegation of **India** as to a possible contradiction in the draft Decision, **ICOMOS** explained that the National Park already had full protection and that additional sites were added.

The Delegation of **Benin** observed that there was much misunderstanding in the ICOMOS evaluation report and, in this respect, asked how the Committee could take a decision before clarification of these misconceptions. It therefore suggested postponing the decision until the afternoon session to allow an informal working group, appointed by the Chairperson of the Committee, to work on an amendment to the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** said that that was a constructive suggestion, and took it that the Committee agreed to the proposed consultations in an informal working group.

The Delegation of **Israel** said, by way of general comment, that the Committee tended to look at sites at the national level but not on a global scale as should be the case. It referred to the example of the withdrawn nomination from Malawi which could be part of the broader Rift Valley initiative. A new creative approach for such nominations was required.

The meeting rose at 01.15 p.m.

EIGHTH MEETING

03.00 p.m. - 06.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/8B
WHC-06/30.COM/8B.Add
WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.4
Decisions: **30 COM 8B.1 to 8B.58**

Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lopé-Okanda, Gabon (continued)

The **Chairperson** summed up the results of the working group that had met over lunch to discuss the Gabon nomination.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft amendment to the draft Decision, proposing to delete paragraph 4, and presented the modified text to which the working group had agreed.

The Delegation of **Benin** asked for clarification regarding the procedure.

The **Rapporteur** clarified the request from the Delegation of Benin.

The Delegation of **India** strongly supported the amendment, which was considered feasible and proper, and expressed the view that, because Gabon had no World Heritage sites and came from a very under-represented continent, a referral was preferable to a deferral.

The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the Delegations of Benin and India.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** strongly supported the amendment.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** indicated its support for Gabon and concurred with the amendment, but requested clarification on the difference between referral and deferral, expressing concern that there would be an insurmountable time-limit issue if the nomination were referred.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that a referred nomination could be re-examined within three years.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported the referral of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the word “defers” be replaced by “refers”.

ICOMOS expressed sympathy with the nomination, which needed improvement, but warned that problems would again arise in referring the nomination, as there would not be enough time to complete evaluations within the referral time frames.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it appreciated the concerns of ICOMOS, but wondered about ICOMOS’ evaluation capacity, as there was in fact a three-year time frame.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that a referral had a three-year time frame, which could certainly accommodate ICOMOS’ concerns.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.29** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 20
APRIL 2006 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE *OPERATIONAL
GUIDELINES* (continued)**

The **Chairperson** requested the Committee to refer back to previous items, and recalled the text proposed by the Delegation of Israel, which had not been translated and distributed, in regards to the item on tentative lists.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** supported the second subparagraph of 3-a, but questioned subparagraph 3A.1, and requested that Israel explain its understanding of the extent of the evaluation requested. What was it about? It also questioned the linking of tentative list to the national registers and mechanisms, and reminded the committee that it could raise some problems as each country had different systems. Finally, it asked if there were any extra-budgetary implications for the World Heritage Centre. It also requested to delete subparagraph B.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendment, submitted by the Delegation of Japan, whereby subparagraph A would be entirely removed.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked for the deletion of the entire paragraph A, noting that it was not realistic to submit such a huge task to the Advisory bodies, along with the removal of the directions on how to produce a tentative list.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** wondered about the kind of actions the Committee could recommend to States Parties without tentative lists.

The Delegation of **India** wondered if the Rapporteur could redraft the decision, and recalled the need to be clear on how to produce nominations, and stated that paragraphs 2 and 3 were indeed useful.

The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** explained that paragraph C information was already contained elsewhere in the document and questioned the need for the paragraph altogether.

The Delegation of **Canada** wondered what was left to approve if all paragraphs had been removed.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the decision would be adopted without amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared decision **30 COM 8A** adopted without amendments.

The Delegation of **Morocco** took the floor to make a declaration in the name of the Arab Group concerning the Tentative List presented by the State Party of Israel, which included Jerusalem. The Arab Group recalled that the site of « Jérusalem, Old City and its Walls » was already inscribed by Jordan on the World Heritage List in 1981 and on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1989. In this respect, the Arab Group reaffirmed the special status of Jerusalem.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/8B
WHC-06/30.COM/8B.Add
WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.4
Decisions: **30 COM 8B.1 to 8B.58**

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ICOMOS presented an introduction outlining how it approached its evaluations.

C.1 AFRICA

C.1.1 New nominations

The Delegation of **Morocco** recalled that since its adhesion to the *Convention*, it had contributed untiringly to its implementation and in this spirit it respected the decision of the Committee not to inscribe the site of Toubkal. However, it expressed its regret and disagreement with the evaluation of the site that did not recognize its universal value and questioned the possibilities for small countries of seeing their natural sites inscribed on the List if one began to link the outstanding universal value to the spatial size of the site. It then thanked the persons who had supported its country in the examination of the dossier.

Property	Ruins of Loropéni
Id. N°	C 1225
State Party	Burkina Faso
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS presented the site.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, referring to the last-minute information submitted by the State Party in regard to procedural errors, asked if that information was reflected in ICOMOS recommendation, and if not, whether it would be possible to change the recommendation on the basis of that information.

ICOMOS explained that the letter submitted was on factual errors, and that the information referred to in the presentation was related to the management plan, but that information did not alter ICOMOS decision.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** remarked that this was a first request for nomination from the country. It noted that the draft Decision requested much additional information and wondered whether ICOMOS had invited the State Party to provide this information. Referring to the excavations, it remarked that they could be destructive and noted that there existed other methods. With regard to the stabilisation of the walls, it noted that on page 16 of the evaluation document, it was written that they were conserved, and this appeared to be contradictory.

ICOMOS said in reply that the September mission had gathered available information for ICOMOS, which had been combined with information gathered in other ways. No request for further information from the State Party had been made as there was no need for it. As for excavations, ICOMOS questioned the quality of the surveys, and noted that any stabilization and conservation of the ruins would have to be well documented. The

laterite walls with mud water would eventually need some type of conservation plan to protect them.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** was enraptured by the monumentality of the walls, that were a rare phenomena in this region of the world. In its view, the State Party letter clarified their functionality as a sacrificial place. Given that Burkina Faso had no site inscribed on the List, it proposed its inscription.

The Delegation of **Morocco** emphasized that account must be taken of oral tradition as a source of history and noted with regard to conservation that the site had a management plan. It declared in favour of inscription.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that it was also in favour of inscription as the ruins seemed to have a certain value and importance, even if they were not unique. It noted that the requested excavations were of an ongoing character and noted that there had been a communication problem between ICOMOS and the State Party.

The Delegation of **Kenya** questioned the fact that small countries appeared to have to face insurmountable hurdles in trying to inscribe sites. It quoted ICOMOS report, citing what it considered to be inconsistencies. It noted that, in ICOMOS report, there was no mention of oral tradition, which was considered outstanding. Kenya requested that the site be given due consideration; a decision to defer such sites was too harsh.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it was uncomfortable with ICOMOS report, which it compared with the Gabon report, suggesting that pragmatism was needed. It sympathized with the magnitude of the task in evaluating such sites. It suggested an amendment to the draft Decision, stating that it was desirable for the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to give pro-active assistance in the tasks mentioned under paragraph 2. It emphasized the need to help small countries in preparing good dossiers.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the proposal from the Delegation of the Netherlands. Noting that international assistance from the World Heritage Fund had been provided to the State Party, it asked why nomination dossiers were still not duly completed when such support was provided. It also raised the issue of comparative analysis, wondering if there was not perhaps a fixed mindset within the Committee, leading to a misapprehension of that kind of site.

The Delegation of **Norway** noted that, while the site might well be of great value and it supported the inscription of new African sites on the List, that could only be done if the criteria were clearly met. Referring the nomination did not seem appropriate, given the amount of work to be done. It therefore suggested deferral and asked ICOMOS how much additional time would be needed.

ICOMOS replied that the time needed depended on the resources available.

The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** favoured inscription of the site, noting the quality of conservation and its universal value. It emphasized the fact that Burkina Faso had no site inscribed on the List, and that a sign of encouragement was required.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it was important to be sensitive to the special needs of Africa. It would support the proposed referral but noted that the site could probably respond to criterion (vi). Like the Delegation of India, it was surprised that the nomination did not contain the information needed as the State Party had received international assistance to prepare it.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the immediate inscription of the site and did not consider the recommendations in the draft Decision crucial. It therefore suggested that the State Party should fulfil them in due course.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** pointed to the significance of oral traditions and supported the views of the Delegations of Morocco and Kenya. It also supported the suggestion by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that its position was the same as that of the Delegation of the Republic of Korea, or, at the very least, that the nomination should be referred.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recognized that it was an important site but insisted that deferral or referral were not to be seen as negative. It reiterated that it was the obligation of the Committee to request the highest standards for proposed World Heritage sites. It further expressed concern that the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies were only followed if they were in line with the wishes of Committee members.

The Delegation of **Cuba**, noting the importance of the site as well as ICOMOS' analysis, acknowledged the difficulty of the decision. In view of the under-representation of Africa, it recommended inscription.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled that it could not accept an inscription, but that consensus might be found by referring the nomination back to the State Party and ensuring support for the continuation of the process, as proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Delegation of **India** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Norway and requested the Rapporteur to read out the changes.

The **Rapporteur** recalled the new paragraph 3 proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands and the new paragraph 4 proposed by the Delegation of India.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.31** adopted as amended.

Property	Senegambian Stone Circles
Id. N°	C 1226
State Party	Gambia/Senegal
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS presented the site and the evaluation of the proposed nomination.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.32** adopted by acclamation.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the inscription of the property, in particular since it concerned a trans-boundary World Heritage property. It suggested that, in the future, the property might also be inscribed under criterion (vi) and welcomed the suggestion by ICOMOS to extend the site and inscribe it as a cultural landscape.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended the States Parties on the way local communities had been involved in the preparation of the management plan and nomination.

The Delegation of **Kenya** pointed to the exemplarity of ICOMOS evaluation.

The Observer Delegation of **Senegal** expressed its pleasure and honour to see this multinational property inscribed on the World Heritage List and announced that the State Party would try to enlarge the property to include all the associated sites.

Property	Aapravasi Ghat
Id. N°	C 1227
State Party	Mauritius
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (iv)(vi)

ICOMOS gave a presentation of the site.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** highlighted the fact that the Committee and UNESCO had already reacted favourably towards the inscription of places of memory, and sites linked to slavery. This was a slavery site. ICOMOS requested deferral of the site to undertake research, and requested that the floor be given to the State Party so that it could inform about the progress made in recent research. The Committee was informed that the judicial apparatus had been approved by the Mauritius Parliament the day before. The Delegation of Madagascar therefore recommended the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that, in its view, no other place represented the issue of indentured labour better than the site under consideration. It was a question of memory versus monument: should the size of the site be considered or the globality of the phenomenon it represented? Given the importance of recognizing that global phenomenon, the site deserved to be listed.

The Delegation of **Benin** requested ICOMOS to justify its recommendation to carry out further research. It appeared that research had been ongoing for over 50 years and asked how more research could strengthen the inscription dossier.

The Delegation of **Morocco** noted the connection of the site with the celebration of the combat against slavery. It stated that it had expected a more favourable examination and thought that the decision to defer the site was rather harsh; it proposed that it be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** noted that the nomination had been prepared on the basis of extensive research but that part of that information had been removed from the nomination document at the request of the World Heritage Centre to keep the document shorter. It also pointed out that the waterfront development mentioned in the evaluation had already been halted by the Government.

ICOMOS said that a great deal of research existed on the issue of indentured labour, but that it had not been applied to the nomination under consideration. It reiterated that there were other similar significant places elsewhere in the world and therefore recommended that a global framework was needed.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** responded that that was a lot to ask for and pointed out that in the Netherlands too, there had been a great deal of research on the issue, which it would happily make available to the State Party.

The Delegation of **India** noted that the proposed nomination had a special meaning for its country as this issue had originated from India. The Delegation made a detailed presentation on the historical perspective of indentured labour and Outstanding Universal Value from the perspective of criterion (vi). Indentured labour was just a prettier name for slavery and should not be confused with modern immigration, which is based upon the desire of immigrants to improve their status and future and which is a decision based on their choice. Aapravasi Ghat marked a living memorial of the pain of sorrows of those people who had been brought here knowing they could never return to their homeland. India could not agree that more research needed to be done on this issue. So much research is already available, including in India. The proposed site was unique and India did not agree that size was an issue. India strongly objected to the language of the proposed name change by ICOMOS to “Immigration Depot”. Aaproavashi Ghat reflected a historical reality, which could not be confused with issues of immigration. India called upon the Committee to support its immediate inscription.

ICOMOS responded to the questions raised and noted that the 2004 seminar had never taken place. It pointed out that a great deal of work was being done on and around the theme of the slave trade in order to develop a linked nomination around the theme, and considered the issue of indentured labour to be similar. It needed to be considered at the global level in the same way as the slave trade, as it was of the same significance.

The Delegation of **Israel**, expressing concern about the process for the evaluation of the nomination of the site, inquired why the State Party had not supplied the additional information. With regard to the themes, it wished to know whether it was a serial nomination and whether the site had outstanding universal value that could be applied to other similar sites.

In response, **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that the theme of the Diaspora should be considered in similar terms as the “slave route” movement, which had similar significance but in a different way, and that criterion (vi) was important in the nomination under discussion.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** questioned whether one could change the name of a site and was surprised that the State Party accepted this change of name. It added that the site had outstanding value. It concerned the memory of slavery, even if the formulation used attempted to soften the wording. The Delegation concluded by proposing the inscription of the site without reserve.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** inquired whether the management plan of the site had been completed or not and whether management had been discussed with the local people. The Delegation was in favour of removing paragraph 3 from the list of recommendations.

Referring to the issue of referral and deferral of proposed sites, the Delegation of **Norway** said that the site was of great importance, whether on the List or not, and that it found itself in a difficult situation as it had the impression that the *Convention* and the demands of the *Operational Guidelines* were not in focus.

The Delegation of **New Zealand**, supporting the views of the Delegation of India, stressed the need for flexibility with regard to the *Convention*. Indentured labour was a form of slavery. It therefore supported the Delegation of India’s proposal to remove paragraph 3 from the recommendations.

The Delegation of **Peru** said that the site deserved to be included in the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** questioned the relevance of the proposed wider studies for the nomination.

The **Chairperson** underscored the importance of criterion (vi) for the nomination and requested the Committee to make proposals based on the relevant criteria, and to reach a consensus on inscription.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed an amendment to the recommendation: in proposing the site on the basis of criterion (vi), the Committee should recommend that the State Party together with other international parties should undertake research on indentured labour around the world.

The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** supported inscription.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, expressing support for the inscription of the site, endorsed the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.33** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** thanked the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their assistance in the nomination process.

Property	Harar Jugol, the Fortified Historical Town
Id. N°	C 1189 Rev
State Party	Ethiopia
Criterion proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)(v)

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Chairperson declared Decision **30 COM 8B. 34** adopted without discussion.

The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their assistance in the nomination process.

Property	Chongoni Rock Art Area
Id. N°	C 476 Rev
State Party	Malawi
Criterion proposed by State Party	C (iii)(vi)

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the inscription of the property, adding that it was a property that demonstrated that traditions continued to live. Rock art sites should be used as nodes and as cultural instruments for supporting the local communities.

Having sought clarification from ICOMOS, the Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the Delegation of Kenya, noting the authenticity and the outstanding universal value of the site and the presence of a management plan.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the management plan was in place.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** congratulated ICOMOS on its work but did not understand the recommendation to refer the nomination on the pretext that it was not

protected by a legal instrument. Whereas, according to page 38 of the report, the legal text existed. Secondly, this category of property was underrepresented.

The Delegation of **Benin** drew attention to the fact that a national law of 1970 protected all the rock art sites. The proposed site had outstanding universal value and the Delegation proposed its inscription on the List with a possible recommendation to the State Party.

Clarifying the issue of protection, **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that the site was protected, but not all the rock site areas.

The Delegation of **Israel** said that such sites should be encouraged. Similar sites were to be found in the Mediterranean region and were listed as “adopted” sites, but only such sites would receive funds and technical support. As the Committee would be looking at rock art sites, it should scrutinize them comparatively by type, by history and so on. The Delegation wished to know whether the site was also a cultural landscape.

ICOMOS informed the Committee that it gave a very high profile to rock art and that it did not view the site as a cultural landscape, but felt that it could develop into one. Furthermore, as some people had moved out of the area, it would be necessary to develop a programme for sustainable use of the woodlands and other types of wood harvesting in the area.

The Delegation of **Israel** further called for putting management mechanisms into place.

The **Chairperson** proposed the inscription of the site with conditions, particularly the involvement of stakeholders.

The **Rapporteur** read out the additional clause to be added to the recommendation urging the State Party to put in place legal protection for all the rock art shelters.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.35** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, expressing its gratitude on behalf of the State Party and Africa, reiterated the importance of rock art.

Property	Kondoa Rock Art Sites
Id. N°	C 1183 Rev
State Party	United Republic of Tanzania
Criterion proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)(vi)

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The **Chairperson** invited comments on inscribing the Konda Rock Art Sites on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (vi).

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it was happy with the proposed nomination but wondered about the integrity of the property, since a number of sites were being excavated; it proposed that in the recommendation the Committee include wording to the effect that the State Party should ensure that illegal excavations on the site had to be brought to an immediate halt.

The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the inscription of the site but with amendments as proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands.

The Observer Delegation of **United Republic of Tanzania** thanked the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their assistance in the nomination process for the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.36** adopted as amended.

C.2 ARAB STATES

C.2.1 New nominations

Property	Aflaj Irrigation System of Oman
Id. N°	C 1207
State Party	Oman
Criterion proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)(v)

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The Delegation of **Spain** commended ICOMOS and congratulated the State Party of Oman. Spain believed that the ICOMOS proposal was justified and proposed more studies to finalize the system which in its operation could set an example to all. The criteria proposed were justified. A complementary form given to the State Party, requesting a traditional management plan could perhaps enable the Committee to receive the necessary information.

The Delegation of **Kuwait**, congratulating ICOMOS and the State Party, said that the nomination demonstrated an example of irrigation of arid lands in the Arab States. The State Party had addressed relevant issues put to it, for instance with regard to legal systems: laws on the protection of the wider area, the project and other buildings in the area were already in force.

The Observer Delegation of **Oman** confirmed that the legal protection of the property was already in place. The national heritage protection law passed in 1991 also covered the nominated site, as did the government plan to include the protection of the buildings as well. The current law prohibited the use of the agricultural land for construction, the

local communities inhabiting the area were already assisting in the management of the land and the management plan was under completion.

The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated ICOMOS for its work. It noted that the property under review concerned an important form of water technology and recalled that the Committee had already been advised that there was a traditional law to protect the site. It asked whether the existing protection measures included above-ground areas and in that connection if the new laws covered underground installations. It further asked whether criterion (v) might not also apply.

The Delegation of **Lithuania**, referring to the system of management of the site and of water distribution, proposed that the site might also be presented for listing under the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage.

The Delegation of **Morocco** voiced its support of the delegations who had expressed interest in this site. In Morocco, there existed similar sites. The Delegation emphasized that the site could be inscribed on the World Heritage List under criterion (vi).

ICOMOS informed the Committee that it recommended strong legal protection for both the underground and surface areas, and that there was no protection for the downstream part. It had noted that there was commitment on the part of the State Party to put in place a system of protection.

The Delegation of **Japan** said it echoed the opinions in favour of inscription, as the State Party showed commitment for the management plan and the protection of the site.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** recalled that for several reasons water is life. It commended ICOMOS for its report. The Delegation emphasized that the State Party had made a commitment for the protection of the site and it was convinced that if there was a recommendation, the State Party would respect it. It therefore proposed the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** commended ICOMOS and the State Party for its commitment to protect the site. It believed that the State Party would not fail to comply with the Committee's recommendations, and recommended inscription of the site.

The Delegation of **India** commended the State Party for bringing that type of traditional irrigation system to the attention of the Committee. It believed that the traditional system of management in question was the most dynamic and efficient of its kind. Expressing its support for inscription, the Delegation proposed to change criterion (ii).

The Delegation of **Chile** expressed concern about some earlier interventions. In its opinion, the site was a model of water management. It was not easy to improve the management plan. The Delegation proposed the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that there were similar systems in Peru. It proposed inscription on the List under criterion (v).

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** emphasized the importance of having a management plan for the site.

ICOMOS informed the Committee that the traditional management system in place dealt with the water and not the physical fabric of the entire area.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that it was a wonderful site and wondered what would happen if hotels were built in the area and if other types of degradation occurred in the meantime; it proposed a referral back to the State Party in order to finalize the management plan.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said in support of the Delegation of the Netherlands proposal that the Committee must insist on securing a management plan.

The Delegation of **Japan** observed that the State Party had already addressed the issues that the Committee was now raising, and asked if the State Party could be requested to give further explanations.

The Delegation of **India** added that the clarification required from the State Party was as to whether there was a management plan.

The Observer Delegation of **Oman** informed the Committee that a management plan as well as rules to protect the site existed to protect both the area and the buffer zone.

The Delegation of **India** expressed the view that conditional inscription might be considered requesting the State Party to come back with information confirming that all measures had been undertaken.

The Delegation of **Peru** suggested that, given the differences of views, a comparison should be made with previous similar cases. As in the case of Algeria, a compromise might be to agree on a deadline for the submission of the necessary information, for example by February 2007.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the State Party had all the necessary resources and proposed that the State Party give all the substantiating information requested by 1 February 2007. The alternative to that proposal was to inscribe the property with conditions, but that was not the most satisfactory solution. With reference to previously inscribed sites for the Africa Region, the Delegation noted that consideration had been given to the fact that Africa was under-represented and that, unlike the State Party in question, some countries from Africa did not have any site inscribed on the List.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said it should be clear that the African sites merited inscription, and that it was not a question of special consideration by the Committee as opposed to other regions.

In response to a further request for clarification, the Observer Delegation of **Oman** specified that the management plan had been provided.

The Delegation of **India** proposed that discussion of the site in question be postponed until the following day to allow for consultations among Committee members.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it did not agree with the postponement proposal and suggested that the Committee should find a way towards consensus.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the Committee needed a majority of two-thirds of its members in support of the decision.

Following several interventions in favour of postponement, the **Chairperson** said she took it that further discussion would be postponed until the following day.

C.5 LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN

Property	Agave Landscape and Ancient Industrial Facilities of Tequila
Id. N°	C 1209
State Party	Mexico
Criterion proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)(v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS presented the site and its evaluation report.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.58** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the host country, UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee, and assured the Committee that Mexico would comply with ICOMOS recommendations.

The meeting rose at 6.30 p.m.

FIFTH DAY – THURSDAY 13 JULY 2006

NINTH MEETING

09.00 a.m. - 01.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/8B
WHC-06/30.COM/8B.Add
WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.4
Decisions: **30 COM 8B.1 to 8B.58**

C.2 ARAB STATES

C.2.1 New nominations (continued)

Property	Aflaj Irrigation System of Oman
Id. N°	C 1207
State Party	Oman
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)(v)

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Bureau meeting had reached a consensus on Oman and that the last two Latin American nominations would be dealt with as the first item after Oman.

The **Rapporteur** explained that the draft Decision on the Omani irrigation system now included an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Kuwait.

The Delegation of **Norway** stated that it did not agree with that procedure, as a matter of principle, and that the Committee should follow the *Operational Guidelines* – in the case under consideration the legal protection and management system should be in place before inscription. It expected the Committee to be just and fair and to apply the same procedure to all nominations, either following the rules or changing them.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that in the past, sites had been inscribed on the basis of traditional management systems and that the Committee needed to recognize that different cultures had different legal mechanisms. Sometimes, the traditional mechanisms were better, and in the case under review, there was more protection than had been originally understood. The Delegation could therefore support the amendment.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it did not object to the compromise text but was sympathetic to what the Delegation of Norway had said. The site was extremely important and the Delegation of the Netherlands supported its inscription.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.37** adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Oman** thanked the Committee and also expressed gratitude to the World Heritage Centre for its efforts, adding that the decision would boost Oman's efforts to protect its heritage.

C.5 LATIN AMERICA/CARIBBEAN

C.5.1 New nominations

Property	Incallajta: the fundamental rock of the Inca power in the Collasuyo
Id. N°	C 1218
State Party	Bolivia
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(ii)(vi)

ICOMOS explained that the Inca site in question was situated at the convergence of two rivers. There were remains of peripheral walls, a fortress, a ceremonial site and an Inca power rock.

The site was associated with the Incas but the significance of the site was not yet known and it was difficult to establish its outstanding universal value on the basis of the current information available. ICOMOS recommended that examination of the site be deferred to allow the State Party to undertake further research to establish its relation with other sites, and to determine whether it was in fact the “fundamental rock of Inca power”. Perhaps the site could be integrated into a larger Inca routes project.

The Delegation of **Cuba** congratulated ICOMOS for its clear and precise report and, with reference to proposed criteria (i) and (ii), said that the problem of lack of information pointed out in the evaluation report could be solved by giving the possibility to the State Party to provide additional information. It therefore suggested amending the draft Decision to the effect that the nomination was referred, not deferred.

The Delegation of **Spain** asked the State Party to clarify whether the proposed nomination was part of the Camino Inca cultural itinerary project in which several States Parties had been involved. It expressed its surprise that the nomination had been proposed as a separate and autonomous project.

The Delegation of **Tunisia**, in commending the extremely minutious work accomplished by ICOMOS, expressed its perplexity with regard to point b) of paragraph 2 of the draft Decision and asked ICOMOS for clarification.

ICOMOS replied that the “fundamental rock of Inca power” referred to the name of the site “**Incallajta: The fundamental rock of Inca power in the Collasuyo**”, and paragraph 2 (b) referred to that.

The Delegation of **Chile** recalled that the Andean countries involved in the project mentioned by the Delegation of Spain met regularly to develop the project further, but the State Party was free to present its nomination in an autonomous way and could eventually join the trans-national project of Qapaq Ñan in the future.

The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that paragraph 2 (c) might read “evaluate the appropriateness of including it in the Inca routes”.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.56** adopted as amended.

Property	Sewell Mining Town
Id. N°	C 1214
State Party	Chile
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)(v)

ICOMOS, presenting the nomination, stated that the authenticity and integrity of the site were largely intact and, although Sewell was not unique, it was an example of a company mining town in a hostile environment which gave it outstanding universal value. ICOMOS considered that the site met only criterion (ii).

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether it should be named a company town rather than a mining town and added that the Delegation of Israel supported the inscription.

ICOMOS replied that it was a company town, built to house miners. The mine was still functioning.

The Delegation of **Norway** supported the inscription of this site on the World heritage List.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stated that it was an interesting case. It was no longer a working town and nobody lived there – what was the prospect for the future?

ICOMOS replied that the local population had moved further down the slope to a new town, but it might be possible for some life to be brought back to the town now that threats from air pollution had been addressed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.57** adopted.

The Delegation of **Chile** commended the way in which the Committee had debated the nomination and thanked ICOMOS for its excellent work. It further recalled that next to the property there still was the largest copper mine in the world and that all the workers were very proud that what they felt was their own heritage would now become the common heritage of humankind.

C.2 ARAB STATES (continued)

C.2.1 New nominations

Property	Castles of Syria
Id. N°	C 1229
State Party	Syrian Arab Republic
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)

ICOMOS, noting that the State Party had agreed to change the name of the property to Crac des Chevaliers and Qalaat Salah El-Din, introduced the property as being well preserved. The Crac des Chevaliers was usually recognized as the best example of all the crusader castles.

ICOMOS had requested clarification from the State Party on certain issues, including its commitment not to build cable-cars, and on the implementation of the management plan. The State Party had provided the required information, the management system was in place, the cable-cars would not be built, and the Aga Khan Trust was helping in the process. Authenticity was not in doubt and integrity had been maintained. The outstanding universal value was justified, and ICOMOS recommended inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Norway** said that the State Party had made every effort to settle the question of cable-cars.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed full support for the nomination and also raised the question of serial nomination as recommended by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** wondered whether an amendment could be made in this sense.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** referred to page 56 of the report, and asked if the open-air theatre was being built.

ICOMOS replied that any new construction would not disturb the integrity of the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.38** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of the **Syrian Arab Republic** thanked the Committee, the Centre and ICOMOS. It recalled the historical dimension of the decision that the Committee had just adopted in inscribing the property on the World Heritage List. It reassured the Committee that it would respect its commitments regarding the conservation of the property and added that its country warmly welcomed all the participants.

C.3 ASIA/PACIFIC

C.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Yin Xu
Id. N°	C 1114
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS introduced the site, explaining that Yin Xu was an early capital of the Chinese empire and stood as a testimony to the rich history of early China. There were two core zones. The palace had been excavated and was well preserved, and the royal tombs were prototypes for later royal tombs. ICOMOS believed threats to the site were under control, including flooding, the railway, and an industrial plant which had now been removed. Management was in order, authenticity verified, and integrity satisfactory. The property's outstanding universal value was established and ICOMOS recommended inscription on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii), (iv) and (vi).

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.39** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **China** expressed its gratitude to the Committee, to ICOMOS and to the World Heritage Centre for their help and advice, and pledged the State Party's commitment to preserve the new World Heritage site.

Property	River Island of Majuli in midstream of Brahmaputra River in Assam
Id. N°	C 1206
State Party	India
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)(v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS presented the nomination. With regard to the site's integrity, it was not clear how the Sattras could subsist, and the nomination dossier had not yet demonstrated how the property's outstanding universal value was reflected in the landscape. More information was needed on spiritual values in relation to the landscape, but the site did have the potential to demonstrate outstanding universal value. With regard to criteria (ii), (iii), (v) and (vi), more information was needed. At the same time, the State Party had furnished a considerable amount of new information and was willing to take the process forward over the next year.

Following the oral presentation of the evaluation report by ICOMOS, the Delegation of **Benin** asked whether it would not be more appropriate to refer the nomination for inscription back to the State Party rather than to defer it.

ICOMOS replied that the questions could be addressed in the coming year and referred to the next Committee session.

IUCN observed that increased flooding was a serious threat and a risk management plan was a priority.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if that could be undertaken in the following year.

The Delegation of **India** replied that, as far as it was concerned, the site could be inscribed now.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if there was enough information for the outstanding universal value criterion to be met and if the referral concerned other issues.

ICOMOS stated that more information was needed on how the spatial patterns in the landscape reflected the very powerful spiritual ideas underpinning the nomination, but they believed that more information could be provided in the coming year.

The Delegation of **Norway** said that it was a very interesting nomination and agreed to referral, expressing concern about whether a risk preparedness plan been put in place.

The Delegation of **India** replied that Majuli had survived floods for over four hundred years and there were long-term plans in place for risk preparedness.

The Delegation of **Mauritius** asked for clarifications about the management plan.

The Delegation of **India** replied that there was a very detailed management plan which provided for a specific management structure to be put in place.

The Delegation of **Japan** inquired what exactly needed more clarification from ICOMOS.

ICOMOS replied that the property in question was a cultural landscape developed over many centuries and a better understanding was needed of how the landscape reflected the ideas constituting outstanding universal value.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if risk preparedness was a pre-condition to listing a site.

IUCN replied that a risk preparedness plan should be an element of the management plan.

The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the question posed by ICOMOS might have been asked earlier.

The Delegation of **Benin** asked the Advisory Bodies whether the additional information required could not be addressed by simply referring the nomination back to the State Party, thus permitting it to provide this additional information.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee agreed to referral and declared Decision **30 COM 8B.40** adopted as amended.

Property	Bisotun
Id. N°	C 1222
State Party	Iran (Islamic Republic of)
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)

ICOMOS presented the nomination and explained that further information had been requested and received from the State Party. The management system and management plan were now in place. Authenticity was not in doubt, integrity was intact, and the site had outstanding universal value. It met criteria (ii) and (iii).

The **Chairperson** declared the site inscribed and Decision **30 COM 8B.41** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** expressed thanks to the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, adding that Bisotun was also a part of the Islamic Republic of Iran's intangible heritage and was the setting for its oldest and most famous love story.

C.3.2 Minor modifications to the boundaries

Property	Katmandu Valley
Id. N°	C 121 Bis
State Party	Nepal
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (iii)(iv)(vi)

The **Chairperson** introduced the amended decision on the modification to the boundaries of the Kathmandu Valley.

ICOMOS explained that the site covered seven ensembles and had been listed in 1979 under criteria (iii), (iv) and (vi). A joint ICOMOS-UNESCO mission in 2005 had determined that the site's outstanding universal value was still intact but in reduced zones. The State Party had submitted the proposed modifications in June 2006, and the related changes were included in the amended decision. The integrated management plan was at an advanced stage and was now in line with the revised boundaries. The authenticity, integrity and outstanding universal value of the property were all retained and adequately reflected within the new boundaries. All the criteria for the site's original inscription were still valid.

ICOMOS recommended that the minor modifications be approved.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked how ICOMOS decided that it was a minor modification.

ICOMOS replied that that had in fact been the decision of the Committee in Durban.

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that it was an important issue and that in 2005 ICOMOS, the State Party and the stakeholders, together with the World Heritage Committee, had organized an intensive workshop to identify and agree to the new boundaries which were being proposed.

The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed that decision but asked if three of the ensembles had completely lost their authenticity.

ICOMOS replied that, while the authenticity of those three ensembles had been affected by the loss of urban fabric, there had not been a complete loss of authenticity. That loss of urban fabric was why the boundaries had been reduced.

The **World Heritage Centre** pointed out that it was a living heritage and some transition was inevitable and understandable.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.42** adopted.

C.4 EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1 New nominations

Property	The Causses and the Cévennes
Id. N°	C 1153
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS presented the nomination and explained that it was difficult to identify outstanding universal value for the entire nominated area under criteria (v) and (vi); indeed, they were not justified and the nomination should be deferred.

IUCN informed the Committee of the variety of natural values in the Cévennes and the creative relationship between the environment and the local communities.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its surprise at the conclusions of ICOMOS, considering that the outstanding universal value of the property could not be denied for Protestants, as a place of great importance for their resistance, as well as for Jews, who had found refuge there during the Second World War. Since 1911, 30,000 people gathered there each year to celebrate tolerance. A Protestant was notably involved in the drafting of the French Declaration of Human Rights. The site had specific values, with the relationship between the community, the valleys and the mountains, to which should be added biodiversity and the unity of the geological plate. It also called upon ICOMOS to reconsider its position.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** declared that this site benefitted from an outstanding originality and authenticity, as much for its landscape as for its extraordinary history. It commended ICOMOS for its work, whilst considering that its conclusion was somewhat harsh, and urged it to revise its position. It further requested that the State Party be given the floor.

The Delegation of **Norway** pointed out that if none of the criteria were met, the site should not be inscribed. It requested ICOMOS to indicate whether there was any probability that the outstanding universal value requirement would be met by the site.

ICOMOS said that there was no proof of outstanding universal value for the whole area, but it might possibly apply to part of the area. It therefore recommended that the State Party should formulate a new request with a reduced area.

The Delegation of **Morocco** stated that this dossier raised fundamental questions for the Committee: that of the size of sites and transhumance. If ICOMOS considered there was a doubt as to the outstanding universal value of the property, the Committee must therefore accept the proposed decision.

The Delegation of **India** said it believed that the entire area was related to important historic events and therefore suggested inscribing the site under criterion (vii) (vi).

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed doubts; IUCN had indicated natural values of the area, but what was their relation with the cultural values? It also quoted a World Heritage publication in which the site had been said to have the potential to be on the World Heritage List, but now that potential was being denied. The Delegation suggested that the site might be considered as part of a serial nomination, but not enough information was available in that connection. It therefore recommended adopting a decision to defer examination of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** questioned the format of the document, stating that it did not concern one site but an ensemble of sites, and the use of the conditional in « could be a cultural landscape » was not appropriate, whereas it was clearly a cultural landscape. The Delegation also questioned the basic information, considering that the outstanding universal value was clearly evident. It recalled a World Heritage Centre publication in 1995, citing the property as a potential cultural landscape for inscription on the World Heritage List. It found criterion (vi) pertinent, considering that it referred to places of memory and a way of life linked to a landscape (transhumance) whereas it had disappeared elsewhere.

The Delegation of **Benin** considered that the conclusion did not correspond to the content of the dossier and that, although criterion (vi) often gave rise to interpretation, here it was justified. It also wished that the floor be given to the State Party and wondered why it was necessary to reconsider the characteristics of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **France** stated that this dossier had been prepared over many years, based on publications and expertise which concurred that the Causse-Cévennes was an eco-pastoral cultural landscape worthy to be placed on the World Heritage List. The Delegation contested the ICOMOS evaluation, stating that the Cévenol desert is part of the memory of the Protestants of the world and that the geographical continuity of the Causse-Cévennes was undeniable. According to the Delegation, there was no question of postponing or deferral, as there were no other characteristics than those already indicated in the dossier.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** reiterated the concerns of the Delegation of Norway and recommended adoption of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Japan** supported India's proposal to inscribe the site.

The Delegation of **Peru** supported the inscription.

The Delegation of **Norway** said it could not see the outstanding universal value of the site and recommended deferring the examination to allow for a better analysis.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recognized the site’s outstanding universal value and suggested inscription.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said it valued the site highly and suggested that criterion (vi) should be used together with another criterion. It therefore recommended either the inscription of the site under criteria (v) and (vi) or, as a compromise, to replace the word “Defers” by “Refers” in paragraph 2.

ICOMOS said it still had some concerns but would agree to replace the word “Defers” by “Refers” in paragraph 2.

The Delegation of **India** pointed out that, the previous year, criterion (vi) alone had been used for the inscription of the site of Mostar. It would not accept referral of the examination and recommended either inscription of the site or suspension of the discussion.

The Delegation of **Canada** supported the proposal to suspend the discussion.

The **Chairperson** said she took it that the Committee wished to suspend the discussion and adjourned the discussion on this nomination.

Property	Old Town of Regensburg with Stadtamhof
Id. N°	C 1155
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(ii)(iii)

In its presentation, **ICOMOS** described the site and its history since the Roman period. It stressed the importance of the historic ensemble and the cathedral and showed the area covered by the core and buffer zones. The threats were mainly due to post-Second World War developments, as the war destruction had taken place in the industrial zone outside the historic centre, and concerned the present state of conservation and flooding by the river. The site possessed legal protection and a management structure and management plan. ICOMOS had no doubt about its authenticity. A comparative study had been carried out with other old towns in Central Europe, most of them already inscribed on the World Heritage List. The site was the only large, intact German medieval city still functioning. ICOMOS had no doubt about the site’s outstanding universal value and proposed to consider it as a trading centre. It agreed to reconsider its “deferral” recommendation and was in favour of recommending the site’s inscription under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by ICOMOS, said that it should be clarified how and when the required material would be provided by the State Party to the World Heritage Centre. The Delegation welcomed the revised recommendation of ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.45** adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** expressed thanks to all those who had helped to arrive at the decision, stating that the news would be very well received in Germany.

Property	Genoa: Le Strade Nuove and the system of the Palazzi dei Rolli
Id. N°	C 1211
State Party	Italy
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

In its presentation, **ICOMOS** described the site and the history of that outstanding ensemble since its creation in the 16th century outside the medieval centre. It had strongly influenced baroque architecture in the rest of Europe. The core and buffer zones had been defined according to an ICOMOS recommendation, to include only the most significant palaces. The threats were under the State Party's control and a suitable management system had been in place for 15 years. A comparative analysis showed how innovative the approach had been in its time. There was no doubt about the property's outstanding universal value. ICOMOS recommended inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.46** adopted.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** thanked the Committee for the decision and ICOMOS for its work. In expressing its pleasure with regard to the inscription, it wished to emphasize the enduring commitment of Italy in the strengthening of the *World Heritage Convention* and that it would continue its assistance to countries that were poorly or underrepresented on the World Heritage List. The Delegation further recalled the law recently adopted by the Parliament regarding the management plans of all the World Heritage properties in Italy.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated the Observer Delegation of Italy but drew attention to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision, requesting the State Party to eliminate the section of the motorway in front of the historic centre.

Property	Centennial Hall in Wroclaw, Poland
Id. N°	C 1165
State Party	Poland
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(ii)(iv)

ICOMOS described the ensemble, which had been constructed in 1911 with a courageous design, innovative techniques and impressive dimensions. Its authenticity

was intact. The core zone included the building and the surrounding park. The only threat was from flooding by the river. Management was efficiently ensured by the municipality and there was no doubt about authenticity. ICOMOS therefore recommended inscribing the site under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Israel** said that the development of guidelines on how to treat modern architecture was to be encouraged. It also saw a problem with inscribing the site under criterion (iv).

ICOMOS said it regarded criterion (iv) only as an additional qualification, but not the main one.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recommended inscription of the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.47** adopted.

The Delegation of **Poland** thanked the members of the Committee.

Property	Vizcaya Bridge
Id. N°	C 1217
State Party	Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS described the Bridge and its history. The core zone was the Bridge itself and the buffer zone covered areas on both sides of the river. The risks were minimal in the core zone and higher in the buffer zone on account of tourism. Management was in private hands and had proved efficient. The site's authenticity was intact and comparative study had revealed that it was the first gondola bridge in the world, constructed with innovative techniques; only 8 out of 18 bridges of that type had survived. There was no doubt about its outstanding universal value. ICOMOS recommended inscribing the site under criteria (i) and (ii).

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed an amendment to paragraph 3 of the draft Decision to reflect the State Party's recent decision not to construct the car park next to the site.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.49** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Spain**, thanking the Committee, said that the inscription was very important as the first listing in the Basque country and the first Spanish industrial site. It thanked ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and all those who had contributed to the successful nomination, notably the managers of the site. It showed how protection could be ensured, with three institutions responsible for management.

Property	Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape
Id. N°	C 1215
State Party	United Kingdom
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)(iv) + CL

ICOMOS described the site, consisting of ten core areas forming a cultural landscape with a variety of industrial infrastructures, transport network (bridges, harbours, etc.) and settlements. The threats were development pressure, conversion of structures, resumption of mining, removal of secondary materials, such as waste heaps, and farming. A management system was in place. The authenticity and integrity of the site were very well preserved. There was no doubt about its outstanding universal value. ICOMOS considered that the site met criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). However, it recommended referral of the nomination to allow the State Party to provide better legal protection and create buffer zones. It had some concern about micro-management by the different villages and the development of Hayle harbour.

IUCN pointed out that insufficient consideration had been given to the fact that the site was one of the highly polluted areas of the country and recommended the inclusion of decontamination in the management plan.

The Delegation of **India** requested clarification of the affirmation by the State Party that buffer zones could be detrimental to the site.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** reassured the Committee that legal protection was in place and had proved efficient for 60 years through special plans. It also drew attention to the fact that the *Operational Guidelines* stipulated that in exceptional cases a site could be inscribed without a buffer zone. In the case under consideration a buffer zone was not required, bearing in mind that it would damage the site. However, Cornwall as a whole could be considered a buffer zone.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recommended inclusion of historic waste in paragraph 4 of the draft Decision.

ICOMOS agreed that historic waste should be taken in consideration for the management plan.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recommended taking into account the human factor, namely the miners, and agreed with the Observer Delegation of the United Kingdom that a buffer zone would not be required and that the development of the harbour should not be overly restricted.

The Delegation of **Norway** said there was some confusion in the statements by ICOMOS acknowledging on one hand that the United Kingdom possessed one of the world's best

systems of legal protection, yet finding its implementation insufficient. How could the United Kingdom improve its implementation?

ICOMOS pointed out that the plans were not yet implemented at the site.

The Delegation of **Canada** stated that the site clearly possessed outstanding universal value in the category of industrial sites, which was under-represented. The recommendations of ICOMOS were unclear as to whether it recommended a larger or smaller site.

ICOMOS referred to subparagraph 2 (a) of the draft Decision and suggested that the State Party might consider reducing the area to be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it would support inscription of the site and asked whether that could be done within the framework of a serial nomination of mining sites.

In response to a question by the Delegation of **Norway** as to whether there was legal protection or not, the Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** assured the Committee that all parts of the proposed site were legally protected.

The Delegation of **India** proposed amending subparagraph 2 (c) concerning buffer zones.

The Delegation of **Israel** referred to paragraph 160 which concerned guaranties regarding meaning and implications of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Canada** made reference to the similar case of Oman where there was no question about the property's outstanding universal value, but an issue around legal protection. Canada supported inscription and proposed that the State Party be asked to submit a report to the World Heritage Centre, for examination at the 31st session, confirming that adequate protective measures are in place.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the inscription of the site and pointed out the many redundant requirements of the draft Decision. For example, a buffer zone would not be required.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it considered that the ICOMOS recommendations were not clear enough and would propose to delete subparagraph 2 (c) of the draft Decision and inscribe the site.

The Delegation of **Morocco** favoured the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada for an inscription with a recommendation for the protection of the site.

The Delegation of **India** suggested deleting paragraphs 2 (b) and 2 (c).

The Delegations of **Peru, Spain** and **Cuba** indicated that they would favour inscribing the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Chile** supported the proposal of the Delegation of the Canada.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** gave its support to the Delegation of Canada.

The Delegation of **Spain** stated its support for the Delegation of Canada's amendment.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed amending paragraph 2 (c), noting the statement made by the State Party on buffer zones.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.50** adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** thanked the Committee.

C.4.2 Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Schloss Eggenberg (Extension to "City of Graz – Historic Centre")
Id. N°	C 931 Bis
State Party	Austria
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iv)(vi)

ICOMOS introduced the case and recommended deferral.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.51** adopted.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

TENTH MEETING

03.00 p.m. - 06.30 p.m.

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/8B
WHC-06/30.COM/8B.1
WHC-06/30.COM/8B.2
Decisions: 30 COM 8B.1 to 8B.58

C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES

C. EUROPE/NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1 New nominations (continued)

Property	The Causses and the Cévennes
Id. N°	C 1153
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (v)(vi) + CL

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the Causses and the Cévennes site and the relevant draft Decision. She further invited the Observer Delegation of the Holy See to make a statement.

The Observer Delegation of the **Holy See** voiced its concern as regards the mention in the ICOMOS evaluation that the Catholic religion was indicated as a danger. It was not acceptable that a religion, whatever it was, could be considered as a threat.

The Delegation of **India** remarked that the issue had already been clarified with ICOMOS and was no longer contentious.

The **Chairperson** requested a report back from the informal group that had met during the lunch break.

The Delegation of **India** reported that, although the group had sought to reach consensus based on three options, it had not been possible to do so. It had also worked with and tried to develop the proposal made by the Rapporteur under which the property would be inscribed with strong encouragement to the State Party to consider, by 2007, further qualities that would fully display the site's outstanding universal value. But there had been no meeting of minds. While the Chairperson might wish to open the floor for further views, it was clear that the Committee would need to vote.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** sought clarification about the criteria under which property might be inscribed under the proposed compromise. It remarked that to inscribe the site first and then ask the State Party to establish its outstanding universal value afterwards would make a mockery of the *Convention*. It asked if the State Party could clarify whether it would bring it back if the final decision was to defer or refer.

The Delegation of **India** specified that it had not suggested that the outstanding universal value should be established, but fully displayed.

In response to the Delegation of the Netherlands, the Observer Delegation of **France** recalled its intervention of the morning in that the proposal for nomination was already complete and that no further information could be added, it could not be modified, in nature or in its boundaries, and reiterated its wish to obtain a clear decision on the part of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Norway** remarked that there had been no compromise within the informal group. Some delegations believed that the dossier as presented did not fully display the qualities of the site in order for its outstanding universal value to be established. It would therefore be worthwhile for the State Party to spend more time displaying the qualities – for example through a comparative analysis. The Committee could not inscribe a property if it was unsure about its outstanding universal value. Some Committee members were unconvinced in the case in question. But it was for the State Party to decide whether it wished to carry out the comparative analysis.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** remarked that it was shocked by the views of the State Party. It fully supported the position taken by the Delegation of Norway and commented that there was no shame in being asked to do more work. The case could not be compared with the decision taken on the Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius). There were other examples of Huguenot resistance, and it considered that to be asked to make a final decision now was an affront.

The Delegation of **India** clarified that it had not said that the group had reached a compromise but that it had attempted to develop a compromise as suggested during the morning session. It now wished to propose an amendment in its name under which paragraph 1 would remain, paragraph 2 would inscribe the property, and paragraph 3 would request the State Party to consider further the qualities of the property including a comparative analysis to fully display its outstanding universal value by 1 February 2007.

The Delegation of **Norway** concurred with the clarification in relation to the compromise.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that if the proposal went ahead it would refer the issue to the General Assembly on the grounds that the *Convention* was not being applied seriously.

The Delegation of **Kenya** observed that the Committee faced a very delicate situation. Its own position was clear but it wished to see the Committee working together. The State Party was a very important member of the *Convention* and host to UNESCO, and had consistently demonstrated that it took its responsibilities under the *Convention* very seriously. It observed that the proposal made by India might cause problems and appealed to the State Party to consider a referral of one year in order to fully display the property's outstanding universal value and conclude the matter.

The Observer Delegation of **France** thanked the Delegation of Kenya for its words to the French State Party. It confirmed that it had no doubt as to the outstanding universal value of the proposed property and repeated that it wished to receive a clear response from the Committee.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee could therefore inscribe or defer.

The Observer Delegation of **France** recalled that, not being a Committee member, it left the final decision to the wisdom of the Committee.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that the cart had been put before the horse. It did not understand how a property could be inscribed before the comparative analysis to establish its outstanding universal value had been carried out. It supported what it assumed was the Delegation of Kenya's proposal to refer. However, if the State Party wanted a clear decision then a member of the Committee could put forward a motion not to inscribe.

The Delegation of **India** cautioned against pursuing that course of action. It formally moved to close the debate and to vote on the amendments.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested a secret ballot.

At the request of the **Chairperson**, the **Legal Adviser** explained that a proposal for a secret ballot should be made by two members of the Committee, or could proceed by simple decision of the Chair.

The Delegation of **Norway** seconded the request of the Delegation of the United States of America.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, speaking on a point of order, asked if the vote was to be on the amendment proposed by the Delegation of India.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** recalled that the category of cultural landscapes was very important for the future, and that so far, of the four nominations of cultural landscapes proposed for inscription, only one had been inscribed.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled that the discussion had been closed pending the vote.

The **Chairperson** asked if the Committee wished to open the discussion.

Following an objection by the Delegation of **Tunisia** regarding the right to speak, the **Chairperson** apologized if there had been a misunderstanding but recalled that there had been a point of order and the debate had been closed.

The Delegation of **India** sought clarification from the Legal Adviser as to whether a secret vote could be opposed.

The **Legal Adviser** said that it could not if two members of the Committee or the Chairperson had so moved. Continuing, it said that, as India had formally moved the closure of the debate in order to vote, the Chairperson should proceed on those terms.

The Delegation of **India** withdrew its move to close the debate so that the Delegation of Tunisia could complete its intervention.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its wish to see more importance given to cultural landscapes in the future, and that the possibility of reviewing the *Guidelines* should not be considered as taboo.

The **Chairperson** extended her apologies, closed the debate on the property in question pending the ballot, and invited the Committee to proceed with its consideration of other properties under item 8B.

A.1.1 Minor modification to the boundaries of a property already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Name of Property	Madriu-Perafita-Claror Valley
Id. N°	1160 Bis
State Party	Andorra
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (v)

ICOMOS presented the nomination.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the draft Decision.

Responding to a question posed by the Delegation of **Israel**, **ICOMOS** clarified that there was no buffer zone beyond the border with Spain.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.59** adopted.

Property	Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Extension to “Dečani Monastery”)
Id. N°	C 724 Bis
State Party	Serbia and Montenegro
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

The **Chairperson** invited The Committee to consider two draft Decisions, concerning approval of the proposed extension and inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS presented the nomination and recommended inscription on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of the **United States of America** informed the Committee that it had pledged USD 1 million at a donor meeting at UNESCO on the Churches of Kosovo, one of which was the Church of the Virgin. A number of missions had taken place under the leadership of Mr Mounir Bouchenaki, Assistant Director-General for Culture, and it could assure the Committee that the repairs would be done in an appropriate manner.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.53** adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the proposal to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **India** sought clarification about the name of the State Party.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that there was no mention of it in the name of the property and that the nominating State Party was now the Republic of Serbia.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked if the State Party had consented to the proposed danger listing.

The Observer Delegation of **Serbia** confirmed its agreement to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Morocco** recalled paragraphs 183 and 184 of the *Guidelines* and asked whether prior consultations with the State Party had been undertaken.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that there had been prior consultations with the State Party following the ICOMOS evaluation as well as agreement on the benchmarks and corrective measures.

The Delegation of **India** asked whether the corrective measures in paragraph 5 were also benchmarks to be met before the site could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS clarified that the benchmarks relevant to danger listing were set out in paragraph 3 and that paragraph 5 referred to corrective measures.

The Delegation of **Lithuania** supported the proposed extension of the property but observed that the reality on the ground meant that it would be difficult for the State Party alone to implement the recommendations of paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft Decision. It therefore proposed amending them to include references to cooperation with UNESCO programs, the United Nations Mission in Kosovo and the Provisional Institutions of Self-Government in Kosovo.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to paragraphs 4 and 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted a reference to “Serbia” in paragraph 3.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that it was appropriate in that context, as Serbia was the abbreviated name of the State Party under the *Convention*.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.54** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Cuba** sought clarification as to why the name of the State Party did not appear in the draft Decision as it did for other properties.

The **Chairperson** explained that it had been agreed with the State Party and, in response to a question from the Delegation of the **United States of America**, reconfirmed that Serbia was not part of the name of the property.

C.4.1 New nominations (continued)

Property	The Causses and the Cévennes
Id. N°	C 1153
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	C (v)(vi) + CL

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the nomination of the Causses and Cévennes. She informed the Committee that ballot papers were being distributed, in English and French.

Speaking on a point of order, the Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the voting procedure was governed by rule 42 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the World Heritage Committee. The **Legal Adviser** confirmed that procedure.

Following a request for clarification by the Delegation of **India**, the **Legal Advisor** explained that, as there were three proposed amendments and no way of knowing which would pass, it was necessary to proceed paragraph by paragraph.

The **Chairperson** explained that the Legal Adviser had confirmed that a two-thirds majority would be required for an amendment to pass. The first ballot would consider the proposal furthest in meaning from the draft Decision and Committee members needed to vote for or against it. All 21 members of the Committee were present in the room. However, any abstentions would be deducted from the numbers having voted.

A vote was taken by secret ballot.

At the **Chairperson**'s request, the Delegations of the United States of America and Benin acted as tellers.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Numbers of Members:	21
Numbers of Members absent:	0
Numbers of blank or invalid ballot papers:	0
Numbers of votes recorded:	21
Majority required:	14
Number of votes obtained:	9

Having failed to obtain the required majority, the amendment was rejected.

The **Chairperson** stated that there had been another amendment on referral and invited the Committee to proceed to a second vote, on whether to refer the nomination.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, seconded by the Delegation of **India**, requested that the vote also be taken by secret ballot.

The **Legal Adviser** stated that a simple majority was required to decide on a referral.

The result of the vote was as follows:

Numbers of Members:	21
Numbers of Members absent:	0
Numbers of blank or invalid ballot papers:	1
Numbers of votes recorded:	20
Majority required:	11
Number of votes obtained:	12

Having obtained the required majority, the proposal to refer the nomination was adopted.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.44** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 8B.3 LIST OF COMPLETE NOMINATIONS RECEIVED AS OF
1 FEBRUARY 2006 FOR EXAMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE
AT ITS 31ST SESSION (2007)**

Document: WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.3

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the information document contained a list of nominations received by 1 February 2006 and considered complete. Those nominations were currently being processed for evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. There had been a total of 44 nominations accepted in that manner in 2006. The World Heritage Centre pointed out that 44 nominations was just one short of the maximum number of nominations accorded under the Suzhou-Cairns decision. It should be noted that some nominations had been referred, and it was possible that more than 45 nominations would be up for consideration for a decision by the Committee at its 31st session. The World Heritage Centre would continue with the nomination process, but warned that the limit of 45 nominations might be exceeded and that the Committee would have to decide on how to proceed at that point.

The **Chairperson** explained that some nominations had been received late, and that the Bureau had decided not to accept them; they would be considered for the following year.

The Delegation of **Japan** referred to a factual error, noting that the Japanese nomination name was incorrect.

The **Chairperson** informed the Delegation of Japan that the error would be corrected by the World Heritage Centre.

In reply to questions by the Delegations of the **Netherlands** and **India** about how and when late nominations would be treated, the **Chairperson** and the **World Heritage Centre**, explaining the procedure, said that they would be dealt with the following year.

The Delegation of **Peru** recalled that during the informal meeting of the previous year no decision had been taken and said that it did not understand that such cases should be delayed for one year for discussion in New Zealand because of a problem of mailing which was beyond the responsibility of the State Party.

The Delegation of **India** said that the Serbia-Croatia nomination was expected to be dealt with at the 31st session in New Zealand. The Bureau had discussed the possibility of looking into the whole matter at a future meeting, and the Delegation sought clarification as to when that nomination would be dealt with.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, as the nomination would not be accepted in the 1 February 2006 cycle, it would enter the pipeline on 1 February 2007, and would accordingly be decided upon by the Committee in 2008.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it wondered about the list of nominations and the issues that the Committee would be facing the following year. It noted that there were at least six modern heritage sites for consideration the following year, and appealed to ICOMOS to take a holistic approach to those six sites, and not to consider them individually.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that each nomination warranted particular attention, but that perhaps the Committee could decide to look at particular nominations in a different way.

The Delegation of **Peru** said it put itself in the position of the State Party of Croatia: the problem of delayed DHL delivery could be seen as a punishment for the State Party. It asked whether it might be possible to review the case at the current session.

The **Chairperson** explained that it was necessary to comply with the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Norway**, quoting the *Operational Guidelines*, said that the nine late nominations should not be discussed.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** noted that the Heidelberg nomination was to be its priority for 2006.

The **World Heritage Committee** took note of Document *WHC-06/30.COM/INF.8B.3*.

ITEM 8C UPDATE OF THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER

Document: *WHC-06/30.COM/8C*

Decisions: *30 COM 8C.1*
 30 COM 8C.2
 30 COM 8C.3

The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the update of the List of World Heritage in Danger contained in document *WHC-06/30.COM 8C* and the three decisions before the Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8C.1**, **30 COM 8C.2** and **30 COM 8C.3** adopted.

ITEM 8D REVISION OF CRITERIA OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST ACCORDING TO THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (2005)

Document: WHC-06/30.COM/8D

Decisions: 30 COM 8D.1
30 COM 8D.2

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the information document on the change in criteria numbering.

The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8D.1 and 2** adopted.

ITEM 9 EVALUATION OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/9

Decision: 30 COM 9

The **Chairperson** described the background to the item and outlined the discussions that had led to the presentation of the draft Decision by the **World Heritage Centre**.

ICOMOS provided additional background on the nature of the issue.

IUCN added further comments on the Kazan meeting.

ICOMOS gave a presentation.

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

The Delegation of **India** agreed that it was a difficult process to identify outstanding universal value, particularly in cultural landscapes. It wondered how to go about helping to identify outstanding universal value in the preparation of tentative lists. It called into question the practice of the World Heritage Centre supporting the nomination of sites that were considered to have outstanding universal value, and suggested that that be reflected in the decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the Advisory Bodies on the paper. It agreed that outstanding universal value was the *de facto* corpus of decisions made by the Committee over time, and should be considered as the basis of the work that could be done. Canada had some amendments, but first wished to raise a few points, referring to page 2 of the document, where some of the ideas that Canada wished to present were captured. It

proposed that the total corpus of decisions of the Committee would help define what outstanding universal value actually was. The resource manuals needed to be prioritized. As there were insufficient funds to review them all, a discussion on the matter was needed. Application of criteria also needed further discussion, along with thematic and regional studies. A training session for new Committee members would be useful.

The Delegation of **Benin** commended the Advisory Bodies for their presentations and agreed that it was a very difficult concept, and this was evident by the examination of some nomination dossiers for which it was difficult to reach a consensus within the Committee. Further, it questioned the evaluation procedure that the Advisory Bodies would apply in the case of an « Asiatic » site, for example. It added that certain local experts were consulted at the beginning of the evaluation process but regretted that their ideas were not taken into account afterwards. It wished that the Advisory Bodies would have more confidence in local experts and integrate their opinions into the procedure for examination for inscription. The Delegation supported the proposal for reference manuals on practices.

ICOMOS replied to the query of the Delegation of Benin, explaining that it tried to use regional experts when evaluating properties, and to do so in their geo-cultural contexts. In terms of additional support to States Parties in enhancing their understanding of outstanding universal value, finding the best tools for that purpose was important, as it facilitated evaluation processes.

IUCN pointed out that it had a database of all protected areas and relevant literature on flora and fauna worldwide. Once it received a nomination, it reviewed those databases. It also sought out regional experts – trying at the very minimum to send someone who had an in-depth knowledge of the region. It also had a very comprehensive training programme for all evaluators. The evaluator's opinion was, however, not all that counted, as there was an independent review by experts worldwide on the dossier that was produced as a result. IUCN agreed that the process was not perfect, but constantly endeavoured to improve it, and noted that the next step involved training a new generation of evaluators.

The Delegation of **Norway** warned of the risk of a lengthy discussion on the subject. It concurred with the Delegation of Canada on the importance of the list on page 2 of the document. It also expressed some concern over the resource manuals and reminded the Committee that there would be a comprehensive discussion on the issue in New Zealand. It requested that paragraph 6 be deleted, along with paragraph 7, which did not appear to have anything to do with outstanding universal value. The Delegation proposed an additional paragraph, requesting the Advisory Bodies to carry out a preliminary review of the outstanding universal value of tentative list sites. The Delegation noted the statement of the Delegation of Benin and also encouraged some discussion on authenticity.

The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it appreciated the Lithuanian Chairperson's words on what constituted outstanding universal value, noting that the local situation should be taken into consideration when considering outstanding universal value. The Delegation

expressed disappointment at the treatment of religious places, suggesting that their outstanding universal value needed to be looked at critically. Comparative studies were also a critical component of that work, and the Delegation observed that they were also used to suppress certain sites and to support others. The most important part of determining outstanding universal value was to look at the local component, utilizing the knowledge available. The Delegation supported the IUCN use of two people in evaluation missions.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with the Delegation of Kenya that nobody had a monopoly on what constituted outstanding universal value, although it was clear that the concept of outstanding universal value must include integrity, authenticity, protection and management, and that should not be forgotten. The Delegation remained firmly behind those principles and suggested that the Committee should have a discussion on outstanding universal value at every meeting before discussing state of conservation reports and nominations in order to frame the Committee's discussions more clearly.

The Delegation of **Spain** said that outstanding universal value was probably the philosopher's stone of the *Convention* and explained how the notion had developed and expanded with time. It was necessary to speak the same language when talking about outstanding universal value. The Delegation drew the Committee's attention to the example of some nomination dossiers which could not be treated properly because of difficulties in identifying their outstanding universal value due to their different typological and cultural content. There were some good ideas in the draft Decision which should be maintained. It might be difficult to produce a manual in time for the following year, but even a draft of the document could be sufficient.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** reminded the Committee that a wide interpretation of outstanding universal value had been used, although indigenous people, especially in the Pacific, had expressed concern that it did not take their interests into consideration. There was some concern that indigenous world views could not easily fit with the outstanding universal value discussions to date. Indigenous peoples were more inclined to link authenticity with continuity. The ideals of trans-boundary mechanisms were relevant to indigenous people. There was merit in exploring the implications of indigenous in that issue.

The Delegation of **Morocco** remarked that outstanding universal value was based on both the intrinsic and extrinsic value, local and global. It compared the evolution of the 2003 Convention (on intangible heritage) from the concept of « masterpieces » to the more simple concept of intangible heritage, while the 1972 *Convention* had taken much more time to pass from the "superlative" of a monumental heritage to that of the simpler, closer to mankind and representative of local values. It queried how one could clearly apply outstanding universal value and the criteria? It emphasized the importance of the manuals for a better understanding of outstanding universal value and requested clarification on the procedure for comments on the establishment of the Tentative Lists.

ICOMOS said in response that it was difficult to give advice on tentative listing, particularly on account of the resource implications, and had no recommendations on the manner of proceeding.

The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the information documents contained much of interest, indeed more than what was presented, namely on the issue of representation, and wondered if, when considering a site, it was seen as one element in the whole world, or one that represented a particular geography. On the issue of comparative analysis, that there was a feeling that more help from the Advisory Bodies was needed. Both ICOMOS and IUCN evaluated tentative lists, and the Delegation suggested that the situation must be improved, as the format of tentative lists was poor. It also noted that the diagram in figure 1 on page 12 classified issues in boxes, and recommended that there should be sharp dividing lines between different kinds of items, and suggested that tentative lists be part of that group. It further suggested that the idea of decisions and corporate knowledge, and the use of key words to help identify gaps, would be useful.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** indicated that Man is the measure of all things and the essential reference. It requested that account be taken of authenticity and remarked that it did not have the same meaning for different cultures and traditions. It added that authenticity was inherent in mankind, as is spirituality. In concluding, it proposed a reflection based on these concepts of mankind.

The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the quest for sharing an understanding of outstanding universal value would be difficult.

The **Chairperson** proposed a review of draft amendments, to be presented the following day.

The Delegation of **India** requested that a paragraph should be included in the draft Decision on indigenous issues.

The Delegation of **Norway** suggested that a paragraph be deleted. It said it also wished to discuss the issue further in the context of another item.

The **Chairperson** said that the discussion would be resumed on the following day.

The meeting rose at 6.30 a.m.

SIXTH DAY – FRIDAY 14 JULY 2006

ELEVENTH MEETING

09.00 am - 01.00 pm

Chairperson: Ms. Ina MARCIULIONYTE

**ITEM 9 EVALUATION OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE
(continued)**

Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/9
WHC-06/30.COM/INF.9

Decision : 30 COM 9

The **Chairperson** reported on the Bureau meeting, and invited the Committee to resume its consideration of agenda item 9, requesting the Rapporteur to present the consolidated revised decision prepared on the basis of the discussions held on the previous day.

The **Rapporteur** explained that he had had to integrate nine different amendments that had been submitted. A tenth amendment had been submitted on that morning by the Delegations of Canada, Israel and the United States of America, concerning paragraph 13 of the draft Decision **30 COM 9**, which he read out.

The Delegation of **Benin** thought that there were sites that were not represented on the List, although they possessed outstanding universal values and proposed an amendment on this matter to paragraph 5 of the draft Decision **30 COM 9**.

The Delegation of **Peru** referred to paragraph 3 of the revised draft Decision and reiterated that it believed that outstanding universal value could not be the monopoly of any culture, proposing to express that in a more positive manner.

ICOMOS strongly supported the idea of making paragraph 3 of the draft Decision more positive in its tone, and offered some new wording in that regard.

The Delegation of **Kenya**, referring to the guidance manuals, asked who would be responsible for their preparation. With respect to paragraph 6 of the decision, it suggested that the World Heritage Centre be mentioned first as the body to which the Committee was entrusting the responsibility for implementing that activity.

The Delegation of Canada proposed an amendment to paragraph 8 of the draft Decision, and requested clarifications on the financial implications of the requests made by the Committee to the World Heritage Centre. It also suggested that paragraph 9 be deleted from the decision, and made a further suggestion to amend paragraph 10 a). With reference to paragraph 11, the Delegation asked what exactly was meant by “feasibility study”. Finally, it proposed to delete paragraph 13 since it was a repetition of a previous paragraph.

The Delegation of **Israel**, which had submitted the amendment on paragraph 11, clarified that a feasibility study was intended to assess the viability of a nomination from the point of view of the threats affecting the site and its management framework.

The Delegation of **India** suggested that a paragraph be added at the end of the draft Decision to ensure that a debate on the issue of outstanding universal value be held at every session of the Committee. With reference to paragraph 7, it requested that the mention of “unsuccessful inscriptions” be removed. It agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Peru to make paragraph 3 more positive; however, it felt that the strong message conveyed by that paragraph should have been retained.

The Delegation of **Norway** said it was comfortable with the draft Decision and proposed some amendments. It supported in principle the point made earlier by the Delegation of Kenya on the need to identify the World Heritage Centre as the responsible body for the elaboration of the manuals. It wondered, however, if it was feasible for the World Heritage Centre to carry out all the tasks requested of it and, while recommending not overburdening the Secretariat, asked for an estimate of the financial implications so as to define the priorities. Perhaps the two requested manuals could be prepared over a period of two years, instead of one.

IUCN supported the point just made, and stressed that more resources would be required in order to produce the requested guidance manuals.

The **Chairperson** sought the consensus of the Committee on the suggestion made by the Delegation of Norway to spread the tasks requested of the World Heritage Centre over two years.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** stressed the need to give appropriate recognition to the views of indigenous communities in defining outstanding universal value by retaining the original wording in paragraph 3 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Morocco** thanked the Rapporteur for the excellent version but said it wished to return to paragraph 3 where it was stated that concept could not be monopolised or belong to a certain culture, as it belonged to humanity as a whole. It added that outstanding universal value in comparison to indigenous values was addressed in paragraph 7(e) where the Committee gave the impression of substituting outstanding universal value by indigenous values. As this was not in the spirit of the *Convention*, it felt that the sentence should be reformulated so as not to give the impression that indigenous values were of less importance. The Delegation also proposed that a reference to technical consultations be inserted into paragraph 11.

The **Chairperson** stated that the feasibility studies referred to in paragraph 11 would presumably include the technical consultations mentioned by the Delegation of Morocco.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** suggested adding a reference to “non-represented countries” in paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Israel** supported the positions expressed by the Delegation of Peru and ICOMOS on paragraph 3, for which the words “embrace and integrate values” would seem more appropriate. In paragraph 4, it suggested adding a reference to “natural context”, while it agreed with the proposals made earlier by the Delegation of Benin on paragraphs 5 and 6. With respect to paragraph 7, it was too heavy and would imply too much work for the World Heritage Centre. What was required at the present stage was simply a draft paper to develop the contents for discussion, not the final publication that could have been left for later. Paragraph 7 could certainly be streamlined. The Delegation also confirmed that Israel would host a meeting on buffer zones, which it considered very important.

The Delegation of **Japan**, referring to the suggestion that Tentative Lists could be used as tools to promote a better use of the concept of outstanding universal value, drew the attention of the Committee to the need to take into account cultural, institutional and legal differences among the various countries. It suggested adding to paragraph 10 the words “while taking into account States Parties’ situations”.

The **Rapporteur** stated that paragraph number 7 was not included in the final draft Decision because the Delegation of Norway wanted to introduce it into another part of the decision.

ICCROM wished to add to paragraph 4 the following words: « tangible and intangible interpretations cannot be separated ».

The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, noting that both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies were already overstretched, requested assurances that they could take on the extra work.

The **World Heritage Centre** said it identified five distinct tasks that the Committee had requested. They included the preparation of two “compendiums”; the organization of two experts’ meetings; and the elaboration of a new format for the submission of Tentative Lists. Perhaps they could be split into two cycles, meaning that there would be one compendium and one meeting each year. All the activities were very important and required resources, which the World Heritage Centre would have to identify.

The Delegation of **Canada** requested a clarification on the way the tasks were going to be distributed between the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, suggesting that the latter could take some of the responsibility for the work required.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the work would be carried out in full collaboration, recalling however that the Secretariat, as the depository of all the documentation related to the *Convention*, would play a major role.

The Delegation of **Israel** agreed with the comment made by the Delegation of the Netherlands on paragraph 7 of the draft Decision. Noting that documentation was a

means rather than an end, it suggested that the two requested compendiums could be merged into one.

The Delegation of **India** disagreed with that view, stating that the two compendiums concerned very different subjects. It recognised the need for reducing the workload of the Secretariat and suggested that the work could be spread over two years. The Delegation reiterated its request that the words “unsuccessful inscriptions” be deleted from paragraph 7.

Noting consensus in the room, the **Chairperson** declared **Decision 30 COM 9 adopted** as amended.

ITEM 10 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY: FILLING THE GAPS – AN ACTION PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

The **Chairperson** introduced the item, explaining that consideration of the item would be limited to two presentations by the Advisory Bodies.

IUCN presented to the Committee its interpretation of the concept of outstanding universal value, stressing that rigour in its application was key to ensuring the credibility of the *Convention*, as well as a guarantee for potential donors and other partners. Credibility was also very much dependent on ensuring strong and effective management at the site level. IUCN explained how it categorized the different types of properties and how gaps had been identified. It noted that, on the basis of that analysis, IUCN had concluded that there should be a finite number of natural World Heritage properties, probably around the figure of 300 to 350. Considering that in the over 30 years of the *Convention* some 180 sites had been listed, IUCN believed that there was scope for many years of new inscriptions.

ICOMOS introduced its recent publication, “Filling the Gaps”, explaining that the analysis contained therein had been based on three complementary approaches, covering typological, chronological and thematic frameworks. In the light of the study, ICOMOS had concluded that some ten different themes were currently under-represented on the List. The reasons ICOMOS had identified for the gaps in the List were of two types: structural and qualitative. Structural reasons included lack of capacity in applying the processes of the *Convention* and weakness in managing and protecting heritage properties. Qualitative ones, on the other hand, related to the lack of proper identification and recognition of sites of potential outstanding universal value. ICOMOS considered that appropriate training programmes could address both those issues, and noted that that was actually included in the Action Plan proposed at the end of its document.

The **Chairperson** thanked the two Advisory Bodies for their presentations and declared the debate closed on item 10 of the Agenda.

ITEM 15 EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET 2006-2007

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/15.Rev
WHC-06/30.COM/15.Rev.Add

Decisions: 30 COM 15.1
30 COM 15.2

The **World Heritage Centre** explained to the Committee that the document prepared contained a review of the previous budget cycle, for 2004-2005, and an update on the implementation of the current budget for the first three months of the biennium. It clarified the structure of the document, drawing the attention of the Committee to the first Section in particular, which contained the official statement of the accounts for the previous biennium, as certified by the UNESCO Comptroller. The World Heritage Centre emphasized the need for the establishment of a reserve within the World Heritage Fund, mainly to address problems of cash flow, which should have consisted of around USD400,000 to USD500,000. The Committee had decided in the past to progressively abolish that reserve, but now it had again become a necessity since the UNESCO Comptroller would not authorize any expenditure unless the corresponding amounts had been received from States Parties' contributions.

The Delegation of **Japan**, referring to page 4, paragraph 21 of the working document WHC-06/30 COM/15.Rev, asked for clarification on whether the amount of USD865,288 was exclusively from the World Heritage Fund, and whether the decision to approve a carry-over of the unspent funds should not have been taken by the General Assembly, rather than by the Committee.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the amount mentioned was entirely from the World Heritage Fund and that, according to the financial regulations of the Committee, it was possible for the latter to decide on the carry-over of funds from one budget cycle to the next.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested more information on the costs related to the activities carried out by the Advisory Bodies, noting that they appeared to be already much overstretched.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the costs related to the Advisory Bodies were based on estimates submitted by the latter before the approval of the budget by the Committee. In the previous year, for example, the Advisory Bodies had requested an increase in their budget of 39 percent, of which eventually 21 percent was "accepted" and reflected in the World Heritage Fund. ICCROM was in a different situation since it did

not carry out evaluations of nominations. In general, the World Heritage Centre would establish contracts with the Advisory Bodies for the implementation of their activities. If some funds remained unspent, they were returned to the World Heritage Fund.

ICOMOS concurred with the Delegation of the United States of America that its resources were inadequate to carry out all the tasks requested from it. In particular, ICOMOS recalled to the Committee that in the previous year it had organized some 37 missions. It suggested that the Committee should look at the issue carefully, in comparison with the costs of IUCN.

IUCN reassured the Committee that its funds were spent as effectively as possible. IUCN had conducted fewer missions than ICOMOS; however, they were often to very large sites requiring complex logistics, and were therefore more expensive. IUCN believed that the proposal before the Committee was therefore justified. If the requested funding could not be approved, then IUCN would urge the Committee to establish priorities.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that its previous question had not been fully answered. It wished to know, in particular, what was the average cost of one mission, and also whether or not the World Heritage Centre was meeting the demands of the Advisory Bodies. Could the Secretariat also provide an update on the implementation of the activities funded through the United States Special Account?

The **World Heritage Centre** stated that the average cost of a mission for IUCN was around USD4,000; ICOMOS could provide information on its own costs. Concerning the United States Special Account, as indicated in the working document, some USD290,000 remained unspent.

ICOMOS stated that in the previous year its missions had cost an average of USD2,867.

IUCN confirmed that its missions cost an average of USD4,000, considering the often remote locations of their sites and the expensive transportation required, including by helicopter, but explained that in addition to the cost of the mission there were many other costs that were not covered by the budget requested. IUCN could provide more details in that connection to the Committee if requested.

The Delegation of **India** asked if the Advisory Bodies obtained what they requested from the World Heritage Centre and what was the procedure involved. It asked more clarifications about why IUCN costs were double what ICOMOS spent for each mission. It further noted that the budget presented to the Committee did not take into account the activities that the Committee had just agreed to entrust to the World Heritage Centre, such as the compendium on the issue of outstanding universal value. Finally, the Delegation sought clarifications on the different types of missions dispatched by the World Heritage Centre.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the budget proposed to the Committee was prepared in advance of the Committee sessions. It reiterated that the budget for the

current biennium showed an increase of 21 percent in the amounts allocated for IUCN and ICOMOS, while ICCROM's budget had been increased by 5 percent to allow for inflation, since the activities of that Advisory Body were more stable. While the expectations of the Advisory Bodies could not be fully met, the increase was significant and was the maximum possible given other priorities set by the Committee. With respect to the relative costs of IUCN and ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre noted that USD4,000 was not the double of USD2,867, but only a third higher. As for the compendium, an additional amount of USD50,000 to 60,000 could be estimated, to cover the cost of a junior staff member to conduct the work required. It would be possible to fund that initiative immediately out of the funds for which the Secretariat proposed a carry-over, or it could be proposed again the following year in the context of the budget for the next biennium. On the issue of the missions sent by the World Heritage Centre, they were basically of three different types. There were first of all the missions requested by the Committee, both for reactive monitoring or in the context of other activities. Secondly, there were missions that UNESCO carried out officially in the framework of its special projects, of which the World Heritage Centre implemented a significant number. They were not necessarily carried out together with the Advisory Bodies, although they were often involved. Finally, there were missions of a ceremonial nature, mostly to celebrate the listing of new properties. Such missions were always at the request of the concerned States Parties and very often paid for by them. The resources of the World Heritage Fund were used to pay for missions of the Advisory Bodies and consultants, not for World Heritage Centre staff.

IUCN reiterated that its costs were very carefully estimated and that no further reduction was possible. It also stated that IUCN would have welcomed the possibility of receiving support from the States Parties in the form of secondments.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it wondered if ICCROM could not be more involved in monitoring missions. It agreed with the Delegation of India that the Committee should have taken into account its earlier decisions in discussing the budget. It finally asked where the status of the accounts related to the Israeli voluntary contribution appeared in the document.

The **World Heritage Centre** noted that ICCROM had indeed been involved in reactive monitoring missions, where it had been considered appropriate, including very recently to a property in Africa.

ICCROM confirmed that it had taken part in a number of missions, which did not appear singled out in the budget as they were covered under the item "advisory services".

With reference to the voluntary contribution by Israel, the **World Heritage Centre** explained that it appeared in the budget under the item "earmarked contributions", together with all other similar contributions, since it was not a Special Account like the one established by the United States of America. It explained however that in the following year the Secretariat would provide a more detailed budget update where individual activities would be shown.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** reiterated the concern expressed by previous speakers on the difference in costs between IUCN and ICOMOS. With reference to the staffing table shown in Appendix III of document *WHC-06/30.COM/15.Rev*, the Delegation requested information on the seven additional staff members that the Director-General of UNESCO had promised to transfer in order to strengthen the Secretariat, and particularly on what specific tasks had been entrusted to them.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that there were indeed seven new staff members in the Secretariat, four of them in established posts under the regular programme of UNESCO, and three currently paid out of the so-called FITOCA funds, i.e. the funds generated by the accrued interests on the extra budgetary projects implemented by UNESCO.

ICOMOS said that it had never meant to suggest that IUCN costs should have been reduced, but only that the resources made available to ICOMOS were insufficient.

The Delegation of **Canada**, noting that a drop in the extrabudgetary resources available to the World Heritage Centre was foreseen, asked what adjustments the Director had in mind. On the issue of the manuals and compendiums, it agreed that they were needed but requested that a decision on them be taken only within a comprehensive framework explaining what exactly was going to be done, how and by whom. The current piecemeal approach as reflected in the budget did not allow the Committee to take a considered decision.

The **World Heritage Centre**, referring to Annex III of the working document under discussion, clarified that there was no expected drop in extra budgetary sources. On the contrary, they were increasing, especially considering that it was only the beginning of the biennium and that more contributions might be expected. Perhaps the trend would not continue in the medium term, taking into account a recent shift in the policies of the United Nations Foundation. On the manuals, the World Heritage Centre would consult with the Advisory Bodies in order to develop at least one over the following year, taking into account that the priorities were clearly nominations processes and management aspects.

The Delegation of **India** stressed that the current state of affairs with respect to the costs of ICOMOS was not satisfactory. If that Advisory Body could not obtain adequate resources to carry out its work, that would negatively impact on the effectiveness of the process and quality of the results. With reference to the statement made by IUCN, suggesting that States Parties might second staff to the Advisory Bodies, India was very well endowed in expertise and could also provide funding, if necessary. Perhaps that idea could be integrated in the draft Decision somewhere. The Delegation, finally, agreed with the Delegation of the Netherlands that a difference in the costs of IUCN and ICOMOS was not justified.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stated that if three of the new staff members of the World Heritage Centre were being paid with FITOCA funds, then that would reduce the promised structural reinforcement of the Secretariat. The Delegation had also asked what specific tasks had been entrusted to them, as there were rumours that the newcomers were continuing to work on projects that they had inherited from their previous posts and that did not concern World Heritage.

The **World Heritage Centre** reassured the Delegation of the Netherlands that the new staff members had been fully integrated in the structure of the Secretariat, noting that two of them had actually occupied the position of Chief of Unit. Some of them had indeed brought their projects to the World Heritage Centre, but that did not pose any problems since the projects mostly concerned World Heritage properties. The integration of the former Division of Cultural Heritage within the World Heritage Centre, moreover, had considerably improved the coordination of UNESCO activities. In conclusion, that reform had brought significant benefits to the Secretariat and the *Convention* in general.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** explained that the FITOCA Funds were foreseen for the funding of the Central Services but, since a certain time, the posts of some staff members were financed by FITOCA. The mid-term goal was to halt this practice and finance these posts from Regular Programme funds.

The Delegation of **Morocco** referred to Annex 4 of the document concerning the thematic study on rock art in Africa and requested on the one hand, whether this study also included North Africa as, methodologically, it was difficult to separate it, and on the other hand, whether, with regard to document *30.COM/15.Rev.ADD*, Appendix 4 paragraph 1.2, it was possible to know about the content of this information.

ICOMOS gave explanations about the Thematic Studies for Africa and indicated that North Africa could be included.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that, at the next Committee meeting, the budget should be discussed at the beginning of the session, to allow States Parties to have a better financial overview when taking decisions.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** wished to know whether, following the examination of the previous days of the state of conservation and the nomination dossiers, the budgetary situation had changed radically? It further requested that priorities be fixed for activities implementing unutilised funds. It flagged that some States Parties were not aware of preparatory assistance and requested that the Centre play a proactive role for this type of assistance with States Parties.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that four additional missions had been added to the initial budget. With regard to the role of the Centre as regards Preparatory Assistance requests, he agreed with the comment made by the Honourable Delegate of Madagascar and emphasized the difficulty linked to the fact that these funds could only be used upon request from the State Party. USD 300,000 remained to be

allocated. He explained the impossibility of transferring the allocation of funds from one chapter to another of the budget without prior authorization from the Committee.

The Delegation of **Israel** proposed an amendment to draft Decision **30 COM 15.1**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 15.1** adopted as amended.

She invited the Committee to consider **Decision 30 COM 15.2**.

The Delegation of **Canada** said it was uncomfortable with paragraph 2 of draft Decision **30 COM 15.2** and proposed an amendment.

The **World Heritage Centre** said it was ready to accept the amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 15.2** adopted as amended.

ITEM 11 PERIODIC REPORTS

ITEM 11.A PRESENTATION OF THE PERIODIC REPORT SECTIONS I AND II OF EUROPE

Documents : *WHC-06/30.COM/11A.1*
WHC-06/30.COM/INF.11A

Decision : *30 COM 11A.1*

The **World Heritage Centre** presented document *WHC-06/30.COM/11A.1* jointly with **Mr Tamas Fejerdy** (Chairperson of the European Working Group) for the Eastern and South-Eastern European Regions and **Mr Christopher Young** (Rapporteur) for the Western, Nordic and Baltic and Mediterranean Regions. In addition to the information contained in the document, the World Heritage Centre presented some relevant conclusions of the report such as the strengthening of international cooperation through the process and the growing awareness at the national level in many European countries, specifically through the network of the focal points. Even if there was a growing understanding of outstanding universal value, 15% of the site reports claimed that the current statement of significance did not reflect the outstanding universal value of the property. Finally, like all other regions, Europe faced a number of challenges, ranging from tourism pressures, lack of resources, threats of various kinds, from mining to climate change, man-made impacts and natural disasters. Moreover, it appeared that 60% of the European sites analysed had no legislation specific to World Heritage and no management plan; an issue which remained a priority to address.

The World Heritage Centre added that, during the informal meeting on document *WHC-06/30.COM/INF.11A* organized on 11 July 2006, it had been announced that the follow-up meeting proposed by Greece was to be changed from September to November 2006

and that the Mediterranean meeting would be hosted by Spain in January 2007. Those changes would be reflected in the draft Decision **30 COM 11A.1**.

The Delegation of **Spain** expressed sincere thanks to the World Heritage Centre for the work done for the accomplishment of the exercise, to Germany for organizing the coordination meeting in Berlin, and to Italy for organizing the Mediterranean sub-regional meeting in Rome. It added that the Government of Spain would like to undertake the implementation of the outcomes of the periodic reporting exercise which was a very good tool for coordination at the national and regional levels. Spain would continue to support coordination at the sub-regional level. The Delegation asked for the floor to be given to Mr Guido (Mediterranean Sub-regional Coordinator) from the Observer Delegation of Italy.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** stressed the importance of the coordination meetings held in Berlin and Rome, and added that the forthcoming meeting in Madrid would mainly focus on the follow-up of the reports, elaboration of management plans, changes of boundaries and Tentative Lists, where the major imbalances occurred.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that 60% of the European sites evaluated did not possess a management plan, which was an important tool. It would like to see a better balance of European nominations as there are too many churches and not enough cultural landscapes. It proposed an amendment to the draft Decision to take that into account.

The Observer Delegation of **Georgia** intervened in its capacity of sub-regional representative of the World Heritage Centre for the preparation of the Periodic Reports for the countries of Eastern Europe. It informed the Committee that in May 2005, the Secretaries-General of the seven States Parties of the region had met in Chisinau (Moldavia), where they adopted a declaration for the implementation of the *Convention* by these countries and highlighted the progress accomplished in the preparation of the Periodic Reports. It emphasized that the Reports had greatly contributed to the establishment of an adapted analytical base defining the future strategies for the implementation of the *Convention*. As other European States Parties, Eastern Europe awaited with optimism and enthusiasm the adoption by the Committee of the pertinent decision that would pave the way for the launching of the regional Plan of Action, as well as a new steps in the implementation of the *Convention* in the European region.

The Delegation of **Spain** proposed an amendment to paragraph 9 of the draft Decision, requesting the inclusion of the forthcoming sub regional meeting of January 2007 in Madrid.

The Observer Delegation of **France** emphasized that the Periodic Report established in 2005 had been a complex exercise culminating in numerous positive results:

- On the one hand, the report had created a synergy with regard to the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, a mobilisation of the actors and a reflection on the level of knowledge of the property, its conservation or again its presentation.

- It became clear to all the actors that as much attention, if not more, should be given to properties already inscribed, rather than to securing new inscriptions.
- It also appeared that the development of cooperation between States Parties as well as between World Heritage sites of different countries, oriented towards the improvement of their management and conservation, was fundamental.
- Following the Periodic Report, this cooperation has encouraged the preparation of new nominations, serial or transboundary. The Delegation also underlined that the future of the *Convention* mainly hinged on the acceptance of this wider vision that could give a meaning to the idea of universality going beyond national frontiers.
- The Periodic Report represented a very important effort, as much within the teams of the World Heritage Centre as with the States Parties and the site managers.
- Finally, it was fundamental to establish continual interaction between the monitoring of the state of conservation of the properties and the Periodic Report. Consideration of their complementarity offered rich perspectives for the conservation of World Heritage properties.
- Next October, France would organise a Western European sub-regional meeting to reflect upon the follow up to the Periodic Report and notably the harmonisation of the Tentative Lists.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11A.1** adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the second part of the Periodic Report of Europe and draft Decision **30 COM 11A.2**.

The **World Heritage Centre** presented document *WHC-06/30.COM/11A.2* and explained that it simply contained clarifications of the original nominations through the Retrospective Inventory Project.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11A.2** adopted.

Mr. Alfredas Jomantas, Chair of the Steering Committee for Heritage of the Council of Europe, speaking at the invitation of the Chairperson, made the following points:

The Steering Committee for Cultural Heritage of the Council of Europe, comprising the 46 signatory countries of the European Convention on Human Rights, was the first to welcome and reintegrate Lithuania amongst its Member States. Lithuania also rejoined the European Cultural Convention and once again became involved in basic daily work towards making culture accessible and open to all. Vilnius and other sites have been inscribed on the World Heritage List; some remain fragile, like the site of Kernavé or the Peninsula of Kursiu Nerija.

The activities carried out by the 47 delegate colleagues of the Steering Committee for Heritage of the Council of Europe is in line with the fundamental work carried out at the Maison des Droits de l'Homme with regard to the democratic security of the European continent, in complete synergy with the initiatives of UNESCO, and also involving other

continents represented by many delegates here, and with whom we continually seek to restore the links established during the course of history.

For several years the Council of Europe has been responsible for new regulatory tools, but its Committee responsible for heritage has concentrated upon the use of the extraordinary influence of networking which implies the confrontation of national heritage policies, especially as almost half of the member countries have had to remodel this policy almost from the grass roots.

In creating the HEREIN programme, all elements, and all texts governing our policies and actions are pooled. It has provided to be an opportunity for the best specialists to communicate, made available a computerised data base, established a thesaurus in a dozen languages of the European continent, among which are some very archaic and rare languages such as the Lithuanian language, very close to Sanskrit. At the last plenary session in May last year, the Steering Committee for Heritage also decided to use the HEREIN tool for monitoring the follow up to the conventions, among the oldest of which is, first and foremost, Valetta, and of course the Grenada Convention, but also the more recent ones that came into force not long ago, such as that of Florence or the European Landscape Convention, and soon that of Faro concerning relations between heritage and society. The setting up of a pilot group on this question therefore constitutes a major objective for the HEREIN programme in the years to come.

Following a first phase at the beginning of the '90s, the Council of Europe privileged assistance to South-East European countries over several years. A year ago, the Kiev procedure was established which favoured the Ukraine and Moldova but also the countries of the Caucasus, since it is true that in this long history that once again we wish to share, on a par with the Mediterranean, the Baltic and Black Sea or the Caspian Sea, there is much to learn about our common cultures.

The joint programme of the Council of Europe and the European Union, the European Heritage Days, is celebrated throughout Europe in September, and is an extraordinary awareness-raising programme that each year invites more than 20 million visitors, young and older, to learn, discover and identify themselves with the heritage of all the European countries, not only in its local dimension but in its intercultural perspective.

Another passionate and emblematic programme with which the Committee has been involved for nearly twenty years, is the « Cultural Itineraries of the Council of Europe », a programme which is not only an exemplary tool for the concrete establishment of European heritage conventions mentioned above, but is also a communication tool for culture and heritage for the major axes of Europe. It promotes communication, continuity, explanation and European mediation, implying that an Hanseatic city cannot be conceived without the others, that a Roman monument situated in a territory is, however, the result of an architectural and artisanal influence outside that territory, that a historical synagogue belongs to one of the great European currents of Judaism, or a historical garden is modelled on an earlier creation and will transmit its stylistic and landscape inventions to other European cultural landscapes.

The **Representative** emphasized once again one of the major advances with regard to heritage, which the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe opened for signature on 27 October 2005: the Faro Convention, known as the « Framework Convention of the Council of Europe on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society ». This is a very original convention as it places emphasis on the person rather than on the object. It draws our attention to the fact that this framework-convention does not take a protection approach, already treated by the Conventions of Grenada, Valetta and Florence, but rather a global perspective approach, expounding the principles of heritage use in a globalised society experiencing contradictory tensions. The text in French and English is available on the Council of Europe website.

ITEM 11B FOLLOW-UP TO THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR NORTH AMERICA

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/11B
WHC-06/30.COM/11B.Add

Decision : 30 COM 11B

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the document and explained the process of preparing the statements of significance for North America. That pilot exercise, which was useful for other regions, also had implications for the item relating to the Reflection on Periodic Reporting (item 11G).

The Delegation of **Canada** said it was satisfied with the format adopted for the statements of significance, but recommended to the Centre that in some cases research on past Committee decisions might be necessary to clarify the initial inscriptions. It also requested removal of paragraph 7 of the draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked whether there would be an additional nomination if paragraph 7 was removed.

The **World Heritage Centre** reassured the Delegation that there would not necessarily be an additional nomination submission, as that would be a different process, in the event of re-nomination under different criteria.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested correction of a name in the draft Decision, from “Redwood National Park” to “Redwood National and States Parks”.

The Delegation of **India** requested clarification of the Delegation of Canada’s request.

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that paragraph 7 did not come from the Secretariat, but from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11B** adopted as amended.

ITEM 11C PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR THE ARAB STATES

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/11C.1
WHC-06/30.COM/11C.2

Decision : 30 COM 11 C.1
30 COM 11 C.2 Rev

The **Secretariat** presented a resumé of Document *WHC-06/30.COM/11C.1* concerning the implementation of the recommendations of the Periodic Report for the Arab Region, recalling that the Arab States were the first to carry out this exercise in 2000, and that they were also the first to undertake the second cycle of the Periodic Report, taking into account the experience of the other regions and the results of the Year of Reflection.

A brief recall was made regarding the adoption by the Committee at its 27th session (2003), of the Regional Programme, rediscussed by the Arab States during the consultation meeting of December 2005 in Abu Dhabi, where a great majority of cultural and natural heritage experts for the Arab States were present. At the end of this meeting, regional action plans were adopted, as well as a certain number of decisions and recommendations, notably:

- the preparation of national action plans,
- the creation of national committees for World Heritage,
- the launching of a feasibility study with ALECSO, for the creation of an Arab Fund for World Heritage,
- the strengthening of national legislations,
- the submission or the revision of the Tentative Lists with particular emphasis on natural heritage.

The Secretariat mentioned some of the activities carried out in the framework of the regional programme, in conformity with the four « C »s, such as the preparation of the nomination dossier for the City of Samarra in Iraq (with the Nordic World Heritage Foundation), capacity building in the field of documentation, information management (thanks to the Flemish Authorities of Belgium), site management (with ICCROM and WMF), the elaboration of Assistance Models (with IUCN and ICCROM), and finally the translation and publication of the « Basic Texts of the *Convention* » in Arabic.

The Observer Delegation of **Oman** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the good report and recommended organizing regional and sub-regional meetings to create a new methodology for the Arab States to reach a better understanding about the contents of the periodic reports.

The **World Heritage Centre** agreed to that proposal, saying that such consultation meetings would be organized once the process had been reviewed during the Reflection Year, in order to have a more effective format.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11C.1** adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider document *WHC-06/30.COM/11C.2* and draft Decision **30 COM 11C.2 Rev**, noting that there was agreement on the revised text of the draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11C.2** adopted.

ITEM 11D PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR ASIA PACIFIC

Document: *WHC-06/30.COM/11D*

Decision: *30 COM 11D*

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the document and indicated that, as a follow-up to the periodic reporting exercise in Asia and the Pacific, three main types of actions had been implemented: production and distribution of information materials, including through the Web; development of sub-regional action plans to implement the regional programmes; and specific technical assistance and capacity-building activities at the sub-regional and national levels. The World Heritage Centre stressed in particular the significant progress achieved in the Pacific, where all States Parties were expected submit their Tentative Lists by 2007, while several nominations were being prepared thanks to intensive training of national heritage professionals. Another major initiative under way was the serial and trans-boundary nomination of the Silk Road World Heritage property. As next steps, it was expected that each State Party would establish a national World Heritage focal point and develop national strategies for implementing the sub-regional action plans.

The Observer Delegation of **China** provided an update on the work of the Chinese World Heritage Training and Research Centre. It also recommended that that Centre be accorded UNESCO category 2 status and that reference be made to the World Heritage Centre in draft Decision **30 COM 11D**.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its support to the Pacific Region and welcomed the creation of the Chinese World Heritage Training and Research Centre.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11D** adopted as amended.

ITEM 11E PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBBEAN

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/11E

Decision : 30 COM 11E

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the document, informing the Committee that the full version of the Periodic Report for the Latin American and Caribbean Region had been published in May 2006 and that many meetings of States Parties from Latin America had been convened to develop a detailed Action Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean. A further regional meeting, to set an implementation structure for the Action Plan for Latin American and the Caribbean, was scheduled to take place in Santiago de Chile. It had been rescheduled to March 2007.

The **Rapporteur** introduced two amendments.

The Delegation of **Chile** proposed amendments to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the draft Decision about the seminar on the Action Plan for the Caribbean region and noted that Cuba had been omitted from the list given.

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the Report and requested that it should be better disseminated. Argentina would also like to participate in the follow-up activities.

The Observer Delegation of **Barbados** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its useful activities in the region. It indicated the usefulness of the meeting on Places of Memory related to the Slave Trade and Slavery in the Caribbean, held in Havana in May 2006, and recommended holding further meetings on the subject in other parts of the region.

The World Heritage Centre indicated, that if funding allowed, that would be treated as a priority.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it wished to add the name of Saint Lucia to paragraph 3 of the working document *WHC-06/30.COM/11E*.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11E** adopted as amended.

ITEM 11F PROGRESS REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR AFRICA

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/11F

WHC-06/30.COM/INF.11F

Decision : 30 COM 11F

The **Chairperson** expressed his gratitude to Algeria, which had pledged USD60,000 for the African World Heritage Fund.

The **World Heritage Centre** presented the document.

ICCROM informed the Committee about its 12-year Africa 2009 Programme, which was now in its final phase. The programme had largely assisted in the preparation of African nomination files. Yearly training courses in site management had been organized and two seminars on legal frameworks had been held, one in French and one in English. Research had been carried out and publications produced. One of the most important outcomes of the programme was the building of networks in the region, bringing together 200 professionals of the region. ICCROM also thanked its donors for the programme.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed that the word “Applauded” be replaced by the word “Welcomed” in paragraph 7 of the draft Decision. It underlined the importance of the participation of the non-represented countries in the regional meetings and remarked that only 24 of the 53 African countries had properties inscribed on the List.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11F** adopted as amended.

ITEM 11G REFLECTION ON THE PREPARATION OF THE NEXT CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/11G

Decision : 30 COM 11G

The World Heritage Centre presented Working Document *WHC-06/30.COM/11G*, underlining the need for the Committee to immediately adopt the terms of reference of the Year of Reflection on the preparation of the next cycle of Periodic Reporting.

The meeting rose at 01.00 p.m.

TWELFTH MEETING

03.00 pm - 06.30 pm

Chairperson: NETHERLANDS

Later: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 11G REFLECTIONS ON THE PREPARATION OF THE NEXT CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/11G

Decision : 30 COM 11G

The **Chairperson** explained that before discussion of item 11 resumed, a short presentation would be given about a management effectiveness tracking tool.

Ms Sue Stolton, from Equilibrium Consultants, presented a short analysis comparing the tracking tool with the Periodic Reporting Section II and gave some suggestions about how it could be adapted for World Heritage use.

The **Chairperson** noted that the important new tracking tool could be downloaded from <http://www.panda.org>.

Turning to item 11G, he drew the Committee's attention to the proposed amendments submitted by the Delegations of Norway, Canada and the United States of America that had been circulated in the room and noted that an additional amendment had just been proposed by the Delegation of Canada.

The **Rapporteur** read out the Delegation of Canada's amendment.

The Delegation of **Benin** echoed the concerns expressed by several Committee members as the amendment was presented in English only. The Delegation wished that the text be read and translated into French so that the francophone Committee members could understand.

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to read out the revised text in its entirety so that French-speaking delegations could listen to the interpretation.

The Delegation of **Benin** gave its agreement to simultaneous interpretation.

The **Rapporteur** read out the draft Decision with the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **India** indicated its support for the proposed amendments, although it wished to add a line to the last sentence of the amendment proposed jointly by the Delegations of United States of America and Canada to the effect that, as a result of the pause, States Parties would be entitled to submit up to 2 natural and 2 cultural properties each for consideration by the 33rd session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** provided some information about the cumulative impact of the proposal.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that a number of States Parties had taken the view in recent years that the Committee had reached a transitional point in the implementation of the *Convention* and that it should move from being a body that inscribed sites to one that focused on the state of conservation of properties on the List. It acknowledged the concerns of States Parties with no or few inscriptions, but the time had come to take a pause in order to facilitate a reflection on processes. It recalled that the United States of America had not submitted any sites for inscription since 1998 and that it would not do so while it was a member of the Committee. That was a policy choice intended to make room for the entry on to the list of under-represented countries and categories.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed a small change to paragraph 3 to strike out ‘credibility of the World Heritage List’ and replace it with ‘to ensure the implementation of the strategic objectives’.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said it understood the purpose of the proposed amendment but disagreed with the terms proposed.

The **Chairperson** sought clarification as to whether the Delegation of Cuba supported the proposal of the Delegations of United States of America and Canada.

The Delegation of **Cuba** said that it did not.

The Delegation of **Norway** requested clarification as to how that would affect nominations that had already been submitted.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** said it shared the concerns of others about the perceived lack of fairness in treating those nominations that had just missed the cut-off point for consideration in 2007, noting that regions that were relatively under-represented would be disappointed if that amendment were accepted.

The Delegation of **Kenya** acknowledged that the proposal of the Delegations of the United States of America and Canada had been made in good faith and appreciated its noble aims but likewise noted that States Parties with few or no sites on the List would be disappointed. It proposed amending the draft Decision to the effect that the 32nd session of the Committee would only consider nominations from States Parties with four or fewer properties on the List. Alternatively, the Committee could plan to take a pause in

consideration of nominations in five years' time in order to facilitate planning by States Parties. There was a need to find middle ground.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** said it withdrew its proposal in the spirit of consensus but reaffirmed that the points it had raised were serious ones which required consideration.

The Delegation of **Israel** observed that it would be content to leave paragraph 3 un-amended, as credibility covered a range of issues.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** indicated its preference for 'strategic objectives'.

The Chairperson proposed incorporating both concepts in the text and asked the World Heritage Centre to specify how much the working group proposed in paragraph 9 would cost.

The **World Heritage Centre** said it estimated the cost at USD45,000.

The Delegation of **Israel** said it believed that the Committee would wish to discuss the policy document referred to in paragraph 6 at the session preceding the General Assembly of States Parties in 2007 and that the paragraph should be amended accordingly. It also requested that the project proposal requested under paragraph 11 should be submitted to the Committee at its 31st session in 2007.

After summing up the discussion, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11G** adopted as amended.

ITEM 12 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR WORLD HERITAGE

Document : *WHC-06/30.COM/12*
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.12

Decision : *30 COM 12*

Ms Ina Marčiulionytė took the Chair

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the item.

Ms Louise Bizier, representing the Baastel Group of Canada, presented the information related to the Result-Based Management (RBM) approach contained in document *WHC-06/30 COM/INF.12*.

The **Chairperson** referred the Committee to the draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** observed that it was very much in favour of results-based management but that it would be difficult to move forward without being sure where things stood at the present moment. It recalled that there had been no management audit of the World Heritage Centre since 1998 and that the Committee's discussions over the preceding days had returned to the respective roles of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It proposed amending the draft Decision to request a management audit and asked that no management changes should be implemented at the World Heritage Centre before the Committee had had the opportunity to review the results of that audit.

The **Rapporteur** read out the text of the amendment, which was supported by the Delegations of **India, Canada, Norway** and the **Netherlands**.

The Delegation of **Japan** requested that paragraph 7 be amended, replacing 'Requests' by 'Invites'.

The Delegation of **Morocco** wished to know what the financial implications were for the implementation of a management audit.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that, as the proposal had only just emanated from the floor, he did not yet have an estimate to hand but he would urgently consult with colleagues. As the item on the budget was still open, the proposal could be duly incorporated.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** clarified that the proposal of the Delegation of Japan would not take effect until the management audit had been completed and reviewed by the Committee. Responding to the Chairperson's request about how that should be treated, it proposed deleting paragraph 7 on the understanding that it would come back after the management audit.

It was so agreed.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked the World Heritage Centre to clarify the implications for its activities that did not concern World Heritage.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** answered that the majority of the new projects were related to World Heritage but he could foresee potential difficulties with the volume of correspondence with States Parties on projects which did not concern World Heritage. Having consulted colleagues he said it appeared that a management audit was likely to cost in the region of USD80,000 to 100,000.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the Committee had agreed to request a management audit and that it was time to move business forward.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed but reiterated that the results of the audit should be put to the Committee before any further structural changes were introduced at the World Heritage Centre.

ICCROM, speaking on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, expressed concerns about the apparent lack of understanding in document *WHC-06/30.COM/INF.12* about the role of the Advisory Bodies under the *Convention*, which went well beyond evaluating nominations. The Advisory Bodies wished to collaborate with the management audit and expected that the full breadth of their role would thus emerge.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked the representative of Baastel if the information given in Appendix I, starting on page 32 of the English version, encapsulated some of the information relative to a management audit.

Ms Bizier observed that the first step would be to define the current situation, then undertake a SWOT analysis, decide what was being aimed at, identify the gap between the two and decide strategically how to achieve the desired result. Responding to the concerns expressed by ICCROM, she noted that page 28 of the English version dealt with the range of tasks carried out by the Advisory Bodies.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 12** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 6 REPORT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE ON ITS
ACTIVITIES AND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
DECISIONS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE
(continued)**

Documents : *WHC-06/30.COM/6*
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.6A
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.6B
 WHC-06/30.COM/INF.6C

Decision : *30 COM 6*

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** requested guidance about the mandate and terms of reference for the management audit in order to ensure that it met the Committee's expectations.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee needed to reconsider draft Decision **30 COM 6**, which had been left open in view of its references to RBM.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that he had received an amendment requesting a management audit before any management changes were made, in line with that adopted for Decision **30 COM 12**.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** recalled that paragraph 3 should be replaced.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 6** adopted as amended.

ITEM 13 WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Document: WHC-06/30.COM/13

Decision: **30 COM 13**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the item.

The **Chairperson** referred the Committee to the proposed amendment of Norway that had been circulated in the room and opened the floor for comments.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested deletion of the first two bullet points, so that the sentence read "...based on an efficient voting mechanism".

The Delegation of **Benin** emphasized that, as pointed out by the Delegation of the United States of America, the document submitted concerned the voting mechanism but mention was also made of elements for reflection. How could they be conciliated? There was also the proposal from the Delegation of Norway. The Delegation of Benin requested that clarification should be given on the matter to avoid confusion.

The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee would discuss voting mechanisms at its 31st session and that document WHC-06/30.COM/18B was intended for noting, prior to reflection on the points raised in the coming year.

The Delegation of **India** said it wished to understand the reasons why the Delegation of the United States of America wished to delete the bullet points and asked the Legal Adviser to confirm that the issues raised by them fell within the Committee's ambit.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** explained that its discomfort stemmed from what it perceived as an emerging trend to meet regional needs at the expense of a global focus. It believed that the bullet points would foster the growth of that trend.

The **Legal Adviser** observed that the bullet points were perfectly in order from a legal point of view.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked if the intention in paragraph 7 was to establish a working group.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that at present it was a recommendation about a tool that the Committee might consider useful for the future.

The Delegation of **Norway** explained its position. Some of the points in the working document were so important that it considered they needed to be reflected in the draft Decision. It believed that the General Assembly of States Parties should play a more strategic role in the implementation of the *Convention* and that Committee sessions should have a sharper focus on key issues relating to nominations and state of conservation. Referring to regional groups, it acknowledged the overriding need to work globally, explaining that its main concern was really to streamline the voting process which was currently extremely time-consuming. Continuing, it suggested that the first bullet point could be modified by deleting '*fixed and*'. The key point was to move to a position where there would be one round of voting underpinned by good geographical distribution. A reference to the global role of the Committee's work could also be inserted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee not to focus too intensely on voting mechanisms at present.

The Delegation of **India** observed that a modification of the first bullet point should be based on the notion of fair geographical balance of the 21 members of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Norway** confirmed that that had been its intention.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked if the Secretariat had the power to amend procedure implied by paragraph 6.

The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that it did not.

The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that the *Rules of Procedure* recognized the need for fair geographical representation and supported the proposal of the Delegation of the United States of America. It also reiterated the need to honor the professionalism of the Committee enshrined in the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the Committee was an instrument of UNESCO and that UNESCO recognized the role of regions. The question before the Committee was therefore how to promote regionalism within a global context. It was clear that, without regional groupings, some parts of the world would not be adequately represented. The Committee needed to find a way to resolve a pressing problem. It urged the Committee not to be afraid of terminology and to ensure that the draft Decision captured what was necessary.

The **Chairperson** proposed retaining the proposal of the Delegation of the United States of America pending discussion at the 31st session.

The Delegation of **India** disagreed.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the views of the Delegation of Norway and believed that the concerns of the Delegation of Israel could be addressed by inserting a reference to the *Rules of Procedure* in paragraph 3. It further observed that article 8.2 of the *Convention* was explicit on the need for election of the Committee to ensure an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world.

The Delegation of **Peru** stated that fair geographical distribution was needed, as the Delegation of Norway had said, and proposed to add that voting mechanisms would be examined at the next session.

The Delegation of **India** suggested amending paragraph 6 to the effect that the Committee would reflect on changes to the voting system based on the principle of fair geographical distribution at its 31st session in 2007.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Committee appeared to agree.

The Delegation of **Norway** indicated its assent.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** expressed its discontent because it had requested the floor before the Delegations of India and Norway. That said, the Delegation underlined that the Committee had another year to reflect upon this question so that, as the Delegation of Kenya mentioned, the smaller countries could be represented.

The Delegation of **Benin** said it was somewhat disoriented. In examining draft Decision 13, the Delegation was concerned with regard to paragraph 8 and expressed its reserve. With regard to the proposal of the Delegation of Norway that the Committee concentrate on priority questions, the Delegation questioned its viability and wondered how the other non-priority questions would be examined. The Delegation finished by emphasizing that the situation was rather confused.

The **Chairperson** apologized but explained that the Delegations of India and Norway had been amending the text and therefore took precedence.

The Delegation of **Benin** stated that the amendment was good but needed improvement.

The **Chairperson** summarized the debate, noting that paragraph 9 took account of other items in the working document (*WHC-06/30.COM/13*) and that they would be debated in New Zealand.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** intervened, explaining that the working document had been badly printed and the logical numbering thus altered. This was why the Delegation of Benin was a little lost. The Assistant Director-General for Culture indicated the logical order for the document to be read correctly.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** put forward an additional proposal to improve transparency. It was concerned that the current verbatim record of proceedings was slow

to produce and sometimes inaccurate. It therefore wished to propose moving towards an easy-to-use audio record of proceedings, in line with international best practice. It could be quickly produced, in contrast to the Summary record of the 28th session, which had taken two years to complete, and had the added advantage of being relatively inexpensive because of the savings in staff time, printing and translation. The resources could be put into conserving heritage rather than conserving the works of the Committee. Continuing, it explained that the audio record would be accompanied by a written summary. It proposed that on an experimental basis the proceedings of the current session would be produced in the traditional format but accompanied by an audio record. The World Heritage Centre should be requested to prepare a cost-benefit analysis for consideration at the 31st session so that the Committee could decide which method best served its needs for efficiency, transparency and accuracy in the twenty-first century. It had provided text to the Rapporteur which could be inserted between paragraphs 8 and 9.

There being no objection, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 13** adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider a point carried forward from its 29th session, relating to whether the Committee could decide to defer consideration of nominations from States Parties that had failed for two consecutive years to provide complete reports on the State of Conservation of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. She invited the Legal Adviser to give his opinion.

The **Legal Adviser** observed that the *Convention* did not deal with the issue of deferral directly, although paragraph 160 of the *Operational Guidelines* did provide guidance about the circumstances under which the Committee might decide to defer a nomination. That list was not exhaustive and a review of Committee practice showed that deferral had been used for a number of reasons, including requesting a State Party to complete a management plan, putting into place appropriate protection measures, or allowing for the refinement of the outstanding universal value of the nominated property, or simply leaving open a final decision on the nomination pending further clarification on the outstanding universal value of particular types of properties. Thus viewed, deferral could be interpreted as a procedural tool that could be used by the Committee for a variety of purposes, not all of which were set out in the *Operational Guidelines*. The Committee had no legal obligation to take a final decision on each nomination submitted to it at a particular session. Indeed, such an obligation would place the Committee in a difficult situation whereby it would have to take either a positive or a negative decision on all matters, notwithstanding the fact that it might consider a specific item not ripe for a final decision, and in that perspective deferral was to be read as a procedural tool that allowed the Committee to take time.

Returning to the question whether the Committee could decide to defer if a State Party had not submitted full State of Conservation reports for two consecutive years, he said there appeared to be no reason why it could not. The power of the Committee to inscribe properties on the World Heritage List under Article 11.2 entailed examination of nominations submitted to it. Such examination might encompass not only the nature and

qualities of the property submitted but also the overall legislative, regulatory and policy measures adopted by the State Party submitting the nomination with regard to cultural and natural heritage located in its territory, including those that had already been inscribed on the List. That examination might lead to a decision to inscribe, to refer or to defer.

Deferral should thus be viewed as a procedural tool at the disposal of the Committee in the case where it might require more time or more information in order to take a decision on a nomination. Deferral was not a definitive judgment but simply a procedural stage in the decision-making process. It did not imply a failure to take a decision. In conclusion, the Committee did have the authority to defer consideration of items on its agenda and individual nominations. What mattered was that the decision was taken in a procedurally correct manner. Deferral did not constitute a rejection of the nomination nor was to be considered a final judgment, or a sanction. On the contrary, it represented a mere stage in the decision-making process, not a failure by the Committee to take a decision but a preparatory step to decision-making. The Legal Adviser concluded by therefore reaffirming that, as part of its deliberative process, the Committee had the authority to defer items on its agenda or the evaluation of proposed nominations, whatever the reasons were for the deferral.

The **Delegation of India** thanked the Legal Adviser and reminded the Committee that when the matter had arisen in Durban, it had raised a procedural issue. In some parts of the world, States Parties had difficulties submitting their reports on time, for reasons beyond their control. Under such circumstances, the decision to defer would be interpreted as being a sanction. It emphasized the difficulty in distinguishing between a State Party that had such difficulties and one that had no valid reason; the Committee could not therefore validly take a decision on that matter.

The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested the opinion of the Legal Adviser in writing, noting that it confirmed the importance of knowing the right procedures, and recommended that all World Heritage Committee members think about the issue clearly, in particular when making the distinction between inscribing, referring and deferring.

IUCN reminded the Committee of decision 4B.1 taken at the Seventh Extraordinary session to have 31 March as the deadline for supplementary information. Since that had not proved feasible, as had been determined earlier in the current week, IUCN suggested that the date be changed to 28 February and included in the decision.

The Delegation of **Israel** expressed support for bringing the date forward, conditional upon the dialogue between Advisory Bodies and States Parties and supplemented information as part and parcel of the package.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed an amendment to adjust the due date for new information from 31 March to a postmark of 28 February in any given year.

The Delegation of **India** supported the proposal.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 13** adopted as amended.

ITEM 14A EXAMINATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS ON INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/14A

Decision : 30 COM 14A

The **Chair** introduced the item.

Ms June Taboroff, consultant to the World Heritage Centre, presented her report.

The Delegation of **India** said it wished to raise two issues. In regard to the application form, it observed that the form was designed to make the system more efficient, but that it should also be designed with the beneficiary in mind. It expressed concern over the increased complexity of the form. That was possibly due only to the presentation, but it might cause difficulty to those for whom it was intended. It suggested that the form be tested, and then evaluated in terms of its practicality, and the results presented at the next Committee session. Referring to paragraph D of the draft Decision, it reminded the Committee of the three pillars of the *Convention*, namely the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the Committee, and suggested that a provision be included to have the Committee included in that paragraph.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** supposed that the report and its conclusions should reflect experiences and requested the consultant to give one or two examples.

Ms June Taboroff requested clarification of the question from the Delegation of Tunisia.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** repeated that it wished to hear about an example that justified the need for the proposed reforms.

Ms June Taboroff noted that various elements of international assistance had been reviewed, including emergency assistance, followed by a portfolio review of all of the international assistance grants, which included a few case studies, including missions to Riga, Lebanon and Laos. Questionnaires had been carried out for Africa 2009 and for Brazil and extensive data had been gathered.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to be enlightened concerning some elements of the draft Decision. For point 6 (d), it perceived a contradiction with the *Guidelines* that stipulate that it is the Advisory Bodies that should evaluate the requests for international assistance. It wished to know the weaknesses noted that justified the proposed change. It

was also concerned that the procedure could slow down the implementation of emergency assistance. It proposed to add point 6 (d) to paragraph 7.

Ms June Taboroff noted that emergency assistance needed to be disbursed quickly, but it appeared that it was in fact being distributed in such a way as to function more like a reward for lack of ongoing maintenance to World Heritage sites. She noted that the Advisory Bodies worked with great integrity, but that there was a need for them to apply common criteria.

ICCROM agreed on the initial premise that capacity building through training was one of the most critical areas of international assistance, and went on to highlight some aspects of the report it considered important, drawing attention in particular to paragraph 42. It noted that the previous year's decision did not seem to have been implemented yet, in terms of how many categories of assistance were not going to be used, and wondered if that issue would be addressed. It raised the issue of selection criteria, noting that work had been going on in that regard, but was not yet complete. ICCROM would be pleased to work on revising the global training strategy; it specified that the panel of Advisory Bodies was not the decision-making body – it was the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee who made the final decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** explained that, in Durban, Decision **29 COM 14B** had not been adopted for lack of time. That decision had been referred to the Committee by ICCROM, as it included a proposal to change the structure of International Assistance. The World Heritage Centre suggested that that decision be adopted, with a new symbol corresponding to the current session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed some concerns over the fact that the report stated that some States Parties did not even know they were receiving International Assistance funds. It suggested that the introduction of what appeared to be the logical framework approach could complicate matters, and recommended that those applying for International Assistance should first receive training in that regard. It questioned recommendation 6(a), which appeared ambiguous, and sought a modification that would make it clearer, with more measurable results. It asked whether recommendation 6(d) had financial implications.

The **World Heritage Centre** responded that Advisory Body / World Heritage Centre meetings were already taking place, and that there would be no extra cost.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** insisted on the priority to be given to new States Parties and wondered why that was no longer included in the decision.

The Delegation of **Norway** pointed to the importance of giving a more strategic direction to International Assistance. It agreed that the application form should be as simple as possible and supported in principle the proposal by the Delegation of India to involve the Committee in the panel proposed in paragraph 6(b) but questioned its practicability. Perhaps one of the Vice-Chairpersons could participate.

Referring to paragraph 7, the Delegation of **Canada** noted that the Committee needed to establish a procedure for updating the *Operational Guidelines*. It was important not to return to the problems encountered in the nineties and therefore a proper procedure was necessary.

Referring to the draft Decision, the Delegation of **India** proposed including in paragraph 6(b) the need to assess the impact of the new application form at the 32nd session, and in 6(d) the need to have the Committee represented on the panel by one Vice-Chairperson. It further suggested that the Delegation of Canada might propose wording for a new paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed to delete the words “where possible” in paragraph 6(a).

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 14A** adopted as amended.

She sought the Committee’s views on the manner of treating Decision **29 COM 14B**, which had not been adopted at the 29th session.

The Delegation of **Madagascar** indicated that the earlier decision had been adopted without having considered ICCROM’s question, and suggested that that which had been modified be integrated, or otherwise to delete the unwanted elements in the present draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the points covered in paragraphs 4(d), (e), (f), (g), and 5 were already included in the decision just adopted and suggested incorporating the remaining subparagraphs 4(a), (b) and (c) in the current decision.

The Delegation of **Morocco** supported Canada, but noted that there were implications to the *Guidelines*, and questioned whether it would be necessary to take this into consideration.

The **Chairperson** explained that the Delegation of Canada had already proposed to include them in the decision.

ICCROM drew attention to the implications of subparagraph 4(a). Under the current system, a number of middle-income countries had taken advantage of International Assistance, and that that would no longer be possible in the future.

The Delegation of the **United States of America**, supported by the Delegation of **India**, speaking on a point of order, noted that it was a policy question and up to the Committee to decide. It would ask ICCROM for advice if it judged it necessary.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 14A** adopted as amended.

ITEM 15 EXECUTION OF THE BUDGET 2006-2007

Documents : WHC-06/30.COM/15 Rev
WHC-06/30.COM/15 Rev.Add
Decisions : 30 COM 15.1
30 COM 15.2

The **Chairperson** explained that there were a number of decisions pending as they contained paragraphs with budgetary implications.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed to delete the paragraphs with budgetary implications out of the relevant decisions and adopt them as part of Decision **30 COM 15.2**. He explained that it was necessary to return to that decision as several proposed actions with budgetary implications had been approved and it was therefore necessary to review the budget and propose some other budget cuts. He therefore proposed to leave draft Decision **30 COM 15.1** as it stood, and to incorporate the following changes into draft Decision **30 COM 15.2**:

- (i) Material for risk preparedness: cut from USD50, 000 to USD20, 000
- (ii) The periodic report deleted and replaced by management audit (USD80, 000)
- (iii) Retrospective Inventory cut from USD50, 000 to USD30, 000
- (iv) **Taboroff** Resource manuals: deleted but the World Heritage Centre would try to identify extra budgetary resources, replaced by the compendiums requested by the Committee
- (v) Meeting on the revision of periodic reporting cut to USD40, 000.

The rest remained unchanged. The remaining USD10,000 would be taken out of the allocation to replenish the reserves.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 15.1** adopted and Decision **30 COM 15.2** adopted as amended.

ITEM 16 ELECTIONS OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 31st SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE-JULY 2007)

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/16
Decision : 30 COM 16

The Delegation of **India**, seconded by the Delegation of **Norway**, nominated Mr Tumu te Heuheu (New Zealand) as Chairperson of the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** declared Mr Tumu Te Heuheu (New Zealand) elected as Chairperson of the 31st session of the Committee.

The newly elected **Chairperson** of the 31st session thanked the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** proposed Mr John Pinkerton (Canada) as Rapporteur.

The **Chairperson** of the 30th session declared Mr John Pinkerton (Canada) elected as Rapporteur.

The newly elected **Rapporteur** thanked the Committee.

The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed Benin as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Africa Group.

The Delegation of **India** proposed Japan as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Asia Pacific Group.

The Delegation of **Chile** proposed Cuba as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Latin America and the Caribbean Group.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed Norway as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Europe / North America Group.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** proposed Morocco as Vice-Chairperson on behalf of the Arab Group.

The **Chairperson** of the 30th session declared Benin, Japan, Cuba, Norway and Morocco elected as Vice-Chairpersons.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 16** adopted.

ITEM 17 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 31st SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE-JULY 2007)

Document : WHC-06/30.COM/17

Decision : 30 COM 17

The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to move up items 9 and 10 in the agenda.

The Delegation of **India** agreed with the proposal for item 9 but not for item 10, as it dealt with the Suzhou-Cairns Decision.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked where the nominations would appear on the agenda.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that they would appear under item 8.

The Delegation of the **United States of America** questioned the desirability of placing a discussion of the Suzhou-Cairns Decision before item 8.

The **World Heritage Centre** reminded the Committee that the subject under discussion was the agenda, and not the timetable, and that the items were not necessarily sequentially arranged.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** said that it would be providing a “World Heritage in the Pacific” item after the opening session, to follow item 6.

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** sought confirmation that the Qapaq Ñan would be addressed during the meeting.

The Delegation of **Canada** asked if the Director of the World Heritage Centre would be submitting a policy document on climate change before it was to be presented to the General Assembly of States Parties.

The **Chairperson** answered that that point would be dealt with under the State of Conservation reports agenda item.

The Delegation of **Norway** said it assumed that other items would be included in the course of the coming year.

The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if the reflection on periodic reporting would be considered under item 11G.

The **World Heritage Centre** answered in the affirmative.

The Delegation of **Norway** recalled that an extra day had been requested, for the preparation of the General Assembly meeting that would occur a few months after 31st session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** answered that it was too early to confirm that request, as it would have cost implications.

The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the preparations for the General Assembly should be an agenda item.

The **Chairperson** noted that the agenda was still provisional, and that the Director-General of UNESCO could amend it.

The Delegation of **Japan** asked if the findings of the external auditors would be ready for the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the matter would be discussed.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 17** adopted.

ITEM 18 OTHER BUSINESS

Documents: *WHC-06/30.COM/18A*
 WHC-06/30.COM/18B

Decisions: *30 COM 18A*
 30 COM 18B

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider item 18A and the relevant decision, which concerned a proposal to amend Rule 21 of the Committee's *Rules of Procedure*.

In clarifying the document, the **World Heritage Centre** explained that at its 29th session (Durban, 2005), the World Heritage Committee decided that the recommendations of the subsidiary bodies should be presented to it in the form of draft decisions, and to this end, it also decided to inscribe on the agenda of its 30th session a proposal for the amendment of the *Rules of Procedure*, adding a new point 21.6.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 18A** adopted. She invited the Committee to consider item 18B and the relevant decision.

The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the voting procedures had already been discussed in point 13. In the draft Decision, the World Heritage Centre asked States Parties to present written comments before 1 February 2007, for discussion at the 31st session.

The **Chairperson** requested clarifications from the Rapporteur on an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway.

The **Rapporteur** referred to an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Norway to Decision **30 COM 9** concerning outstanding universal value which should be included in the decision now under discussion, and read out the proposed amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 18B** adopted as amended.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** took leave of the meeting, congratulating the Chairperson in the name of the Director-General for the efficient conduct of the debates.

The meeting rose at 07.00 p.m.

SEVENTH DAY – SUNDAY 16 JULY 2006

THIRTEENTH MEETING

03.00 pm - 07.00 pm

Chairperson: Ms Ina MARCIULIONYTE

ITEM 19 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

*Documents: WHC-06/30.COM/19
WHC-06/30.COM/INF.19*

The **Chairperson** announced that the meeting would be suspended to give Committee members time to examine document *WHC-06/30.COM/19* (Part I) before adopting the decisions.

The meeting was suspended at 3:10pm and resumed at 4:00pm.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the first part of document *WHC-06/30.COM/19* (Decisions **30 COM 3A** to **30 COM 7B.100**).

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 3A**, **30 COM 3B**, **30 COM 4**, and **30 COM 5** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 6**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that the audit of the World Heritage Centre was an external management audit, and that that remark also applied to Decision **30 COM 13**.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that in paragraph 5 of the English version, it should be specified that only natural heritage was concerned. Furthermore, it noted a discrepancy between the French (“Approuve”) and English (“Welcomes”) versions of paragraph 6, saying that “Approuve” was too strong. Lastly, in the final paragraph of the French version, the wording should be “cette série” and not “ces séries”.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 6** adopted as amended.

On Decision **30 COM 7.1**, paragraph 11, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** reminded Committee members that it had been agreed that there should be a “balance between natural and cultural properties”, and therefore proposed to add wording to that effect to the Decision.

The Delegation of **Benin** wished for clarification in the French version of paragraph 12 of this Decision. It was not clearly indicated to which reports it referred.

The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the reports in questions were the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change assessment reports.

The Delegation of **Canada** recalled that an addition had been made from the floor in paragraph 13 (e) and asked if the Rapporteur could propose better phrasing.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7.1** adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Decision **30 COM 7.2**.

The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to add “together with other UNESCO mechanisms” in paragraph 3.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that it was preferable to use the wording «for examination» in paragraph 8 instead of “for consideration” in the French version.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7.2** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.1** adopted.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** pointed out that in paragraph 11 of Decision **30 COM 7A.2**, the words “Director-General of UNESCO” were missing.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that with regard to paragraph 6 c), the management structure for the property already existed. It would therefore be more correct to request that its activities be broadened.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.2** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Benin** noted that with regard to paragraph 6 of Decision **30 COM 7A.3**, the word “objective” was not clear: “mission having as objective to ...” in the French version.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.3** adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that with regard to paragraph 11 of Decision **30 COM 7A.4**, it would be clearer if “on the one hand, to conserve this property” and also « and on the other, to promote” be added. Finally, it remarked that paragraph 6 k) was

redundant with paragraph 5, both requesting a viability study of the rhinoceros population.

The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** agreed to link paragraph 6 k) to paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** pointed out that in paragraph 7, the words “Director-General of UNESCO” were also missing and suggested that the Secretariat review all decisions for consistency.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.4** adopted as amended.

With regard to the Decision **30 COM 7A.5**, the Delegation of **Benin** indicated that it would be appropriate to mention “Invited the State Party of...” and not “invited the State Party to ...”. Furthermore, it remarked that paragraph 7 is repeated in all the decisions concerning the properties of the DRC and proposed that this paragraph be mentioned only once.

The **Chairperson** said that the repetition had been requested by the Committee during the examination of the state of conservation reports on properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The Delegation of **Benin** emphasized that a funds-in-trust was to be created for all the properties concerned and not a funds-in-trust for each property.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.5** adopted as amended.

With regard to Decision **30 COM 7A.6**, the Delegation of **Benin** indicated an error in the formulation of paragraph 4 a).

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.6** adopted as amended.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7A.7**, the Delegation of **Benin** remarked that in paragraph 4, the word “possible” was unnecessary.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that, as the mission had initially proposed not to include benchmarks, the matter should remain open and the word “possible” should be kept.

The Delegation of **Benin** did not insist, but wished for reassurance that the State Party clearly understood what was requested by the Committee.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.7** adopted.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.8** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7A.9**, the Delegation of **Canada** questioned the use of the word “Regazet” in paragraph 5 (b) and suggested it be replaced.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.9** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.10** adopted.

Concerning the French version of Decision **30 COM 7A.11**, the Delegation of **Benin** requested that it be written “Requests the State Party to approve”, and not “to approve”.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.11** adopted as amended.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7A.12**, the Delegation of **Madagascar** indicated that in the French version, paragraph 13 required clarification with regard to the English version, and requested that it be stated that the reinscription would be announced « by the 31st session ».

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7A.12** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7A.13**, **30 COM 7A.14**, **30 COM 7A.15**, **30 COM 7A.16** and **30 COM 7A.17** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7A.18**, the Delegation of **Norway** reminded the Committee that it had asked for a report by 1 February 2007.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7A.18**, **30 COM 7A.19**, **30 COM 7A.20**, **30 COM 7A.21**, **30 COM 7A.22**, **30 COM 7A.23**, **30 COM 7A.24**, **30 COM 7A.25**, **30 COM 7A.26**, **30 COM 7A.27**, **30 COM 7A.28**, **30 COM 7A.29**, **30 COM 7A.30**, **30 COM 7A.31**, **30 COM 7A.32**, **30 COM 7A.33** and **30 COM 7A.34** adopted.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.1** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.2**, the Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** remarked that paragraph 4 had been challenged but still appeared unchanged.

The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that his visit to the site had not been a regular monitoring mission and now requested the State Party to invite a joint monitoring mission to thoroughly assess the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Kenya** said that that issue had been raised and thought it had been resolved. It added that both the World Heritage Centre and IUCN had received a number of reports highlighting concerns about the state of conservation of the property.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.2** adopted as amended.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.3**, the Delegation of **Kenya** indicated that the Committee should note in paragraph 2 that the State Party had not responded, and that, in paragraph 4, the wording should be “an independent EIAs”.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.3** adopted as amended.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.4**, the Delegation of **Kuwait** asked whether paragraph 4 should begin with, “Notes”, or “Notes with concern”. The **Chairperson**, confirming the second opinion, declared Decision **30 COM 7B.4** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.5**, **30 COM 7B.6**, and **30 COM 7B.7** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.8**, the Delegation of **Kenya** said that the wording should be “Notes with concern” in paragraph 2.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.8** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.9**, and **30 COM 7B.10** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.11**, the Delegation of **Spain** drew attention to a mistake in the numbering of the Decision (**30 COM 7B.10** should be **30 COM 7B.11**).

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.11** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.12**, **30 COM 7B.13**, **30 COM 7B.14**, **30 COM 7B.15**, **30 COM 7B.16**, **30 COM 7B.17**, **30 COM 7B.18**, **30 COM 7B.19**, **30 COM 7B.20**, **30 COM 7B.21**, **30 COM 7B.22**, **30 COM 7B.23**, **30 COM 7B.24**, **30 COM 7B.25**, **30 COM 7B.26**, **30 COM 7B.27**, **30 COM 7B.28**, **30 COM 7B.29**, and **30 COM 7B.30** adopted.

Concerning **30 COM 7B.31**, the Delegation of **Canada** reiterated its proposal to split paragraph 7 into two new paragraphs.

The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** said that it had been agreed to delete “Argentina” from paragraph 9 and keep it in paragraph 7. The Delegation of **Canada** confirmed that understanding.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.31** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.32**, **30 COM 7B.33**, **30 COM 7B.34**, **30 COM 7B.35**, **30 COM 7B.36**, **30 COM 7B.37**, **30 COM 7B.38**, and **30 COM 7B.39** adopted.

Concerning **30 COM 7B.40**, the Delegation of **Canada** reminded the Committee that it had been agreed to replace the “Ethiopian authority” by the “State Party”.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.40** adopted as amended.

Concerning **30 COM 7B.41**, the Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that there had been three amendments to the Decision. Paragraph 3 should read “who have made some improvements”; it had been suggested, between paragraphs 4 and 5, to add a paragraph calling on international donors; and finally, that the last sentence of the final paragraph about danger listing the property, should be removed.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.41** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.42**, **30 COM 7B.43**, **30 COM 7B.44**, **30 COM 7B.45**, and **30 COM 7B.46** adopted.

With regard to Decision **30 COM 7B.47**, the Delegation of **Morocco** wished to make a minor modification to paragraph 5, noting that the word “reste” in the French text is employed three times.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.47** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.48**, **30 COM 7B.49**, **30 COM 7B.50**, and **30 COM 7B.51** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.52**, **ICOMOS** said that paragraph 5 was rather confusing and should be rephrased.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.52** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.53** and **30 COM 7B.54** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.55**, in the French version, the Delegation of **Morocco** indicated that in paragraph 5, the word “à” following the words “Urgently invited the State Party” should be deleted, and in paragraph 6, the expression “Also urgently invited” appeared rather heavy-handed.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.55** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.56**, **30 COM 7B.57**, **30 COM 7B.58**, **30 COM 7B.59**, **30 COM 7B.60**, **30 COM 7B.61**, **30 COM 7B.62**, **30 COM 7B.63**, **30 COM 7B.64**, **30 COM 7B.65**, **30 COM 7B.66**, **30 COM 7B.67**, **30 COM 7B.68**, **30 COM 7B.69**, **30 COM 7B.70**, **30 COM 7B.71**, and **30 COM 7B.72** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.73**, the Delegation of **Canada** stated that in paragraph 8, “World Heritage Values” was still mentioned in the English version as opposed to “valeur universelle exceptionnelle” (outstanding universal value) in the French version.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.73** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.74**, **30 COM 7B.75** and **30 COM 7B.76** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 7B.77**, the Delegation of **Japan** suggested that the expression “in a prudent manner” should be deleted.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 7B.77** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.78**, **30 COM 7B.79**, **30 COM 7B.80**, **30 COM 7B.81**, **30 COM 7B.82**, **30 COM 7B.83**, **30 COM 7B.84**, **30 COM 7B.85**, **30 COM 7B.86**, **30 COM 7B.87**, **30 COM 7B.88**, **30 COM 7B.89**, **30 COM 7B.90**, **30 COM 7B.91**, **30 COM 7B.92**, **30 COM 7B.93** and **30 COM 7B.94** adopted.

Concerning **30 COM 7B.95**, the Delegation of **Canada** said that there was some confusion about dates in paragraph 5, and sought clarification from the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed the date as being 30 August 2006.

The Delegation of **Kenya** indicated its willingness to change the date.

The **Chairperson** stated that the date should in fact be the 1 February 2007, and declared Decision **30 COM 7B.95** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 7B.96, 30 COM 7B.97, 30 COM 7B.98, 30 COM 7B.99** and **30 COM 7B.100** adopted.

The Delegation of **Tunisia** remarked that during the session, the site of Jerusalem was placed within the Arab Region, whereas in this report it was in the Caribbean.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that this error had been indicated and that instructions had already been given in this regard.

The Observer Delegation of **Romania** mentioned an error in Decision **30 COM 7B.24**, in the French version of the document, in paragraph 7, where it was indicated “1 February 2007” instead of 1 February 2008”.

The **Chairperson** said that the error would be corrected. She suggested suspending the meeting to enable delegates to read the Part II of document *WHC-06/30.COM/19*.

The meeting was suspended at 5:00pm and resumed at 5:30pm.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of the first part of Document *WHC-06/30.COM/19*.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8A, 30 COM 8B.1, 30 COM 8B.2, 30 COM 8B.3, 30 COM 8B.4, 30 COM 8B.5, 30 COM 8B.6, 30 COM 8B.7, 30 COM 8B.8, 30 COM 8B.9, 30 COM 8B.10, 30 COM 8B.11, 30 COM 8B.12, 30 COM 8B.13, 30 COM 8B.14** (Decision not examined by the Committee), **30 COM 8B.15, 30 COM 8B.16, 30 COM 8B.17, 30 COM 8B.18, 30 COM 8B.19, 30 COM 8B.20, 30 COM 8B.21, 30 COM 8B.22, 30 COM 8B.23, 30 COM 8B.24, 30 COM 8B.25, 30 COM 8B.26, 30 COM 8B.27, 30 COM 8B.28, 30 COM 8B.29, 30 COM 8B.30** (Nomination withdrawn by State Party) and **30 COM 8B.31** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 8B.32**, paragraph 2, criterion (iii), the Delegation of **Kenya** proposed to add “and a half” after “millennium”. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.32** adopted as amended.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 8B.33**, the Delegation of **Mauritius** proposed, in paragraph 2, to delete “free” from the second line, to delete “now” from the third line, to add “canes” after “sugar” in the fourth line and to replace reference to the Caribbean by

“other parts of the world”. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed support for those proposals.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.33** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8B.34, 30 COM 8B.35, 30 COM 8B.36** and **30 COM 8B.37** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 8B.38**, **ICOMOS** asked whether there was not a need to insert a date in paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** agreed to add “1 February 2007” and declared Decision **30 COM 8B.38** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8B.39, 30 COM 8B.40, 30 COM 8B.41, 30 COM 8B.42, 30 COM 8B.43** (Nomination withdrawn by State Party), **30 COM 8B.44, 30 COM 8B.45, 30 COM 8B.46, 30 COM 8B.47, 30 COM 8B.48** (Nomination withdrawn by State Party) and **30 COM 8B.49** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 8B.50**, the Delegation of **Canada** questioned the formulation of paragraph 3, asking whether the paragraph was about the site itself or the broader cultural landscape outside the World Heritage property.

The **Rapporteur** confirmed that it might be appropriate to replace “cultural landscape” by “Cornwall and Devon Mining Landscape”.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.50** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8B.51, 30 COM 8B.52** (Nomination withdrawn by State Party), **30 COM 8B.53, 30 COM 8B.54, 30 COM 8B.55** (Nomination withdrawn by State Party), **30 COM 8B.56, 30 COM 8B.57, 30 COM 8B.58** and **30 COM 8B.59** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 8B.60**, the Delegation of the **United States of America** remarked that there was no need to keep the Decision as it was already covered by Decision **30 COM 11B**, paragraph 5.

The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the Decision about name change had to be mentioned under item 8B, and that there was a cross-reference with Decision **30 COM 11B**. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 8B.60** adopted.

IUCN remarked that, concerning Decision **30 COM 8B.24**, paragraph 3 (c), the management plan had already been adopted and paragraph 3 (c) should be on the allocation of resources for the implementation of that management plan.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 8C.1**, **30 COM 8C.2**, **30 COM 8C.3**, **30 COM 8D.1** and **30 COM 8D.2** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 9**, the Delegation of the **United States of America** pointed out that the second line of paragraph 6 was not worded properly.

Confirming that the paragraph would be reworded, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 9** adopted as amended.

30 COM 10 (No Decision required)

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 11A.1**, **30 COM 11A.2**, **30 COM 11B**, **30 COM 11C.1**, **30 COM 11C.2**, **30 COM 11C.3**, and **30 COM 11D** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 11E**, the Delegation of **Spain** recalled that the Committee had requested a report from the Secretariat.

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11E** adopted as amended.

With regard to Decision **30 COM 11.F**, the Delegation of **Benin** indicated its wish to replace the word «applauds» in paragraph 7, French version, by «favourably welcomes».

Considering that comment, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 11F** adopted as amended.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 11.G**, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that, in paragraph 9, it thought that the amount in question was USD 45,000 and not USD 40,000.

The **Chairperson** explained that it had been reviewed to USD 40,000, and declared Decision **30 COM 11G** adopted.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 12** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 13**, the Delegation of **Norway** asked for some minor editorial changes to be made to paragraph 8 for greater clarity.

The Delegation of **Morocco** referred to the «reserved seat» in paragraph 7 a) and proposed indicating the seat as «to be reserved». In paragraph 8, it wished to note that the transmission would be made «by the Committee» to the General Assembly. Finally, it considered the word “normally” unnecessary in paragraph 10.

The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed its wish to specify, in paragraph 12, “and to report back at the 31st session”.

The Delegation of **Benin** indicated that in paragraph 13, the term “competence” should be replaced by “competent”.

The Delegation of **Norway** disagreed with the amendment to paragraph 8 proposed by the Delegation of Morocco and said that the World Heritage Centre should forward the report to the General Assembly, not the Committee.

The **Director of World Heritage Centre** suggested that the part of the phrase to be retained should be “... to be forwarded to the General Assembly”.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 13** adopted as amended.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decisions **30 COM 14A**, **30 COM 15.1**, **30 COM 15.2** and **30 COM 16** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 17**, the Delegation of **Kenya** said that Item 14, “Implementation of the Global Training Strategy”, should include “cultural heritage” as well as natural heritage.

In replying to the Delegation of Kenya, the **World Heritage Centre** stated that it concerned a procedure requested by the Committee at its 29th session (Durban, 2005) but that the Secretariat had taken note of the comment.

Considering those comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 17** adopted.

The Delegation of **Benin** proposed, with regard to Decision **30 COM 16**, paragraphs 2 a) and 2 b), to replace «will begin» by «at the end».

Considering these comments, the **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** declared Decision **30 COM 16** adopted as amended.

Returning to Decision **30 COM 17**, and responding to a remark made by the Delegation of **Kenya**, the **Chairperson** confirmed that the presentation of the World Heritage Programme for the Pacific was included in the Agenda under Item 11C.

The **World Heritage Centre** said that the agenda had 25 items, but that the Committee had requested that it be streamlined and given careful consideration.

The Delegation of **Canada**, supported by the Delegation of **Norway**, said that there had been a motion from the floor that an extra day be added at the 31st session in 2007 for policy discussions, in preparation for the General Assembly.

The Delegation of **Kuwait** said it wished to know what kind of information would be included in the World Heritage Committee's report to the General Assembly.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that the General Assembly had to be made aware of all the documents approved by the Committee during its sessions, and that that information constituted the content of the report.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 18.A** adopted.

Concerning Decision **30 COM 18.B**, the Delegation of **Canada** said that paragraph 4 in the English version was incomplete.

After confirming that the French version was properly drafted and that the English text would be redrafted, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 18.B** adopted.

After consulting Committee members and noting no comments, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **30 COM 18.C** adopted.

ITEM 20 CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The Delegation of **Benin** wished to formally express the thanks and congratulations of the Committee, the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for a very good Report of the Decisions.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic of Iran** commended the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for inviting the people of Vilnius to a concert in the city square; saying that that was exactly what was needed in UNESCO, involving the people of the world. It concluded with the reading of a poem.

The Delegation of **Canada** said that the meeting could not be concluded without thanking the Chairperson. Since she had been declared to be of "outstanding universal value", she now had to prepare a report, giving details on the following benchmarks: ways and means of applying voting procedure, application of timing mechanisms, and conducting meetings with grace and harmony. In conclusion, it thanked the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for the warm welcome.

The **President of the UNESCO General Conference** thanked the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. He took the opportunity to express his gratitude for the organization of the World Heritage meeting. Such benevolence, wisdom and friendliness reflected on the Committee's work. Thanking the Lithuanian Government for the visits to the sites, he said that on the previous day, the delegates had experienced tangible and intangible culture at the Trakai Castle. He also extended a special thanks to the volunteers, staff, and the Lithuanian students, who had made the delegates' stay so enjoyable, hoping that in the near future they would also be part of the Committee and of UNESCO. The meeting would remind everyone of the importance of common understanding between South and North for the benefit of all mankind and the protection of world heritage. After thanking the new Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee and New Zealand, he concluded with a poem.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said that, although it had been a very complex meeting involving among other things, the preparation of all the documents, everything had proceeded very smoothly. The venue was perfect. The Secretariat had been admirably assisted by the volunteers and an efficient security team. He thanked the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee for her leadership and for the organization of the session. He likened the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee to the President of the UNESCO General Conference, and assured the Committee that the dedicated World Heritage Centre staff would continue to serve the Committee and UNESCO in the best possible way. He gave special thanks to Mr Kishore Rao, Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre, and to Ms. Anne Lemaistre. The Committee had been most fortunate to have had such an effective Rapporteur in the person of Professor Alexander Gillespie. He thanked the Assistant Director-General, who had spent a week in Vilnius and witnessed so very complex an enterprise, and also all Committee members and the interpreters. He concluded his address by showing some photographs of the session and paying tribute to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** said it had been a very challenging and demanding session. She emphasized the fact that the session had been a celebration of Africa, with four new sites inscribed. She added that the Committee really had working methods and that everything is possible. She thanked the Committee members, the Observers, the World Heritage Centre staff, the UNESCO Legal Adviser, the interpreters and all the volunteers for their work. She concluded by inviting the newly elected Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, Mr Tumu Te Heuheu, to take over the chairing of the Committee, extending all best wishes to him and handing over the gavel to him.

At the invitation of the **Chairperson**, the newly elected **Chairperson**, Mr Tumu te Heuheu (New Zealand), took a seat on the podium. The newly elected **Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee** extended a very warm welcome to Committee members. He wished merely to say that he would try his utmost to keep up the high standards which had been set in Vilnius, and that New Zealand would ensure that the Committee members' stay was a happy one. He concluded by thanking the Chairperson of the 30th session for her work.

The outgoing **Chairperson of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee** also thanked the Rapporteur for his work and declared the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee closed.

The meeting rose at 7.00 p.m.