



United Nations  
Educational, Scientific and  
Cultural Organization

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

**World Heritage**

**31 COM**

**Distribution Limited**

**WHC-07/31.COM/INF.24**

**Paris, 20 December 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  
Thirty-First Session**

**Christchurch, New Zealand  
23 June – 2 July 2007**

**DRAFT SUMMARY RECORD**

**PROJET DE RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS**

**Sunday, 23 June 2007 (afternoon)**

**OPENING CEREMONY**

**03.00 p.m – 06.50 p.m**

**ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION**

1. The 31st session of the World Heritage Committee was opened by Tumu te Heuheu, Chairman of the World Heritage Committee. A traditional Powhiri welcome celebration took place at the Christchurch Town Hall auditorium to open the session in the presence of, among others, the Governor General of New Zealand, Anand Satyanand; the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Helen Clark; Deputy Director-General of UNESCO, Marcio Barbosa, who represented Director-General Koïchiro Matsuura; the Chairman of UNESCO's Executive Board, Zhang Xinsheng, alongside the representative of the 21 States that make up the World Heritage Committee: 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.
2. The following States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention* which are not members of the Committee were represented as observers: Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Barbados, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cambodia, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Finland, France, French Polynesia, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Holy-See, Hungary, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kiribati, Latvia, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, New Caledonia, Nigeria, Oman, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Vietnam, Zambia, Zimbabwe.
3. 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.
4. 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/2007>. (Note: this web address is password-protected until the documents are made available to the public.)
5. **Rick Tau, Respected Elder of the Ngai Tahu tribe of South Island** (New Zealand) welcomed the participants, notably those of the Northern Hemisphere, "to the winter of the Southern Hemisphere, winter being a season of planning" and exhorted them "to open the doors to knowledge and thought... so that the results of the meetings be acceptable in terms of brotherhood... and so that we may follow in the footsteps of our ancestors who left us the landscapes that we know."

6. **Te Kananawa Pitiroi, a Respected Elder of the Ngati Tuwharetoa tribe of the central North Island**, also spoke in Maori and exhorted participants to “remember that the pristineness that remains here is worth preserving”.
7. **Parekura Horomia, Maori Affairs Minister and Associate Minister of Education**, also used Maori in his welcome address and urged participants to let the spirit of the language permeate them.
8. He was followed by **Garry Moore, Mayor of Christchurch**, who welcomed the participants of the 31st session of the Committee and introduced them to the heritage of Christchurch.
9. **The Governor-General of New Zealand, Anand Satyanand**, then spoke of the need to protect world heritage sites in the face of serious challenges including “climate change, depleting fisheries and water resources, declining ecosystems and a host of other problems”. He pointed out that while the Pacific Region covers one third of the globe, it is underrepresented on the World Heritage List. Speaking of the particular history of New Zealand and its longstanding respect for both Maori and Western institutions and traditions, the Governor-General quoted a Maori proverb: “Care for the land and care for the people; go forth”.
10. **Prime Minister Helen Clark** for her part highlighted New Zealand’s particularity as a land that has experienced only 1,000 years of human habitation. As a result, New Zealand has many fragile and unique ecosystems which must be preserved. Ms Clark stressed that East Rennell, of the Solomon Islands, is the only World Heritage site to be found among all of the South Pacific Small Island States.
11. **Mr Marcio Barbosa, Deputy-Director General of UNESCO, on behalf of the Director-General of UNESCO**, praised the Maori cultural heritage that “embraces many different and interlinked forms, both tangible and intangible. In recognizing the spiritual links uniting Maori people with their environment, the World Heritage Committee had taken a decisive step in celebrating the intangible value of natural heritage.
12. **Mr Zhang Xinsheng, the Chairman of UNESCO’s Executive Board**, encouraged Small Island Developing States of the Pacific to ratify UNESCO’s World Heritage Convention to help correct the region’s underrepresentation on the World Heritage List. He stressed that “in our ever more globalized world, all dimensions of heritage – natural, cultural, tangible and intangible – are part of the sustainable development equation” and warned against the dangers of uniformization generated by globalization.
13. **Dame Silvia Cartwright, Chair of New Zealand’s National Commission for UNESCO** then introduced the presentation of the UNESCO Asia Pacific World Heritage Youth Forum organized prior to the Committee meeting (19-23 June 2007) in which 30 young students from 12 countries in the region had participated (Australia, Cook Islands, Fiji, Japan, Republic of Korea, Marshall Islands, Samoa, Thailand, Tonga, French Polynesia, Vanuatu and New Zealand). She stated that the New Zealand National Commission was actively working on promoting the work of UNESCO in particular among the youth.
14. “The World Heritage Youth Challenge”, prepared as a 10-minute film by the 30 young students, was shown, highlighting the forum which focussed on the development of understanding and skills relating to World Heritage and the environment, integrating Information and Communication Technologies to encourage and stimulate a fresh perspective to international heritage issues. The film showed sequences from the youth

forum which had taken place not only in Christchurch but also in five locations around the Canterbury region, where they were filming and collecting material while learning about the *World Heritage Convention* from heritage and conservation experts.

15. The final speaker of the opening ceremony was **Mr Tumu te Heuheu, Paramount Chief of the Central North Island Tuwharetoa Tribe and Chairperson of the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee**. He stressed the importance of having communities play their part in the preservation of heritage, and spoke of the Pacific region's heritage and the history of its peoples.

The meeting rose at 6:50 p.m.

## FIRST DAY – SUNDAY 24 JUNE 2007

### FIRST MEETING

09.00 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.

**Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu**

#### ITEM 1 OPENING SESSION

16. The **Chairperson** opened the session at 9:15 am by inviting the Deputy Director-General to address the Committee on behalf of the Director-General.
17. The **Deputy Director-General of UNESCO** brought greetings from the Director-General, who could not attend due to illness, and presented the Director-General's speech in French.
18. Le **Directeur général adjoint** lit le message du Directeur général en français. Dans son texte, le Directeur général remercie la Nouvelle Zélande d'accueillir la 31<sup>e</sup> session du Comité du patrimoine mondial à Christchurch. Il passe en revue les différents points difficiles que cette session aura à examiner et à débattre, comme par exemple les risques qui pèsent sur certains sites de la Liste du Patrimoine mondial et qui pourraient conduire le Comité à décider de les retirer de la Liste. Il évoque aussi le danger que constitue le tourisme soulignant que ce risque pourrait devenir un atout s'il est responsable et maîtrisé. Il peut, en outre, favoriser les économies locales et, de ce fait, contribuer au développement durable. Il ajoute aussi que le Comité aura à examiner l'audit de gestion réalisé par la Société Deloitte, en attirant l'attention sur le fait que IOS, le service d'audit interne a fait une série d'observations sur ce rapport. Les décisions et recommandations issues des débats de cette session seront très utiles au Directeur général pour prendre les mesures nécessaires dans le but d'améliorer les capacités du Centre du patrimoine mondial.
19. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy Director-General and extended the best wishes to the Director-General on behalf of the Committee. He then continued with Item 2 Requests for Observer Status and gave the floor to DIR for information.

#### ITEM 2 REQUESTS FOR OBSERVER STATUS

Documents: WHC-07/31.COM/2  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.2  
Decision: **31 COM 2**

20. The **Director of the World heritage Centre** referred to document WHC-07/31.COM/2 given out that morning and explained that a draft of the List of participants (document WHC-07/31.COM/INF.2) was under finalization and would be distributed at the end of the day.

### **ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE TIMETABLE**

Documents: WHC-07/31.COM/3A.Rev3  
WHC-07/31.COM/3B.Rev  
Decisions: **31 COM 3A**  
**31 COM 3B**

21. After the **Chairperson** had asked the Spanish-speaking Delegations to indicate in which language (French or English) they wished their interventions to be recorded in the Summary Record, to which the Delegations of Chile, Cuba and Spain all referred to English, he continued with Item 3 Adoption of the Agenda and asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to provide explanation.
22. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to the previous day's Bureau meeting, where it had been discussed the issue of requesting Committee Members to indicate, within the review on the State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List, which sites currently on the so-called B-list (for noting) should be moved to the so-called A-list (for discussion), adding that the Delegations of Canada and Lithuania had already handed in their requests – these lists were not to be read out yet, but will only after integration with further requests to follow.
23. The Director of the World Heritage Centre recalled that items 19 (Report of the Management Audit) and 20 (Budgets) of the Provisional Agenda had been also discussed at the Bureau meeting, clarifying that Tuesday's evening session of two and a half hours currently foreseen might not be enough and that additional time could be allocated on Friday – the proposal was to start with the Budget on Tuesday 26, followed by a discussion on the auditor's report, which could be resumed on Friday 29 June.
24. Upon opening the floor for comments, the Delegation of the **Netherlands** provided a statement on behalf of the Head of the Delegation, who regretted that due to unforeseen circumstances he was not able to attend this 31st session and thanked all Committee Members and colleagues for their collaboration.
25. The **Chairperson**, on receiving no further comments, adopted the Agenda and gave the floor to the Rapporteur, who explained that blue papers were to be used by the Delegations for the submission of amendments to Draft Decisions.

The Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid (Norway) took the chair.

26. The **Chairperson** explained the need for efficiency regarding time management of the tight agenda and proposed imposing a time limit for intervention: 3 minutes for Committee members and 2 minutes for Observers. He furthermore asked for repetitions to be limited, mobile phones to be switched off, individual discussions to be

held outside the meeting room and the sessions to be started on time. He then moved to Item 4, Report of the Rapporteur.

**ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 30TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Vilnius, 2006)**

27. The **Rapporteur** of the 30th session of the World Heritage Committee explained that the Decisions were part of a tapestry linking past to future, as well as to other regimes and fora, and that they should be read with that in mind. He continued that the Decisions, numbering 200 in the past and currently 230, were more intricate and complex which reflected a mounting work pressure.
28. The **Chairperson**, on receiving no further comments, adopted the Report of the Rapporteur and moved to Item 5, subdivided into two parts, asking the Director of the World Heritage Centre to provide explanation.

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

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/5  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.5A  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.5B

WHC-07/31.COM/INF.5C

*Decision:* **31 COM 5**

29. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** summarized the main content of document WHC-07/31.COM/5 as an account of all activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre in the implementation of the *Convention*.
30. The **Chairperson** referred to the Draft Decision on page 9 and opened the floor for comments.
31. The Delegation of **Canada** raised two comments: (i) requesting a focus on results instead of activities; and (ii) proposing as amendment to the Draft Decision that the Committee “takes note” of the report.
32. The Delegation of **India** seconded Canada and, in referring to section 20, encouraged a stronger relationship with the Intangible Heritage Committee to be reflected in the Draft Decision.
33. The Delegation of **Israel** seconded Canada and mentioned it had prepared an amendment.
34. La Délégation du **Bénin** se joint à ceux qui l’ont précédée pour féliciter le Centre du patrimoine des activités accomplies mais elle se pose un certain nombre d’interrogations. Par exemple, en lisant le paragraphe 18 du document 31COM/5 la délégation voudrait savoir si, pour ces activités, on tient compte de la répartition géographique pour les Centres de formation. En ce qui concerne les paragraphes 19 et 20, la délégation prend note de la participation du Centre du patrimoine mondial à la première session ordinaire du Comité intergouvernemental de la Convention pour la sauvegarde du patrimoine immatériel mais elle se demande quels sont les résultats

d'une telle participation. La Délégation souhaite savoir aussi quels sont les rapports du Centre du patrimoine mondial avec la Banque Africaine de Développement. En ce qui concerne le paragraphe 57, qui rend compte des langues dans lesquelles les Textes fondamentaux ont été traduits, la délégation demande d'envisager leur traduction dans les langues africaines les plus importantes, comme le swahili ou le wolof. Finalement, la délégation attire l'attention sur le fait que dans le projet de décision manque l'aspect du Renforcement des capacités.

35. The Delegation of **Kuwait**, in commenting on section 34, encouraged the World Heritage Centre to assist the countries mentioned in the development of their Tentative Lists, and that this should be reflected in the Draft Decision.
36. The Delegation of **Lithuania** seconded Canada.
37. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** thanked the Delegates and agreed on a revised format for a results-based Report for the next edition. Responding to a geographical representation of training activities, he explained that although the World Heritage Centre utilizes opportunities that arise in the field as much as possible and capitalizes upon the broader networks offered by existing training institutions, more should be done in addition to initiatives such as the Chinese training institute and the Africa 2009 Programme.
38. He further explained the relationship with the African Development Bank, which is currently involved in the Master Plan for Mozambique Island in cooperation with the State Party of Portugal, while activities of the African World Heritage Fund would provide more opportunities for cooperation.
39. As regards the languages for translation of documents, he referred to the success of the *Operational Guidelines* and the Heritage in Young Hands Kit, and while striving for as many languages as possible the need for resources was the bottleneck.
40. Finally, relating to the link with the 2003 Intangible Heritage Convention, he expressed strong favour, because of UNESCO's mandate, as well as the cross-fertilization in heritage conservation innovations, and that follow-up would be given.
41. The **Chairperson** turned to the Draft Decision and without any written amendments so far, he invited suggestions from the floor.
42. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to revise paragraph 2 into "takes note with appreciation", to cut out paragraphs 3 to 7, and to revise 3 into "make its future report more results-oriented".
43. The Delegation of **Chile** proposed to add to paragraph 5 "Pacific States" and for the countries "to work with the World Heritage Centre" to get support.
44. The **Chairperson** enquired whether the Delegation of Chile had an amendment, to which the Delegation responded negatively, but the idea was to be noted by the World Heritage Centre.
45. La Délégation du **Maroc** intervient dans le même sens que les délégations du Chili et Koweït en ce qui concerne le paragraphe 5 du projet de décision. Elle propose la formulation suivante : « Demande au Centre du Patrimoine mondial d'apporter aux Etats parties de l'Afrique, les Etats arabes et ceux du Pacifique l'appui nécessaire, etc.... »

46. The Delegation of **Israel** commented that without a discussion on the *Global Strategy*, this should be combined into a paragraph and stated that it would prepare an amendment.
47. The Delegation of **India** commented on the lack of logic in current proposals, with Canada proposing to cut out most paragraphs, and put forward the proposal to include a separate paragraph on the Pacific as it had currently no sites.
48. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** seconded India and suggested to take a Decision on Canada's proposal before preparing new paragraphs.
49. The **Chairperson** agreed and asked Canada to reflect.
50. The Delegation of **Canada** responded that the document appeared to be just a report on activities undertaken and suggestions for inclusion of other items such as on the Pacific could be addressed later when discussed.
51. The Delegation of **Norway** seconded Canada.
52. The Delegation of **India** was not in agreement and proposed to retain paragraph 5, while modifying paragraph 4, and requested the Director of the World Heritage Centre to react to Canada's proposal.
53. The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Chairperson and host New Zealand and seconded Canada.
54. The Delegation of **Lithuania** seconded Canada and suggested a compromise on paragraph 5 as regards the Pacific, since it seemed to have widespread support.
55. The Delegation of **Chile** seconded Morocco and proposed to keep paragraph 5 and to include the Pacific.
56. The Delegation of **New Zealand** seconded Chile.
57. La Délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie les autorités du pays hôte pour l'accueil offert. Elle soutient l'amendement proposé par la délégation du Maroc qui l'a précédée.
58. La Délégation du **Bénin** considère que le renforcement des capacités relève des activités de type transversal du Centre du patrimoine mondial et que cela devrait être reflété dans la décision. Elle ajoute aussi qu'elle soutient la proposition des délégations du Maroc et de la Tunisie.
59. The Delegation of **India** reiterated the request for a reaction by the Director of the World Heritage Centre on Canada's proposal.
60. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that most issues of the Draft Decision would come back in other agenda items, so a reduction of the Draft Decision as proposed by Canada would not have a detrimental effect.
61. The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed paragraph by paragraph, as no suggestions had been withdrawn:
  - paragraph 1 – adopted;
  - paragraph 2 – the Rapporteur reiterated Canada's proposal that the Committee "takes note with appreciation", which was adopted;



- paragraph 3 – the Rapporteur reiterated Canada’s proposal to delete, which was adopted;
  - paragraph 4 – the Rapporteur reiterated Canada’s proposal to delete, which was adopted;
  - paragraph 5 – two proposals in French, both focusing on assistance by the World Heritage Centre to African, Arab and Pacific States;
62. La Délégation du **Bénin** propose de formuler l’amendement en insérant la phrase suivante : « Demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d’intensifier le renforcement d’activités... ».
63. La Délégation du **Maroc** intervient pour proposer la formulation suivante : « Encourage le Centre du patrimoine mondial à apporter, aux Etats parties de la région d’Afrique, des pays arabes et du Pacifique, l’appui nécessaire... »
64. The **Chairperson** asked India for its amendment, but the State Party responded it wanted to withdraw it; thus paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.
65. The **Chairperson** returned to the proposal from Benin for a new paragraph, which was adopted as the new paragraph 4 before 5 as had just been amended. Subsequently the proposal from Canada to delete paragraphs 6 and 7 was adopted.
66. The **Rapporteur** mentioned Canada’s proposal for a new paragraph to reflect the need for a results-based report, which was adopted accordingly.

**ITEM 5.2      MECHANISM PROPOSED BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL TO ENSURE THE PROPER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE DECISIONS**

Document:    *WHC-07/31.COM/5.2*

67. The **Chairperson** invited the Deputy Director-General to provide a short introduction.
68. The **Deputy Director-General** explained the background to the document related to the Executive Board meeting last April and the long consultation process in order to understand the concerns of Member States, which was the reason for the delay in dispatch, resulting in a consensus not to invent a new mechanism, but to strengthen existing modalities within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention* and applicable to all World Heritage properties. The document distinguished between reactive monitoring and the new mechanism, not with a decision-taking on the part of the Director-General, but with a focus on a process initiated by the State Party with clear roles and responsibilities of the various parties.
69. He further clarified several ambiguities in the report identified by States Parties by emphasizing 1) that UNESCO would not intervene without consultation and approval of the State Party concerned and 2) that consideration should be given to the available resources, as this mechanism would create additional work for the World Heritage Centre. He stressed that the Advisory Bodies' concern about confusion between this new mechanism and reactive monitoring was unfounded, and he concluded by reading out an amended Draft Decision, in order to save time, proposing changes to paragraphs 2 and 4.
70. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy Director-General and opened the floor for comments.
71. The Delegation of **India** commented that this was a new and very important issue, thanked the Deputy Director-General for his consultations, although the State Party itself had only been consulted at a very early stage, and further stated that it was dangerous to deal with specific problems in a general fashion, as was the case here. The Delegation pointed to the various ambiguities in the document and commented that throughout the United Nations system the principle of verification processes was rejected; that the document did not give enough attention to the power of the Chair and the World Heritage Committee; and that the responsibility of the State Party in the implementation of the *Convention* was understated.
72. The **Delegation** continued that paragraph 14 was particularly troubling; that in between Committee sessions the Director-General deals with general solutions to specific problems, while the *Rules of Procedure* have not been addressed, the Advisory Bodies not been consulted and that the document made no reference to how this new mechanism would work with existing mechanisms for Danger Listing – subsequently the Delegation was not in a position to adopt paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.
73. La Délégation du **Maroc** remercie le Directeur général adjoint pour son exposé très clair et ses efforts pour aboutir à un consensus, mais elle se demande si la proposition ne nécessite un budget renforcé. Si le Comité décide de renforcer le budget, la délégation souhaite que le Directeur général adjoint apporte plus de précisions sur les ressources nécessaires. En ce qui concerne le paragraphe 4 proposé par le Directeur général adjoint la délégation souhaite éliminer la mention « dans le cadre des ressources disponibles ».
74. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed an amendment to paragraph 4 and expressed concerns related to the sovereignty of the State Party, the overburdening of the Director-General, and the language used in the document, which left open ends to applicability.

75. The Delegation of **Japan** welcomed the amendment proposed by the Deputy Director-General, while supporting the amendments on the role of the Chair and Committee as raised by India.
76. **IUCN** presented a statement on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies. Noting that this important proposal had been tabled only recently and without prior consultation with the Advisory Bodies, it felt that there was great potential for ambiguity and confusion between the proposed new level of monitoring and the existing system of reactive monitoring and questioned how this would add value to the decision-making process of the Committee. IUCN also noted that the addition of a new level of monitoring would add more work for an already overtaxed system, thus questioning the feasibility of the proposal. It further stressed that the criteria for determining whether the Advisory Bodies would be involved in the proposed activities were unclear, while noting that their involvement would be necessary given the need for consistency across World Heritage processes. Moreover, a clear understanding of the human and financial resource implications would need to be made. IUCN concluded by requesting that the Draft Decision be amended to reflect these points, calling for further reflection by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.
77. The Delegation of **Chile** expressed the opinion that more time should be allowed in order to fine-tune the text and avoid ambiguity.
78. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended the World Heritage Centre for the timely preparation of the proposal but pointed out that, due to this speed, some of the Delegations had not been consulted. It advised that one should distinguish between States Parties not meeting their obligations under the *Convention* and those not implementing the Committee's Decisions, and that IUCN's comments should be taken seriously. It pointed out that more time was needed for reflection, however, should a Decision need to be adopted today, the Delegation would agree with the amendments proposed by the World Heritage Centre.
79. The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated the World Heritage Centre for this proposal given that such a mechanism was lacking in the implementation of the *Convention*. However, it agreed with India that States Parties as well as Advisory Bodies were not present enough in the Draft Decision. It commented that an informal Committee meeting could have been held to discuss the issue in advance and better prepare all the outstanding aspects, particularly those of a financial nature. The Delegation felt that more consultations were needed at this point.
80. The Delegation of **Spain** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the efforts made and expressed its support for the mechanism of monitoring. It explained that it is a very complicated process, which needs to be implemented in the future within the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*, with the Advisory Bodies involvement. It stressed that a better and longer discussion was needed to ensure the quality of the mechanism and the monitoring.
81. The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the efforts of the World Heritage Centre. It noted that the proposal was important in terms of strengthening actions linked to state of conservation reports. It fully supported the statement of the Advisory Bodies, and agreed with the need to reflect this mechanism in the *Operational Guidelines* to ensure there is no overlap. However it felt that more time was needed to allow for reflection and budget considerations and stated that sites where this mechanism should be applied needed to be identified.
82. La délégation du **Bénin** reconnaît les efforts entrepris. Les responsabilités de ce mécanisme de suivi reposent sur les membres du Comité, mais les responsabilités

doivent aussi être partagées. L'amendement proposé par le DDG limite les champs d'action. Il est difficile d'adopter le projet de décision. La délégation du Bénin propose d'adopter la décision à la fin de la session, et soutient la création d'un groupe de travail.

83. The **Deputy Director-General** said that he had listened carefully to all the comments. He shared entirely the concerns expressed by the Delegation of India with regard to general solutions being sought for specific problems. He regretted that the proposal gave the impression that responsibilities and power had been taken away from the States Parties and the Committee, as there had been no intention to do so. The intention was rather to clarify when it was important for the UNESCO Director-General to intervene. He underlined that while roles and procedures have to be respected, it needs to be clarified how and when, at the request of the Committee, the Director-General should intervene to help implement the Committee's Decisions. Realizing that some ambiguities needed to be addressed, he offered wording to further amend paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.
84. The **Chairperson** offered several ways to proceed at this point: 1) Discuss the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph; 2) create a working group; and 3) defer the issue to the next Committee.
85. The Delegation of **India** stated that the amendment took care of some concerns but not all and asked the Rapporteur to read out the amendments submitted by a number of Delegations.
86. La délégation du **Maroc** appuie la proposition de créer un groupe de travail et de différer l'adoption de la décision.
87. The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the creation of a working group in which they were willing to participate.
88. The Delegation of **Cuba** supported the creation of a working group and considered that at this stage the Committee could only take note of the actions proposed.
89. The Delegation of **Kenya**, after having thanked New Zealand for their hospitality, expressed its support for the creation of a working group.
90. The Delegation of **Japan** considered that this was an issue important enough for a working group to be created.
91. The Delegation of **India** recalled that the proposal was already the result of a working group in which regrettably the regional group to which it belongs had not been represented. It recommended that if a new working group was to be created it should be open-ended. However, its suggestion was to read out the submitted proposals for amendments and finalize the discussion.
92. La délégation du **Maroc** considère que la décision pour des amendements devrait être prise après les discussions du groupe de travail.
93. The Delegation of **Japan** stressed that, should a new working group be created, the amendments made should be minimal in order to respect the basic text which had been agreed upon after much discussion.
94. The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments submitted by the Deputy Director-General, the United States of America and India.

95. The Delegation of the **United States of America** clarified its position as being slightly different from the World Heritage Centre's: rather than aiming to change the *Operational Guidelines*, it proposed to produce a document to submit in the form of an amendment to Document *WHC-07/31.COM/5.2*.
96. La délégation du **Maroc** souhaite soumettre une proposition de texte pour supprimer le paragraphe 4, ou reprendre l'idée des ressources dans un nouveau paragraphe.
97. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought to clarify the procedure and asked whether a working group was needed now that the amendments had been presented?
98. The **Chairperson** expressed his feeling that things were getting somewhat complicated with the different amendments proposed. He presented two options for moving forward: 1) Suspend this item in order to allow for a new Draft Decision to be prepared for discussion, thus avoiding the creation of a working group; and 2) creating a working group.
99. The Delegation of **India** supported the first option and pointed out that the matter, being of general concern, should still be discussed in the plenary.
100. The Delegation of the **United States of America** recalled that a number of Delegations had expressed interest in the creation of a working group so that each party could express its detailed concerns.
101. The Delegation of **Chile** supported the first proposal in order to help countries to express their opinion, yet a working group would be more efficient.
102. The Delegation of **India** would not oppose the creation of a working group if such was the consensus, but reiterated the need for it to be open-ended. The matter concerned national sovereignty and was thus of high importance. It expressed that it reserved the right to take this up in the Plenary.
103. The Delegation of **Lithuania** proposed that informal consultations, with a view to reaching consensus on a Draft Decision, be carried out before deciding if the creation of a working group was inevitable.
104. The **Chairperson** considered this to be a good compromise and confirmed that the issue would be discussed again in the Plenary regardless. He requested the Rapporteur to prepare a consolidated revised Draft Decision for consideration by the Committee.
105. The proposal by the Delegation of **Lithuania** was adopted.

#### **ITEM 11C      PRESENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMME FOR THE PACIFIC**

*Document:*     *WHC-07/31.COM/11.C*

*Decision:*     **31 COM 11C**

**The Chairperson, Mr Tumu te Heuheu resumed the Chair.**

106. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the background information on this Programme. It gave an overview of the Pacific, the sites inscribed in the region and the Tentative Lists submitted by the 11 States Parties. Four ratifications remained to be undertaken. It presented the World Heritage Global Strategy events in the Pacific over

the last ten years, recalled the objectives of the "Pacific 2009" programme and stressed that there was a continuing need for capacity building and awareness-raising in the region. The World Heritage Centre presented the objectives and results of the Pacific Regional Workshop for Delegates from Pacific Island countries, held from 19 to 23 February 2007 at the Tongariro National Park. Activities proposed for implementation under the World Heritage Fund in the biennium 2008 – 2009 were highlighted.

107. The **Vice-Chair of ICOMOS Asia-Pacific**, introduced the work of ICOMOS in the region stressing that the preparation of thematic studies was one of the ways in which ICOMOS supported the work of the *Convention*.
108. **ICOMOS regional experts**, Anita Smith and Kevin Jones, gave a brief overview of the Interim Report on the Thematic Study on the Cultural Landscapes of the Pacific Islands. They underlined that this study aims to capture the key attributes of cultural landscapes in the Pacific Islands, illustrate examples of various types of cultural landscapes in the region, and identify gaps in the current knowledge of cultural landscapes. The study provides a comparative framework with which to identify cultural landscapes that reflect the special characteristics of the region. In the long term the study would assist in balancing out the representation of the Pacific Islands on the World Heritage List. The completion of the report was planned for December 2007.
109. The Observer of **Tonga**, Albert Vaea, Secretary of the Tonga Traditional Committee, presented the Appeal to the World Heritage Committee from the Pacific Island countries. Among the main issues emerging from the workshop and reflected in the Appeal, two aspects were particularly emphasized: 1). The special character of the Pacific heritage, in relation to the geographical context of the region, its high level of indigeneity, and the challenges faced by the countries of the region to conserve it; and 2). The call for a stronger recognition of this special character and needs within the World Heritage process, and for the support of the international community. The Appeal asked that a 5th 'C', Community, be added to the existing 4 Cs.
110. The **Chairperson** thanked Mr Vaea for the tapa cloth presented at the Powhiri.
111. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** thanked New Zealand for their hospitality. It emphasized that the Republic of Korea pays great attention to the concerns of the Pacific countries. It advised that the Committee should take note of the preservation by indigenous peoples of their heritage under threat from climate change. Korea affirmed its support for the establishment of a Pacific Heritage Fund. The Delegation mentioned the initiative of Republic of Korea - a Biosphere Reserve at Jeju Island, hoping that this could serve as an example for other Pacific heritage preservation efforts.
112. The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the recommendations presented.
113. **IUCN** expressed its appreciation for the opportunity they had to participate in the Pacific 2009 Action Plan, along with the World Heritage Centre and other partners. It congratulated ICOMOS for having identified cultural landscapes as a priority for World Heritage recognition, as many natural values would also be captured through this exercise. It endorsed the priorities for action; in particular the urgent appeal for increased capacity building with regard to preparation of nominations and management plans. IUCN informed the Committee that it had recently opened a regional office in Fiji and is therefore much better placed to participate in the regional efforts. It also acknowledged the support provided by the French government.
114. ICCROM thanked **New Zealand** for their hospitality and the Chairperson for having visited ICCROM's headquarters. It was pleased to note progress made in the 2009

programme, stating that this region had already been one of ICCROM's priorities for several years. It pointed out that conservation in this region had an integrated approach to heritage of all kinds: movable and immovable; natural and cultural; and tangible and intangible. It urged that lessons learned should be communicated via training initiatives for management planning and community involvement.

115. The Delegation of **Canada**, having thanked New Zealand for its hospitality, congratulated all States Parties of the Pacific for great progress made in a short period, as well as the Advisory Bodies for their work. It supported the Draft Decision.
116. The Delegation of **India** also thanked New Zealand for its hospitality, recalling that India had participated in the Tongariro workshop and would continue to provide the necessary support, including financial aid. It expressed the hope that many new inscriptions would be presented. The Delegation supported the Draft Decision.
117. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its support for the creation of a Pacific World Heritage Fund, offering help in view of the experience gathered with the African World Heritage Fund.
118. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the findings presented. It wished to highlight ICOMOS' exemplary way forward through which they provide help to States Parties. It proposed that this work should be recognized by including a reference to it in the Draft Decision.
119. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled its country's dedication to the 4Cs , and fully endorsed the report and the Draft Decision.
120. La délégation du **Bénin** félicite l'excellent travail réalisé pour la région du Pacifique. Les régions du Pacifique et de l'Afrique sont confrontées à des problèmes similaires. L'Etat partie soutient l'initiative pour la création d'un fonds du Pacifique et remercie pour la proposition d'un nouveau C, la notion de communauté étant aussi très importante pour la région Afrique. L'Etat partie propose d'être présent pour les prochaines réunions organisées dans la région du Pacifique, tout en invitant les Etats parties du Pacifique lors de prochaines réunions pour la région d'Afrique.
121. Due to time constraints the **Chairperson** closed the list of speakers.
122. The Delegation of **Norway** thanked New Zealand for its hospitality and pledged that Norway would continue to strongly support the work undertaken to obtain a better representation of the Pacific region on the World Heritage List.
123. La délégation du **Madagascar** remarque que son pays est proche géographiquement de l'Afrique, mais présente de grandes similitudes avec les îles du Pacifique. L'Etat partie apporte son soutien au programme et demande si des programmes pour cette région ont déjà été développés par le passé.
124. The **World Heritage Centre** recalled the numerous efforts within the Global Strategy and in particular through regional workshops for potential World Heritage listings, as well as within the Pacific 2009 programme.
125. The **Chairperson** declared the adoption of the Draft Decision, while drawing the attention to Item 10 on funds allocation which would be left for consideration under the item dealing with the budget.

## **PRESENTATION OF THE AFRICAN WORLD HERITAGE FUND**

126. **Mr Themba Wakashe**, Chairperson of the African World Heritage Fund, thanked New Zealand for its hospitality. It welcomed Benin's proposal to invite cooperation between the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) and the proposed Pacific World Heritage Fund, and acknowledged the support extended to the Fund by the following countries: Algeria, China Gabon, India, Israel, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa and the United Kingdom, the most recent being the Chinese contribution of USD 1 million in February 2007. At the time of the 31st session, USD 4.7 million had been contributed.
127. He continued by informing the Committee that the process for the selection of a Director of the Fund would soon be completed. In the meantime, the World Heritage Centre was providing support to the Fund through a consultant. Mr Wakashe pointed out that the African Development Bank should be included as a Permanent Observer to the Board of Trustees. Two Permanent Observers were registered at the time of the 31st session: the African Union and UNESCO, represented by the World Heritage Centre.
128. The Delegation of **Norway** commended the work that had gone into the establishment and functioning of the AWHF. It encouraged further contributions from African countries in order to render the Fund successful. It advised that Norway's contribution for phase II of the Kenya Project was USD 230,000.
129. The Delegation of **India** reiterated its solidarity with the Fund and expressed the wish to learn more about interesting projects funded by the AWHF such as the preservation of manuscripts, languages and other types of heritage. It also stressed that traditional donors should be contributing more to the AWHF.
130. La délégation du **Maroc** félicite leur collègue d'Afrique du Sud pour son exposé sur le fonctionnement du fonds africain. L'Etat partie apprécie que ce point soit intégré à l'agenda directement, et non plus traité dans les annexes. L'Etat partie annonce que le Maroc a fait en juin dernier un don de 50,000 dollars EU et est donc très intéressé par le suivi du dossier.
131. The Delegation of **Mauritius** appreciated the progress made and gave thanks for the contributions, while appealing for more donations from African countries. It announced that it would contribute with the sum of USD 10,000.
132. The Delegation of the Republic of **Korea** recalled its commitment to the protection of African heritage and announced a contribution of USD30,000 to facilitate the forthcoming organization of the meeting of regional directors of heritage sites.
133. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed its satisfaction with the progress of the AWHF, while supporting the appeal to African countries to contribute more towards the Fund. It commented that the new Director should be putting emphasis on the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
134. The Delegation of **Kenya** said that it had made commitments in the past and would continue to do so in the future. Africa as a continent had contributed to the heritage of humanity – it was now time that humanity contributed towards the preservation of African heritage.
135. The Delegation of **Japan** stated it would continue to contribute by dedicating a part of the Japanese FIT established at UNESCO, through which USD48 million had already been invested.



136. **ICCROM** declared it was looking forward to strengthening its relationship with the AWHF, as a way of building on the success of the Africa 2009 programme. It would work closely with the Fund in particular with regard to capacity building in the region.
137. The Delegation of **Spain** mentioned it was considering making a direct contribution to the African World Heritage Fund. The State Party had already contributed through extra budgetary funding to analyze the inscriptions of future sites for the African region. It added that the full meaning of this fund could be found in the general collaboration needed between States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*.
138. **Mr Wakashe** thanked the States Parties for their support and expressed his appreciation for all the comments and pledges, while assuring the Committee that everything would be done in order to ensure expectations are fulfilled.

**ITEM 7.2: ISSUES RELATED TO THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STRATEGY FOR REDUCING RISKS FROM DISASTERS AT WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/7.2

*Decision:* **31 COM 7.2**

139. The **Chairperson** recalled that at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) the Committee had requested the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to prioritise a list of actions. This was presented in the revised strategy now being put forward.
140. Following a presentation by ICCROM of the ten priority actions undertaken by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies since July 2006, the **Chairperson** invited observations from members of the Committee.
141. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that the concern expressed in paragraph 16 of the working document may not have been fully reflected in the Draft Decision and suggested that it may be preferable to refer instead to the need to integrate policies on Climate Change into the Strategy for Risk Reduction.
142. The Delegation of **Kenya** observed that the definition of disaster needed to extend beyond natural disasters, and to encompass human-induced disasters. It also stated that many social and economic disasters are slower acting and caused by extreme poverty and other factors.
143. The Delegation of **Norway** proposed amending the Draft Decision to include in paragraph 6 a recommendation that risk management components should be integrated into management plans for World Heritage properties.
144. **IUCN** noted that a recent monitoring mission to Macchu Picchu had highlighted the need to keep Climate Change and the risks it posed to World Heritage properties high on the agenda. It therefore appreciated the proposal of the Delegation of Norway.
145. The Delegation of **Israel** supported Norway's proposal and remarked that there could be a need to prepare a manual to help States Parties to focus their work.
146. The Delegation of **Canada** supported Norway's suggestion. It noted that the strategy was not time bound and did not have resources allocated to it. It therefore suggested that the scope of paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision should be broadened to encourage States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to implement the

action plan. It also considered that paragraph 5 as presently drafted was limiting and that a more general statement about disaster planning was needed.

147. Responding to the points raised, **ICCROM** agreed with the sentiments expressed by the Delegation of Kenya but clarified that for the purposes of this strategy, the definition referred to sudden disasters albeit of a human or natural type. Continuing, it observed that while it was the Committee's prerogative to decide on the matter, an integrated approach to risk preparedness and climate change seemed highly desirable and that the more general statement on risk preparedness that had been included in the document prepared for the 30th session should have been carried over to this 31st session.

The meeting was suspended at 1.30 p.m. and resumed at 3.00 p.m.

## FIRST DAY – SUNDAY 24 JUNE 2007

### SECOND MEETING

03.00 p.m. – 6.00 p.m.

Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)

#### ITEM 7.2: ISSUES RELATED TO THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: STRATEGY FOR REDUCING RISKS FROM DISASTERS AT WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (Continued)

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/7.2

*Decision:* **31 COM 7.2**

148. Resuming discussion after lunch, the **Chairperson** proposed reviewing the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, and 4 were adopted.

149. The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments put forward by the Delegations of Canada, the Netherlands and Norway.

150. The Chairperson declared Decision 31 COM 7.2 adopted as amended.

151. **Agenda Item 7.3:** Issues related to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties: "Expert Meeting on Benchmarks and Chapter IV of the Operational Guidelines" (Paris, 2-3 April 2007)

#### ITEM 7.3: ISSUES RELATED TO THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: "EXPERT MEETING ON BENCHMARKS AND CHAPTER IV OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES" (PARIS, 2-3 APRIL 2007)

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/7.3

*Decision:* **31 COM 7.3**

152. In presenting the main results of the meeting, the **World Heritage Centre** drew attention to the apparent confusion, in the view of the experts, around the use of the term 'benchmarks' and their consequent recommendation to replace it with the "desired state of conservation" and "corrective measures" as set out in paragraph 13 of the Draft Decision.
153. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** observed that the expert meeting had generated a great wealth of discussion and shown that progress could be made not so much by developing new tools but by linking existing procedures, and that future decision-making of the Committee could be facilitated if the recommendations put forward at the meeting were adopted. However, it believed that paragraph 14 of the Draft Decision as presently drafted did not fully reflect recommendation 9.
154. The Delegation of **Norway** said that it understood the rationale behind the proposal to suspend nominations for one year but asked whether this was in accordance with the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines* and also how the Committee would cope with 90 nominations in 2009.
155. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested a series of small modifications in relation to the Draft Decision: in paragraph 5, replace 'Requests' with 'Decisions'; in paragraph 7 replace 'limits of acceptable change' with 'desired state of conservation'; paragraph 10 should incorporate the Advisory Bodies; paragraph 12 should read: "Decides to add" in place of "Recalls"; the Draft Annex referred to in paragraph 13 should be fine-tuned by the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies; and finally, the Committee should formally adopt the monitoring framework through the Decision.
156. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification on the processes relating to the development and adoption of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.
157. The Delegation of **Japan** found the proposal to suspend nominations for one year problematic.
158. The Delegation of **Israel** was concerned that in rejecting the use of the term benchmarks, the important notion of phasing may be lost.
159. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** recognized the need for well-organized monitoring but considered that as the concept of Outstanding Universal Value was still in need of refinement, that the Committee should intensify its efforts in this regard. It considered the proposal to suspend nominations for one year to be premature.
160. The Delegation of **New Zealand** welcomed the realization that stakeholders were significant; considered that it would be desirable to include monitoring baselines into the Draft Annex; and drew attention to a contradiction between the proposed moratorium on nominations and attempts to encourage more nominations from under-represented regions.
161. Responding to the questions posed, the **World Heritage Centre** said that it had been advised that the Committee could decide to introduce a pause in nominations; that the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value had to be prepared by the State Parties in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre as a follow up to Periodic Reporting and then presented to the Committee for adoption; that the 'desired state of conservation' was certainly intended to reflect the idea of phasing; and considered that the points raised by New Zealand and Canada in relation to the Draft Annex could be merged. It confirmed that the drafting of paragraph 14 of the Draft Decision was ambiguous and that the intention was only to suspend for one year.

162. **The Rapporteur of the Expert Meeting** suggested that the focus on phasing could perhaps be addressed via the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.
163. The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification on the point it had raised in relation to how the Committee could deal with 90 nominations in 2009.
164. **The Director of the World Heritage Centre** observed that it would be very difficult unless the Committee were to devote an entire session to nominations or add extra days in order to do so.
165. The Delegation of **Norway** recalled that the *Operational Guidelines* specified that complete nominations presented by 1 February had to be dealt with by the session of the Committee in the following calendar year.
166. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 and 13 were adopted as drafted. Paragraphs 5, 7, 10 and 12 were adopted as amended by Canada; a new paragraph 5 formally adopting the monitoring framework was introduced and paragraph 14 was deleted.
167. The Chairperson declared Decision 31 COM 7.3 adopted as amended.

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

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/7A  
 WHC-07/31.COM/7A.Add  
 WHC-07/31.COM/7A.Add.2  
 WHC-07/31.COM/7A.Add.3

*Decisions:* **31 COM 7A.1 to 7A.31**

168. In introducing this item, one of the most important on the Committee's agenda, the **Chairperson** explained that in order to maximize time he hoped it would be possible to limit general comments and to focus consideration on the Draft Decisions. Reports on the state of conservation of properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger would begin with natural properties and be taken in the following order: Europe and North America; Latin America and the Caribbean; Africa and Asia-Pacific.
169. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** drew the Committee's attention to the 4 revised Decisions that had been circulated in the room.
170. Before presenting the first report, the **World Heritage Centre** noted that the working documents presented reports on the state of conservation of all 31 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger: 13 natural properties and 18 cultural properties.
171. State of conservation reports had been received for almost all properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger but some of them had arrived after the 1 February deadline, complicating the timely preparation of the document. In certain cases, State Party reports provided little information on the implementation of the Decisions of the Committee. The World Heritage Centre also requested the Committee to mandate the Rapporteur to work with the World Heritage Centre to amend the Draft Decisions so that they conformed with the conclusions of the expert meeting on benchmarks and the Committee's adoption of Decision **31COM7.3**.

## EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

172. The **World Heritage Centre** said that the State Party had submitted a report on 1 February, indicating progress made in the restoration and conservation of the Everglades national park and on the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee at the previous session.
173. Progress had been noted on most of the corrective measures and efforts to address the alteration of the hydrological regimes and restore a more natural water flow through the property were expected to be completed by 2011. Other pressures, such as the population growth rate within the Miami-Dade County and the water quality of Shark River Slough remained challenging. The Centre and IUCN noted that it would be important to monitor the impact of the restoration activities on the status of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including on the populations of certain key species.
174. **IUCN** commended the State Party both for the very positive efforts it had made to restore the property and for its cooperation with IUCN in developing key corrective measures. It requested the State Party to cooperate with IUCN in developing indicators on key species such as the Cape Sable seaside sparrow, woodstork, and manatee, that could guide the Committee in determining when the property should be removed from the endangered list.
175. The Delegation of the **United States of America** welcomed the opportunity to discuss the significant progress made in achieving the indicators in what constituted the world's largest environmental restoration programme. In light of the very significant progress made, it requested that the Committee remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger on the understanding that it had no intention to change its plans for the continuing restoration of the property.
176. The Delegation of **India** observed that the property had been on the Danger List for a long time, that the State Party had worked hard to restore the property and that the remaining elements could be dealt with through 'normal' state of conservation reporting. It supported withdrawing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and proposed amending paragraph 8 accordingly. The Delegations of Kenya, Lithuania, New Zealand, and Canada supported India's intervention.
177. The Delegation of **Canada** also congratulated the State Party for having rallied so many scientific and financial resources and added that the property was clearly well on the road to recovery. It encouraged the State Party to publish a case study on the work, which could serve as a very useful reference point for other countries.
178. La Délégation de **Madagascar** soutient les propositions des délégations de l'Inde et de la Lituanie compte tenu des efforts consacrés par l'Etat partie et les progrès enregistrés. Elle est d'avis d'enlever le site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.
179. La Délégation du **Chili** se joint aux délégations qui se sont exprimées pour le retrait du site de la Liste du patrimoine en péril et félicite l'Etat partie pour tous les progrès accomplis.
180. La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite également féliciter l'Etat partie pour tous ses efforts. Elle ajoute qu'il s'agit d'un cas d'école, tant les efforts ont été considérables. La délégation rappelle qu'un site figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril peut être enlevé seulement si les efforts nécessaires par l'Etat partie sont réalisés. La

Délégation du **Bénin** a suivi l'état d'avancement des progrès accomplis pour ce site. Elle se joint aux délégations qui l'ont précédée pour demander le retrait du site de la Liste du patrimoine en péril.

181. **IUCN** concurred with the remarks of the State Party of the United States of America that significant progress had been made but advised the Committee that concerns remained and it stated it believed the property should remain on the In Danger List until the corrective measures identified during the 2006 monitoring mission had been assessed. It proposed that a mission to assess the impacts of those corrective measures on the conservation of the property be undertaken as soon as possible. If the impacts were positive then IUCN could recommend removal at the following session, emphasizing the fact that as a technical body, it had to examine outputs rather than intentions.
182. The Delegation of **Kenya** said that there had been too many missions already, that the report clearly showed what had been done and the property should be removed from the In Danger List.
183. La Délégation d'**Espagne** souligne que les progrès réalisés justifient le retrait du site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril surtout tenant en compte le fait que l'Etat partie s'engage à continuer les efforts nécessaires pour éliminer complètement les menaces.
184. The Delegation of **India** commented that other properties had been removed from the In Danger List without a monitoring mission taking place, thus there was no need for such a mission.
185. The **Chairperson** observed that consensus was reached and proposed amending paragraph 8 so to remove from the List of World Heritage in Danger. He then declared Decision **31 COM 7A.12** adopted as amended.

#### **Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)**

186. The **World Heritage Centre** explained that it together with IUCN had undertaken a joint mission to the property in December 2006 to review progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2003 and 1995 missions. The mission concluded that the level of threat to the property had further decreased since the 2003 mission and substantial progress had been made in the implementation of the mission's recommendations. The mission had also noted the high-level commitment of the government towards the conservation of the property and the long-term assistance provided by Germany.
187. The mission pointed out that certain outstanding issues remain to be resolved but that they mainly concerned the buffer zone outside the property. In view of the conclusions of the mission, the Centre and IUCN believed that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was no longer under imminent threat and recommended removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, further efforts were needed to consolidate the gains and progress achieved, and the 2006 mission had developed a number of concrete recommendations to achieve this, which had been included in the draft decision.
188. The **World Heritage Centre** and **IUCN** proposed a monitoring mission to be planned for 2 years time, to review the implementation of these recommendations. **IUCN** then noted with pleasure that the State Party had largely complied with both the specific recommendations made by the 1995 UNESCO / IUCN evaluation mission, and other

recommendations made in 2000. The overall threat to the property, particularly the core zone of the RPBR, had decreased considerably, though certain threats and problems did persist. Of particular concern were the advance of the agricultural frontier and illegal timber harvest in the buffer and cultural zones. The relocation of families from the reserve's core zone had been completed successfully. A decrease in institutional capacity by the Reserve's management agency, COHDEFOR, had been offset by increased commitments and performance by the Armed Forces and other governmental and non-governmental organizations. While the property had met the conditions for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger, additional efforts were still needed in the areas of: maintaining and increasing the support of the Armed Forces; working with the Attorney General's and Public Prosecutor's Offices to assure legal disposal of all illegal timber confiscated so there would be no possibility for subsequent re-entry into the market; capacity building within COHDEFOR, especially the regional office located in the RPBR.; completion of the land zoning process; initiating the Reserve's co-management process involving local organizations.

189. Finally, IUCN congratulated the State Party for its commitment to effective management of the Reserve and for the substantial progress made.
190. The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification of which maps were referred to in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision, as this seemed to be in contradiction with the main document.
191. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** doubted the need for a further mission to assess the remaining corrective measures and proposed deleting paragraph 7.
192. The Delegations of **Lithuania** and **Kenya** noted some contradictions between the approach to the two States Parties concerned by this and the previous report. The Delegation of India concurred and supported the proposal to delete paragraph 7.
193. **IUCN** said that a mission had taken place at the end of 2006 and that the report had been written in response to its findings. Responding to suggestions of a contradictory approach, it said that it needed proof that corrective measures had been completed and that the outstanding universal value had been restored, rather than assurances about intentions. It clarified that the boundaries of the biosphere reserve had been changed, but that those of the World Heritage property had not.
194. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that there was a need for close follow up on the remaining corrective actions, as failing to address them might affect Outstanding Universal Value of the property in the medium term. This concern lay at the heart of the proposed mission.
195. The **Representative of the Assistant Director General for Science** explained that the property was a biosphere reserve as well as a World Heritage Property. As the non protected areas of the biosphere reserve had been expanded but those of the World Heritage property had not, he suggested that the World Heritage Centres of the *World Heritage Convention* and Man and Biosphere should work together to clarify the boundaries.
196. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.13** adopted as amended, by amending paragraph 6 and deleting paragraph 7.

## **AFRICA**

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

197. The **World Heritage Centre** said that a report from the State Party highlighting some progress in the implementation of the recommendations of the 2001 Centre / IUCN monitoring mission had been received on 5 February. Unfortunately, it had not provided details on the current state of conservation of the property. Regrettably, the monitoring mission planned for April had had to be postponed again at the request of the State Party as a result of the poor security situation. An additional report requested by the Centre on the state of conservation of the property had not yet been received.
198. The security situation in northern Central African Republic had degraded significantly since the previous session. The region in which the property is situated lies close to the Sudan / Chad borders and had been affected by the Darfur conflict. The Centre had received information that poaching pressure was very high with organized groups of poachers operating openly in the region to hunt down remaining elephants.
199. Taking into account the dramatic results of the 2005 wildlife survey, which showed a drastic decline in wildlife populations including a 95% decline of the elephant population combined with a lack of financial support for anti-poaching activities, it was likely that the continued pressures on this property would lead to the loss of its Outstanding Universal Value in the near future. To effectively address poaching, it would be necessary to attend to this issue on a regional scale but prospects for such a cooperation seem dim in the light of the Darfur crisis and the tensions between the different States Parties.
200. The **Chairperson** noted no objection and declared Decision **31 COM 7A.1** adopted.



### **Comoe National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 227)**

201. The **World Heritage Centre** said that a report had been received from the State Party on 23 January confirming the findings of the 2006 mission and providing a brief update on progress in implementing the mission recommendations adopted at the previous session.
202. According to the report, no progress had been made in terms of extending management to the entire property. Drafting of a management plan was reported to have begun and efforts to seek funding for the rehabilitation plan were underway. The report provided no ecological data such as statistics on wildlife populations which could enable a clear assessment of the property's current state of conservation.
203. In response to the recommendation of the 2006 mission to establish wildlife corridors linking the property with protected areas in neighbouring Burkina Faso and Ghana, IUCN had organized a regional planning meeting in December. Early April, a new Government of national unity had been established, putting a formal end to the conflict and the division of the country. It was expected that this positive development in the coming months would enable the management authority to regain control over the entire property, which would greatly facilitate the implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 mission.
204. The **Representative of the Assistant Director General for Science** specified that this was one of those cases where a World Heritage property overlaps with a MAB designated area and that the property had received support from a UNESCO/UNEP/GEF project for activities with the local communities.
205. La délégation du **Bénin** souhaite commenter le fait que l'inscription du site sur la liste en péril est liée au contexte de conflit armé. Une réconciliation semble avoir lieu depuis quelques mois. L'Etat partie encourage donc les bailleurs de fonds, en conformité avec le paragraphe 5 de la décision d'être prêts à engager à nouveau leur soutien financier.
206. The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Benin for its encouraging comment.
207. The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the issues concerning African endangered properties seemed to suffer from common problems and suggested a thematic workshop that would try to address them.
208. The **Chairperson** invited the World Heritage Centre to further explore the proposal made by the Delegation of Kenya and then declared Decision **31 COM 7A.2** adopted.

### **Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Côte d'Ivoire / Guinea) (N 155 bis)**

209. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the findings of the latest mission that had not been included in the working document and announced that reports had been received from the State Parties of Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea on the 23 January and 3 February. The monitoring mission announced in the working document had visited the Guinean part of the property from 13 to 22 May. The mission had already been planned earlier in the year but had to be postponed twice because of political unrest and regional insurgency. The mission concluded that the outstanding universal value for which the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List was still present.
210. However, the mission had identified two significant and immediate threats to the values of the property: 1) poaching pressure seemed to have increased significantly and 2)

the serious threat of fire. Over the last few years, a significant proportion of the high altitude grasslands of the property had been burned every year thus provoking serious damage to the vegetation. However, more studies were needed to determine the precise impact, in particular on the species composition and endemic species. Other threats were noted as unsustainable agricultural practices immediately adjacent to the property leading to deforestation and increasing pressure from livestock grazing. The mission noted that these pressures had increased significantly since the 1993 mission and could pose serious problems for the integrity of the property in the near future. The management of the property was extremely weak and lacking the necessary resources to implement its mission.

211. A particular problem for the efficient management of the property was its unclear legal status, which had never been updated since the time of creation of the Reserve in 1944. The legal status of the World Heritage property, the buffer zone, the mining enclave and the two other core zones of the biosphere reserve needed to be determined.
212. The mission also looked into the on-going and planned mining activities in the enclave that was removed from the property in 1993 and which constituted another major potential threat. At the time of the 31st session, the mining activities were still in an exploration phase. Towards the end of 2007, the mining company was expected to have started the pre-feasibility study of the project, followed by the feasibility study. If these are positive, mining could start around 2012.
213. The mission also reviewed the results of recent efforts by the mining company and CEGENS to precise the limits of the enclave as adopted by the Committee in 1993 and provided recommendations on certain outstanding issues which were included in the mission report.
214. The mission further discussed in detail the planned environmental impact assessment of the mining project. Whilst the mining project would have important impacts on the immediate environment of the mine, there was also a possibility that the mining activities would affect the property. Three major potential impacts had been identified so far: climatic impacts, impacts on the biodiversity and impacts on the watersheds of the property. The environmental impact assessment would need to clarify to what extent these potential threats would affect the values and integrity of the property.
215. It was noted that the mission was impressed with the preparatory work conducted for the impact assessment and that the State Party and mining company should keep the Centre and IUCN updated on intermediary results of the impact study. However, little progress had been achieved in implementing the 15 recommendations of the 1993 monitoring mission. Based on this assessment, the mission developed 11 recommendations to be considered as corrective measures.
216. **IUCN** added that while the mining issues had rightfully been given prominence in the report, it was equally concerned about the issues related to poaching, the influx of refugees, agricultural encroachment, deforestation, and bush fires which threaten not only the buffer zone, but increasingly the Reserve as well. IUCN welcomed the commencement of the Mt. Nimba GEF Project, but noted that the development of management capacity and the reversal of threats is a long-term process that would take years to implement. As capacities develop, it would be important to establish a monitoring program that would provide specific data to the Committee on progress being achieved and the point at which the Reserve may be removed from the endangered list.

217. La délégation du **Bénin** demande si les recommandations mentionnées sont de nouvelles recommandations ou bien si elles s'ajoutent aux recommandations déjà proposées, ceci afin de clarifier les actions qui doivent être faites par les pays concernés.
218. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** répond que les recommandations présentées intègrent celles de 1993 qui devaient être mises à jour.
219. The Delegation of **Netherlands** asked for clarification concerning paragraph 11 of the Draft Decision and suggested deleting the words "if possible".
220. The **World Heritage Centre** noted that taking out the words "if possible" and making the provision obligatory may be difficult due to the situation on the ground.
221. The **Chairperson** suggested adopting the Draft Decision in its entirety without amendments and declared Decision **31 COM 7A.3 adopted**.

### **Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of Congo) (N 63)**

222. The **World Heritage Centre** announced that a report on the five Democratic Republic of Congo properties submitted on 12 February had unfortunately lacked detailed information on the implementation of the various corrective measures adopted by the Committee. There had been insufficient time to analyze in detail an additional report, received on 22 June. After the Committee's 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the Democratic Republic of Congo had organized its first multiparty presidential, parliamentary and provincial elections since 1960, with considerable support from the international community. This process had largely dominated public life in the country, and had impacted on the implementation of the recommendations of the four monitoring missions organized in 2006 and the decisions taken by the Committee at its previous session. The run up to and aftermath of the elections saw renewed violence and fighting which had affected the Virunga National Park in particular. Since the time of writing the state of conservation report, fighting had again broken out in various areas in and around this property. Many of the armed groups involved in this fighting used the park and immediate surroundings as base camps and in some instances ICCN staff and facilities were directly targeted. As recently as 20 and 30 May 2007, militants had attacked the Burusi patrol post in the Tshirabirimu sector and the Lubimbi station of the park. In the recent attack on Burusi, an ICCN staff member had been killed and 3 others seriously injured. There had also been a notable impact on wildlife. The hippopotamus had been the main victim of this election period, having been systematically targeted by various armed groups in search of meat. Current estimates were that fewer than 300 hippos remained in Virunga, a dramatic decrease from an estimated 20,000 at the time of inscription. The mountain gorilla, the main flagship species of the property was also being targeted. In addition to the 2 silverbacks killed in January, one of the habituated gorilla families, the Kabirizi family, had been attacked on 10 June. One female had been killed, leaving behind a young infant. 8 members of the family were still unaccounted for. These developments were extremely worrying – gorillas had been well protected in Virunga since the start of the war with almost no animals lost. Of particular concern were declarations from some fighter groups that they would specifically target wildlife, notably gorillas, if attempts were made to chase them out of the park. There were also increasing problems with deforestation of gorilla habitat for charcoal production in the Mikeno sector, allegedly involving elements of the Democratic Republic of Congo's army. The Director-General of UNESCO and the Chairperson of the Committee had written to President Kabila to voice their concern about the situation in eastern Democratic Republic of Congo and the impact on the World Heritage properties and their wildlife. The Director-General had also written to

the Undersecretary General for Peacekeeping of the United Nations, to request a more active role of the United Nations mission to the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) in addressing these issues. The renewed insecurity had seriously hampered the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee at the previous sessions and the emergency action plan developed to support this. The military training camp in Nyaleke was still in use, despite promises by the Ministry of Defense to close it down by August 2006. The Centre had been informed that MONUC was planning to use the facility to train the army and the Centre had written requesting the assistance the special representative of the Secretary-General in DRC on this issue. There had been some progress with the development of a trust fund for the Democratic Republic of Congo World Heritage sites. At a conference on the future of the forests of the country in February, the Government of Belgium announced a 1 million Euro contribution for setting up and capitalizing such a fund. The Centre had worked closely with the Government of Belgium, WWF and the World Bank on a proposal and was expected that a feasibility study for the fund would start imminently.

223. The Delegation of **Israel** asked IUCN if the property has yet lost its Outstanding Universal Value and suggested that the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies should have a more proactive attitude rather than just writing letters.
224. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** made the following statement on behalf of its Government: 'The United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) has chosen Nyakele as one of the most appropriate locations for training in the military reunification process. The Draft Decision 31 COM 7A.4 calls for immediate closure of the Nyakele training camp. The Netherlands are very concerned about the possible impact of the camp on the park. Yet, at the same time, we do think that the training activities conducted by MONUC are very important. Given MONUC's central role in these training activities, we believe that any possible negative impact of the camp on the park will be minimal. At this moment, the Netherlands, together with MONUC and ICCN, are exploring the possibility of involving the rangers in the training of the military personnel. This concerns mainly those military units stationed in and around the park, which are already performing regular joint patrols with the park management against illegal rebel troops and poachers in the park. The aim of involving the rangers in the training of the military is to make the soldiers aware of the interests of the park and of the role of the rangers, thereby improving the cooperation between the military personnel and the park management.
225. The Delegation of **Lithuania** proposed that the Draft Decision should contain a mention of condolences to the families of those who lost their lives in the protection of the property.
226. La délégation du **Bénin** soutient la proposition du Kenya de changer le cadre de travail pour les sites africains et d'impliquer l'Union africaine, une considération plus large étant nécessaire. Une réunion d'ensemble permettrait d'analyser l'ensemble des problèmes.
227. The Delegation of **Canada** supported the statement made by the Delegation of Lithuania concerning condolences and proposed to add a reference to the International Council on Mining and Metals Position Statement on Mining and Protected Areas (2003), agreement to the text of the Draft Decision.
228. La délégation du **Maroc** s'interroge si la formulation de « prie instamment ... de stopper la présence de troupes armées... » entre dans les prérogatives du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle propose de modifier la décision en vue d'attirer l'attention du gouvernement sur la conséquence des actions militaires sur le statut de patrimoine mondial.

229. The **Chairperson** announced that there were two written amendments to the Draft Decision proposed by Canada. The first amendment concerned the addition of the following text after paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision: “Expresses his sincere condolences to the families of those who lost their lives for the protection of the park”.
230. The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that it had asked a question concerning Outstanding Universal Value.
231. Both **IUCN** and the **World Heritage Centre** affirmed that the species, especially gorillas, protected in this park had been reduced but that no species were extinct in the property, thus making rehabilitation possible. They confirmed the concern regarding new clashes in the region.
232. The **Chairperson** proposed proceeding with the adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. The first two paragraphs and a third one proposed by the Delegation of Canada were adopted without amendments.
233. Au sujet du paragraphe 4, la délégation du **Maroc** propose qu’il soit formulé de la façon suivante : « attire vivement l’attention de l’Etat partie et de la MONUC des graves conséquences de la présence de troupes armés dans le parc et alentours ».
234. The Delegation of **India** emphasized the importance of keeping a reference to the fights in the region. It therefore proposed the wording “in view of the extremely negative consequences of the presence of armed groups in and around the park”.
235. The **Rapporteur** proceeded with the reading of paragraph 4.
236. The Delegation of the **United States of America** wished to emphasize the issue of poaching in the park.
237. The Delegation of **India** suggested adding the word “illegal” before “armed groups”.
238. The Delegation of **Kenya** wondered what the word “illegal” meant in this context.
239. The **World Heritage Centre** explained the current situation concerning the combat in the region, noting that the park was used as a base for various armed groups.
240. The Delegation of **Chile** proposed that the expression “armed groups” be changed.
241. The Delegation of **India** proposed to remove the word “illegal”.
242. The **Rapporteur** read paragraph 4 without the word “illegal”, then continued reading the paragraph of the Draft Decision and, upon reaching paragraph 7, added the reference to the International Council on Mining as requested by the Delegation of Canada.
243. The Delegation of **Kenya** requested to add the same reference to the mining issues prepared for Virunga also in the Draft Decisions of the other 4 properties in Danger of the Democratic Republic of Congo, as appropriate.
244. The Delegation of **Israel** asked which would now be the benchmark for this property to be removed off the list of World Heritage in Danger.
245. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the benchmark would be the desired state of conservation of the property.
246. The **Chairperson** adopted Decision **31 COM 7A.4** adopted as amended.

**Kahuzi-Biega National park (Democratic Republic of Congo) (N137)**

247. **The World Heritage Centre** recalled that Kahuzi-Biega National Park had also been seriously affected by the deterioration of the security situation in the run up to and aftermath of the elections. The presence of armed groups, in particular in the lowland sector of the park, remained a major problem and little progress had been made in dealing with this since the previous session; indeed several park stations and patrol posts had been attacked, resulting in one guard being killed and several wounded. As with Virunga, the current situation had resulted in limited progress in the implementation of the corrective measures adopted by the Committee at the previous sessions and the emergency action plan developed to support this: whilst all park stations were now operational, the insecurity limited the ability of the guards to patrol certain areas. There had been no progress in reclaiming the corridor between the high and lowland. The requested survey of the lowland sector of the park was underway but was seriously hindered by the insecurity. Preliminary results of a cursory exploration had confirmed the presence of chimpanzees and gorillas, but no sign of elephants had been found. The service of the Ministry of Mines responsible for the mapping of mining concessions published a new map of attributed exploration and exploitation concessions. The maps showed several concessions inside the protected areas, including exploitation concessions in Kahuzi-Biega (PNKB) and Okapi Wildlife Reserve and a prospecting concession in Virunga National Park. The Minister of Mines had instructed his mapping office to verify this information and a mixed working group set up to study the issue. The results of this work were not yet known. New information was received on the planned rehabilitation of the RN3 road which crosses the property, with funding from the European Union. It was suggested that the Committee may want to recall that a previous project to rehabilitate this road in the nineties led to serious discussions on the potential impact on the property, including discussions by the Committee at its 15th session in Carthage. A 1992 impact study by IUCN had recommended realigning the road around the northern boundaries of the park. However, with the outbreak of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo, road works had been halted before reaching the park. For the current proposed rehabilitation, a technical, socio-economic and environmental impact study had been undertaken by the German technical cooperation GTZ and a provisional report submitted to the Centre on June 11. This confirmed that the rehabilitation project could have direct and indirect impacts on the property. The most significant indirect impacts were noted as increased deforestation, illegal mineral exploitation and bushmeat trafficking as a result of the increased accessibility of the area. A major direct impact is that the rehabilitation of the stretch of the road crossing the property cuts through important gorilla habitat. The report recommended that this stretch should only be rehabilitated as a local road and that a substantial increase in traffic should lead to a decision to construct the alternative road circulating the northern edge of the park as proposed by the 1992 impact study. Unfortunately, the report failed to provide any guidance on which traffic volume should trigger such a decision. The report also failed to present concrete recommendations for which measures could be taken to reduce the indirect impacts on the property that were identified. The **Centre** and **IUCN** therefore insisted that these important questions be addressed in the final version of the report and appropriate measures taken before the rehabilitation work begins.
248. **IUCN** noted the importance of monitoring gorilla behaviour in relation to road use, and possible mitigation measures and alternative routes, especially with increasing traffic. IUCN recommended that the Advisory Body's Primate Specialist Group be invited to help design monitoring programmes, and could assist in defining thresholds that would trigger consideration of alternative routes.
249. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed the addition of condolences to the people that have been killed as already discussed for the previous property.

250. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to change paragraph 8 so to reflect the impact on gorilla habitat.
251. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A. 5** adopted as amended.

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

252. **The World Heritage Centre** noted that since the Committee's 30th session, the protected area authority with the assistance of the African Parks Foundation had been further able to consolidate control over the property, in spite of continued poaching pressure and security problems. A new aerial survey, conducted in April confirmed this, as only four signs of poacher camps had been observed in the property and no recent carcasses of elephants, rhino or buffalo had been discovered.
253. The aerial survey, however, had not observed any rhinos. An intensive ground survey in March of the areas where four rhinos had previously been discovered, had failed to produce direct sightings, although their presence had been confirmed through seven indirect observations.
254. Whilst the presence of rhino was thus reconfirmed, it seemed clear that the remaining population was very small. The planned expert meeting to discuss the viability of the population and future management options had had to be postponed to September due to the unavailability of certain experts.
255. While there had been significant progress in strengthening anti-poaching activities and securing wildlife, there had been fewer advances in reinforcing cooperation between the Democratic Republic of Congo and Sudan regarding better control of the incursion of armed groups and transboundary poaching. Contacts had been established by the Centre and African Parks Foundation (APF) with the Sudan programme of the Wildlife Conservation Society, which was assisting the regional government of South Sudan on wildlife issues, and also helped broker a transboundary cooperation agreement on conservation between Uganda and Southern Sudan.
256. On 22 June 2007, the World Heritage Centre had received, by email, a letter from the protected area authority requesting removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. While it is clear that the situation in Garamba had improved considerably since 2005, this improvement remained fragile and further dependent on the evolution of the security in the region. The planned deployment of the United Nations mission in the country in and around Garamba was a clear indication that the security situation remained a major concern.
257. Even if current levels of improvement could be sustained in the coming months, it was noted that it would take a long time for the animal populations to recover. It was presently unclear if a viable rhino population remained in the property. Numbers of all other key species were still dramatically low. A comparison of data from the 1995 survey pre-dating the inscription on the In Danger list in 1997 with the figures of 2007's survey, showed that elephants were now estimated at 3,696 animals, compared to 11,175 in 1995 (and probably 20,000 at the time of inscription); buffalo at 5,207, down from 25,242 in 1995; and Congo giraffe were numbered at 82 animals, down from 178. No clear upwards trend had been established.
258. While the World Heritage Centre and IUCN acknowledged the efforts of the State Party and APF to stop the dramatic decline, the outstanding universal value of this property was still in danger and a clear and sustained upward trend in the key flagship species would need to be demonstrated before removal from the List of World Heritage in



Danger could be considered. It would also be important to establish some indicators in terms of minimum populations and population trends to guide such possible future decisions on a removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. This should include the question of the viability of the remaining rhino population.

259. **IUCN** expressed its deep concern about the viability of the remaining northern white rhino population, possibly down to only four individuals, and other wildlife that were the main elements of the Outstanding Universal Value for the property. The upcoming meeting of IUCN Rhino Specialist Group in September would provide further insight into population viability and management options. Urgent measures were required to equip and train the guard force to implement an anti-poaching programme in the southern sector where the white rhino was present. There was continuing concern about the inability to eliminate cross border incursions from Sudan, and the need for training and equipping of the military brigade posted around the property. There was a further need to couple a disarmament campaign, with the United Nations Mission to the Democratic Republic of Congo, with a community conservation campaign for communities around the property. IUCN recommended that the property remain on the endangered list.
260. Recalling lengthy discussions at previous sessions of the Committee, and noting that the species were progressively further endangered, the Delegation of **Lithuania** wondered whether the property still had outstanding universal value.
261. The Delegation of **Israel** asked IUCN to indicate a timeframe for corrective measures and enquired whether a representative of the concerned State Party was in the room to talk about these five properties.
262. The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the request for the State Party to take the floor.
263. **IUCN** stated that it was not possible to give a definitive timeframe for corrective measures but that at least 5 years would be needed to evaluate the impact of the corrective measures decided. It affirmed that there was no precise number of species populations to determine whether Outstanding Universal Value is still present. IUCN commented that it was easier to look more generally at trends.
264. The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that rhinos had not been seen during the last aerial survey of the area, but added that their presence had been confirmed through indirect sightings. The big question remained the viability of the remaining population, which would be discussed in the expert meeting foreseen for September.
265. The **Chairperson** noticed that the State Party was not present in the room.
266. The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that the Committee had previously discussed these issues in Durban (2005), and Vilnius (2006).
267. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.6** adopted as amended.

#### **Salonga National park (the Democratic Republic of Congo) (N 280)**

268. **The World Heritage Centre** recalled that the Committee at its previous session had requested that a mission to Salonga, as the only property of the five properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo not then visited by a monitoring mission, should be undertaken. The remoteness of the property and its sheer size of 36000 km<sup>2</sup> had made the logistical challenges for this mission extremely demanding. The findings and

recommendations of the mission were presented in Document *WHC-07/31.Com/7A.Add*. It had concluded that whilst the Outstanding Universal Value of the property remained, the decrease of its wildlife populations was reaching alarming levels. Recent survey work had estimated the elephant population at merely 2,000 animals, despite the belief that the park has potential for at least 16,000 animals. The situation of the other flagship species, the bonobo, the closest relative to man, was more positive with an estimated almost 15,000 animals, but there was clear evidence of a recent increase in poaching pressure. The mission had concluded that the decrease in large mammals in the long term could affect the ecology and biological structure of the ecosystem and thus threaten the property's outstanding universal value.

269. The mission had identified illegal poaching for commercial purposes and the presence of villages within the park as the main threats. Poaching pressure seemed to have increased significantly, involving members of the military as well as civilians. 18,000 metric tons of bush meat were thought to be extracted every year from the park and transported to urban centres, including large cities as Kinshasa and Kisangani, as far as 1,000 km away.
270. Another serious threat to the integrity of Salonga was the presence of 9 villages in the park, resulting in deforestation and pressure on the natural resources, in particular wildlife. Management of the property remained very weak. In contrast to the other sites in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Salonga had received external support only since 2000. The vastness of the property, together with the logistical challenges, insecurity during and after the war and the complexity of the issues involved had limited the ability of these projects to sufficiently address the threats to the property and much work remained.
271. The mission had developed a number of recommendations as corrective measures to address the main threats to the property but noted that it would take time to reverse the current degradation and that progress towards the impact of the corrective measures would need to be monitored to adapt them to the rapidly changing situation in the field.
272. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested a more precise formulation of paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision as the statement contained in it was too vague and submitted a written amendment that was consequently adopted.
273. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.7** adopted as amended.

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

274. **The World Heritage Centre** reported that the implementation of the corrective measures and emergency action plan had been hampered by the prevailing political situation. Nevertheless there had been progress in securing the reserve and removing poachers, illegal mining activities and armed groups. 90 percent of the Reserve was currently controlled by the management authority. At the time of the 31st session, poaching was thought to have decreased by 80 percent and 20 illegal mining sites had been closed down, with over 1000 miners evicted. Law enforcement had also been strengthened and an additional 15 guards recruited to ensure surveillance of the secured areas of the Reserve. The recently published map of mining concessions by the Ministry of Mines mentioned in the report on Kahuzi-Biega was also impacting on the Okapi Wildlife Reserve, in that several concessions had entered the reserve. There had been no progress in the implementation of some of the other recommendations of the 2006 mission such as measures to control immigration into the property, the proposed forest zoning plan or measures to address illegal trafficking of timber, ivory and minerals extracted from the Reserve across the border with Uganda. The

rehabilitation of the RN4 national road crossing the Reserve was a cause for concern. The 2006 monitoring mission had pointed out that the EIA conducted for these works had failed to address the potential impact on the reserve. When rehabilitation works had reached the reserve in early March 2007, the Centre had contacted the World Bank, which was funding the rehabilitation. The Bank had immediately dispatched a mission to look into the issue. On the basis of the conclusions of this mission, the rehabilitation works for the stretch crossing the Reserve were stopped on March 19. The World Heritage Centre had not received the additional impact study requested by the Committee at its 30th session. The impact study should take into account both direct and indirect pressures as a result of the rehabilitation project. On June 22, the Centre had received by email a letter from the State Party dated 20 June 2007 requesting removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Whilst the Centre and IUCN acknowledged that the situation the Reserve had improved recently, the improvement remained fragile and dependent on a sustainable improvement of the security situation in the region. The situation in Virunga, a mere 200 km from the property clearly demonstrated the fragility of the situation. It was crucial that the remaining corrective measures were implemented to address the threats to the integrity and Outstanding Universal Value of the property identified by the 2006 mission. The Committee was asked to recall that the mission had identified 3 major direct threats; poaching, mining and immigration into the property and two potential threats; the RN4 rehabilitation and the approaching front of deforestation. Whilst there was definite progress on the question of poaching, it remained to be seen if ICCN would be able to consolidate the results. Concerning mining, the issue of the concessions attributed by the Ministry of Mines had not yet been resolved and park staff had also reported constant pressure from the local authorities to re-open some illegal mining sites within the property. There had been no progress in addressing the issue of immigration into the property. The RN4 question also remained unresolved and no progress had been made in the development of a forest zoning plan to control deforestation in the region. Finally, more survey and inventory work was required to determine the exact status of the outstanding universal value of the property. To date, only a survey of some flagship species covering the central part of the reserve had been completed. However, even the results of this survey demonstrate important impacts on the value of the property: elephant numbers were down to approximately 3000 animals, compared to 10000 before the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and Okapi populations were also seriously impacted. With surveys currently underway in the remaining parts of the property, a better view of the current status of the property was expected to be available by the next session. Based on the situation at the time of the session, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre believed that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was still endangered and that all corrective measures must be implemented, and a clear upward trend in the populations of key species be demonstrated, before removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger could be envisaged. The importance of establishing some indicators in terms of minimum populations and population trends was stressed in order to guide such future Decisions on a removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

275. **IUCN** was encouraged by the progress made in removing poachers, illegal mining, and armed groups from the Reserve, yet remained concerned by the potential environmental impacts of the rehabilitation of the RN4 national road, and potential mining concessions. It recommended that the property remain on the list in danger until agreed indicators had been established, implemented regarding specific elements of the Reserve's outstanding universal value, and a clear positive trend over several years is documented.

276. A revised Draft Decision, referenced **31COM7A.8.Rev**, taking into account the suspension of the road works had been distributed in the room.
277. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to delete the word “new” before government, in paragraph 4.
278. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested inserting here the previously agreed wording concerning mining.
279. The **Chairperson** reassured the Committee that the changes concerning Statements of Significance/Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and benchmarks would be consistently applied throughout the document.
280. The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the proposal made by the Delegation of Kenya to group these five properties of Democratic Republic of Congo and treat them together could be taken into account by the World Heritage Centre.
281. The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** expressed its concern about the 5 properties within the Democratic Republic of Congo on the List on World Heritage in Danger and recalled that there was an urgent need to be more proactive and to work more closely with other United Nations agencies.
282. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.8** adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 06:00 p.m.

## FIRST DAY – SUNDAY 24 JUNE 2007

### EVENING SESSION

#### THIRD MEETING

6.30 p.m. – 8.30 p.m.

#### MUGHRABI ASCENT AND OLD CITY OF JERUSALEM AND ITS WALLS

283. Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente, à l'aide d'une présentation visuelle, l'état de conservation de la Vieille ville de Jérusalem et, plus spécifiquement, la situation concernant les travaux entrepris sur la rampe d'accès à la Porte des Maghrébins, depuis la mission de l'UNESCO entreprise fin février 2007 jusqu'à maintenant.
284. La délégation du **Maroc** rappelle le caractère universel de Jérusalem et, tout en se déclarant satisfaite de la Décision du Conseil exécutif, insiste sur la nécessité de donner une suite concrète à ses recommandations et de commencer leur mise en œuvre. Elle insiste sur le fait que le plan de restauration de la rampe devrait venir de l'ensemble des parties prenantes et que des consultations en amont auraient pu permettre d'éviter le problème.
285. La délégation de la **Tunisie** remercie le Directeur du Centre pour la clarté de son rapport. Se référant elle aussi à l'universalité de Jérusalem, elle note que la ville est sous l'emprise d'Israël et qu'il faudrait éviter de faire des travaux « à thèse ».
286. The Delegation of **Kuwait** underlined the historical, cultural and religious significance of the site. As next steps were being considered, it stressed that emphasis should be on achieving tangible progress on the ground. In this connection, the Delegation welcomed the overall Action Plan for the safeguarding of the cultural heritage of the Old City of Jerusalem, supported the proposal of applying reinforced monitoring to the Mughrabi ascent and stressed the importance of establishing a consultative process with the Waqf and the Jordanian authorities regarding the conservation of the Mughrabi ascent.
287. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the recommendations of the technical mission to study the reconstruction work and archaeological excavations at the Mughrabi ascent (28 February – 2 March 2007). It also said that a proposal of applying reinforced monitoring to the site deserved careful consideration and suggested the establishment of a working group to discuss the matter in detail.
288. The Delegation of **Kenya** stressed the richness of Jerusalem's history and cultural diversity and indicated the critical role UNESCO should play in promoting mutual respect and understanding between peoples. It also welcomed the recommendations of the technical mission.
289. La **mission de la Palestine auprès de l'UNESCO (observateur)** remercie, au nom du peuple palestinien, des Arabes et de tous ceux qui ont soutenu les acteurs de ce long travail de négociation, destiné à résoudre une crise. Elle rappelle que Jérusalem-Est est appelée à devenir la capitale de la Palestine libre. Elle souligne les leçons qu'il faut tirer de cette situation : l'importance de la notion de temps, la nécessité d'informer avant et non de diffuser un fait accompli et, dans l'intérêt de la ville, le besoin de coopération entre toutes les parties concernées. Elle souligne, par ailleurs, le caractère exemplaire de ce débat, indiquant que ce sujet dépassait Jérusalem et mettait en

lumière l'ensemble des activités du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Enfin, elle espère que ceci serve de leçon et évite, dans les années à venir, que d'autres sites ne subissent ce même genre de crise.

290. The Delegation of **Israel**, while stressing the sensitivities involved, said that it was strongly committed to a consensual and constructive way forward, based on professionalism, and acceptable to all parties concerned. It further noted that names used in Draft Decisions should not solely refer to one religion, but equally acknowledge names used by other religions. The Head of the Delegation presented further information on the Mughrabi ascent through a visual presentation, in particular on the excavations undertaken at the site in the past, showing the complexity of the levels of history accumulated and intermingled. He summarized key elements provided by the Israel National Commission for UNESCO in recent reports, namely that: (i) archaeological excavations at the site had stopped and that work was on-going aimed at consolidation to secure the stability of the ascent; (ii) complete documentation of the archaeological excavations was being finalized; (iii) that alternative proposals for the final design of the Mughrabi ascent were being prepared. Such proposals would look at using the Mughrabi ascent while maintaining its integrity and authenticity and would be subject to an inclusive and transparent public hearing process.
291. The **Deputy Director-General of UNESCO** stated that, over the past months, important developments had allowed for the advancement towards a positive solution for the conservation of the Mughrabi ascent, including the recommendations of the technical mission, the debate during the Special Plenary Meeting at the 176th session of the Executive Board and, finally, the thorough discussion of this matter at the present session of the World Heritage Committee. He expressed confidence that an agreement on a consensual text, which would guide future steps, would be reached in the coming days.
292. The Observer Delegation of **Jordan** stressed two points. Firstly, that one should refrain from carrying out archaeological excavations that may threaten the site, as well as the safety of people living close to the site; and secondly that close consultation with the Waqf and the Jordanian authorities was imperative, given the responsibility of Jordan vis-à-vis Islamic religious sites in Jerusalem.
293. The Delegation of **Spain** commented that by addressing critical matters such as the state of conservation of the Mughrabi ascent, UNESCO fully demonstrated its potential and the value of the World Heritage Convention. It continued by expressing that a positive solution could contribute to a better understanding between peoples and that Spain would be available to assist in this regard.
294. The Delegation of **Lithuania** said that the Committee should do its utmost to protect this site and, in particular focus efforts on preparing a Draft Decision acceptable to all parties.
295. At the invitation of the Chairperson, **ICCROM** and **ICOMOS** provided further details on the technical mission, in which they had taken part.
296. **ICCROM** recalled the unique location of the Mughrabi ascent at the junction of two of the holiest sites respectively of Muslims and Jews. It noted that the technical mission was an important step for reporting technically on the situation on the ground and that an immediate priority was to deploy all efforts to consolidate the Mughrabi ascent, given its weak structure. It went on to add that one should protect evidence of the different historical levels of the site while at the same time aim at making the ascent usable again. It stressed that a consultative process with both the Waqf and the Jordanian authorities would be very important for the future.

297. **ICOMOS** stressed the importance of consolidation and conservation of the site at this stage. Recalling that many archaeological excavations had a destructive dimension, he suggested that it could have been wiser to avoid archaeological excavations at this particular site, as these had now revealed the extreme structural fragility of the ascent. He also stressed the importance of cooperation for the future conservation works.
298. The **Chairperson** stated that there was a need for further informal consultations between the parties involved and proposed to suspend the discussion on this item until a consensus was reached to adopt Decision **31 COM 7A.18**.

The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.

## SECOND DAY – MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2007

### FOURTH MEETING

09.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson Mr Tumu te HeuHeu

#### ITEM 5.2: MECHANISM PROPOSED BY THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL TO ENSURE THE PROPER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE DECISIONS (*continued*)

299. The **Rapporteur** presented the revised draft decision **31 COM 5.2** in view of the major amendments proposed by the Committee the previous day.
300. The **Chairperson** invited the Deputy Director-General of UNESCO to provide additional clarifications on the proposed amendments in the revised draft decision presented to the Committee.
301. The **Deputy Director-General of UNESCO** provided background elements for the revised version of the Decision.
302. The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Deputy Director-General for the improved text of the revised Decision. Referring to paragraph 4, it said that the word “fine-tune” should be replaced with “refine”. It also proposed to include a reference to the List of World Heritage in Danger.
303. The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Deputy Director-General for the hard work. It concurred with the Delegation of India concerning paragraphs 4 and 6. Regarding paragraph 7, the Delegation said it should not be a burden on the Committee.
304. The amendments proposed by India were supported by the Delegation of **Norway**.
305. The Delegation of **Israel** recognized the efforts made in the revised Decision. A trial period of two years was suggested before integrating the new mechanism in the text of

the *Operational Guidelines*. It also suggested keeping the mechanism general, without limitations to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

306. **ICOMOS**, responding on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies, concurred with India. It expressed that the refinement of the reinforced monitoring mechanism should be done in consultation with the Advisory Bodies and the Chair, in particular to clarify its link with reactive monitoring.
307. The Delegations of **Lithuania** and **Kenya** supported the amendment by the Delegation of India and in particular to limit the possible application of the mechanism to the List of World Heritage in Danger.
308. The Delegation of **India** reiterated that the mechanism should be limited to the List of World Heritage in Danger.
309. The Delegation of **Israel** accepted additions to paragraph 7.
310. The Delegation of **Chile** referred to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision stating that the reinforced mechanism should not be used systematically but only as a last resort activated in appropriate cases. This should apply to normal sites on an exceptional basis. Otherwise the regular monitoring process would apply.
311. La délégation du **Maroc** fait remarquer qu'il y avait maintenant deux propositions à considérer: celle de l'Inde et celle du Chili.
312. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the intervention of the Delegation of Israel concerning the need to abide by the *Operational Guidelines*.
313. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to add a reference to the trial period prior to institutionalizing the mechanism in the *Operational Guidelines*. It said that normal sites, which are likely to be In Danger later, should be considered in addition to sites on the In Danger List so that they could be prevented from In Danger Listing.
314. The Delegation of **Lithuania** pointed out that this was de facto a trial period with financial implications, and that after two years an evaluation of the mechanism would be made.
315. La délégation du **Maroc** pose une question d'ordre linguistique concernant la traduction de « exceptional cases » par « cas spécifiques ».
316. The Delegation of **Chile** referred to the Spanish translation of this term “casos cualificados”.
317. The Delegation of **India** concurred with the Delegation of Morocco.
318. The Delegation of **Chile** said the right terminology was “specific” and not “exceptional” in the Spanish language.
319. The Delegation of the **United States of America** concurred with the Delegation of India.
320. The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed that both exceptional and specific terminology be used.
321. The Delegation of **Chile** drew attention to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision where reference should be made to the role of the Chair of the World Heritage Committee.



322. The **Rapporteur** advised that during the translation these two words should be taken into account and be translated according to the proposed suggestions from the Committee members.
323. The Delegation of **Israel** sought clarification of the meaning of “come into effect immediately”.
324. La délégation de la **Tunisie** fait une remarque d’ordre linguistique concernant le terme «peaufiner ».
325. La délégation du **Maroc** estime qu’il était nécessaire de travailler en deux langues parallèlement, notamment dans des cas délicats comme celui-ci.
326. The Delegation of **Kenya** remarked that “fine-tune ” had in the meantime been changed into “ refine ”, thus there was no need for further discussion.
327. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 5.2 adopted** as amended.
328. The **Deputy Director General** on behalf of the Director General, thanked the Committee for approving this document, which would help in implementing decisions. He said that there would be a three year trial period to implement the Mechanism and that the identification of properties that needed a Reinforced Monitoring could be done in cooperation with States Parties.

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

##### **Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9)**

329. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and informed the Committee of the contents of the report received from the State Party on progress achieved in the implementation of the corrective measures adopted at the 30th session (Vilnius, 2006). The requested extension of the park to Ras Dejen was underway and the requested regazetting had been postponed in order to include this new extension. A comprehensive proposal for an alternative livelihood project had been developed and the next step would be to secure the necessary funding, estimated at USD8.7 million. While the draft management plan submitted by the State Party provided a detailed description of the park, IUCN and the Centre felt that some of the key management challenges of the property had not been addressed, in particular the problem of grazing, which has a serious impact both on the Walia Ibex and on the Ethiopian wolf. As recommended by the 2006 mission, it was extremely important to address this issue in a strategic way, in order to safeguard the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. In order to improve the draft management plan, the Centre had facilitated cooperation between the park authority and the Frankfurt Zoological Society, an international conservation Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) which had already assisted the State Party with similar cases (the Mbale Mountains). The NGO was now providing technical assistance to the management authority to revise the management plan, which was expected to be completed in the next 1 to 2 years.
330. **IUCN** said that in 2006 a reactive monitoring mission had been conducted at the property. The mission proposed corrective measures including the extension of the property, dealing with the population inside the property, and grazing issues. It further

explained that the State Party had requested to postpone the extension of the property. Regarding grazing, it was stated that no progress had been made by the State Party and that the grazing issue should be included in the management plan. It said that the State Party had been working on developing a Terms of Reference (TOR) for a consultant to implement the plan for grazing.

331. The Delegation of **Israel** said that the Draft Decision seemed to be inconsistent with last year's Decision regarding the removal of the property from the In Danger List. It felt that the goal posts had been moved again, in particular with regard to the grazing issue.
332. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed with Israel, noting that in 2006 there seemed to be a good possibility of removing the property from the In Danger List. It accepted the Draft Decision as written.
333. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its concern that the report had highlighted the grazing as a major issue this time. It felt that this issue should be addressed through the measures for alternative livelihoods. Although the State Party had made efforts to develop an alternative livelihoods project it did not, however, seem fair to impose the funding of this project, estimated at more than USD 8 million, as a condition for removal from the In Danger List.
334. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to assess the capability of the State Party in addressing these problems.
335. La délégation de la **Tunisie** demande à l'UICN de clarifier la question des « repères » cités au paragraphe 7.
336. The Delegation of **New Zealand** said that the previous session had set clear benchmarks for removal, such as for the boundaries, and now the grazing issue had been added. This was inconsistent and therefore the decision should be revised accordingly.
337. **IUCN** explained that benchmarks and indicators could fluctuate as the situation in the field was changing. It further explained that grazing had an important impact on wildlife and thus the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It stressed the need for proper consultation with key stakeholders in developing the management plan.
338. The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the 2006 mission had proposed 4 new benchmarks, which were adopted by the Committee at its last session. One of these benchmarks asked for the development of a clear strategy to deal with the grazing issue, one of the main threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It was therefore very clear that the goal posts had not been moved and that the Draft Decision was consistent with the decision adopted in Vilnius. It further added that the State Party had prepared a draft revised management plan and submitted this to the Centre and IUCN for comment. This draft did not include any strategic considerations on how to deal with the grazing issue. The Centre therefore was currently assisting the State Party together with the Frankfurt Zoological Society, to revise the management plan and develop this strategy on grazing. It was expected that this work would take one to two years.
339. The Delegation of **India** supported the comments from New Zealand that the goal posts should not be changed given the depressing situation in Africa. It said that there was a total contradiction with the last decision where it was said that few measures were required before putting the site back on the normal list. It requested that the last paragraph be reverted which would give hope to the State Party.

340. The **Chairperson** said that the Delegation of Ethiopia had not yet arrived due to unforeseen circumstances and proposed that the discussion on this property be postponed until the arrival of the Delegation.
341. The Delegation of **Canada** said that an alternative livelihood programme had to be able to address the threats to the property and that it should be developed in harmony with local values and systems.
342. The Delegation of **Lithuania** recalled that there had been an understanding at the previous session that the property would be removed from the In Danger List during this session.
343. The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegations of **the United States of America and Kenya** requested that the Decision should be put on hold until the Ethiopian Delegation arrived next day.
344. The **Chairperson** proposed the Committee to suspend further discussions on the property until the arrival of the Ethiopian Delegation.

**The Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid (Norway), took the chair.**

#### **Air and Tenere Natural Reserves (Niger) (N 573)**

345. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, indicating that the report received from the State Party had provided information on the progress achieved in the implementation of the corrective measures with the assistance of the UNDP/GEF project.
346. Progress included the re-establishment of the management authority in Iferouane, increases in staff, the planned establishment of land commissions and the development of a new anti-poaching strategy. The project would also seek to address some of the important natural resource management issues that threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, such as timber and thatch collection and land degradation. However, given the extent of these threats, tangible results could be expected only after a certain period of time.
347. **IUCN** provided the Committee with its comments, noting that wood collecting, poaching and tourism management problems continued in the Reserve. It expressed concern about the absence in the State Party's report of specific information on the status and trends of natural values that form the basis for the property's Outstanding Universal Value, such as the distribution and trends in the population of threatened species.
348. The Delegation of **Kenya** said the State Party was implementing the corrective measures. It expressed that the property had been on the Danger List for 15 years and that the consultation with local people had not taken place until now. It proposed to add into the Decision that a removal from the Danger List should be considered next year.
349. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that there was a positive trend noted in the report presented by the World Heritage Centre and that this was not reflected in the Draft Decision. It proposed to remove paragraph 5 from the Draft Decision.
350. La délégation du **Bénin** s'associe aux commentaires faits par les délégations du Kenya et des Pays Bas et attire l'attention sur les efforts que font les Etats dans la sauvegarde de leur patrimoine ainsi que sur leurs limites. Les problèmes qui sont évoqués dans le rapport sont communs à l'Afrique en tant que continent et ses vastes

territoires. Ceci nécessite une approche innovatrice et urgente. La délégation suggère que des consultations au plus haut niveau aient lieu au niveau du continent, avec la participation de l'UNESCO, de l'Union africaine, des Nations Unies et des bailleurs de fonds.

351. The Delegation of **Chile** reflected that it would take time to return the property to the normal List. It warned that climate change was enduring threat to the property and told the Committee that the situation at this site provides a clear example of the conditions that a large number of natural sites are facing with ever increasing permanence. It went on to request deletion of paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.
352. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked to include a reference to removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session of the Committee.
353. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the property had been on the In Danger List since 1992 but that no measures had been taken to address the key problems for an extremely long time; this was due to a number of reasons such as the insecurity of the region. It explained that the UNDP-GEF project had only started last year and had begun to address these issues. It further clarified that the threats to this property were complex, as they related to the use of certain natural resources by the local communities as well as land degradation. The World Heritage Centre advised that addressing them would require a participatory approach in negotiating with the communities in order to find better ways of managing these resources sustainably and exhorted that this was a lengthy process. Hence it was highly unlikely that sufficient progress could be achieved in one year to remove the property from the In Danger List.
354. **IUCN** congratulated the State Party for corrective measures but stressed that the rehabilitation of the property would be a time-consuming operation and that it was important to keep the property on the In Danger List.
355. The **Rapporteur** reminded the Committee that the Netherlands had proposed to remove paragraph 5, and insert it into paragraph 8, and Chile had proposed to drop paragraph 4. It read the revised decision.
356. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.10** adopted as amended.

## **ASIA-PACIFIC**

### **Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338)**

357. The **World Heritage Centre** and **IUCN** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, indicating that the report, received from the State Party in February had noted progress in the implementation of the corrective measures set by the Committee at its 29th session. Efforts were underway to rebuild park infrastructure with a total of 29 camps reported reactivated, however more work was needed to rebuild everything that had been damaged during the insurgency. The report provided no information on the rebuilding of bridges, which was crucial in ensuring accessibility of the park. The number of Park staff had increased, although efforts were still underway to fill some of the vacant positions; no information had been provided about whether staff had been deployed in all areas of the property - a crucial element to ensure thorough law enforcement. No information had been received on the continuing problem of funding for the property. With regard to the requested comprehensive wildlife survey, a rapid assessment of wildlife values had been undertaken, providing only limited quantifiable data which could not be used for establishing baselines for key wildlife species. The report acknowledged that wild populations of two of the key

species which contributed to the outstanding universal value of the property, the swamp deer and rhino, were now extinct. For the rhinoceros, a re-introduction programme was underway, with one animal transferred to the property so far and a similar programme could be envisaged for swamp deer. The assessment had not provided new quantified data for tiger and elephant populations but acknowledged that the most recent data available showed significant declines in both species. Further data was needed on the actual status of these species in order to establish a base line for monitoring trends, which could form a basis for a future Decision on a possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The State Party report included little information on the implementation of some of the other recommendations of the 2005 mission.

358. The Delegation of **India** expressed its concern over the IUCN comments as data regarding extinction had not been provided by the State Party. It noted that considerable progress had been made by providing funds and filling vacancies, and that the World Heritage Biodiversity Conservation Project had been approved. It also stated that paragraph 4 was not appropriate, paragraph 5 was acceptable as it stood, and paragraph 6 was not relevant; hence it requested to consider removing the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger at the next session of the Committee.
359. The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with India, and expressed that there were already benchmarks thus there was no need for new ones. It requested the removal of paragraphs 4 and 6.
360. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed concern that the report noted that figures on the elephant population were inconsistent with the previous figures submitted by the State Party.
361. The Delegation of **Israel** said the inconsistency in the figures was embarrassing and that it should be clarified by the State Party.
362. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed that the corrective measures in paragraph 7 should be brought forward to the State Party in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.
363. La délégation du **Bénin** rappelle que l'une des grandes préoccupations de l'UICN était l'affectation de personnel qualifié et demande s'il n'était pas possible d'établir un calendrier pour enlever ce site de la Liste en péril.
364. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that a number of missions had taken place. It said that in view of paragraph 5 a mission should take place and be completed by June next year.
365. La délégation du **Maroc** est d'accord avec la délégation du Bénin sur la nécessité d'établir un calendrier pour envisager d'enlever le site de la Liste en péril. Ceci pourrait même déjà être signalé dans un paragraphe ajouté.
366. The Delegation of **Chile** agreed with the proposal of the United States of America to modify the date of the field visit replacing it with "as soon as possible".
367. The Delegation of **Spain** supported this proposal.
368. **IUCN** noted that the 2005 mission resulted in a series of corrective measures adopted by the Committee. It stressed that the reference made to benchmarks had to be seen in light of the conclusions of the benchmark meeting and should be replaced with new wording, as mentioned at the start of the item. It agreed with Benin that the process for

taking a property off the In Danger list should be formalized and should include a mission to the property.

369. The Delegation of **India** expressed that it was not easy to census elephants due to the large area; hence the figure was not perfect. It said that the census of tigers had been planned by the Indian Tiger Commission and repeated that the State Party had never provided data confirming the extinction of the rhino or swamp deer
370. The Delegation of **Cuba** reiterated the proposal by the Delegation of Kenya.
371. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.11** adopted as amended.

## **CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

#### **The Walled City of Baku with the Shirvanshah's Palace and the Meidan Tower (Azerbaijan) (C 958)**

372. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and recalled that the recent mission had reported some positive developments, including the appointment of a Director for the site, and that the demolitions had officially been halted. However there was still some progress to be made in terms of involving stakeholders and the integrated management plan which was supposed to have been finalized in April 2007 but had not yet been received.
373. The **World Heritage Centre** had been informed by different, independent, sources of a continuous demolition process within the boundary of this World Heritage property. By a letter dated 11 June 2007, the Centre had requested the State Party to clarify the situation and to provide detailed and complete information on any ongoing demolition/construction/reconstruction works and projects in the Walled City of Baku.
374. Invited by the Committee to make a brief statement, the Observer Delegation of **Azerbaijan** thanked the Committee for the attention it had paid to the state of conservation of the property. Recalling the difficult discussions about possible de-listing of the property at Vilnius in 2006, the State Party reported that it had used the ensuing year to clarify and improve the situation. It had appointed a special state commission for the development of the Old Town, undertaken a complete inventory of buildings and prepared a management plan, with the assistance of the World Bank. Acknowledging that the proposal to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger reflected the need for further work, the State Party said it hoped it would be possible for the Committee to remove it from the Danger List at its 32nd session.
375. Replying to a request for clarification on any boundary changes in relation to the buffer zone from the Delegation of Israel, the **World Heritage Centre** said that none had been formally submitted.
376. The Delegation of **Israel** asked that paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision be amended to reflect this. It also requested that the Rapporteur take action to replace 'benchmarks' in paragraph 8 with 'corrective measures'
377. The Delegation of the **United States of America** commended the State Party on the evident progress that had been made but observed that the case demonstrated the

great burden the Committee placed on itself when it inscribed properties in the absence of a management plan.

378. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.26** adopted as amended.

### **Dresden Elbe Valley (Germany) (C 1156)**

379. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and recalled that at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) the Committee had decided to include the property on the In Danger List and to consider de-listing if the construction of the Waldschlösschen Bridge were to go ahead. This was based on the specific bridge project which had been carefully reviewed by an independent study on the impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site which had been inscribed as a cultural landscape. The 2006 Decision also called for other solutions and a dialogue. Intensive consultations had taken place throughout the year, including meetings at UNESCO with specific stakeholders, the parliament and the court. It provided the **Committee** with the following additional information received since the document had been prepared.

380. The World heritage Centre further recalled that the State Party, through the Ambassador of Germany to UNESCO, had transmitted a letter on 2 June 2007 dated 1 June 2007, from the Saxony Ministry for Science and Culture to the Director of the World Heritage Centre and a letter from the Mayor of Dresden dated 21 May 2007 which highlighted the mediation process in December 2006; said that the Saxon Higher Administrative Court on 13 March 2007 had not accepted the proposal for a new solution of the moderated workshop procedure and had decided that construction must take place. On 27 April 2007, the city had announced that a bridge would be constructed at the location foreseen, but that it should comply with the World Heritage status. As a result, the city had commissioned 7 teams to deliver competing designs which would take into account : (i) an integration into the Dresden Valley as a sensitive, moderate addition; (ii) the need for visual relationships to the castles and the silhouette; and (iii) the reduction of the dimensions of the bridge (a reduction of 7.5m of bridge width). On 28 April 2007 a moderated planning workshop at Dresden City Council reviewed possible solutions, basic principles and conditions including minimal impact on landscape, minimization of the bridge and quality design. This was followed on 5 May 2007 by a colloquium between the city council, the commissioned architects and participants of the previous planning workshop. By a letter dated 15 June 2007, the State Party had summarized the situation and in particular the fact that the Federal Constitutional Court's (Bundesverfassungsgericht) decision of 29 May 2007 to reject the city's petition against the building of the bridge (following the decision dated 13 May of the Saxony Constitutional Court) meant that all legal means had been exhausted.

381. Continuing, the World Heritage Centre noted that the all the court decisions had focused on the procedures and not on the content and that this raised questions about the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in Germany regarding the different levels of federal state, regional land and the site/city level. In spite of all the legal and court decisions (the last court decision of the administrative Court of Dresden was dated 19 June 2007), the City of Dresden had continued its search for a compromise and alternative solutions. In particular, at an expert meeting on 8 June 2007 with architects, planners and other professionals the City had opted for two new design proposals which were now available: (i) by Schlaich/Bergemann and partner (Stuttgart) for a lighter and as unobtrusive bridge as possible with minimal visual relationships with the silhouette of the city centre (slim support, optimal height and

continued into the Fetscherstrasse on the south bank and disappears into tunnel on north side) and (ii) Slobek. New investigations had also been made about the feasibility of a tunnel – however, the letter mentions difficulties for the inclusion of pedestrians. The Mayor had issued an appeal “that the people of Dresden value the World Heritage site and requests that the new design be considered.”

382. In closing its presentation, the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that a mission to Germany for the European Union meeting on World Heritage on 13 and 14 June 2007, had permitted it to have final consultations with the German authorities prior to this meeting, including the Federal Minister for Transport, Mr Tiefensee, who had made a public appeal to the Government of Saxony for a dialogue and solution of the case. The Draft Decision did not include any of the potential solutions of either a revised bridge or a tunnel option so far – as neither the World Heritage Centre nor ICOMOS knew whether they were feasible (including legally) under the current situation. This was significant because de-listing under paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines* had far reaching consequences beyond the case under discussion and the task for all stakeholders in the 1972 *Convention* was to safeguard the sites of Outstanding Universal Value.
383. Invited by the Committee to make a statement, the Observer Delegation of **Germany** noted that the judicial process had been exhausted and that there was currently no legal possibility for the city to present alternative solutions. However, it was important to note that the court decisions did not concern the substance of the matter but only a question of a temporary injunction against the construction of the bridge. The State Party was determined to find a solution to protect the property and at the same time meet the transport needs of the residents. It expressed that it hoped to be able to turn the situation around, as it had with Cologne Cathedral but to do so, it needed more time. The many people who were looking for compromise needed to see both a strong message and a sign of flexibility from the Committee.
384. The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification from the State Party about whether it would be possible to hold a second referendum on the protection outstanding universal value of the property.
385. The Delegation of **Lithuania** noted that opinions in Germany were clearly divided. However, the dialogue underway opened up the possibility of compromise. It recommended that the Committee should encourage this while sending a strong message. It noted with interest that one of the options included the construction of a tunnel and requested more information about this from the concerned Non-Governmental Organisation currently present in the room.
386. The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled that it had taken a strong position on this case at the 30th session in 2006 and had advocated de-listing. While it had not changed its position, it acknowledged that the State Party was making an effort and that it would therefore be wrong to de-list before an irreversible Decision had been taken. It supported the position of Lithuania.
387. The Delegation of **Norway** raised a point of order and asked for answers to the questions raised before proceeding further.
388. La délégation du **Bénin** demande que les commentaires de l'Etat partie soient acceptés avant l'intervention des membres du Comité.
389. The **Observer Delegation of Germany** informed the Committee that the City Council could decide by a two-thirds majority to hold a further referendum on the issue. A representative of the Tunnel Initiative said that opinion polls showed 60% support for a



tunnel should this protect the Outstanding Universal Value. It believed that a strong message from the Committee stating that this was a viable solution could assure the necessary two-thirds majority required for another referendum.

390. La délégation du **Maroc** considère que la décision qui va être prise est fondamentale car elle va créer un précédent important. L'Etat partie espère que d'autres solutions vont être trouvées, le tunnel semblant être une bonne alternative. La délégation pose la question de savoir si le nouveau pont proposé répond aux attentes et souhaite avoir des précisions sur les documents en cours d'examen. Une clarification est demandée au Centre du patrimoine mondial ainsi qu'à l'ICOMOS.
391. The **World Heritage Centre** remarked that the information it had received had not been in either of the working languages. The summary provided through the working document focussed on the content of the proposals, rather than the legal cases, which it considered to be of more help to the Committee.
392. **ICOMOS** said that as the property had been inscribed as a cultural landscape, any solution must respect that landscape. While the new information about the tunnel was heartening, its feasibility and impact on the Outstanding Universal Value would have to be investigated.
393. The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that according to the *Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines* responsibility for adhering to its provisions lay with the State Party. The complexities of the present case suggested that the Committee may wish to consider requiring all levels of government within a State Party to co-sign the *Convention*. Continuing, it proposed that the Committee may wish to apply the reinforced monitoring mechanism.
394. The Delegation of **India** sought clarification as to whether the new design for the bridge would affect the Outstanding Universal Value and supported the proposal to apply the reinforced monitoring mechanism.
395. The **World Heritage Centre** agreed that the case showed that there may be a need for a seminar to examine the implementation of the *Convention* in Federal systems. It said that the available evidence was that while the revised design of the bridge would be an improvement, it was not optimal in terms of avoiding any impact on Outstanding Universal Value.
396. The Delegation of **Canada** said that the debate should focus on Outstanding Universal Value. It was emphasized that the Decision taken at Vilnius (2006) was a valid one and should stand. It added that if that bridge were to be built, the property should, regrettably, be de-listed. However, the Delegation went on to say that it was heartening to see alternative proposals in prospect and these should be factored into the Draft Decision. Continuing, it offered a personal observation that no bridge could fail to have an impact on Outstanding Universal Value, and that a tunnel seemed instinctively preferable.
397. La délégation de **Tunisie** est très sensible aux efforts faits par la ville de Dresde, qui illustre la prise de conscience des citoyens pour le patrimoine mondial. La situation actuelle pose des problèmes juridiques, tandis que la technique semble pouvoir apporter une solution. L'Etat partie propose que, dans la mesure de ses possibilités, le Comité intervienne clairement auprès des autorités allemandes compétentes pour trouver une solution.
398. La délégation de **Madagascar** rappelle que sa position très stricte de l'année passée, et soutient celle du Kenya. Le creusement d'un tunnel est une alternative. Cependant,

le site est inscrit comme un paysage culturel, et toute intervention comme les entrées de tunnel, même dans la zone tampon, peut avoir des conséquences. L'Etat partie considère que la présence d'un pont est de toute façon inacceptable et implique le retrait de la liste du patrimoine mondial.

399. La délégation du **Bénin** rappelle que le Comité est pour la première fois confronté à un tel choix. La valeur universelle exceptionnelle d'un bien reste la base pour toute décision. Il convient que le Comité agisse avec fermeté, tout en gardant une certaine ouverture pour d'autres options.
400. The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that the *Convention* had two primary goals: the first was to identify and inscribe properties of Outstanding Universal Value; the second was to conserve them. The trend in favour of the first represented a backward step and there was a need to put conservation back into prime position. Continuing, it said that while the *Convention* did provide for de-listing, that far-reaching step had not yet been taken. It observed that the State Party in question had dedicated itself to conservation. Others had not. It therefore seemed strange to launch the process of de-listing in this case. It further observed that the Committee, in seeking to direct the design and zoning, was showing signs of trespassing on issues of sovereignty. Finally, it sought clarification from the State Party as to whether one year would be sufficient to arrive at a Decision.
401. Replying, the Observer Delegation of **Germany** confirmed that one year would permit it to make the basic political decisions. But it would not be sufficient to address all the issues related to zoning.
402. The Delegation of **Chile** considered that the site remained in danger. The State Party was concerned by paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision. It considered that the Decision for de-listing was inappropriate and asked to delete the last paragraph.
403. The Delegation of **New Zealand** aligned itself with those of Canada and Benin on the need to focus on Outstanding Universal Value. It had not yet disappeared and New Zealand wished to encourage the exploration of viable alternatives.
404. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** agreed that the Committee should focus on the credibility of the World Heritage List. In that respect, it drew attention to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision which made the construction of the bridge the condition for de-listing. This was a subjective criterion. It advised that a Decision to de-list should come as a result of deliberation by the Committee and not as the outcome of an automatic process.
405. La délégation du **Bénin** considère que c'est au Comité d'être ferme et d'imposer des délais pour l'Allemagne. Il convient de maintenir une certaine pression jusqu'à la prochaine session du Comité.
406. The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with that of Benin on the need to be firm. It urged the Committee to give the State Party just one more year.
407. The Delegation of **Peru** wished to have a general reflection on the issue. It questioned how it would be possible to protect World Heritage properties without taking into account the evolution of the general public society, and also how to combine protection and progress.
408. The Delegation of **Canada** thanked the World Heritage Centre, and in particular Dr Rossler, for the extraordinary work undertaken in the past year in representing the Committee's Decision to the State Party.

409. The Delegation of **India** did not support the deletion of paragraph 7 from the Draft Decision and expressed support for the proposals of Canada and Lithuania.
410. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the Canadian proposal was generally acceptable.
411. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested invoking the reinforced monitoring mechanism.
412. The Delegation of **Cuba** wished to highlight that the site had been inscribed under criterion (iv) and further stressed that the Committee had to be certain that the property had lost the Outstanding Universal Value defined at the time of inscription.
413. The Delegation of **Spain** considered that the World Heritage Committee was responsible for the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and supported the decision for delisting if the bridge were to be constructed. It believed other options were possible and the technical solution of the tunnel could be a viable alternative. It suggested that this solution should be examined by the Committee and that Committee could consider indicating through its Decision that the tunnel option appeared to be the best solution for ensuring the protection of the *World Heritage Convention*.
414. The Delegation of **Kuwait** recalled that de-listing represented a last resort. It supported and encouraged further pursuit of the steps the State Party was taking to prevent loss of the Outstanding Universal Value, so that the Committee and Advisory Bodies could evaluate the impact of the proposed alternatives on Outstanding Universal Value. The State Party should be accorded a further year to do so.
415. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision, paragraph by paragraph and, noting that there was a consensus on the first 4 paragraphs 1 to 4, declared them provisionally adopted without amendments.
416. Following debate and interventions by the **Rapporteur**, and the Delegations of **Lithuania, Israel, the United States of America, India, Chile, Kenya, Benin, New Zealand, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, Cuba, Morocco, ICOMOS** and the Observer Delegation of **Germany**, the Committee adopted amendments to paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 of the Draft Decision.
417. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.27** adopted as amended.

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

418. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation of the property by introducing a brief report from the UNESCO Office in Venice, on mission in Kosovo at the time, to evaluate the situation of the cultural heritage in Kosovo. The mission had visited 3 out of the 4 parts of the World Heritage property and paid particular attention to the **Decani Monastery**. It concluded that the grenade attack to Dečani Monastery which took place on 31 March 2007 had caused only minor damage to the main fencing of the wall and that observation and patrolling points in the Decani Valley had since been reinforced.
419. Concerning the **Bogorodica Ljeviska Church**, certain activities had been carried out to implement the decisions of the Committee concerning the protection of the building and to improve monitoring, including a video monitoring by the local police station of the monument. Concerning the Patriarchate of Peć Monastery, it appeared unchanged, only a wall between the monastery and the road above had been constructed to reinforce security.

420. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.28** adopted.

## **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

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

421. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property, recalling the main threats for which the property had been inscribed on the List of the World Heritage in Danger, namely the extremely fragile nature of the buildings; the lack of maintenance for 40 years; the vandalism due to looting of re-usable materials and the damage caused by the wind. As a general remark, the report submitted by the State Party responded to the general situation of the property and it pointed out that the struggle against the dismantling and theft of materials was continuing and, with regards to the implementation of the Management Plan, it showed that the legal framework, the administrative procedures and the core principles of the plans had started. Moreover, an architect and an industrial civil engineer had been appointed.
422. The Delegation of **the Republic of Korea** sought clarification on how a property could simultaneously be inscribed on the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Chairperson explained that this had happened on a number of occasions where a particular property was considered to have Outstanding Universal Value but where its state of conservation was severely threatened. ICOMOS said that in this case, the extremely fragile state of the industrial buildings had indicated the need for Danger Listing, which had happened with the full consent of the State Party, observing that Danger Listing could be a powerful tool for mobilizing further resources for conservation.
423. The Delegation of **Chile** thanked the members of the mission. This site was the only Chilean property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It informed the Committee that works were currently underway with the Public Works Ministry and that funding for the implementation of several projects had become available.
424. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.29** adopted.

### **Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) C 366**

425. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property, in particular by recalling the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission, carried out in February 2007, which observed a variety of decay phenomena and processes caused by both from natural and cultural factors that could threaten the outstanding universal value, authenticity and integrity of the property. As was noted at the time of inscription, the earthen architecture of the site was extremely fragile and systematic and continuous maintenance is needed to comprehensively address these conditions. The Centre also recalled the problems caused by the variety of roads surrounding the property.
426. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked to what extent the road building referred to in the report had affected the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and why the Draft Decision did not refer to the need for a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.
427. The Delegation of **Peru** thanked the members of the missions and called attention to the fact that the property was faced with serious problems linked to climate change and urbanization. The State Party confirmed that it was taking into account the recommendations of the mission, and local consultations were currently underway.
428. Referring to the comments made by the Delegation of the United States of America, the Delegation of **Israel** said that the Committee should be systematically informed, for each property, of the existence of a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Continuing, it said that the important differences between the authenticity and integrity of earthen structures and urban development should be reflected in the Decision.
429. The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its concern due to the fact that the site had been registered on the World Heritage List in Danger for many years. The property was still faced with urban expansion and the Delegation mentioned that the question remains whether some areas could be open to the public in the future, as well as the continuation of the current excavations.
430. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.
431. The Committee adopted amendments proposed by the Delegation of **Israel**.
432. La délégation de **Tunisie** considère que la décision ne doit pas mentionner que l'Etat partie doit mettre en œuvre les recommandations de la mission, alors que la Délégation du Pérou a annoncé son désir de mettre en œuvre ces mêmes recommandations.
433. The **Chairperson** ruled that the paragraph had already been adopted and could not be changed.
434. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.30** adopted as amended and closed the session.

The session rose at 1.15 p.m.

**SECOND DAY – MONDAY, 25 JUNE 2007**

**FIFTH MEETING**

**3.00 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

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

**LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN**

**Coro and its Port (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) C 658**

435. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property and informed the Committee that the State Party had sent a letter to the World Heritage Centre, dated 30 May 2007, requesting the opportunity for further debates on the findings and recommendations of the abovementioned technical assistance mission undertaken in the framework of the France-UNESCO *Convention*. The Committee was to be informed about the revised Decision.
436. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed concern that the local community did not appear to be involved with the conservation management of the property, nor aware of the basic conservation management concerns. It also expressed misgivings that inappropriate materials (such as concrete and acrylic paint) had been used in “conservation” work.
437. **ICOMOS** concurred with the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Kenya and stated that this was why a conservation management plan for the property was required as provided for in the proposed Draft Decision.
438. The Delegation of **Chile** requested to hear from the State Party.
439. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested clarification of the need for the proposed reactive monitoring mission, when a mission had visited the site in 2006.
440. The **World Heritage Centre** responded that the 2006 mission had been a technical mission undertaken within the framework of the France-UNESCO *Convention*, not a reactive monitoring mission authorized by the Committee.
441. The Delegation of **Venezuela** expressed satisfaction for the modifications that were added to the report by the World Heritage Centre and to the revised document that was circulated in the room. It welcomed and invited a monitoring mission so that the implementation of the management plan could be fully verified.
442. The **Rapporteur** read an amendment of the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Kenya which was a new paragraph requesting the State Party to verify whether the materials used for restoration works were compatible with accepted intervention techniques. He then read a further amendment of the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of the United States of America.
443. The **Committee** approved both amendments.
444. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.31** adopted as amended.

## AFRICA

### Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323)

445. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property. The report summarized the main threat for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger as being the major deterioration of the palaces following the 1984 tornado and restoration without respect for the authenticity of materials, volumes or colours. The following benchmarks for removal from the List in Danger and according to the Decision **28COM 15A.14** were introduced:
- Establishment of national legal and administrative mechanisms regulating the protection of Benin’s cultural heritage
  - Approval by the Committee of new boundaries for the property and its buffer zone

- Completion and adoption of the conservation and management plan
  - Restoration of at least half of the structural elements considered to be in a serious state of degradation.
446. **ICOMOS** congratulated the State Party for the finalization of its very detailed management plan, which expressed very clearly the involvement of all the stakeholders.
447. The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated the State Party, thanking Norway for the support obtained and requested the removal of the property from the World Heritage List in Danger.
448. The Delegation of **Israel** commended the task undertaken by the World Heritage Centre which was crucial in obtaining the results expected by the Committee.
449. The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the efforts made by the State Party and underlined the vital support received by international co-operation in the framework of the Africa 2009 Programme, since the site manager is a participant of the mentioned programme. It requested corrections concerning the boundaries of the property as shown in the management plan as well as in the Action Plan.
450. La délégation du **Madagascar** s'associe aux propos exprimés par la délégation du Kenya.
451. La délégation du **Bénin** remercie au nom de son gouvernement le Comité pour cette décision qui doit se lire comme une victoire de tous. Elle rappelle le long chemin des 22 ans d'inscription sur la Liste en péril, au cours duquel les capacités africaines et la conscience patrimoniale du Bénin ont été renforcés. Elle souligne que ceci n'aurait pas pu être possible sans l'aide de la communauté internationale et notamment de la Norvège, du Japon, de la France, de l'Italie, des Etats-Unis d'Amérique et de la Suède, qu'elle tient à remercier encore une fois. Elle loue le Comité et les organisations consultatives pour la patience dont ils ont fait preuve face à la lenteur administrative du Bénin. Elle conclut en affirmant que le gouvernement du Bénin va pleinement coopérer avec le Comité pour maintenir cette décision.
452. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.14** adopted.

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



453. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and exposed the threats for which the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the reasons for a continuing deterioration and serious threats affecting the property. The most significant threats were noted as: ruins damaged by sea erosion; collapsing monuments; a lack of clear boundaries; out of date legal framework; and Kilwa Kiwinje not being included in the property's boundaries. Corrective measures were mentioned as: updating of Outstanding Universal Value,; the delineation of boundaries for core and buffer zone; implementation of the management plan; and feasible extension of the property.
454. The Delegation of **Kenya** underlined the importance of the site and the need for international assistance due to the sea erosion and the land moving effect which affects the stability of the main structure of the Fort. It stated that a fund should be set up and the priority actions undertaken as to put the management plan into action.
455. The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** thanked the Government of New Zealand for its hospitality. It clearly expressed the need to obtain more assistance from the international community in order to help reduce the threat affecting the property.
456. **ICOMOS** underlined that substantial funds were required to support conservation activities as elaborated in the 10 years Conservation Plan.
457. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.15** adopted.

## **ARAB STATES**

### **Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)**

458. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation, raising many issues, namely the rising ground water level and lack of consolidation, conservation, protection and management measures. It further explained that the project to lower the water level based on a detailed soil and survey investigation was being finalized. However, a rapid condition survey of all excavated remains and urgent conservation, establishment of a buffer zone and preparation of a conservation and management plan were all matters of urgency.
459. The Delegation of **Israel** requested a coherent use of terminology.
460. The **United States of America** proposed to amend the Draft Decision and to include the standard United States of America amendment in the text.
461. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.16** adopted as amended.

### **Ashur (Qala'at Sherqat) (Iraq) (C 1130)**

462. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and introduced the current threats, such as the conflict situation in the country, a lack of conservation and management planning and fragile mud brick structures. It also recalled that no written report had been received by the World Heritage Centre, which was however informed by the State Party that such a report could not be produced within the present conditions in the country.
463. The Delegation of **India** requested the comments from the State Party. It speculated whether this was a case in which the reinforced monitoring mechanism could be

implemented and suggested adding text to the decision similar to that adopted for Dresden.

464. La Délégation du **Maroc** s'associe à la demande avancée par la Délégation de l'Inde d'écouter la réaction de l'Etat partie. Elle demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial de clarifier si les informations que celui-ci a reçues après la préparation du rapport sont en mesure de modifier le projet de décision contenu dans le document de travail.
465. The **Chairperson** requested if there was any amendment from India.
466. The Delegation of **India** asked the Rapporteur to read the amended Decision.
467. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed concern about the implementation of the follow up of the Decision within the State Party. It suggested reflecting on whether this could be a special case to be undertaken with the new mechanism of reinforced monitoring.
468. The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** explained that USD 50,000 had been allocated to avoiding damage caused by the rise of the water level foreseen due to the building of a dam, now abandoned.
469. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to include the United States of America amendment.
470. En réponse à la demande de clarification posée par la délégation du Maroc, le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** précise que les nouvelles informations reçues ne changent pas la substance du rapport, ni le fond du projet de décision en discussion. Il rappelle en outre les efforts accomplis par le bureau de l'UNESCO pour l'Iraq à Amman même s'il se révèle très compliqué de vérifier et d'assurer la mise en œuvre des activités planifiées à cause de l'impossibilité de se rendre sur place. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial précise qu'il est en contact régulier avec le Département des antiquités irakiennes.

471. The **Rapporteur** confirmed that the amended Decision would include the reference to the new reinforced monitoring mechanism as in the case of Dresden.
472. The Delegation of **Canada** stated the need to be sure about the conditions for a mission, before dispatching a team.
473. The Delegation of **India** requested the opinion of the State Party as had been in the case of Germany.
474. La délégation du **Maroc** exprime son accord sur le principe d'appliquer le mécanisme de suivi renforcé mais, à la lumière des graves difficultés que vit actuellement le pays, demande si les moyens à dispositions sont suffisants pour garantir la mise en œuvre d'un tel mécanisme.
475. The Delegation of **Iraq** agreed to include the mention of the mechanism.
476. La **Sous-directrice générale pour la culture** précise qu'en conformité aux règles en vigueur pour le personnel des Nations unies, aucun membre du Centre du patrimoine mondial de l'UNESCO n'est autorisé à rentrer en Irak.
477. The Delegation of **India** suggested writing the statement in conditional form "...when conditions allow...".
478. The Delegation of the **United States of America** wondered if this request went beyond the prerogatives of the World Heritage Committee.
479. The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the statement made by the Delegation of the United States of America suggested waiting a year.
480. The Delegation of **India** withdrew its comment.
481. The **Rapporteur** confirmed that there will be no reference to the reinforced monitoring mechanism and explained that the revised Decision would only include the amendment proposed by the United States of America.
482. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.17** adopted as amended.

### **Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)**

483. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, underlying the main issues as being: the deterioration of the traditional urban fabric; the loss of integrity and authenticity; socio-economic degradation; and lack of urban regulations for the historic core. An ICOMOS/World Heritage Centre mission took place in January 2007 and it confirmed that the city was in decline, with little conservation framework in place, with more than 50% of the buildings within the city walls now built of concrete. Furthermore, the lack of active maintenance and the poor quality and uncontrolled nature of modern construction mean that there was little confidence that the situation could be reversed.
484. The Delegation of **Kuwait** expressed concern regarding the increased deterioration suffered by the property. It underlined the lack of human and financial resources in the Arab States and Africa. It then affirmed that the Government of Yemen had tried to do its best to improve the conditions of the site notably through the new framework of co-operation signed with the German Development Agency (GTZ). It proposed that the Committee request the State Party to implement corrective measures for three years

time, but with the submission of an annual report on the state of advancement of the process.

485. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed concern about this alarming situation and asked the representative of ICOMOS if the Outstanding Universal Value of the site was still intact, taking into account that 50% of the constructed heritage had disappeared. It wondered whether a mission should be sent in three years time.
486. La délégation du **Maroc** partage l'avis exprimé par la délégation du Koweït. Elle rappelle le prêt de 10 millions de dollars EU récemment pris par l'Etat partie et souligne la nécessité d'assurer le soutien technique et financier du Centre. Elle exprime son soutien à la proposition de reporter à trois ans le retrait du bien de la Liste comme il a été proposé par la délégation du Koweït car elle considère que le délai d'un an n'est certainement pas suffisant. Mais elle souligne l'importance de maintenir la proposition d'organiser une mission technique du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle conclut en invitant le Centre du patrimoine mondial à s'occuper davantage de ce bien.
487. The Delegation of **Kenya** speculated whether the transformation was reversible or if on the contrary it affected the authenticity and integrity of the property. A statement from ICOMOS was requested on the Outstanding Universal Value. Two years was considered as the appropriate timeframe for the State Party to find a solution.
488. La délégation du **Bénin** demande au Comité de poursuivre dans son aide au Yémen et lance un appel à la communauté internationale pour ne pas laisser seul l'Etat partie face aux défis.
489. The Delegation of **Canada** had the same concerns about the Outstanding Universal Value as Lithuania and Kenya. It expressed its reservation for the GTZ project. Sometimes, it stated, these programmes cause more damage than benefit. It suggested that the World Heritage Centre work with the GTZ in order to assure that no more damage could affect the property, and to take into account the Outstanding Universal Value in the decision-making process.
490. La délégation de la **Tunisie** rappelle qu'outre de graves problèmes économiques, le pays connaît aussi des problèmes éducationnels dans la perspective de la conscience patrimoniale. A cet égard, elle souligne l'urgence de prévoir une formation sur le sujet de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Elle conclut en s'associant aux propos tenus par les délégations du Kenya et du Maroc.
491. The Delegation of **New Zealand** noticed the contradiction between paragraphs 5b and 7 of the Draft Decision.
492. The Delegation of **India** agreed with New Zealand's observation and requested explanation from ICOMOS concerning the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.
493. The Delegation of the **United States of America** agreed with India and New Zealand. It pointed out that the State Party had not followed the precedent recommendations. It expressed concern for the time frame for the implementation of the Decision by the State Party as the information received was poor. It therefore suggested a deadline of one year.
494. The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of India to submit an amendment in case it wanted to include any reference to the extra-budgetary funds.
495. The Delegation of **Israel** requested to include the standard paragraph of the United States of America. It implored that a declaration of the Outstanding Universal Value,

statement of significance and the justification of the inscription should be submitted by the State Party in one year's time.

496. **ICOMOS** stated that this was a matter of concern. According to the representative from ICOMOS, it is necessary to establish management and conservation programmes as a matter of urgency. Over the last 15 years the physical fabric had deteriorated and a process of degradation increased in severity. Therefore a clear baseline on how to reverse the deterioration was included in the mission report. After the mission it was felt necessary to adopt urgent measures within a period of one year to try to reverse to trend. It recommended the establishment of a close co-operation with those responsible for the GTZ programme and this should be coordinated very closely with the detailed actions set-up in the Action Plan.
497. The **Chairperson**, noting no further requests from the floor on the first 4 paragraphs of the draft decision under discussion, declared them adopted and proposed to proceed with the following paragraphs still to be adopted.
498. La délégation du **Maroc** exprime sa perplexité par rapport au paragraphe 4 du projet de décision en discussion, notamment quand il reporte la perte chiffré à 50% du tissu urbain traditionnel à l'intérieur des remparts de la ville. Elle suggère donc de remplacer le pourcentage cité dans le paragraphe avec les mots « nombre considérable », vu qu'il n'y a pas de repères substantiels.
499. The **Chairperson** apologized but paragraph 4 had been approved before the suggestion coming from the Delegate of Morocco and went along with the approval of the remaining paragraphs.
500. **ICOMOS** expressed agreement with paragraph 5.
501. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared paragraph 5 adopted.
502. The **Rapporteur** started to read the amendments proposed by the Delegation of Canada.
503. On a point of order, the Delegation of the **United States of America** requested information concerning the previous decisions concerning this property adopted in Durban and in Vilnius during the 29th and 30th sessions of the Committee, in particular asking what of the actions adopted at that time had not been implemented.
504. **ICOMOS** recalled that the recommendation adopted in Durban had not been implemented, and regretted that the request concerning the urban regulation had not been addressed, nor the violations in the urban space. It further recalled that the mission the main action that was recommended by the Committee at its 30th session in Vilnius, as a means of setting all these recommendations into context.
505. The **Rapporteur** read the proposal made by the Delegation of Canada for an addition coming before paragraph 6 which should read "request the World Heritage Centre to contact the German Development Agency to explain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and encourages the protection of these values in the urban development plan". He then read the suggestion submitted by the Delegation of India to amend the Draft Decision, which shall read: "Calls upon the States Parties to the *Convention*, especially from the region, to consider extra budgetary funding to implement urgent actions to ensure the retention of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property".

506. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared approved the amendments proposed by Canada and India just read by the Rapporteur as well as paragraph 6.
507. The **Rapporteur** then read out the amendment proposed by the Delegation of New Zealand to paragraph 7, which should now read: "Decides to retain the Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) on the List of World Heritage in Danger for a further 2 year with a view to re-considering, in the light of the State Party's report, whether it might justify eventual removal from the World Heritage List at its 33rd session in 2009". The Rapporteur then read the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Kuwait, which should read "for a further 3 year period subject to regular reporting on the part of the State Party as to the progress of the implementation of the activities listed in paragraph 5 above; the State Party reports shall be reviewed by the Committee on a yearly basis to consider the possibility of eventual removal from the World Heritage List at its 34th session in 2010".
508. The Delegation of **Kenya** stressed the inconsistency between the 2 years timeframe stated in paragraph 5, as for the possible reversal of the physical degradation and the one year period given to the State Party before consideration of a possible removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger by the Committee. It further said that the same timeframe agreed upon by the Committee in paragraph 5 should be also reflected at the end of the decision. Therefore, it supported the proposal made by Kuwait with regards to the continuous assessment of the property, by requesting the State Party to submit reports on a periodical basis, but proposed to retain the property on the List in Danger for a 2 year period before considering its possible removal from the World Heritage List.
509. The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the principle contained in the proposal made by New Zealand, and suggesting amending the date to 2009 by inserting a period after the sentence "eventual removal from the World Heritage List," so to have no reference to a specific session therefore allowing the Committee to address the issue at what time it deemed proper.
510. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that paragraph 7 mentioned "removal" instead of "deletion" which was the correct wording. It further said that there was no inconsistency between the 2 years quoted in paragraph 5 for the reversal of the current situation and the possibility of a further degradation that would further impact the Outstanding Universal Value within a year, as reflected in paragraph 7 as originally drafted.
511. The delegation of **India** supported the proposal of New Zealand as amended by the United States of America and requested a clarification on the timeframe of the actions to be undertaken by the State Party to reverse the physical degradation, on one hand, and the period of time given before considering the possible removal of the property from the World Heritage List.
512. The Delegation of **Kuwait** wanted to retain the site on the World Heritage List in Danger for the following three years, which should allow the State Party to undertake the actions requested with the limited amount of finances just received by the donor. It underlined the need to give a chance to the State Party to implement the actions and recommendations, subject to the submission of annual reports.
513. **ICOMOS** confirmed that no information had been received from the State Party and recalled the development approaches that oriented the Action Plan quoted in paragraph 5, approaches that ICOMOS considered manageable.

514. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported once again the proposal submitted by Kuwait with the 3 years timeframe reduced to a 2 year period.
515. The **Chairperson** noting that consensus was reached on the principle of retaining the property on the List in Danger for a period longer than one year as originally suggested in the text submitted by the World Heritage Centre and he drew the attention of the Committee on the exact amount of additional time given to the State Party, whether 2 years as suggested by some Delegations or 3 years as suggested by other Delegations. In this regard, he observed that the majority of interventions agreed on the possibility of retaining the property for a further 2 years and proposed to adopt the Kuwait amendment by reducing the timeframe to 2 years.
516. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled its previous intervention noting that “deletion” was the correct wording.
517. Se référant à la formulation du paragraphe 7, la délégation du **Maroc** signale que le texte parle de demande à l'Etat partie de la soumission d'un rapport tous les ans « en vue d'un possible retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial » et rappelle que la soumission de rapports n'est pas en vue du retrait mais pourrait avoir comme conséquence le retrait d'un bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle suggère donc de corriger la formulation du texte du paragraphe.
518. The **Rapporteur** reformulated the amendment by proposing to split the text in two different sentences, the first one on the retention of the property on the List in Danger for a further 2 year period, subject to a regular reporting and a second sentence on the consideration of eventual deletion.
519. The Chairperson declared adopted paragraph 7 and Decision **31 COM 7A.19** adopted as amended.

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam (Afghanistan) (C 211 rev)

520. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and focused the attention of the Committee on the main threats: lack of legal protection; lack of a comprehensive management plan; and the minaret's inclination. The World Heritage Centre underlined the need for: the construction of a footbridge across the Hari River, in order to facilitate villagers' access from the Bedam Valley to the Jam Valley, as well as allowing a limited number of vehicles to cross the river; and improving the conservation measures and implementation of the corrective measures for possible removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.
521. The Delegation of **Kenya** complained about the technical wording, especially with regards to the reference to spring, which varies following the regions of the world.
522. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested additional information to clarify point 5, and the Delegate proposed to include Outstanding Universal Value “indicators” instead of “benchmarks” and to amend point 6b 3; otherwise the United States of America paragraph would be included.
523. The **World Heritage Centre** expressed the need to propose more precise limits on the site.

524. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to request the State Party to submit comprehensive documentation of the site and surrounding area since this issue had not been included in the Draft Decision.
525. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Israel where it wanted to include the amendment.
526. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that this issue was already reflected in paragraph 6c.
527. The Delegation of **Israel** withdrew its amendment.
528. The Delegation of **Chile** expressed its perplexity regarding the considerable amount of measures that the State Party should undertake as described in the Draft Decision. With this perspective, it underlined the difficulties that the State Party would encounter in implementing them all.
529. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.20** adopted as amended.

#### **Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley (Aghanistan) (C 208 rev)**

530. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property underlying the need for: site security; long-term stability of the Giant Buddha niches; conservation of archaeological remains and mural paintings; and implementation of the management plan and cultural master plan for the protective zoning plan. The World Heritage Centre described the ongoing UNESCO operations for the conservation of the property with Japanese Funds-in-Trust, supporting the corrective measures.
531. Se référant à la décision prise au sujet de la Ville historique de Zabid, Yémen, la délégation du **Bénin** souligne la nécessité pour les organisations consultatives d'uniformiser le temps alloué dans la mise en œuvre des mesures demandées aux Etats parties, de façon à éviter une diversité de traitement entre les différents pays.
532. The **United States of America** proposed to amend the Draft Decision with the United States of America text on Outstanding Universal Value.
533. **ICOMOS** explained the state of progress of some interventions undertaken in the Valley by ICOMOS experts funded by Germany.
534. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.21** adopted as amended.

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

535. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property underlining the need to improve the site security, the long-term stability of the Giant Buddha niches, the conservation of archaeological remains and mural paintings, as well as the implementation of the management plan and Cultural Master Plan (the protective zoning plan). The property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2004 and a minor extension of core and buffer zones submitted on 1 February 2007.
536. The Delegation of **India** asked if the State Party was in the room.



537. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested to include the amendment that it had submitted.
538. The Delegation of **Canada** requested clarification of the term “protection” with reference to the Draft Decision. It questioned whether it was a matter of security, in which case, it would have been better to specify as such.
539. The **World Heritage Centre** replied that there was also a need to ensure the legal protection of the property in the landscape areas outside the citadel of Bam.
540. The Observer Delegation of **Iran** expressed gratitude for the hospitality received from the New Zealand authorities. It informed the Committee that its country was facing major problems in relation to ethics and doctrine in conservation. It expressed thanks for the support obtained by international co-operation and universities. It continued by informing the Committee of the good results obtained from the international meetings and confirmed the decision of the State Party to continue organizing international meetings to reflect upon conservation issues. It further noted that the State Party was in a position to achieve the benchmarks fixed by the Committee.
541. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.22** adopted as amended.

#### **Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) (C 121 bis)**

542. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, recalling that at its 30th Session (Vilnius, 2006), the Committee had requested the Centre to undertake a reactive monitoring mission to examine progress on the benchmarks required to remove the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission was undertaken and concluded that all benchmarks had been met.
543. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the positive report of the much improved state of conservation of the property.
544. The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the State Party on its success in meeting the desired state of conservation.
545. The Delegation of the **United States of America** also commended the State Party.
546. The Observer Delegation of **Nepal** thanked the Committee and the Centre for their support in reversing the long-standing conservation problems at the seven monument zones which comprise the property explaining that at the international level, the Government of Nepal had worked together with the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and donor governments, in particular, the Netherlands. At the national level, the effort had been inter-ministerial. At the grass-roots level, cooperation with municipal governments and local communities had been exemplary.
547. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7A.23** adopted and removed the property from the World Heritage List in Danger.

#### **Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore (Pakistan) C 171**

548. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the two sites composing the property, and explained that the main issue at the Shalamar Gardens had been the partial destruction of the garden’s historic hydraulic system. The Centre reported that the hydraulic system had been repaired, and that

management plans for both had been drafted and adopted by the Government of Pakistan. However, the World Heritage Centre reported that problems still remained concerning the widening of The Great Trunk Road near the Shalamar Gardens, and the lack of buffer zones at both sites.

549. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to add to the Draft Decision its usual amendment concerning the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
550. The Delegation of **Spain** asked for clarification on the proposed reactive monitoring mission, and suggested that the mission team should include an ICOMOS historic garden expert.
551. The **World Heritage Centre** assured the Delegation of Spain that the ICOMOS participation on the foreseen reactive monitoring mission would include expertise on the conservation of historic gardens.
552. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.24** adopted as amended.

## Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras (Philippines) (C22)

553. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and pointed out that the main issues flagged were : the unmanaged development of modern infrastructure including the lack of systematic EIA; the lack of site maintenance; and the continuing absence of an effective management system. The World Heritage Centre further informed the Committee that no substantial progress had been made in implementing the corrective measures identified in April 2006.
554. The Delegation of **Chile** asked if there was a difference between the proposed Draft Decision for the Rice Terraces and previous Decisions that included a long list of corrective actions and indicators.
555. The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the previously identified actions and indicators, included in Decision **30 COM 7A.28** were very difficult for the State Party to implement and therefore the proposed Draft Decision included a review and revision of the action plan, indicators and timetable.
556. The Delegation of **India** expressed disappointment at the negative and discouraging tone of the report and Draft Decision, and asked for the State Party to take the floor to express its view.
557. The Delegation of **Lithuania** noted that a local culture heritage management office had recently been created and asked for clarification from the State Party as to the status and functions of this bureau.
558. The Delegation of **Kenya** outlined the economic aspect of difficulties associated with the conservation of the Rice Terraces, and requested information insight into the economic incentives which the State Party envisaged could result in the retention of the indigenous population in the Terraces.
559. The Observer Delegation of the **Philippines** reaffirmed its commitment to the principles of the *World Heritage Convention* and thanked the Committee for its concern and assistance. The State Party outlined the corrective measures taken. These included: the establishment of a local management authority; capacity building for such an authority; public awareness-raising measures; and economic incentives to encourage the continued cultivation of the traditional variety of rice grown in the Terraces. The State Party also informed the Committee that a draft proclamation establishing the Rice Terraces as an “environmentally sensitive area” was ‘on the President’s desk awaiting signature’. This proclamation would give added legal protection, at the national level, to the property.

560. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed the addition of a new paragraph after paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision, which referred to the usual reference to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value with a reference to the revision of boundaries.
561. The Delegation of **India** proposed a revision of the beginning of paragraph 5 to read: “Encourages the State Party to fully implement the corrective measures identified by the Committee”.
562. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.25** adopted as amended.

## **AFRICA**

### **Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9) (continued)**

563. The **Chairperson** reopened the discussion on the examination of the state of conservation of the property.
564. The Delegation of **India** proposed to postpone the adoption of the Draft Decision on Simian until the arrival of the Ethiopian Delegation. The motion was seconded by the United States of America and the **Chairperson** concurred.

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

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

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

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

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

565. The Delegation of **Israel** took the floor to read a new Draft Decision referenced *31 COM 7A.32* and concerning the properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
566. The Delegation of **India** requested that discussion on this matter be postponed until such time as all Delegations had the proposed new draft resolution in writing.
567. After having commended the Committee on its constructive work, the **Chairperson** concurred with such proposal and declared Decision **31 COM 7A.32** adopted, and declared item 7A closed.

## **ITEM 9: DISCUSSION ON THE OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/9

*Decision:* **31 COM 9**

568. The **Chairperson** after having informed the Committee that this item was mainly devoted to the follow-up of the work undertaken so far by the Advisory Bodies, gave the floor to ICOMOS.
569. **ICOMOS** reported on its progress in the preparation of the compendium on the concept of Outstanding Universal Value which was requested by the Committee at its 30th session in Vilnius. The main issues examined were the *Analysis of use of criteria* and the *Topics for further work*. Under the first issue, it was stressed that less than 50% of all properties have criteria identified by States Parties. There has been a change in the

nature (including the wording) and use of criteria over time. Early nominations were typically of monumental sites nominated under criterion 1. More recent nominations have increasingly tended to utilize criteria 2 and 4, often in combination. The changing definition and use of the criteria points to the need to systematically revisit the statements of Outstanding Universal Value, in light of the criteria that were in place at the time of inscription. As for the second issue, with regards to the finalization of the compendium, ICOMOS will focus its activity on: (i) Linking criteria to attributes of the property; (ii) Application of criteria: verification and thresholds; and (iii) Interviews with key people.

570. **IUCN** presented its progress report and paid particular attention to the Committee's "landmark" decisions which set precedents for future inscriptions. Like ICOMOS, IUCN also noted the change in the use of criteria over time by both nominating States Parties, and the Committee. It considered that the first properties inscribed were typically "iconic" sites, while those inscribed later have been properties demonstrating multiple and linked criteria. IUCN stressed the importance of identifying the Outstanding Universal Value of inscribed properties in order to ensure the credibility of the List. Among the *lessons learned*, IUCN further stressed the importance of the: (i) development and application of Tentative Lists; (ii) upstream involvement of Advisory Bodies; and (iii) Global Strategy.
571. **ICOMOS** and **IUCN** both insisted on the importance of the involvement of local communities and indigenous peoples in the identification, nomination, planning and management of World Heritage properties.
572. The Delegation of **Lithuania** observed that the IUCN report was more structured than that of ICOMOS stating that the ICOMOS report lacked methodology, statistical data and conclusions drawn from this data. It requested ICOMOS to develop a better, more structured methodology with statistics which would demonstrate trends.
573. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** observed that it would be important to address the issue of integrity as it relates to Outstanding Universal Value and the issue of "thresholds." The Delegation of the Netherlands also requested ICOMOS to pay close attention to archaeological sites.
574. The Delegation of **Japan** complimented the Advisory Bodies and requested that IUCN and ICOMOS reports follow similar formats, particularly in the analysis of the evolution of Outstanding Universal Value, and that the final report should draw on the experience from a wide variety and geographical distribution of States Parties.
575. The Delegation of **New Zealand** welcomed the progress report, thanked the Advisory Bodies, and commended, in particular, the work done by IUCN with regard to the involvement of the local communities and indigenous peoples. It recommended that ICOMOS also pay close attention to the role of local and indigenous communities.
576. The Delegation of **Canada** commended both Advisory Bodies and made the point that ICOMOS and IUCN approaches need to be harmonized: the ICOMOS approach to evolution of criteria needs to be followed by IUCN; while the IUCN approach in examining landmark Decisions of the Committee needs to be adopted by ICOMOS. The Delegation of Canada also recommended that both ICOMOS and IUCN should consider issues of authenticity and integrity in their reports.
577. The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the Advisory Bodies on excellent work. It went on to suggest that closer attention to the issues of authenticity and integrity be considered in the reports, particularly in the ICOMOS report. It also suggested that the IUCN "pyramid" should include Tentative Lists, as an additional layer of the pyramid. It further suggested that both reports include cross referencing to themes and categories. Serial nominations was another area which the Delegation recommended the Advisory Bodies should examine more closely. It concluded by suggesting that the World Heritage Centre send, electronically, to all Members of the Committee the draft

versions of the final reports on outstanding universal value by the Advisory Bodies well in advance of the next Committee Meeting, in order that the reports may be carefully studied by the Committee Members.

578. La délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite l'ICOMOS et l'UICN pour l'enquête circonstanciée présentée au Comité. Elle suggère qu'une enquête complémentaire sur la conscientisation de l'habitant soit menée sur la question de la sauvegarde de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Pour cela, elle explique que dans certains pays, l'on manque de connaissance sur cet aspect particulier. Elle souhaite aussi comprendre de la part de l'ICOMOS, pourquoi l'analyse décrit deux groupes distincts de populations, à savoir les « autochtones » et les « autres » ? Elle précise que ce type de distinction pourrait conduire vers une pente qu'elle qualifie de « glissante ».
579. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** commented on the relationship of intangible values to the determination of outstanding universal value. The United Kingdom Government offered to host an Expert Meeting on the Role of the History of Science in relation to World Heritage, during 2007.
580. La délégation de la **France** (observateur) remercie la Nouvelle Zélande pour son accueil chaleureux et la bonne organisation de la cérémonie d'ouverture. Elle remercie également l'ICOMOS et l'UICN pour leurs analyses respectives. Elle souhaite partager avec les membres du Comité, les réflexions actuellement menées par la France, qui ont fait suite à la décision du Comité lors de sa 30e session, de renvoyer l'examen des *Causses et les Cévennes*. L'avancée de cette réflexion se traduit aujourd'hui par l'organisation d'un séminaire sur l'agro-pastoralisme en Méditerranée. Ce séminaire regroupera plusieurs spécialistes issus des pays concernés par cette question.
581. Noting a consensus on the first 3 paragraphs of the draft decision, the **Chairperson** declared them adopted.
582. The **Rapporteur** read out three different amendments submitted by the Delegations of Canada, Israel and the Netherlands, respectively on the harmonization of the methodologies adopted by the Advisory Bodies in the preparation of their reports, on the early distribution of the reports of the Advisory Bodies to the Committee Members, and the third one asking to give consideration in the final report to archaeological sites and their threshold for inscription on the World Heritage List.
583. The **Chairperson** declared all three amendments adopted.
584. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed to accept the United Kingdom offer to host an Expert Meeting on the History of Science in relation to the issue of outstanding universal value of the World Heritage and to include it in the draft decision.
585. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the Expert Meeting proposed by the United Kingdom be on the topic of the History of Science and Technology.
586. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** agreed with the suggestion made by the Delegation of Israel.
587. After the Committee accepted the invitation by the United Kingdom, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 9** adopted as amended.

## ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: WHC-07/31.COM/7B  
WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add

Decisions: **31 COM 7B.1 to 31 COM 7B.130**

## **NATURAL PROPERTIES**

### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

#### **Aeolian Islands (Italy) (N 908)**

588. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property, flagging three main issues: (i) lack of a management plan; (ii) the fact that mining was continuing at the property in spite of government attempts to regulate it; and (iii) the potential danger posed by the planned expansion of the port.

589. **IUCN** confirmed the gravity of the issues flagged by the World Heritage Centre.

590. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.24** adopted.

#### **Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) (N 765 bis)**

591. The **World Heritage Centre** and **IUCN** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property.

592. The Delegation of **Kenya**, identified a punctuation error in paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, noting that the comma after the word “illegal” should instead be placed after the word “logging:”

593. The Chairperson, after having noted the remark from the Delegation of Kenya, declared Decision **31 COM 7B.26** adopted.

#### **Golden Mountain of Altai (Russian Federation) (N 768 rev)**

594. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property and noted that no information had been received about the Russian-China gas pipeline project affecting the property, but that the State Party had informed the World Heritage Centre that an EIA was planned, and had invited the Centre to send a reactive monitoring mission to clarify all issues regarding the state of conservation of the property. It continued that the Centre had also recently received a request from an NGO group to include an indigenous peoples' representation on missions and other activities affecting the property.
595. **IUCN** confirmed that the gas pipeline project would have a major negative impact on the integrity of the property.
596. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed adding a paragraph on the consultation with local communities.
597. The Delegation of **Lithuania** proposed an amendment to include a mention of a reactive monitoring mission by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN.
598. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to reformulate paragraph 6 with added wording to the effect: "The Committee also notes that the construction of a pipeline through the property could result in the loss of its outstanding universal value and its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger."
599. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that if outstanding universal value of a property is lost, it should be deleted from the List, not inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
600. The Delegation of **Canada** concurred with this comment and withdrew its proposed amendment.
601. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.25** adopted as amended.

#### **Belovezhskaya Pushcha / Bialowietza Forest (Belarus / Poland) (N 33-627)**

602. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property.
603. **IUCN** noted that a transboundary council had recently been formed and that steps had been taken to implement the cultural and natural heritage act of Belarus.
604. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed to change paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision to request the States Parties to submit updated reports by 1 February 2008 and that these reports would be examined by the Committee at its 32nd Session in 2008.
605. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.30** adopted as amended.

#### **Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754)**

606. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the report on the state of conservation of the property.
607. **IUCN** commented that the pulp and paper mill had not been converted to cold water cycle as recommended and noted that other recommendations of the Committee had not been reported on by the State Party.
608. The Delegation of **Canada** noted that there were reports that land around Lake Baikal was being offered for sale over the Internet and asked if this posed a threat to the integrity or outstanding universal value of the property.
609. **IUCN** responded by saying that such a sale of land is against Russian law and would be a concern affecting the integrity of the property.



- 610. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed a new amendment to be added between paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Draft Decision.
- 611. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed to amend paragraph 8 of the Draft Decision to move the reporting dates forward to 2008.
- 612. The Delegation of **Kenya** remarked that the Committee should be stricter and more consistent in requiring States Parties to report on the recommendations of the Committee.
- 613. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.31** adopted as amended.

The session rose at 6.40 p.m.

### THIRD DAY – TUESDAY, 26 JUNE 2007

#### SIXTH MEETING

09.10 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

- 614. In opening the session, the **Chairperson** mentioned that still 65 state of conservation reports needed to be examined or discussed before the end of the day.
- 615. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested to move the report on the Western Caucasus from the “for noting” to the “for discussion” category.
- 616. The **Chairperson** agreed, after which the World Heritage Centre presented the case.

#### **Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900)**

- 617. **IUCN** made additional comments and noted the activities proposed pending a decision of the International Olympic Committee and welcomed an invitation for a mission to assess impacts.
- 618. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that no decision had yet been taken on proposed activities in the buffer zone of the World Heritage property, but expressed two concerns for IUCN to reflect upon: the fact that activities outside the site might negatively affect the outstanding universal value of the site and that the issue concerned not only the proposed construction activities, but also the effects of large numbers of people moving through the site as part of the Olympic Games.
- 619. **IUCN** responded that pending the decision, the impacts which were to be assessed by the mission could indeed be considerable.
- 620. **Greenpeace Russia** explained it had updated information on proposed facilities and infrastructure foreseen in the buffer zone and explained that 26 Russian NGOs had expressed their concerns about direct and indirect impacts on the site’s outstanding universal value.
- 621. The **Chairperson** invited this NGO to distribute the updated information to the Members of the Committee and IUCN, after which he turned to the Draft Decision with an amendment brought forward by the Delegation of the Netherlands.
- 622. The **Rapporteur** explained changes in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision.

623. The Delegation of **India** requested that the part stating “and the possible effects on the Outstanding Universal Value” be deleted, as this automatically constituted a part of the terms of reference for the mission.

624. The **Chairperson** remarked that this was an important matter for IUCN, but that it indeed would be part of its terms of reference, to which the Netherlands agreed. He then declared Decision **31 COM 7B.32** adopted as amended.

**Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)**

625. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.27** adopted without discussion.

**Ilulissat Icefjord (Denmark) (N 1149)**

626. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.28** adopted without discussion.

**Durmitor National Park (Montenegro) (N 100 bis)**

627. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.29** adopted without discussion.

**Dorset and East Devon Coast (United Kingdom) (N 1029)**

628. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.33** adopted without discussion.

**Henderson Island (United Kingdom) (N 487)**

629. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.34** adopted without discussion.

**LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

**Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)**

630. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property.
631. **IUCN** made additional comments and noted the increasing problems of conservation and management of the site, and further remarked upon the positive result recognizing these problems by the State Party of Ecuador, which provided a clear case for action at both the national and international level through Danger Listing.
632. The Delegation of **Israel**, upon noting the budget of USD 3.5 million and the request to the international donor community to raise funds, asked IUCN about the priority setting for this budget.
633. **IUCN** responded that a clear plan of priorities existed focusing on control of invasive species, a strategy for tourism management, and measures for quarantine and immigration.
634. The **Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre** further clarified that extra-budgetary funding of USD 2 million for invasive species eradication had been obtained through the United Nations Foundations and UNDP/GEF grants and that the State Party had developed an action plan against invasive species, for tourism management and immigration control and other issues identified by the Committee.
635. The Delegation of **Canada** welcomed the change in approach of the State Party of Ecuador regarding Danger Listing; where it had previously resisted, it now recognized this measure as a tool to achieve positive change. It further reminded other States Parties of their obligation under the *World Heritage Convention* not to cause harm to sites, as many of the current issues lay outside the control of the State Party of Ecuador.
636. The Delegation of **Spain** congratulated the State Party on its change in attitude and the issuing of the Presidential Decree, which showed its commitment to the conservation of the site.
637. The **Chairperson** turned to the Draft Decision with amendments brought forward by Canada and Israel.
638. The **Rapporteur** explained that the Delegation of Israel proposed to add to paragraph 5 “priorities for the use of funding”, which was adopted subsequently.
639. The **Rapporteur** continued to read out several proposals in paragraph 8, which were adopted, then a revision to paragraph 9, which was adopted, and finally the inclusion of a new paragraph between 7 and 8, which was adopted.
640. The **Chairperson** then declared Decision **31 COM 7B.35** adopted as amended and invited the assembly to encourage the State Party for its attitude towards Danger Listing with applause.

#### **Alexander von Humboldt National Park (Cuba) (839 rev)**

641. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property, which was discussed at the request of the Committee.
642. **IUCN** made additional comments and noted the proposals for mining in the western section of the Park with its potential impacts, and referred to the International Council on Mining and Metals and to its Position Statement on Mining and Protected Areas (2003) as currently internationally agreed on.
643. The Delegation of **Israel** noted that current activities were taking place outside the boundaries of the Park, while the best practice on mining activities related to activities inside World Heritage properties.
644. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to include a reference to the agreement with the International Council on Metals and Mining (ICMM).

645. The Delegation of **Spain** requested the State Party to comment.
646. The Delegation of **Cuba** clarified that the Park was located in a mining area with ongoing activities outside the World Heritage site and it further remarked that the site's state of conservation was currently better than at the time of inscription, as a management plan and strengthened capacities were now in place.
647. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified the procedure to follow, which involved asking for a written report from the State Party in view of a possible reactivation of mining activities.
648. La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite connaître la date de la dernière mission sur le site. Si nécessaire, la Délégation est d'avis de demander au Comité du patrimoine mondial de faire une mission sur le site et présenter le rapport à la prochaine Session du Comité pour décision.
649. The **World Heritage Centre** answered that the site was inscribed in 2001 and that no mission to the site had taken place since.
650. The Delegation of **India**, following the intervention by the Delegation of Spain, proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision to insert a reference to the clarification provided by the State Party.
651. The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment submitted by the Delegation of Canada, on paragraph 2, and an amendment proposed by the Delegation of India to paragraph 4.
652. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.37** adopted as amended.

#### **Iguazu National Park (Argentina) (N 303)**

#### **Iguaçu National Park (Brazil) (N 355)**

653. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on Iguazu National Park (Argentina) and Iguaçu National Park (Brazil), which was opened at the request of the Committee, without any new information or comments from IUCN.
654. The Delegation of **Canada** explained that the reason for opening this case was to align and harmonize the separate Draft Decisions for the Argentine and Brazilian sites.
655. The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** took the floor to clarify that after the Committee's Decision in 2006, the State Party had submitted an international assistance request to the World Heritage Centre, which had not been granted, and questioned the consistency of this Decision.
656. The **World Heritage Centre** drew attention to the Committee's Decision to allocate international assistance to developing countries only, which did not apply to Argentina as it is an upper middle income country, while referring to the upcoming agenda item on the Budget for possible further discussion on this Decision. It further clarified that the amendment submitted and agreed upon by the Committee with regards to the Argentinean property should also apply to the Brazilian property.
657. The **Chairperson** then declared Decisions **31 COM 7B.38** and **31 COM 7B.39** adopted as amended.

#### **Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa-Rica and Panama) (N 205 bis)**

658. **IUCN** presented the state of conservation report on the property and informed the Committee that the two key-issues for the mission undertaken were dam construction and encroachment on the site.
659. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.36** adopted.

### **Sangay National Park (Ecuador) (N 260)**

660. At the request of the Delegation of Chile, the **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report on the property, without additional comments from IUCN.
661. The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment to paragraph 2, and a proposal for a new paragraph 3, submitted by the Delegation of Chile.
662. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.40** adopted as amended.

### **Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402)**

663. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.41** adopted.

### **Pitons Management Area (St. Lucia) (N 1161)**

664. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.42** adopted.

## **AFRICA**

### **Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)**

665. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report on the property and **IUCN** commented on the progress achieved, which included removal of infrastructure for tourism outside the site's boundaries, improved traffic management, and a strengthened site authority, which could provide lessons applicable to other World Heritage sites.
666. The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for their work and expressed its gratitude to the State Party of Tanzania for the achievements. The Delegate continued by suggesting a reduction in the number of recommendations proposed in the Draft Decision, as they were apparently already under implementation, and further stressed the need to adjust the language used in the Draft Decision to a wording suggesting cooperation rather than imposition.
667. The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Kenya to submit a proposal for such wording.
668. The Delegation of **India** assisted with a suggestion to amend paragraph 3.
669. The **Chairperson** enquired whether Kenya could accept the suggestion by India and then asked the Rapporteur to read out the amended version of the Draft Decision.
670. The **Rapporteur** explained that the proposal was to replace the opening words of paragraph 3.
671. La Délégation du **Bénin** fait savoir qu'elle soutient les propositions du Kenya et de l'Inde.
672. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.2** adopted as amended.

### **Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199)**

673. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report on the property and IUCN commented upon the positive results of the revenue retention scheme that had been previously developed at the site level, but that had since been discontinued and questioned whether this could not be re-instituted as is the case at Ngorongoro Conservation Area.

674. The **Chairperson** mentioned that a revised Draft Decision for this site report had been distributed in the room.
675. La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite avoir des éclaircissements sur la formulation du petit « a » de la page 9 de la version française, a savoir « sources de revenus ».
676. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that retention of revenues from photography and game hunting had provided significant additional income for the park's management, but indicated that Selous Game Reserve was managed by the Wildlife Department, which had a different regime than Ngorongoro Conservation Area Authority.
677. The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the mission for their report and suggested that the State Party be acknowledged for their management of the site, while requesting two minutes for the State Party to explain ongoing issues at the site level.
678. The Observer Delegation of **Tanzania** thanked the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for the mission and stated that it agreed to all recommendations put forward in the report. The Representative commended the World Heritage Centre for its assistance and recalled that the site was inscribed in 1982, and that at 60,000 km<sup>2</sup> it was one of the largest World Heritage sites containing large herds of wildlife, including elephants. The report concluded that an Environmental Impact Assessment was currently underway.
679. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it proposed any amendments.
680. The Delegation of **India** proposed to delete the part on the “regrets for not sending a report”, which it believed had become unnecessary in view of the regrets expressed by the Representative of the State Party.
681. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.3** adopted as amended.

#### **Niokolo-Koba (Senegal) (N 153)**

682. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property, which was proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
683. **IUCN** further commented on three issues, namely the loss of species, the problem of grazing, and the need for a strengthening of links with local communities in the area.
684. The **Chairperson** noted an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada which was read out by the **Rapporteur** who explained the proposed change to paragraph 11 related to the draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and the draft statement of desired state of conservation. The Rapporteur further mentioned a change of the word “would” into “could” proposed for paragraph 13.
685. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.1** adopted as amended.

#### **Mosi-oa-Tunya / Victoria Falls (Zambia / Zimbabwe) (N 509)**

686. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report on the property and **IUCN** commented on the issues of hotel development in relation to criterion vii (referring to exceptional beauty) the need for integrated management by the two States Parties, and that a letter was received stating that the hotel development project had been stopped.
687. La Délégation du **Bénin** a bien pris compte des évolutions positives soulignées dans le rapport. Elle ajoute que des représentants officiels des Etats parties sont présents dans la salle et qu'il conviendrait de leur donner la parole pour avoir des informations à jour de la situation sur le site.
688. The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with Benin and requested that the language in the Draft Decision be substituted for a more cooperative tone.

689. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commented, in line with Kenya, that the Draft Decision needed to be clear about what the State Party was requested to undertake, and proposed an amendment to paragraph 5.
690. The Observer Delegation of **Zambia** thanked, also on behalf of Zimbabwe, the Committee for the invitation and its interest in the site and continued explaining the measures that had been taken. These include progress in the development of an integrated management plan, thanks to the financial assistance received from the World Heritage Centre, the recent establishment of a joint Ministerial Committee, and the abandonment of both the hot-air balloon project and the hotel development project. The Representative concluded by mentioning that all future activities would be conducted in accordance with the integrated management plan.
691. The **Chairperson** enquired whether the wording for a revised Draft Decision was ready, after which the **Rapporteur** explained that amendments had been received from Kenya and Benin, which were partially overlapping: a change in paragraph 5-d relating to a deletion of “in particular”, which was adopted,; and for paragraph 5-b, which needed to be moved between paragraphs 4 and 5 for consistency.
692. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked whether the World Heritage Centre and IUCN were in agreement with deletion of “in particular” as proposed.
693. The **World Heritage Centre** agreed referring to the joint statement that had just been received from the Representative of Zambia, while **IUCN** concurred if a focus on implementation of the integrated management plan had been built in.
694. The **Rapporteur** suggested retaining existing paragraph 5b with a slight modification to focus on the plan implementation as suggested by IUCN and then clarified that the amendment to paragraph 5c took note of the State Party’s statement on the moratorium on new development of tourism infrastructure, which was to be included in a new paragraph. However, a question remained as regards the wording, referring to a “complete” moratorium. The **World Heritage Centre** answered that it essentially concerned the hot-air balloon project and the new hotel development.
695. La Délégation du **Bénin** propose d’enlever la référence « aux deux Etats parties » ou bien laisser au Rapporteur le soin de trouver une formulation appropriée.
696. The **Rapporteur** explained that in view of consistency the proposal from Benin should be taken referring to a moratorium on “some” development, and further explained that paragraph 5d could be deleted, while paragraph 6 appeared to be out of date due to this cancellation, which complicated matters further.
697. Noting consensus on the amendments proposed, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.4** adopted as amended.

#### **Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda) (N 684)**

698. At the request of the Committee, the **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property.
699. The Delegation of **Canada** had requested the opening of this case to propose an amendment to the Draft Decision involving the insertion of the Code of Practice of the International Council on Metals and Mining (ICMM).
700. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested whether the State Party, if present, had any comments. The State Party was not present.
701. The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment for a new paragraph 5 proposed by Canada, after which the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.9** adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of the Draft Decisions requiring no discussion.

#### **Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroun) (N 407)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 7B.5 adopted.

#### **Tai National Park (Côte d'Ivoire) (N 195)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 7B.6 adopted.

#### **Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 7B.7 adopted.

#### **Cape Floral Region Protected Areas (South Africa) (N 1007 rev)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 7B.8 adopted.

#### **Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156)**

The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 7B.10 adopted.

### **ARAB STATES**

#### **Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654)**

702. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and **IUCN** referred to paragraph 192 of the *Operational Guidelines* explaining that the primary basis for the site's Outstanding Universal Value was the free-ranging habitat for the Arabian Oryx. The Advisory Body further explained that a reduction of 90% of the protected area had taken place by Royal Decree issued in January 2007, that the population of Oryx had significantly declined due to poaching, which would lead to imminent extinction as the breeding herd consisted of only four females and four males, and that exploration for hydrocarbons in the area had been foreseen. All together, the Advisory Body concluded, this constituted a loss of Outstanding Universal Value for which delisting of the site had to be considered and for which the State Party had given its consent, regretful but necessary in maintaining the *Convention's* credibility.
703. The Delegation of **Kenya** mentioned that this case was very unfortunate indeed and constituted a major challenge for the Committee. It said the State Party had done its part and that questions could be raised about the role of the Committee, which was partly responsible. It noted that now that the site had lost its Outstanding Universal Value, IUCN wanted delisting, which could set a possible precedent. In conclusion, the Delegate commented that reflection was certainly needed, but if the State Party had agreed to delisting, then Kenya would follow suit.
704. The Delegation of **Lithuania** remarked that this would be the first time that the Committee was considering delisting and the fact that this site did not have a management plan had led to the prevalent problems. The Delegation said it understood that Outstanding Universal Value had been lost in the protected area with new boundaries, but asked IUCN if Outstanding Universal Value still existed within the boundaries of the World Heritage site as previously defined.
705. **IUCN** answered that the previous mission had studied the existing site and concluded that the Outstanding Universal Value still existed.
706. The Delegation of **Kuwait** commented on the efforts of the State Party to combat illegal poaching, which unfortunately had failed, and questioned how the State Party could be assisted in saving the Oryx from extinction. The Delegate regretted that delisting was



considered and wished the State Party to continue its efforts to protect the species and proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.

707. La Délégation de **Madagascar** se dit préoccupée car les membres du Comité se trouvent devant une situation délicate. En effet, prendre la décision de retirer un site peut avoir des conséquences négatives imprévisibles. La Délégation a bien pris note du rétrécissement important des limites du site mais elle se trouve devant un grave cas de conscience. Elle finit par assurer qu'elle va s'aligner sur la décision du Comité.
708. The Delegation of **India** commented that this would constitute the first deletion of a site from the World Heritage List, which alluded to a failure on behalf of the Committee to protect the site's Outstanding Universal Value and asked if the State Party could provide any comments. The Delegate further questioned as to why no information had been provided at the Committee's sessions in Durban (2005) or Vilnius (2006) on the critical state of this site and asked IUCN to clarify this.
709. **IUCN** replied that on previous occasions discussions had taken place on issues of integrity within the boundaries of the 27,000 km<sup>2</sup> protected area and discussions had taken place many times on threats to the site, which had now been compounded after a 90% reduction of the site in surface area.
710. The Delegation of **Canada** agreed it was a serious situation and that the Committee's decision could establish a precedent for the future. It recalled Article 6.1 of the Convention under which the international community has a moral duty to act to conserve World Heritage properties. It suggested that the Committee's decision should express alarm with the situation but, in the belief that Outstanding Universal Value still exists within the originally defined boundaries, urge the State Party to reconsider the change to the boundary.
711. La délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite que le Comité écoute davantage l'Etat partie expliquer ce choix difficile et fait part de son intérêt à vouloir protéger l'espèce de l'oryx arabe en particulier. Elle indique que les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial peuvent probablement aider l'Etat partie d'Oman à protéger cette espèce par des mesures adéquates ; les Etats parties et les organisations internationales peuvent aussi aider, même dans des limites restreintes.
712. La délégation du **Maroc** indique que la volonté de l'Etat partie n'est peut-être pas motivée par l'absence d'intérêt de l'Etat partie pour le bien, mais peut-être à cause d'autres intérêts internes. Elle dit ainsi bien comprendre quel est l'intérêt de l'Etat partie à retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle souhaite que le Centre du patrimoine et l'UICN mondial puissent aider l'Etat partie à trouver une solution de protection durable.
713. La délégation du **Bénin** fait part de son sentiment d'échec, et attire l'attention du Comité sur le fait que dans le cas présent, il s'agit de l'Etat partie d'Oman qui impose les choses ; et que le Comité ne doit pas céder à l'Etat partie. A son avis, la seule voie viable est de proposer une procédure d'urgence à l'Etat partie. Elle n'est pas en faveur du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial.
714. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed the opinion that, in this case, the Committee's scope for action was limited as the State Party had taken a unilateral decision which undermines the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. It argued that the concern of the Committee should be to maintain the credibility of the List which could only be achieved by deleting the property from the List. It asked the State Party whether the Committee could help protect the property, in the spirit of the Canadian proposal.
715. The Delegation of **New Zealand** regarded the state of conservation of this property to be in a serious situation indeed. It voiced concern over the reduction of the size of the site, and asked for the reason why the Oryx population had declined so severely.

716. The Delegation of **Spain** indicated that the Committee had not followed the procedures since it had allowed this situation to happen. It suggested that a counter-proposal be made so as to still conserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by not cutting down its limits. It proposed to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, hoping that the situation was not irresolvable.
717. The Delegation of **Japan** stated agreement with other expressions of regret over the failure of conservation measures and the loss of Outstanding Universal Value of this property. It supported deletion of the property from the List.
718. In response to the questions posed, **IUCN** reiterated that the reduced area of the property could not support a sustainable free-ranging population of Oryx. IUCN explained that poaching had been the cause of the drastic reduction of the number of animals. IUCN recommended that if any action to safeguard the property was to be taken it should consist of four elements: (i) no reduction in area; (ii) elimination of oil and gas exploitation within the boundaries of the property; (iii) action taken to prevent poaching; and (iv) managing the impacts of off-road vehicle use.
719. La délégation du **Bénin**, étant donnée la gravité de la situation, souhaite donner la parole à l'Etat partie.
720. The Delegation of **India** requested the State Party to take the floor to speak of the suggestion by regarding possible alternative action to deletion of the property.
721. The Observer Delegation of **Oman** thanked the Committee for its concern, and expressed its gratitude to the Delegation of Canada for its proposal which aims to safeguard the outstanding universal value of the property. It then gave a brief history of attempted, but failed, management at the site and expressed the opinion of the Government of Oman that the property is unmanageable and unsustainable, at its present size. It expressed the opinion that with a much-reduced size the management and protection of the site may prove possible if coupled with a captive breeding programme. It concluded that the Government does not believe that the species can be protected in its wild habitat but that once the species is re-established in captivity, a new sanctuary may be established into which the population can be released. It requested the Committee to respect the State Party's request to delete the property from the World Heritage List.
722. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked the Legal Advisor about the procedures to be followed to delete this property from the List, particularly as they concern the sequencing of actions: It questioned whether the boundaries should be modified first and then deletion be considered. It pointed out that these questions arise as it is the opinion of IUCN that with the presently-inscribed boundaries the property retains its Outstanding Universal Value, although very much threatened.
723. The **Legal Adviser** referred to paragraphs 192-198 of the *Operational Guidelines* which sets out the procedure for deletion as decided by the Committee. This procedure was first elaborated by the Committee at its 3rd session. The Legal Advisor pointed out that the Committee is sovereign and solely responsible for deciding on and publishing the World Heritage List. When the possibility of deletion of a property arises, the sequence of actions followed is that, firstly, the World Heritage Centre would obtain all relevant information - gathered from any source, including the State Party. The World Heritage Centre then forwards this information to the Advisory Body(ies) which examines the information and reports to the Committee. The Committee hears the opinion of the Advisory Body(ies) and has three options for action: (i) If the property's Outstanding Universal Value is not seriously deteriorated, then no action need be taken; (ii) if the property's Outstanding Universal Value has been seriously deteriorated, but not to the extent that restoration is impossible, the Committee may decide to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger; and (iii) if the property's condition has deteriorated to the point that no Outstanding Universal Value

remains, according to criteria for which the property has been inscribed, the Committee has the responsibility of deleting the property from the List. The Legal Advisor pointed out paragraphs 164 and 165 of the *Operational Guidelines*, regarding modifications of boundaries explaining that minor modification requires notification and approval of the Committee, while significant modification of the boundaries requires the submission of a new nomination.

724. The **Chairperson** ruled that the boundaries of property are those as originally inscribed, because nothing else had been decided by the Committee.
725. The Delegation of **Chile** expressed its concern over the State Party of Oman's declaration that the Oryx population was well protected and no longer on the list of species in danger, while the size of the property was no longer sufficient to ensure the survival of the species. It said that any modification should undergo the process of the *Operational Guidelines* of the Committee. It also added that the Committee's responsibility was to protect the property and agreed with Canada and Spain to continue to work for a solution.
726. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed the opinion that a State Party has the right to propose a site to be deleted. It argued that the Committee should respect the request of the State Party and also the advice of the Advisory Bodies. Although the Delegation of Kenya supported deletion of the property, it requested that its suggestion that the Committee should continue to work with the State Party to return the (redefined) site as a new nomination, be put on record.
727. The Delegation of **India** reminded the Committee that the only reason for deleting a site is its loss of Outstanding Universal Value. It advised that because IUCN had expressed the opinion that with boundaries as inscribed, Outstanding Universal Value would be retained, the status of the boundaries of the property needed further clarification.
728. The Delegation of **Cuba** withdrew its request to take the floor.
729. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** concurred with the regrets expressed over the state of conservation of this property and suggested that ex-situ conservation of the oryx be pursued.
730. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** associated itself with the position stated by the Delegation of India with regard to the boundaries of the property, and further questioned the meaning of the last sentence of paragraph 196 of the *Operational Guidelines* with regard to its intent: it asked whether this sentence implies that, should a State Party request a property on its territory to be deleted from the List, the Committee is then obliged to comply with the State Party's request. It stated its belief that the Committee is not obliged to acquiesce to every request of a State Party.
731. The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that the Committee was debating rights vs obligations, both in the national and international contexts. It found it heartening that the Government of Oman was serious about the conservation of the oryx species. In reference to proposals made by Canada, India and Kenya, the Delegation of Israel suggested: (i) the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger with reinforced monitoring; and (ii) the World Heritage Centre and IUCN should negotiate with the State Party as to what may be a reasonable size for the property; and propose to the Committee a resultant change in its boundaries.
732. The Delegation of the **United States of America** argued that the Committee can only help those properties for which the State Party desires assistance and that the reality with this property is that the State Party has unilaterally reduced the boundaries, whether the Committee had agreed to this or not. Therefore, in its opinion, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property has been lost. It expressed the opinion that the property should be deleted and the State Party should be invited to submit a

new nomination with new boundaries and management parameters, if it wished to do so. It stated its agreement with the Draft Decision.

733. The **Chairperson** then closed the debate on the state of conservation and turned to the Draft Decision **31 COM 7B.11**. He summarized the two opinions within the Committee: (1) the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary is an important site for the conservation of an endangered species and the Committee should do everything it can to help conserve the property as the species' primary habitat, as per its statutory responsibility; and (2) the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary has irrevocably lost its outstanding universal value and therefore it is the responsibility of the Committee to delete the property from the List, especially as the State Party had so requested, and had informed the Committee of its decision not to attempt to protect the inscribed site any longer. The Chairperson then reminded the Committee that the Decision on the proposal to delete this site would be a landmark one. He encouraged the Committee to find a consensus.
734. The **Rapporteur** introduced a proposed amendment to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision proposed by the Delegation of Kuwait, and then introduced an array of proposed amendments to paragraphs 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the Draft Decision proposed by Canada.
735. The Delegation of **Israel** withdrew its proposed amendments, as they coincided with those proposed by Canada.
736. The **Rapporteur** introduced a new final paragraph proposed by Kenya.
737. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** repeated its request for clarification of the status of the property's boundaries.
738. The Delegation of **India** insisted that the boundaries of the property remained as originally inscribed and noted its disagreement with Kenya's suggestion that the Committee work with the State Party even if the property is removed from the List.
739. The Delegation of **Norway** associated itself with the positions of Netherlands and India with regard to the status of the property's boundaries.
740. The Delegation of **Israel** re-tabled the first two paragraphs of its proposed amendment to the Draft Decision.
741. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed the opinion that it was clear the boundaries of the property had unilaterally been reduced and argued that the Committee shouldn't provoke a State Party, as the Committee cannot exercise control over a site if it is against the will of the State Party to safeguard the site. It supported deletion of the site from the List.
742. The Delegation of the **United States of America** associated itself with the comments by Kenya and once again reminded the Committee that the credibility of the List was at stake regarding this Decision.
743. La délégation du **Maroc** remarque que le Comité doit considérer des propositions d'amendements allant dans des directions différentes, et qu'un besoin de clarification se fait sentir. Elle souhaite également entendre l'Etat partie car il lui semble que le Comité travaille sur des éléments qui sont déjà dépassés au niveau de l'Etat partie (modification des limites). Elle recommande de faire des propositions qui pourraient être acceptées par l'Etat partie.
744. La délégation de la **Tunisie** prend acte que l'Etat partie a déjà procédé à la réduction de la superficie du bien et demande le retrait. Elle ajoute que toute proposition doit impliquer l'accord de l'Etat partie.
745. The Delegation of **New Zealand** pointed out that the Committee was debating aspects arising from the conflict between the need to respect national sovereignty and the responsibility of safeguarding Outstanding Universal Value.

746. The Delegation of **Norway** associated itself with the comment of New Zealand and expressed the opinion that, because the boundaries had been reduced to the point where the Outstanding Universal Value of the property no longer exists, the property should therefore be deleted from the List.
747. The Delegation of **Spain** noted that there were two positions within the Committee: either in favour of the removal of the property from the World Heritage List, or in favour of waiting a further year to find protective measures. It added that, should the Committee decide to apply the first option, the second would never apply, yet, should the Committee decide to apply the second option, the first one would still be applicable the following year. It supported the Delegation of Israel in its suggestion to find a solution with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to ensure the protection of the oryx and the Outstanding Universal Value. It advocated for the Committee to attempt this last effort.
748. The Observer Delegation of **Oman** thanked the Committee and all those who want to help in the conservation of the Arabian Oryx in its natural habitat. However it once again reiterated the decision of the Government of Oman to abandon the failed conservation programme of the property. The State Party concurred that the property had lost its Outstanding Universal Value. It stated that the Government of Oman did not believe that another year of assistance from the Committee would change the situation of irreversible decline at the property or restore its Outstanding Universal Value. It continued by explaining that the Government of Oman had decided to proceed instead with a captive breeding programme in order to protect the Arabian Oryx from extinction, within a much reduced site boundary which could be well-protected against poachers. The State Party appealed to the Committee to accept the State Party's request to delete the property from the List.
749. The **Chairperson** summarized once again the two opinions within the Committee and asked if the Committee wanted to proceed to a vote.
750. The Delegation of **Kuwait** endorsed the State Party's request to delete the property from the List.
751. The Delegation of **Kenya** also endorsed the State Party's request to delete the property from the List.
752. The Delegation of **India** noted with appreciation the frank response of Oman and said it would support the Decision to delete the property, insisting that in this case no change or amendment be made in the text of the Draft Decision.
753. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested IUCN to explain its opinion once again with regard to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as inscribed.
754. **IUCN** responded by stating the opinion that within existing site boundaries, Outstanding Universal Value is apparent but under threat and pointed out that protection status has been withdrawn by the State Party from this area. IUCN also reiterated its opinion that the activities of the oil and gas industry within the boundaries of the site have seriously compromised the integrity of the property.
755. The **World Heritage Centre** concurred with the opinion expressed by IUCN.
756. The Delegation of the **United States of America** moved to close debate and go to a vote.
757. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of **Lithuania**.
758. The Delegation of **India** seconded the motion by the Delegation of the United States of America.
759. The **Chairperson** proposed a roll-call vote.
760. The Delegation of **India** moved to request a secret ballot.

761. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported a roll call vote, for transparency.
762. The Delegation of **India** raised a point of order alluding that the Chairperson must immediately ask for a second on the motion to conduct a secret ballot and if carried, to proceed accordingly. The motion of India for a secret ballot was seconded by the Delegations of Chile and Canada.
763. The **Legal Adviser** pointed out that in accordance with Article 42 of the *Rules of Procedure*, the Chair must appoint two members of the Committee to serve as election tellers.
764. The Delegation of the **United States of America**, asked if arrangements for voting could be completed before lunch.
765. The **World Heritage Centre** responded that arrangements for balloting could be made in time for the voting to take place before lunch.
766. The Delegation of **India** requested a coffee break but this request was not entertained by the Chair, in the interests of time management.
767. While the World Heritage Centre made preparations for balloting, the **Chairperson** proposed to continue with the consideration of other properties to be examined under Item 7B (state of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List).

#### **Banc d'Arguin National Park (Mauritania) (N 506)**

768. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked to open the discussion on this property which originally was foreseen for adoption without discussion, and proposed to amend the Draft Decision so as to ask the State Party to submit a report on the state of conservation of the property by 1 February 2008.
769. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.12** adopted as amended.

#### **Ichkeul National Park (Tunisia) (N 8)**

770. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property noting that the State Party has rehabilitated the site's water consumption regime.
771. **IUCN** confirmed the rehabilitation of the property's water regime, and noted its satisfaction in this regard.
772. La délégation de **Madagascar** propose de remplacer le paragraphe 4 du projet de décision, et fait lecture de son amendement.
773. La délégation du **Maroc** souligne que le paragraphe 4 du projet de décision ne tient pas compte de nouvelles informations apportées par l'Etat partie depuis la rédaction du document de travail. Etant d'accord avec les membres du Comité s'étant déjà exprimés, elle retire son projet d'amendement.
774. La délégation de la **Tunisie** suggère de retirer totalement le paragraphe 4, le nouveau paragraphe proposé ressemblant énormément au paragraphe 4 de la 30e session du Comité à Vilnius.
775. **IUCN** clarified that the wording "occasional flows" in the Draft Decision should be changed to "regular flows."
776. La délégation de la **Tunisie** réitère que le nouveau paragraphe 4 est inutile ; les nouveaux engagements ayant déjà été honorés depuis la dernière session du Comité à Vilnius en 2006.
777. La délégation de **Madagascar** souhaite retirer son amendement et concourt au retrait du paragraphe 4, sans le remplacer.
778. The Delegation of **Lithuania** proposed to change reporting dates to 2008.
779. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.13** adopted as amended.

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### Macquarie Island (Australia) (N 629 rev)

780. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and explained that the major issue affecting the state of conservation of the island was the devastating impact of invasive non-native species of rodents and rabbits on native species. The World Heritage Centre reported that a letter received from the State Party confirms that funding for the eradication plan had been secured. The World Heritage Centre also reported that the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) had recommended In Danger Listing for the property until the proposed eradication plan could achieve the desired change in the state of conservation of the property.
781. **IUCN** underlined the urgent need for implementation of the proposed eradication plan.
782. The Delegation of **Kenya** remarked that this was a serious and interesting case, noting that insufficient funding could be an issue and that the State Party should be encouraged to provide adequate funding for the eradication programme to be fully implemented within the target two year period.
783. The Delegation of **Israel** remarked that in looking at the recommendation and related website, he had concerns about the eradication programme protocols, asking if and how this programme and its protocols were decided upon and approved, especially as the programme would result in some loss of non-target species.
784. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** confirmed that the problem of invasive species on Macquarie Island was very serious. It notified the Committee that the eradication

project had become fully funded, and that programme implementation had already begun. The Delegation informed the Committee about the implementation protocols of the eradication programme, and pointed out that these include an 8 year monitoring period after the completion of the 2 year eradication programme, in order to ensure that all individuals of the invasive species have been eradicated from the island. It also advised the Committee on matters concerning National and State approval processes, and about international consultations undertaken with New Zealand experts.

785. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.14** adopted.

### **Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Areas (China) (N 1083)**

786. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, noting that continuing uncertainty remained over proposed dams and mining projects. Also, the mining activities would necessitate revision of the boundaries of the property.

787. **IUCN** expressed concern over the lack of clarity and information regarding the plans for the development of the aforesaid dams and mines.

788. The Delegation of **Israel** asked for clarification of what dam-building projects had been stopped and which were underway.

789. The **World Heritage Centre** replied that the State Party had not provided clear information on the status of the various projects.

790. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.15** adopted.

### **Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654) (continued)**

791. The **Chairperson** re-opened consideration of Draft Decision **31 COM 7B.11** by introducing the procedures for proceeding with the secret ballot. As a preliminary to the voting, he requested those who had submitted draft amendments to the Draft Decision to withdraw them. All those who had submitted amendments to the Draft Decision agreed to the Chairperson's request.

792. The Delegations of **Spain** and **Japan** were appointed as tellers, in accordance with Article 42 of the *Rules of Procedure*.

793. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the mechanics of the secret voting procedures.

794. Voting then proceeded in accordance with the *Rules of Procedure* for a secret ballot.

795. At the conclusion of the voting, the **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that a two-thirds majority was required to carry a motion to delete a property from the World Heritage List.

796. The **Chairperson** then read the results of the secret ballot:

Voting countries:	21
Absent:	0
Blank papers:	0
Invalid papers:	0
Valid votes:	21
In favour:	13
Opposed:	8
Result:	The motion failed, for lack of the required two-thirds majority.

797. The **Chairperson** declared that Draft Decision 31 COM 7B.11 could not to be adopted as originally drafted. It also stated that the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary was not to be deleted from the World Heritage List.



798. The Delegation of **India** proposed to follow up with the suite of the amendments submitted by the Delegation of Canada to Draft Decision 31 COM 7B.11.
799. The **Chairperson** adjourned the meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

**THIRD DAY – TUESDAY, 26 JUNE 2007**

**SEVENTH MEETING**

**03.00 p.m. – 05.30 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

**ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE  
WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continued*)**

**Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654) (*continued*)**

800. The **Chairperson** recalled the result of the vote and the decision of the Committee not to delete the property from the World Heritage List. Given the outcome, he noted the need to complete the decision-making process and drew the Committee's attention to three options it could consider regarding this property. He felt that these options best reflected the views expressed by the Committee members during the discussion. The first option was to maintain the site on the World Heritage List as it currently stands, the second was to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and consider initiating a reinforced monitoring process or other type of mechanism to assess the situation, and the third option was to keep the site on the List and request a mission to the site to be undertaken with IUCN and others as necessary. The mission, he specified, would aim to study the possible prospects of preserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. The results of the mission could then be studied by the Committee at its next session. He underlined the importance of this decision, noting that the credibility of the World Heritage Committee was at stake. In advising the Committee he emphasized the need to keep this factor in mind and reflect on the role and duty of the international community concerning World Heritage matters. He felt that the Committee would be inclined to opt for placing the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger immediately and conduct applicable monitoring mechanisms as appropriate. He offered the Committee more time for discussion and proposed to move towards the adoption of a decision at another time.
801. The Delegation of **India** recalled that while there was a majority of votes in favour of deletion of the property, it had not obtained a two-thirds majority. It suggested that a small working group could be established to consult with the State Party of Oman and propose a dignified solution that should meet the needs of both the Committee and the State Party.
802. These comments were supported by the Delegation of **Japan** who underlined the importance of preserving the dignity of the Committee and the *World Heritage Convention*.
803. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested using the amendments to the Draft Decision initially proposed by the Delegation of Canada to start the discussion process.
804. This proposal was supported by the Delegations of **Chile** and **Spain**.
805. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed the need to ensure a fair balance of views in the group and stated that time for discussion, and possibly a further vote, would be needed when the working group returned to the Committee with its proposal..
806. The **Chairperson** established a working group composed of the Delegations of **Canada, Japan** and **Kuwait** asking the group to aim for consensus and return to the Committee with a proposal.

### **Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N1167)**

807. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property by recalling that the State Party had submitted a detailed Emergency Action Plan by letter dated 6 June 2007 and that a joint monitoring mission had been undertaken in March following an earthquake that had hit the area and a plane crash. The mission noted that encroachments into the site and the lack of coordination between the three protected areas remained a problem.
808. **IUCN** noted that the State Party was doing its best to tackle issues at this site and emphasized the need for a new Presidential Decree to deal with the encroachment pressures placed on this property.
809. The delegations of **Japan** and **India** both asked to hear from the State Party of Indonesia regarding the issues at the site, and on the possibility of issuing a new Decree.
810. The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** stated that much progress had been made since the 30th session of the Committee. It referred to a workshop scheduled for July 2007 and specified that its results would be made available in the next report submission called for in the Draft Decision. The Representative further explained that a new Director for the Park management authority had been appointed, that the Debt-for-Nature Swap with Germany was underway and efforts to halt encroachment on the site were continuing and would require increased coordination with the People's Welfare, but did not call for another Presidential Decree. The State Party further insisted on the fact that it had no intention of proposing a revision to the boundaries of the property.
811. The proposed amendments of the Delegations of India and Japan were presented by the **Rapporteur** taking into account the fact that the boundaries would not need to be changed.
812. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.16** adopted as amended.

#### **Keoladeo National Park (India) (N340)**

813. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property, drawing particular attention to the fact that the lack of water supplied to the site would continue to impact the property until long term measures can be found.
814. The Delegation of **India** explained that the water management issues were essentially caused by climate change. It noted that Improvements to the supply of water had been made thanks to efforts made by the State Party and longer term measures to sustain these short term measures were being considered. It added that complementary information to confirm the number and diversity of birdlife and flora in the park was available on video. The Delegation further announced that it did not wish to receive unnecessary donor support which could be more useful elsewhere.
815. The Delegations of **India**, **Chile** and the **Netherlands** proposed several amendments, which were read out by the **Rapporteur**.
816. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.17** adopted as amended.

#### **Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955)**

817. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report on the property by noting that threats from mining, development, illegal logging, poaching and the lack of an approved management plan were preventing adequate conservation. However, it was also noted that the State Party had written to the World Heritage Centre to inform it about progress made relating to the status of the management plan and that discussions with the Freeport mine authorities were underway.

818. **IUCN** noted the proposal for a mission to address issues pertaining to illegal logging, management and the Freeport mine in Timika.
819. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification of the human and financial implications referred to and whether the State Party was able to address these.
820. The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** responded by referring to resources it would make available through the newly created National Park management body and confirmed that some funding was already available to effectively manage and protect the site.
821. The Delegation of **Chile** sought clarification as to whether there was a need to refer to funding by the State Party.
822. **IUCN** responded that paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision was indeed appropriate.
823. The Delegation of **Chile** reiterated its question about the requirement for funding by the State Party and proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.
824. The Delegation of **India** concurred with the request by the Delegation of Chile.
825. The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that it had no objection to deleting this reference.
826. The Delegation of **Kenya** sought clarification of the independent audit requested last year.
827. **IUCN** confirmed that this wording had already been used at the previous session.
828. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.19** adopted as amended.

#### **Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653)**

829. The **World Heritage Centre** referred to the continual issues related to the lack of law enforcement at the site and the possibility of mining. It also recalled that any proposal to modify the boundaries of the property would require the submission of a new nomination.
830. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.20** adopted.
831. The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of the Draft Decisions requiring no discussion:

#### **Sagarmatha National Park (Nepal) (N 120)**

832. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.19** adopted.

#### **Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590)**

833. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.22** adopted.

#### **Ha Long Bay (Viet Nam) (N 672 bis)**

834. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.23** adopted.

#### **East Rennell (Solomon Islands) (N854)**

835. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property and indicated that in March 2007 the State Party had submitted a report and a copy of the management plan, containing information on the progress made in implementing the recommendations made by the Committee at its 29th session.

836. The Delegation of **Canada** asked for a modification to the date of the mission undertaken to the site which had taken place in 2005.

837. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.21** adopted.

#### **Dong Phrayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590)**

838. The **World Heritage Centre** indicated that the State Party had submitted a report on the state of conservation of the property on 30 January 2007, with information on progress made in implementing the recommendations of the Committee to enhance the integrity of the property.

839. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.22** adopted.

### **MIXED PROPERTIES**

#### **EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA**

##### **Pyrenees – Mont Perdu (France / Spain) (C/N 773 bis)**

840. The **World Heritage Centre** explained that the Gavarnie Festival had been authorised from 20-31 July 2007, but that new sites for this festival had been identified by the State Party. A joint IUCN-ICOMOS mission to assess these proposals should take place after the festival this year. Attention was also drawn to the need to produce a management plan for the French portion of the site and to work towards better coordination between States Parties concerned.

841. The Delegation of **Israel** called for clarification from the State Party concerning the authorization granted to the organizers to hold the festival again this year.

842. La délégation de l'**Espagne** demande de donner la parole à la délégation de la France (observateur).

843. La délégation de la **France** (observateur) souligne par rapport au projet de décision, paragraphe 7, que le Centre a reçu une lettre datée du 14 juin 2007, invitant et confirmant la mission qui se rendrait sur le site à une date qui permettait aux experts d'être sur place pendant le Festival de Gavarnie.

844. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to amend the order of the points, by moving paragraph 7 between 3 and 4.

845. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.44** adopted as amended.

### **ASIA – PACIFIC**

#### **Tasmanian Wilderness (Australia) (C/N 181)**

846. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property report by drawing attention to the fact that civil society groups had been calling for the extension of the protection of the World Heritage site to state forests immediately adjacent to the inscribed property. It said that these state protected forests were subject to threats associated with heavy logging activity and that recent reports indicated that logging operations were now underway within 100 meters of the boundary of the site, increasing risks from fires. The World Heritage Centre further recalled that the Committee, following an earlier extension of the site in 1989, had expressed its hope to see an additional extension to the site proposed to include these forests.
847. **IUCN** reiterated the need to consider extending the boundaries of the property which was consistent with IUCN positions at prior sessions of the Committee and drew attention to the threats the site is exposed to as a result of clear felling operations.
848. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification on missions that had been undertaken to the site since 1989, at the time of the last extension to the property.
849. **ICOMOS** explained that the property was originally inscribed as a rock-art site and said that it was also concerned about the threats linked to logging that could expose the rock art to the risk of fire.
850. The Observer from **Wilderness Society** expressed concern over logging operations underway in the pristine valleys surrounding the inscribed property. It referred to the World Heritage values of the area and suggested that the logging, if continued, would threaten the values of the inscribed property. It furthermore called for the mission to be scheduled for December 2007.
851. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** noted that a distinction should be made between issues relating directly to the state of conservation of the site and the hopes for an extension to the property. It further noted that, since the inscription of the property, only one minor incident related to burning had affected the site. It was further recalled that since the extension of the site in 1989, the property had been increased by 78% and that at that time IUCN had stated that the revision had met reservations expressed regarding the boundaries of the site in prior meetings.
852. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.
853. La délégation du **Bénin**, propose un projet d'amendement au paragraphe 3, à propos des coûts.
854. The Delegation of **Chile** asked that the concerned NGOs be identified.
855. **IUCN** noted that several NGOs were active in the area, notably the Human Environment Centre and that concerns raised by the Wilderness Society had been raised by others.
856. Revisions of a linguistic nature and amendments were put forward by the Delegations of **Israel, Benin, India** and the **United States of America**.

The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.43** adopted as amended.

## **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

### **Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C 274)**

857. In introducing the report, the **World Heritage Centre** recalled that the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu has experienced increasing threats since its inscription on the World Heritage List in 1983. These were linked to natural threats of landslides, the urban growth of Machu Picchu village, increasing number of tourists and inadequate management. The Citadel was without doubt one of the most painstaking

achievements and icons of the world's cultural heritage but represented less than 2% of the protected area of the sanctuary. The Master Plan had been submitted to the World Heritage Centre in 2005, having been approved without the benefit of full participation by the relevant stakeholders. A UNESCO/ICOMOS/IUCN reactive monitoring mission had taken place in April 2006.

858. On-going issues of concern included: lack of progress on the Public Use Plan; lack of progress on the implementation of the Risk Preparedness Plan; only selective implementation of the 2005 work plan; a violation of the regulations laid out for the Urban Development Plan for Machu Picchu Village (Aguas Calientes); and no submission of the Management Unit's Annual Operations Plan for the last two years. Current threats were noted as relating to: national plans to develop new road systems; pave existing roads in the buffer zone of the Sanctuary; increasing vehicular transportation; increasing number of visitors; and lack of access control - the routes between La Convención and Ollantaytambo were currently being completed and paved, and improvements were being made to those between Santa Teresa, Santa María and Quillabamaba. These Municipalities drew on significant financial resources from the payment of route rights for the Camisea gas pipeline.
859. In May, 2006, the World Heritage Centre had requested information about the construction of the Carrilluchayoc bridge in the buffer zone of the Sanctuary, only a few kilometres from the core zone of the property, enhancing the possibility for Santa Teresa to become a new focus for tourist services, and alternative access to the Sanctuary. The bridge, which was finalized without an environmental impact study or design approval even in the face of strong opposition from the INC and INRENA, was officially opened on 19 March 2007. Machu Picchu Village continued to suffer from the following uncontrolled construction: no action had been undertaken to reinforce the river containment walls; there was an absence of geological risk cartography at a proper scale in the urban area; low levels of awareness among the population living in the core and buffer zones; and massive hotel construction on the river banks. The tendency towards a lack of respect for the application of norms and rules indicated that the national authorities were losing control over local processes.
860. The World Heritage Centre had organized a workshop on 28 and 29 April 2007 in order to facilitate a discussion of the Master Plan among all major stakeholders. The workshop was well attended by representatives of civil society of the Sacred Valley, the INC, INRENA, MINCETUR and the Regional Authority of Cusco, with some 82 institutions taking part. Four working groups had discussed the following: Governance and Management of the Sanctuary; Public Use and Regional Planning; Participation of Stakeholders and Risk Management; and Conservation of Outstanding Universal Value and Monitoring. Consensus had been reached on: the immediate need to redesign and reinvigorate the Integrated Management Unit for the Sanctuary; the need to revise and complete the Master Plan integrating the concerns of civil society, the private sector, and municipalities of the Sacred Valley; and the need to include the sacred values of the site in the Master Plan as an essential tool for management. There was agreement on the urgency of undertaking the Public Use Plan through a participatory process with the stakeholders of the core and buffer zones of the Sanctuary. Risk assessment and preparedness was one of the most immediate concerns.
861. **IUCN** noted achievements in terms of the management of natural resources. It was essential that steps be taken to prevent squatting and an urgent need for a multi-lingual public awareness programme to warn people of the risks of landslide caused by overnight stays.
862. The Delegation of **Peru** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the report and the significant recommendations of the reactive monitoring mission which took place in April 2007. It recalled that a new committee in charge of the management of the property had been recently established with the participation of the civil society. With

regards to the Carrilluchayoc bridge and the access routes, it said that the government had decided to suspend their use and an agreement had been reached for the finalization of a communication plan which would take into account all recommendations of the mission. Finally, it informed the Committee that huge financial resources had been activated aimed at the implementation of the recommendations in a timely manner.

863. The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its satisfaction with the results obtained at the participatory workshop that had taken place in Cuzco in April 2007, as this had been the first time that 82 institutions, all the stakeholders on the Sanctuary, had come together to find a common solution for the property. It promised that the Government of Spain would continue to support the conservation of the Sanctuary through the Spanish funds in trust at UNESCO.
864. The Delegations of **Peru** and **Chile** noted their complete satisfaction with the workshop which had addressed the very complex challenges facing this property. It commented that all stakeholders and members of the local civil society had been involved in it and that the meeting had been an essential step forward in improving the situation.
865. The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the State Party for the work undertaken so far to address the complex challenges surrounding this important property, and proposed drafting amendments to what it considered the regrettably hard language of paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision. It also requested clarification about the location of the market place.
866. The **World Heritage Centre** replied that it was in the core zone.
867. La délégation du **Maroc**, tout comme la délégation du **Chili**, adresse ses félicitations pour le travail accompli. L'Etat partie attire l'attention sur certains problèmes de traduction pour le texte français.
868. In discussing the Draft Decision, the Delegation of **Kenya** requested IUCN to prepare an amendment to list the significant achievements made in the management of natural resources.
869. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.45** adopted as amended.

## CULTURAL PROPERTIES

### EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

#### Kizhi Pogost (Russian Federation) (C 540)



870. The **World Heritage Centre** recalled the intense discussion on Kizhi Pogost, one of the key wooden heritage sites on the World Heritage List, at the 30th session of the Committee (Vilnius, 2006) when Danger Listing had been considered. It stated that a joint ICOMOS-World Heritage Centre mission had been undertaken with the full cooperation of the State Party, supported by additional technical expertise from Norway. The mission had concluded that the conditions for Danger Listing had not been met. However, the mission had provided a full report indicating some areas requiring urgent action to be taken, including the implementation of the restoration project, an integrated management plan and the references to Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Centre confirmed that the report of the international mission had been transmitted to the State Party for review and comments, as had a proposal from a Polish University to assist in the management plan for the property. No reply had yet been received from the State Party.
871. The Delegation of **Norway** sought clarification from the State Party on references in the report to the need for on-site decision-making.
872. The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** said that the World Heritage Centre had already provided information about the mission. The State Party perceived it to be generally positive and it was in the process of preparing its response, which would be ready before the autumn.
873. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.88** adopted.

#### **Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)**

874. **The World Heritage Centre** presented the Committee with the news that a Turkish Delegation composed of local and national authorities and led by the Deputy Governor of Istanbul had visited the World Heritage Centre on 16 May 2007 to inform it about an international symposium and training seminar for the restoration of City Walls held from 30 April to 5 May 2007 in Istanbul. The Delegation had also expressed the State Party's firm commitment towards the preservation of the property and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee Decisions.
875. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if the many constructions it had observed at the walls affected its integrity.
876. **ICOMOS** confirmed that they did and stated that although this was problematic, the current focus of work was on the restoration of the fabric of the work.
877. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed deleting or modifying the reference in paragraph 6b of the Draft Decision to the Vienna Memorandum, as this was only one piece of the 'jigsaw'. It also suggested that as the term 'visual integrity' was not really used in paragraph 104 of the *Operational Guidelines*, it might be more appropriate to adopt an alternative, such as 'important views to and from'.
878. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the Observer Delegation of **Turkey** noted that it was doing its utmost to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in collaboration with the relevant institutions. It informed the Committee that since submitting its report to the World Heritage Centre in February 2007, the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality had established a material analysis laboratory to deal specifically with the timber houses and city walls. The Metropolitan Municipality had also taken the rehabilitation and restoration project of all Suleymaniye timber structures into the 2007 investment programme through the partial financial contribution of the Istanbul Governorship–Private Administration. A budget of approximately USD15 million had been allocated for the project. The budget would be used for the restitution and restoration of 400 registered historic houses and renovation of an additional 350 houses within the site. A historic heritage information system had been established and maintenance and repair permits recently been granted for 30 privately owned timber

houses. In closing, it expressed its willingness to invite a mission to Istanbul in 2008 to examine the developments.

879. La délégation du **Bénin** attire l'attention sur le fait que le texte de la décision en français commence par le paragraphe 5, et que les autres éléments sont manquants.

880. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.89** adopted as amended.

**Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488);**

**Westminster Palace, Westminster Abbey and Saint Margaret's Church (United Kingdom) (C 426)**

881. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that he would present the two properties together and informed the Committee that revised Draft Decisions had been circulated. During its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the Committee had expressed grave concern about the impact of developments on the Outstanding Universal Value of inscribed monuments. The new London skyline was a direct result of an active policy by the Mayor of London promoting tall buildings. Decision **30 COM 7B.74** on the Tower of London had regretted the absence of a visual impact study and noted the need to finalize the management plan. The November 2006 World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission had recommended a new protection scheme in order to retain the remaining iconic view – now only unobstructed from the south; and the finalization of the management plan - without which the property would qualify for In-Danger Listing. Since then there had been a series of important developments to enhance the protection of World Heritage sites including the publication of a White Paper, 'Heritage Protection for the 21st Century' in March 2007; the publication of the London View Management Framework, which would come into effect 13 July 2007; the finalization and publication of management plans for the Tower of London and Westminster; the publication for public comment of revised guidance on tall buildings; and the preparation of visual impact studies, although these had not yet been finalized. The World Heritage Centre had received the management plans on 25 June 2007 and while neither it nor ICOMOS had thus far had time to undertake a careful examination, it appeared that no clear buffer zone had been defined although there was a clear Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.
882. **ICOMOS** congratulated the State Party for the very useful extra material it had provided but recalled that the mission had made clear recommendations, including the need for an adequate and clearly defined buffer zone. However, the management plan appeared only to provide a clearly defined local setting. It was therefore open-ended as to whether all the Committee's requests had been met. The Committee could choose to accept the revised Decisions or revert to the original Draft Decision with its option to defer Danger Listing
883. The Delegation of **Chile** considered that the option proposed in paragraph 7 of the revised Draft Decision was acceptable, but the French translation was not correct and needed to be changed.
884. The Delegation of **India** congratulated the State Party for the efforts it had made. It noted that the Minerva Tower appeared to have been cancelled due to the absence of available funding by the developer. It sought clarification from the State Party as to what would happen if funds were to become available for the 'Shard of Glass' and its construction went ahead. It further queried what the subsequent impact on Outstanding Universal Value would be.
885. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** acknowledged the complexities surrounding development in urban historic landscapes and said that it was of paramount importance for the Committee to address and refine the concept for the twenty-first century and to provide a means for future sessions to examine state of conservation reports.
886. The Delegation of **Israel** asked the State Party to clarify whether the use of the term 'published' meant 'approved' or 'gazetted'? Referring to the comments of ICOMOS concerning the revised Draft Decision, it asked whether a third option was on the table.
887. The **Chairperson** said the relevant Draft Decision was the one referenced *31COM 7B.90. Rev.*
888. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** confirmed that 'published' meant approved and signed by all stakeholders. It said that the plans for the Shard of Glass had been called in for review by the Central Government. Its potential impact on the Tower had been a major consideration as it would be visible from some points within

the World Heritage property. However, the inspector had concluded that the impact would be acceptable, as the Shard of Glass would replace a bulky tower, with a design that was both slender and transparent.

889. The Delegation of **Israel** mentioned that the buffer zone for a monument was different to that for a cityscape. It advised that a forthcoming expert meeting organized by Israel and Switzerland in 2008 would aim to clarify the issue of buffer zones. Clarification was sought on what a dynamic visual impact study was and observed that the buffer zone should protect the full extent of the view. It noted that Westminster had been inscribed under criterion (i), whereas the Tower had not. The Delegation recommended that the State Party should be asked to report by 1 October 2007.
890. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked if the new statement of Outstanding Universal Value clearly explained the relationship of the view to the property's Outstanding Universal Value
891. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as required as part of the Periodic Reporting exercise for Europe, was based on the situation at the time of inscription and thus contained no changes. At the time of inscription, ICOMOS commented on tall buildings near the Tower, but not on buildings distant from the property or from its surroundings and it insisted that focus should therefore be given on the value which was recognized at the moment of inscription of the property.
892. La délégation du **Bénin** remercie l'Etat partie pour les efforts faits durant toute l'année. L'Etat partie considère cependant qu'il est mieux de pouvoir vérifier clairement les informations avant de prendre une décision, ce qui n'est pas possible compte tenu que les documents viennent d'être remis. Il considère que des pays tels que le Royaume-Uni ont une grande responsabilité du fait de leur expérience dans la protection du patrimoine mondial. En remettant au dernier moment des documents, ils ne montrent pas le bon exemple aux autres pays auxquels cette attitude est souvent reprochée.
893. The Delegation of **Lithuania** joined others in commending the State Party for its efforts. It hoped that the visual impact study would be completed in time for consideration by the 32nd session of the Committee. It also asked what the management plan envisaged in terms of a buffer zone.
894. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** said that the Visual Impact Study should be finalized by the end of 2007. It considered that the clearly delineated local setting had the same effect as a buffer zone. Responding to the point raised by the Delegation of Israel, it also said that the visual impact study would consider many views.
895. The Delegation of **New Zealand** welcomed the revised Draft Decisions. It noted that the State Party had fulfilled most of the requirements requested by the 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) in a very short space of time.
896. La délégation du **Maroc** remarque que les décisions concernant la Tour de Londres et le Palais de Westminster sont trop similaires, et que la notion de rapports d'avancement n'est pas claire.
897. Le **Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial** répond que les deux sites présentent de grandes similitudes, c'est pourquoi les décisions sont identiques. Les étapes mentionnées dans la décision se réfèrent aux éléments comme le plan de gestion, l'étude d'impact visuel et la zone tampon.
898. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Draft Decision *31COM 7B.90 Rev.*
899. The Delegation of **Israel** asked the State Party to clarify the definition of 'published'. The State Party said that both the management plans and the Management

Framework had been published and that the Framework would take legal effect as of 13 July 2007.

900. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.90** adopted as amended.
901. Turning to Draft Decision **31 COM 7B.91**, the **Rapporteur** noted that amendments to paragraphs 3 and 4 of the previous Decision would also apply here and that the Delegation of India had proposed inserting the word 'adversely' into line 3 of paragraph 4.
902. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.91** adopted as amended.

**Butrint (Albania) (C 570 bis):**

903. The **World Heritage Centre** had received information on 14 June 2007 from the Butrint Foundation about illegal constructions within the new proposed boundaries. The Centre reported that a major illegal development had appeared on the coast to the south west of Ksamili, within a hundred metres of the Vivari channel.
904. This illegal development (which has no building permit), was currently in its early stages. It was at the extreme southern end of the 'Recreation' zone on the zoning map. This was against the agreement between the World Bank and the Albanian government that there would be no development along the coastal strip until the World Bank's coastal plan had been completed in 2007. It was also within the Ramsar protected area. Such a development would be against the recommendations of the 2007 joint reactive monitoring UNESCO-WHC/ICOMOS/ICCROM mission on the subject of development. It confirmed that a letter had been sent to the authorities, and that a reply had been received from the aforementioned in the days prior to the 31<sup>st</sup> session, indicating that the development would be halted.
905. The newly proposed buffer zone was recommended for adoption by the Committee under item 8B of the Agenda.
906. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.92** adopted.

**Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev):**

907. The **World Heritage Centre** provided new information that, with the assistance of the UNESCO Venice office, a mission of two Italian architects had been carried out and that they had made the following observations and recommendations which were based on an analysis of the site and the available documents:
- It was noted that in January 2007, the joint Commission - established with the mayor of Mostar and composed of the experts from Mostar, the Federal Ministry of Town Planning and investors representatives, had prepared a new proposal that partially took into consideration the recommendations of the 2006 mission.
  - On the basis of the comparison with the sky-line of the city of Mostar, the construction of the new building presented an important visual impact in relation to the adjacent structures (mainly by the building's height and compactness).
  - The building of the new Hotel occupied practically all the plot, without leaving free space for green and external areas.
  - The building in construction, could not be considered integrated either in the context of the part of Mostar listed as World Heritage, or as the environmental insertion due to its imposing and rigid volumetric masses.
  - Having a strong visual impact, it may be necessary to reduce the height of the body of the building by at least one floor (even partially) to obtain a building with volumetric masses not vertically aligned. In particular, to fully respect the criteria set in the Master Plan of 2001 and management plan of 2004, reduction of the

- entire floor of the north wing of the L shape, as well as partial reduction of the one last floor of the south wings was strongly recommended.
- It was further recommended to use the typical materials of the area as stone and wood for the fronts and for the interiors and it would be indispensable to review the relationship of the building with its immediate external spaces, with the streets surrounding the lot and with the adjacent buildings.
  - it would be necessary to avoid big surfaces of reflecting glass and steel. These were recommended to be considered as the minimum level of intervention to ensure the integrity of the property inscribed.
908. The Delegation of **Norway** commented that this was another illustration of the impact of modern architecture on historic landscapes. It expressed surprise that the Draft Decision referred to the need to be in conformity with the Vienna Memorandum. It did not believe that this was the correct approach and requested that this and all similar references to the Vienna Memorandum in other Decisions be deleted.
909. The Delegation of **Israel** recalled that the Committee had adopted the Vienna Memorandum and suggested referring to the 'spirit of the Vienna Memorandum'.
910. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported Israel and agreed with the suggestion to insert "in the spirit of the Vienna Memorandum" in all concerned Decisions.
911. The Delegation of **Canada** said that the difficulty with the Vienna Memorandum was that it contained a multiplicity of recommendations and options. It proposed referring, in the relevant Decisions, to the integrity of the site, rather than that it should be in conformity with the Vienna Memorandum.
912. The **Chairperson** asked for a concrete amendment.
913. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested combining a reference to the spirit of the Vienna Memorandum with one to the integrity of the site.
914. The Delegation of **Canada** formulated drafting to this effect, suggesting the wording "in the spirit of the Vienna Memorandum "World Heritage and Contemporary Architecture, Managing the Historic Urban Landscape" (2005)" in paragraph 5.
915. The Chairperson declared Decision 31 COM 7B.93 adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 5:30 p.m.

**THIRD DAY – TUESDAY, 26 JUNE 2007**

**EVENING SESSION**

**EIGHTH MEETING**

**06.00 p.m. – 08.35 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

**MUGHRABI ASCENT AND OLD CITY OF JERUSALEM AND ITS WALLS (*continued*)**

916. Before re-opening the discussion devoted to the issue of the Mughrabi ascent and the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to Switzerland.
917. La délégation de la **Suisse** (observateur) remercie la Nouvelle Zélande pour son accueil et la bonne organisation de la 31<sup>e</sup> session du Comité. Il explique qu'il a souhaité prendre la parole pour informer les membres du Comité de l'initiative prise par la Suisse d'organiser une réunion sur les zones tampon en mars 2008, organisée conjointement par la Suisse, Israël et le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Cette réunion répond à la Décision **30 COM 9**, paragraphe 14. Elle sera constituée d'experts internationaux culturels et naturels, et des organisations consultatives ICOMOS, UICN et ICCROM. Il espère que le Comité du patrimoine mondial pourra bénéficier de cette réunion. Un rapport sera présenté en 2008 au Comité.
918. The **Chairperson** then invited the Deputy Director-General, Mr Barbosa, to report on the Decision regarding Jerusalem.
919. The **Deputy Director-General** informed the Committee that a consensus had been achieved and that the text was now available in English and French in the room. He underlined that this was a major achievement which was also a demonstration that UNESCO can make important progress in sensitive areas which was not possible in other fora. He stressed that the text was a delicate balance and that at the same time a new text for a Draft Decision on Tentative Lists had been prepared which would be taken up under item 8A. This was also done in view of a revision of Part II C of the *Operational Guidelines* and to further clarify procedures. He thanked the colleagues from the Culture Sector and his assistant as well as all Delegates who actively participated in the process.
920. The **Chairperson** thanked the Deputy Director-General and observed that the text was the result of intense debate and an agreement of all parties. It was proposed to be adopted without debate. He then declared Decision **31 COM 7A.18** adopted by acclamation.
921. The **Chairperson** then invited both parties concerned to make a brief statement.
922. The **Delegation of Israel** noted that this was an emotional moment for all who were involved in the process, and went on to thank the Deputy Director-General and his assistant as well as the Ambassador of the United States who had facilitated the process. He emphasised that Jerusalem was clearly a site of outstanding universal value and was important for the collective safeguarding of all people. The Decision of the Executive Board was unique – no other United Nations agency could have been able to achieve such a result. He then thanked the Committee for the adoption of the text and for its vision to move forward with Jerusalem.
923. La délégation de **Palestine** (observateur) indique que ses remerciements s'adressent à une longue liste de personnes et reconnaît que, pour atteindre un consensus, il est nécessaire d'accepter certains points qui ne sont pas complètement satisfaisants. La délégation exprime son souhait que ces accords vont permettre de passer plus vite à l'action car, en effet, la priorité est de passer aux actes, les délais ayant des conséquences concrètes extrêmement graves. Le défi est de concrétiser ce texte pour

aller dans la voie de la liberté et de la réconciliation. A travers ces négociations, les efforts ont été de placer, en permanence, l'idée d'égalité. Il est fondamental que les choses se passent sur un pied d'égalité entre les parties, quelque soit le déséquilibre sur le terrain. C'est ainsi que ce travail a été mené. La délégation de Palestine déclare qu'il allait être enfin possible de passer aux actes et de sauver ce site, à l'origine de cette crise, la rampe des Maghrébins.

924. The **Chairperson** thanked both parties for their intervention and said that the Committee could now proceed with the item on the budget, the World Heritage Fund and the Audit and requested the Director the World Heritage Centre to make a brief presentation.

**ITEM 20: BUDGET**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/20A  
WHC-07/31.COM/20B

*Decisions:* **31 COM 20A**  
**31 COM 20B**

925. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented documents WHC-07/31.COM/20A and 20B and noted the key elements of document 20A including the new contingency reserve of USD500,000 to be expanded to USD700,000. He then referred to *document 20B* and noted that the current status of implementation had reached 70% and would be certainly be at 100% by the end of the year. He pointed out that the staffing table was included in the Annex and that he would be available for further questions.

**ITEM 19: PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT ON THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/19A.Rev  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.19A  
WHC-07/31.COM/19B

*Decision:* **31 COM 19**

926. The **Auditor** (the independent auditor Deloitte) presented the main outcomes of the report on the management audit of the World Heritage Centre and referred to Documents *referenced WHC-07/31.COM/19A.Rev and WHC-07/31.COM/INF.19A.*

927. The **Chairperson** then invited the Assistant Director-General for Culture to explain the comments by the Director-General.

928. The **Assistant Director General for Culture** stressed the fact that these comments were both late and very preliminary, because they were produced only after the Internal Oversight Service (IOS) had completed its own assessment and because they would be enriched and finalized in the light of the comments by Committee Members themselves. She then highlighted some of the recommendations of the Audit which appeared particularly relevant to the Director-General, namely:

- the need to clarify reporting lines within World Heritage Centre structures;
- the need to further specify the administrative flexibility entrusted to the World Heritage Centre and to combine, on an experimental basis, various sources of financing in order to strengthen the human resources of the Centre.



929. The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Auditors for their presentations and observed that the mission of the Centre had been expanded and was more professional, which was positive. It asked for further clarity with respect to the Centre's administrative flexibility and noted that, from its personal knowledge, it could confirm that the Centre was clearly understaffed with very few staff on a permanent basis. Temporary contracts which were prolonged every three months were also undermining the morale. It requested clarification concerning the issue of formal training.
930. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the Centre had some terrific people and excellent professionals. It was clear however that there was a need for more resources and it regretted that no quantitative data was provided. No indicators had been provided either. It pointed out that the mission of the Centre was indicated in the *Operational Guidelines*, but that the Centre was now dealing with tangible cultural heritage in general, with the 1954 Hague Convention, restitution and other tasks. It stated that the Committee should be clear about what it wanted the Centre to do.
931. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that this agenda Item was for discussion and comments only and that Decisions would be taken during another session, possibly on Friday.
932. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed appreciation of the work done by Deloitte and raised two points: firstly whether there is a broad strategy on knowledge management (in view of the fact that there is web-page documentation and paper documents) and what a reasonable knowledge management system is and secondly, how to limit or control the self-initiated work at the World Heritage Centre.
933. The Delegation of **Lithuania** was concerned about the staffing situation of the Centre, noting that the unstable staffing situation had a negative effect on maintaining the institutional memory. It also expressed concern that there was no specific recommendation on the permanent staff situation. It additionally requested clarification on how the recommendations of the 1997 Audit had been. It concluded by commenting on the quality of the English translation of the document.
934. The Delegation of **Israel** commented that the Audit Report was focused, more or less, on analysis of the situation rather than presenting a synthesis. It was of the view that the spirit and soul of the World Heritage Centre as a centre of excellence should be maintained. In that context, a human-orientation aspect was missing and some flexibility should be allowed for the management of the Centre instead of 'putting things into boxes'. Therefore, an integrated process was considered necessary in order to conserve the soul of the Centre's work.
935. The Delegation of **Netherlands** made specific reference to UNESCO IOS's observations on the Management Audit Report. It noted in particular that there was no clear mapping of the workload and it did not identify and analyze the expected levels of workload. The Delegation commented that the report did not define a clear relationship between the Committee and the World Heritage Centre.
936. Regarding the issue of improving the accounting and budgetary management, the Delegation noted that this was a general issue for UNESCO and it welcomed the Director-General's proposal to build a transparent analytical system for the World Heritage Centre as a pilot exercise for the rest of the organisation. The Delegation expressed its desire to bring this to the attention of the senior managers of UNESCO.
937. The Delegation of **Spain** stated that the World Heritage Centre is an important entity in the implementation of the Decisions made by the World Heritage Committee as well as the *World Heritage Convention* and stressed that this should be the basic role of the Centre. It reiterated concerns expressed by the Delegates of Lithuania and Israel and advised that an attempt to limit micro management should be introduced. Furthermore,

it stated that the human resources situation at the World Heritage Centre was worrying and more resources should be provided to strengthen this aspect. It concluded that the Centre should maintain the best people on the basis of the needs of its main functions.

938. La délégation de **Madagascar** s'associe aux propositions des recommandations figurant en page 6 ; dans les diapositives, il est fait mention de 20 recommandations cependant toutes ne sont pas visibles lors de la projection.
939. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** expressed its appreciation of the work done by Deloitte. It stated that the World Heritage Centre is the most visible part of UNESCO and remains a centre of excellence. It noted however, that some weaknesses exist as indicated in the Audit Report. In that respect, issues such as the continuing debates on the reinforcement of human resources, managing budgets from different sources in a complementary and coordinated manner as well as the granting of administrative flexibility to the Centre in view of a specific feature within UNESCO, should be treated in an integrated manner.
940. On behalf of the Advisory Bodies, **ICCROM** made a statement, recalling that the Advisory Bodies were consulted during the audit process and they welcomed the results of the audit report. They felt, however, that the report contained many important findings and proposals regarding all phases of the work of the World Heritage Centre.
941. The Advisory Bodies emphasized the value of independent expert advice as established by the *Convention*. For this reason, the roles of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre are, and must be, complementary.
942. Regarding Recommendation 4.1, all three Advisory Bodies agreed with the need to clarify roles and responsibilities between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. There are a number of overlapping responsibilities which, if clarified, could lead to a more efficient and effective implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. It brought to the attention of the Committee that the World Heritage Centre has become increasingly involved in the tasks initially reserved for the Advisory Bodies (formulating "expert" advice, carrying out thematic studies, organizing training). Furthermore, it was of the view that there was still much room to clarify these roles and ensure that the best use of available resources was made.
943. Regarding Recommendation 4.2, the Advisory Bodies stated they would welcome a more streamlined process for contracting in line with their status within the *Convention*. In particular, they would emphasize the timely issue of contracts which allow them to carry out the work. Also, they would like to reiterate that all three Advisory Bodies contribute a substantial amount of their own resources to the work of the *Convention*. In brief, they would hope that the issue of increasing resources also be considered in relation to the expectations of the Committee towards the Advisory Bodies.
944. As concerns recommendation 4.3 covering the issue of accountability for the quality of deliverables, they noted that they strongly endorse these concepts in their work. They clarified that they are accountable to the Committee with each piece of advice that they give during Committee sessions and at other scientific forums related to the *Convention*. Regarding the part of the recommendation that the World Heritage Centre could be responsible for monitoring the quality deliverable through "quality" meetings, they stressed that the relationship between the Centre and the Advisory Bodies was a special one which, although it involves a contractual relationship, also calls for the Advisory Bodies to be able to give independent advice to the Committee without pressure from the Centre. They therefore felt that the role of the Centre in accounting for the quality of their work was not consistent with Recommendation 4.1, or with their role in assisting the work of the Committee.
945. The last issue commented on was Recommendation; 1.1 dealing with knowledge management. Although the Advisory Bodies were not specifically mentioned in this recommendation, they felt that the system would be dependent, in part, on their full

participation and inclusion in the system. They expressed a willingness to co-operate with the World Heritage Centre to develop this concept further and ensure that their work could be a part of this new knowledge system. In this regard, clarifications would be needed regarding connecting the archives/documentation centres of the Advisory Bodies to the system, and the role of the UNESCO/ICOMOS Documentation Centre and the databases maintained by IUCN and UNEP-WCMC to ensure there is no overlap.

946. They concluded by stating that they would welcome reference in the Draft Decision to the above points and the importance of continued and strengthened co-ordination between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, respecting the different and complementary roles; and the importance of adequate resources for the work of both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in order to support the work of the World Heritage Committee.
947. La délégation du **Maroc** se félicite des réalisations faites par rapport aux ressources humaines, cependant il faudrait placer l'Audit à sa juste valeur. Un premier test pilote a été limité au Centre et à son fonctionnement, ce qui aurait donné plus d'importance dans le domaine des actions étudiées eu égard aux objectifs et à un Plan d'action. Il faudrait relever l'état des choses et guider les enjeux et les défis et les surmonter. La délégation du Maroc souhaite formuler un Plan d'action de renforcement des capacités humaines et techniques du Centre, et trouver des solutions plus efficaces. La délégation souhaite continuer à travailler avec les Organisations consultatives.
948. The Delegation of **Chili** observed the large number of recommendations from the Audit report and questioned how these would be put into practice. It further noted that the current workload exceeded the capacity of the World Heritage Centre staff. Meanwhile, the energy of the Centre staff had been exhausted in administrative matters. It pointed out that Audit report drew a paradoxical conclusion.
949. The Delegation of **Japan** noted all the interesting recommendations contained in the Audit report and stated that it was in a position to observe when and how the recommendations could be implemented. As there were some discrepancies existing at UNESCO, it suggested implementing some of the recommendations in connection with the work of other parts of the organization, for instance, information technology and budget. It reiterated the point that a Documentation Centre should be improved and strengthened and more accessible to States Parties. Regarding the functional autonomy of the World Heritage Centre, it raised a technical question to Deloitte as to whether it had compared the performance of the Centre with any other similar institutions/organizations, big or small. In brief, the Delegation of Japan supported the proposal of maintaining the Centre's administrative flexibility.
950. La délégation d'**Algérie** (observateur) prenant la parole pour la première fois, félicite les autorités néo-zélandaises pour leur accueil. Puis, elle félicite le rapport d'Audit qui s'inscrit dans le cadre de la réforme des Nations-Unies, de l'UNESCO et du Secteur de la Culture. Elle souhaite aller dans le sens des recommandations de l'Audit, un renforcement des capacités humaines, cependant souhaite attirer l'attention sur le fait qu'il faudrait une meilleure représentation de la distribution géographique et que toutes les régions soient représentées. Elle souligne qu'il faudrait améliorer les relations avec les Bureaux régionaux et les autres Secteurs de l'UNESCO.
951. The Observer from the **United Nations Foundation** referred to the points made by the Delegation of Israel on keeping the soul and spirit of the World Heritage Centre. He pointed out that the co-operation between the Centre and UNF had been highly effective over the past six years through the platform provided by the World Heritage Centre either relating to inter-governmental agencies or non-governmental organizations. Furthermore, UNF benefited from its highly technical guidance in implementing some of the key activities (such as sustainable tourism at World Heritage

- sites) funded by the organization. In brief, the Centre provided a group of highly qualified staff to ensure the effective implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.
952. However, he was concerned with the situation of contractual arrangements for the temporary staff/assistance (on a 3-month basis) which hampered the leadership and efficiency of the UNESCO flagship programme. He also noted that the internal UNESCO support given to the World Heritage Centre was insufficient despite the substantial increase in its missions. Another point of concern was noted as the imbalanced distribution of professional staff for natural and cultural heritage.
953. Although there were recommendations on the modifications of governance, it heeded that they were not moving in a very positive direction. It hoped that restructuring of the World Heritage Centre would be carried out to ensure that its work could be more productive and effective.
954. The **Auditor** drew attention to the definition given, in the *Terms of reference* of the mandate, objectives and tasks of the World Heritage Centre of the *Convention*. They were, in fact, very broad, encompassing both the servicing of the governing bodies of the *Convention* (processing of the nominations; monitoring of the World Heritage properties) and the more operational activities (capacity building, fund-raising; information and education) formerly devoted (at least at the beginning of the Centre in 1995) to the Cultural Heritage Division. Hence, the regrouping of the functions, budget and posts of both elements which was achieved in February 2006 in order to avoid the duplication of tasks and structures (with, for example, regional desks on each side).
955. L'**Assistante Directeur Général pour la Culture** précise que n'ayant pas été en charge de ce rapport d'Audit, elle souhaiterait entendre les commentaires du Directeur du Centre et de son Directeur-adjoint. She continued by expressing the view that nothing the Centre currently does was beyond its mandate as defined in the *Operational Guidelines*. She noted that at the time of creating the Centre, its role was limited to organizing statutory meetings and processing nominations, whereas the Culture and Science Sectors, along with field offices, provided other services. This role seems to have evolved over time, even though the Centre was not enlarging the scope of its mandate, rather just taking stock of the reality. Further, she acknowledged a pressing need to deal with the human resources issues identified by the Audit, based on a need to preserve the "soul" of the Centre and its special identity and recognized the pressing need for more human resources at the Centre. She finally expressed her willingness to do everything possible to ensure that the World Heritage remains a "flagship programme".
956. **The Director of the World Heritage Centre** commented on the good work done by Deloitte which had included some concrete elements, such as:
- Improvement of management accounting control tools
  - International reorganization of the tasks
  - Knowledge management system ( as hub of knowledge on World Heritage)
  - Better clarification on the roles and responsibilities between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies etc.

957. He then stated his pride of the high professionalism provided for the Committee but noted that it had been a free product/service up to the present time. He stressed the high rate of turnover and uncertainty at the World Heritage Centre with two thirds of staff on temporary contracts (58/90 of the workforce) and only 32 regular posts established. As a manager, he commented on his everyday struggle with the rules and procedures of UNESCO governing human resources management. He also stated that there were some irregularities. He implored the Committee to consider some innovative procedures to ensure a highly qualified team to provide services. He further informed the Committee that this was also a point of discussion with the senior management of UNESCO.
958. The **Chairperson** suggested that the adoption of Decision 31 COM 19 should be suspended until later in the session on account of its complex implications and closed the session.

The meeting rose at 08.35 p.m.

**FOURTH DAY – WEDNESDAY, 27 JUNE 2007**

**NINTH MEETING**

**09.00 a.m. – 01.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

**ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE  
WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continued*)**

959. The **Chairperson** opened the session by announcing that he was celebrating his birthday today and that, upon reflecting on this milestone, he concluded that he was fortunate to live in “a wonderful world.” He reiterated that the meeting was behind schedule and said that 20 state of conservation reports remained, followed by the items on Tentative Lists and nominations. He requested the Committee to be cooperative in reaching effective solutions on time.

**Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616)**

960. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It mentioned that through a letter of 4 June 2004, the Permanent Delegation had informed the World Heritage Centre that the Ministry of Culture of the Czech Republic had decided to suspend the administrative procedures concerning two high-rise buildings situated in the Pankrac Plain until the Decision of the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee concerning this issue. It further stressed that the development pressure was enormous, as in many cities in this region.
961. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed slight amendments to paragraph 3.
962. The Delegation of **Norway** said that the reference to the Vienna Memorandum should be deleted from paragraph 6.
963. The Delegation of **Israel** said that Prague was a unique city, which had survived World War II and that the State Party should be informed of this important message.
964. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee for any further comments on the Draft Decision..
965. The **Rapporteur** read the proposal to delete the reference to the Vienna Memorandum from paragraph 6.
966. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.94** adopted as amended.

#### **Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallin (Estonia) (C 822)**

967. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It informed the Committee that there was new information from the Estonian National Commission for UNESCO on 31 May 2007 about a new court decision regarding the planned extension to the Viru Hotel, Tallinn, Estonia. The City authorities of Tallinn wished to alter the detailed site plan adopted in 1999, which provided for the construction of a 17-story extension to the 23-story Viru Hotel. It further explained that on 24 May 2007 the District Court of Tallinn had decided that Tallinn City authorities had no legal grounds for refusing to issue a building permit for the planned 17-storey extension to Viru Hotel, and the next steps of the city were not known yet. In response to the World Heritage Centre letter of 16 March 2007, the Thematic Plan for the "location of high-rise buildings in Tallinn" had been received on 3 May 2007 and sent to ICOMOS on 11 May 2007 for evaluation. It said that at the request of the Centre, additional documents on the Thematic Plan, including site plans of different districts and 3 D panoramic views of the same districts were received on 6 June 2007. These additional documents were also sent to ICOMOS for evaluation. It mentioned that the Plan had been prepared by Tallinn City Planning Department for the city as a whole and was not limited to the Tallinn Old Town 12 districts had been studied in this framework. District one (behind Veru Hotel), the closest area to the World Heritage property, had been earmarked for further densification.
968. The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to specify what needed to be changed in paragraph 5.
969. The **World Heritage Centre** declared that last part of paragraph 5 could be deleted and that changes would be conveyed to the Rapporteur.
970. **ICOMOS** said that the situation had now changed and that it was concerned about the actual implementation of the Plan on site.
971. The **Chairperson** recalled the amendment from the World Heritage Centre in paragraph 5.
972. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.95** adopted as amended.

#### **Historic Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)**

973. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report of the property. It stated that the situation at both the sites (loss of authenticity, lack of management mechanisms and boundary issues) was serious. It proposed that one single mission should be undertaken in order to save time and resources.
974. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked for clarification from the World Heritage Centre as to why the State Party had not been asked to provide a report in 2008 if the situation was so serious.
975. The **World Heritage Centre** responded that there were many sites to be discussed the following year, hence it had tried to reduce the number of sites for 2008, but that it could be brought forward to 2008 as the mission would provide a report.
976. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.96** adopted as amended.

#### **Bagrati Cathedral and Gelati Monastery (Georgia) (C 710)**

977. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee.
978. The Delegation of **Canada** asked the World Heritage Centre to specifically mention the names of the Advisory Bodies in paragraph 5.
979. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the Advisory Bodies were ICOMOS and ICCROM.
980. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.97** adopted as amended.

#### **Old Town of Regensburg with Stadtamhof (Germany) (C 1155)**

981. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It explained that a letter from the Ministry of Bavaria (Bayerische Staatsministerium für Wissenschaft, Forschung und Kunst), sent on 31 May 2007, provided an answer to the Centre's letter of 18 April 2007 concerning a construction project in the core zone which was approved by City in June 2001 and whose construction permit was valid for four years. It proposed that investigations be carried out to find out whether the permit was still valid. It suggested inviting an independent international expert for review.
982. The Delegation of **Israel** pointed out that there was a reference in the text to an international design competition, and that this competition had to be included in the Decision.
983. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the authorities had not informed the Centre about this competition and remarked that there was no general Decision on this.
984. The Delegation of **Israel** asked if anything further could be done in this regard.
985. **ICOMOS** expressed its concern over the design competition and asked for caution in the future.
986. The Delegation of **Norway** proposed to delete paragraph 6 from the Draft Decision.
987. The Delegation of **Canada** said that paragraph 6 should be retained, but amended by including an assessment of Outstanding Universal Value.
988. The **Rapporteur** read the amendments.
989. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.98** adopted as amended.

### **Historic Centre of Riga (Latvia) (C 852)**

990. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It advised the Committee that the State Inspection had requested, by a letter dated 12 April 2007, the assistance of UNESCO's experts participating in the International Seminar on Preservation and Development of Historic Centres of Towns, held in Riga from 16 to 17 April 2007, to evaluate the revised "Conception Project". It explained that it was inappropriate to evaluate such a complex and important project in the framework of a brief mission and in the absence of experts from the Advisory Bodies; therefore, the documents received by representatives of the World Heritage Centre from the city authorities on the Conception Plan were sent to ICOMOS for evaluation. It further noted with concern that construction works were ongoing. It informed the Committee that new information had been received from the French cooperation project on 16 June 2007 highlighting major concerns regarding foreseen projects not only for the Kipsala triangle but also projects to build an administrative centre as well and delocalize town hall services. It stressed the urgent need to address planning issues and develop adequate tools.
991. **ICOMOS** said that the project had an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. It recommended that the impact should be fully evaluated through a mission.
992. The Delegation of **Norway** asked if the reference to the Vienna Memorandum could be deleted in paragraph 7.
993. The Delegation of **Israel** stressed that the outstanding universal value be mentioned in paragraph 7. It stated that rapid urban development was taking place in Europe, and that this rapid development could have a negative impact on historic urban landscapes. It urged that the States Parties use guidelines to reduce the impact on Outstanding Universal Value of historic cities.
994. The Delegation of **Canada** encouraged the Centre and ICOMOS to broadly discuss the issue of urban landscapes and underscored the importance of studying the phenomenon of tall buildings in the 21st century cityscape. It preferred to see the wording "negative impact on Outstanding Universal Value".
995. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** wished to see the impact on the archaeological values of the property.
996. **ICOMOS** supported the comments by Israel on historic cities, and further added that there was an urgent need to look at the issue of buffer zones and Outstanding Universal Value. It said that there was merit in looking at geocultural areas, and that the pace of change was quick and dramatic. It explained that smaller areas would be more useful to look at than global.
997. The **Rapporteur** read the amendments of paragraphs 4, 7 and 8.
998. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.99** adopted as amended.

### **Natural and Culturo-historical Region of Kotor (Montenegro) (C 125)**

999. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It informed the Committee that the management plan had been received by the Centre, as a result of the good World Heritage Centre, BRESCE, ICCROM and ICOMOS joint cooperation. It said that a mission was proposed to review bridge and new construction projects, stating that the pressure by investors in this area was enormous.
1000. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.100** adopted.



## **Auschwitz Concentration Camp (Poland) (C 31)**

1001. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee and remarked that the implementation of the management plan would take time. It explained that the draft management plan received on 7 May 2007 had been upgraded, and that the draft plan in its current form created solid foundations for further, more in-depth activities of the necessary actions. The weakness was that the plan had not had the consensus of all the stakeholders for the key issues, but the strength of the document lay in the fact that it had identified the management process's weak points and even forced the social partners to take a specific stand. The Centre informed the Committee that there was one very important point: the broader acceptance for the protection of Auschwitz-Birkenau's landscape outside the Museum and its statutory zone which remained an open issue. It said that there was an excellent management team which benefited from major international involvement; however it had to go a long way towards the implementation of the plan and most crucially the involvement of the local people.
1002. The Delegation of **Israel** said that some problems had arisen such as the very complex issue between the local people and the State Party, which had also been a global issue. It commended the excellent documentation of the property by the local expert, and noted that this information would also be useful for the management plan. It expressed its concern regarding a lack of guidelines for the buffer zone.
1003. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked the World Heritage Centre if the issue of buffer zones had been addressed in the management plan.
1004. The **Chairperson** asked if the State Party wished to take the floor.
1005. La délégation de **Pologne** (observateur) informe le Comité que la zone bleue s'étend sur 100 mètres autour du bien. La zone rouge comprend des bâtiments privés qui seront analysés au cas par cas. Cette démarche d'analyse fait partie du plan de gestion proposé
1006. The **World Heritage Centre** responded that the property had originally been inscribed with a large buffer zone and that the broader landscape of exploitation had been taken into account in the management plan
1007. The **Rapporteur**, having received the proposal by Israel, read the changes accordingly. He advised that paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 had not been changed, and a new paragraph 5 had been inserted reading "commends the State Party for documentation....". He then recalled that new paragraphs 6, 7, 8 and 9 were added.
1008. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.101** adopted as amended.

## **Historic Centre of St Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540)**

1009. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It informed the Committee of the designs for the so called "Gazprom" tower – including the winning design of an international competition. It further explained that no permits had been issued and the height was undoubtedly against existing regulations in place. Concerning the follow-up of the 2006 mission, unfortunately the maps requested by the Committee were not satisfactory and had to be returned as they did not include the whole property. It noted that there appeared to be a number of issues that had to be solved including the cooperation between the city and the Leningradsk Oblast. It appreciated that the authorities were very cooperative in the

organization of a key seminar on the historic urban landscape with a focus on Eastern Europe in January/February 2007 – some Committee members and others in the room were present and had had the opportunity to see this key site and virtually intact historic city of a horizontal character

1010. The Delegation of **India** asked if the State Party wished to comment.
1011. The Observer Delegation of the **Russian Federation** responded that the groups of monuments were not related to each other. It said that a meeting was planned in cooperation with Eastern and Western European countries which also included the issue of a buffer zone. It stated that the work on the maps was to be completed in December 2007. An analysis of the visual impact of the Gazprom tower had also been carried out. It further explained that the project was under debate and that there were many opponents.
1012. The Delegation of **Kenya** declared that there was a problem with paragraphs 5 and 6. It suggested that the impact of the project on Outstanding Universal Value should be clarified by the State Party, and that any development should be stopped until all materials were received by the Centre.
1013. The Delegation of **Lithuania** conveyed that if the documentation had been successfully completed then paragraph 4 was to be changed, and there was no further need to ask for maps.
1014. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the property was a serial site. It recalled the mission in 2006 which had discovered that the existing maps were not compliant with the standard, and the mission had recommended that the State Party provide standard maps.
1015. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked if there was a need for both the documentation and maps. It declared that the paragraph was inconsistent.
1016. The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to clarify this matter, hence it was agreed to move the word “documentation”.
1017. The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the Director of the World Heritage Centre had made strong representations about this issue to Gazprom during the St. Petersburg meeting and asked whether there had been any follow-up. It referred to the article 104 in the *Operational Guidelines* and recommended that the second part of paragraph 5 should stand.
1018. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** stated that during the St Petersburg meeting, constructive discussions had been held concerning the Gazprom project and the design company and confirmed that there had been further contacts with them..
1019. The Delegation of **Israel** said that it had been saddened by the state of conservation reports that morning especially regarding developments in cities in Eastern Europe. It expressed the view that the Committee’s job was to consider the overall picture. It stressed that the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre must have a discussion on this matter, and further asked for consistency with Decisions, and that the reports should clearly identify impacts on Outstanding Universal Value. It concluded by saying the Committee should send a strong signal to the State Party about possible Danger Listing.
1020. **The Director of the World Heritage Centre** clarified that both the Centre and the Advisory Bodies had been assessing the impacts, and that the issue was emerging. He said that the Committee had welcomed the Vienna Memorandum and further explained that the General Conference of UNESCO would look into a recommendation on the preservation of historic cities. The Director also mentioned collaboration with other bodies including the International Federation of Architects, and that initiatives were being taken to create a team of global experts.

1021. The Delegation of **Kenya** reminded the Rapporteur that it had proposed some changes in paragraph 6.
1022. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** stated that the proposed new text for paragraph 7 was underway.
1023. After the **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments, the **Chairperson**, noting no further discussion, declared Decision **31 COM 7B.102** adopted as amended.

#### **Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545)**

1024. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It informed the Committee that new information concerning the state of conservation of the property had been received from the Ministry of Culture and Mass Media via the Permanent Delegation of Russian Federation to UNESCO on 21 May 2007. It explained that the Federal Service confirmed that “the designing and preparatory works related to the installation of the multifunctional complex at the Red Square were carried out in conformity with the legal instruments related to the protection of the cultural heritage properties, as well as with the requirements of the World Heritage Committee. Furthermore, the “Middle Trading Rows” was a Federal property, and the main front of this historic complex was a part of the urban ensemble of the Red Square.” It noted that the Federal Service considered that, at this time, any violation of Federal law, as well as engagement of the Russian Federation concerning the protection of this World Heritage property was absent.
1025. The Delegation of **Cuba** took note of the fact that the walls appeared to be damaged. The State Party requested further explanation from the Advisory Body concerning the damage incurred.
1026. **ICOMOS** indicated that it was extremely concerned about this issue and that an investigation into these projects should be carried out.
1027. The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the State Party wished to provide any clarification.
1028. The Delegation of **Cuba** proposed ICCROM to take the floor to answer its question concerning potential impacts at the Cathedral. It asked whether ICCROM should not be part of the mission requested by the Decision.
1029. The Observer Delegation by the **Russian Federation** agreed with the World Heritage Centre regarding a mission in September of 2007. The mission would also include ICCROM. It further explained that the projects were beyond the borders of the property which would be clarified by the mission.
1030. The Delegation of **Lithuania** recalled that there had been a mistake in the previous Decision in paragraph 6. It noted that permits were being issued which would legally allow the developers to proceed with their projects.
1031. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to amend the text in the paragraph (6) to “stop developments including the issue of permits...”
1032. The **Chairperson** agreed with the comment from the Delegation of Kenya.
1033. The **Rapporteur** repeated the amendments and the revised Decision.
1034. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.103** adopted as amended.

#### **Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373)**

1035. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It said that a letter by the State Party had been sent by e-mail on 20 June 2007 to find new solutions for the A303 motorway which was still under discussion. Concerning the visitor centre, the Minister David Lammy informed the Centre that

planning consent had been granted for the visitor centre subject to conditions, one of which was improvements to the A303.

1036. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.104** adopted.

1037. The **Chairperson** then went through the list of reports for adoption requiring no discussion:

**Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784)**

1038. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.105** adopted.

**City of Graz – Historic Centre (Austria) (C 931)**

1039. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.106** adopted.

**Fertö / Neusiedlersee Cultural Landscape (Austria/Hungary) (C 772 rev)**

1040. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.107** adopted.

**Belfries of Belgium and France (Belgium/France) (C 943bis)**

1041. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.108** adopted.

**Historic Centre of Cesky Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)**

1042. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.109** adopted.

**Cologne Cathedral (Germany) (C 292 rev)**

1043. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.110** adopted.

**Classical Weimar (Germany) (C 846)**

1044. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.111** adopted.

**Rock Drawings in Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94)**

1045. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.112** adopted.

**City of Vicenza and the Palladian Villas of the Veneto (Italy) (C 712 bis)**

1046. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.113** adopted.

**Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994)**

1047. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.114** adopted.

**The Megalithic Temples of Malta (Malta) (C 132 bis)**

1048. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.115** adopted.

**Cultural Landscape of Sintra (Portugal) (C 723)**

1049. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.116** adopted.

**Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348 rev)**

1050. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.118** adopted.

**Old City of Salamanca (Spain) (C 381 rev)**

1051. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.119** adopted.

#### **L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865)**

1052. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.120** adopted.

#### **Historic Centre of Sighisoara (Romania) (C 902)**

1053. The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the property had been requested for discussion by a Committee member.

1054. The **Rapporteur** advised the Committee that the request had been made by the Delegation of Canada and that it had asked to bring the date back to 2008 from 2009.

1055. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.117** adopted as amended.

#### **Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom) (C 1150)**

1056. The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the property had been requested for discussion by the Committee and that a letter had been received containing new information from the State Party.

1057. The **Rapporteur** said that the Delegation of Canada had proposed a revision of paragraph 3b.

1058. **ICOMOS** recalled the Seoul Declaration. It said that after the Declaration there had been a series of meetings concerning booming economies and their impact on cities.

1059. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked if the State Party wished to comment.

1060. Welcoming the State Party, the Delegation of **Israel** said that paragraph 7 was not clear and asked it to comment on what exactly was being prepared.

1061. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that the only remaining issue was the planning guidelines and advised that the reason for the delay in finalizing this was attributed to the long consultation with stakeholders. It noted that the guidelines should be finalized by March 2008. It further stated that the reason for offering a case study was that Liverpool would provide a good example on the impact of booming economies on the city.

1062. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.121** adopted as amended.

### **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

#### **Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobelo-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)**

1063. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It informed the Committee that the State Party had sent information confirming damage that had already been detected in 2001, and that neither Portobelo nor San Lorenzo were implementing management plans. It further explained that the property lacked visual integrity, and there were no precise limits or buffer zones. It explained the problems in San Lorenzo as following: the World Monuments Fund had listed the site on the 100 most endangered sites in 2002; a landslide had caused a 60 square meter collapse on the south perimeter of the walls; and, in the case of Sal Lorenzo, a lack of proper water drainage system as well as damages to the docks at the basis of the fortress; moreover, there were poor facilities for visitors including an absence of signage, poor visitor centre parking facilities, basic amenities or restrooms; access to the property was unsafe (particularly during the wet season); damage to the

dock at the base of the fortress is evidential and there is an overall low level of maintenance of the site. Referring to Portobelo, it explained the problems as the following: there were various issues relating to informal settlements on the site which had not been resolved; no housing alternatives had been provided for squatter settlements which were in close proximity to the fortifications and there was no system for the management of water and drainage. It mentioned that the World Heritage Series N°19, published in December 2006, was devoted to fortifications in America. A chapter addressed, in detail, the conservation priorities and work already undertaken in San Lorenzo and Portobelo. American experts had expressed concern on the state of conservation of this property.

1064. The Delegation of **Israel** voiced concern over the use of money involved.
1065. The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the World Heritage Centre was correct that this site was on the In Danger List of International Monuments and Sites, but had now been removed from the World Heritage In Danger List. The Delegation asked for details on the possible impact of the expansion of the Panama Canal on the site.
1066. The **World Heritage Centre** stated that the Committee had provided USD 73,000 for the restoration of Portobelo which was being affected by sea-erosion. Concerning possible impacts, the World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that the geographical area in which the two fortresses are located is far from the area in which the National authorities could begin the new infrastructure. The World Heritage Centre had not received any new information submitted by the State Party on this issue.
1067. The **Chairperson** asked if there were other comments.
1068. The Delegation of **Chile** was extremely concerned by the state of conservation of the property. It urged that previous experiences must be integrated and used. The State Party thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Delegation of Spain.
1069. The Delegation of **Spain** expressed deep concern concerning the two fortifications. The State Party asked the World Heritage Centre to continue to ask for the requested information, especially for the master plan which is necessary for the protection of the fortifications.
1070. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** had the same concern as the Delegations of Chile and Spain in relation to the state of conservation of the fortifications. The State Party had already been deeply involved in previous meetings related to the fortification protection issues. In order to save the fortifications, it recommended intensive cooperation and pledged that it would be ready to give Mexican support and expertise on this topic.
1071. The Delegation of **Chile** asked the Committee to include the Mexican offer into the Decision, and stated that other technical cooperation would be established.
1072. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** agreed to integrate this offer into the Decision, to ensure a technical collaboration.
1073. The **Chairperson** declared that proper wording was needed.
1074. The **Rapporteur** read the amended Decision.
1075. The Delegation of **Spain** commented that it would be happy to see a collaboration programme between the two States Parties.
1076. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.122** adopted as amended.

#### **Historical Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016)**

1077. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the state of conservation report to the Committee. It said, referring to the annual conservation report received in February 2007, that the Disaster Preparedness Plan for the city was 90% complete; the State

Party had committed itself to its finalization by the end of 2007. New interventions regarding both buildings at risk and other interventions had, however, been carried out taking risk mitigation into account, respecting judicial process and utilizing holistic restoration practices. Moreover, various national and local institutions had undertaken conservation works in the historic centre, at times with successful collaboration with other institutions, notably with the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation. It further explained that only very basic graphical information concerning architectural interventions had been received, and no archaeological work appeared to have been carried out prior to intervention on buildings. It had therefore not taken into account the pre-hispanic wealth of the city, even in some of the houses. In spite of the decreasing number of demolitions on the site, one of the more emblematic houses of the *Calle San Agustín* had been partially demolished. It had noted that information supplied by a civil society organization in Arequipa had complained about demolitions in the historic area dating from the end of the 1990s. In addition, despite the work carried out on the historic fabric of the buildings, some of which were over four centuries old, no archaeological work had been referred to in the report provided.

1078. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.123** adopted.

1079. The **Chairperson** then went through the list of reports for adoption requiring no discussion.

**San Agustín Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744)**

1080. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.124** adopted.

**Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic) (C 526)**

1081. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.125** adopted.

**Maya Site of Copán (Honduras) (C 120)**

1082. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.126** adopted.

**Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412)**

1083. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.128** adopted.

**Chavín Archaeological Site (Peru) (C 330)**

1084. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.129** adopted.

**Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700)**

1085. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.130** adopted.

1086. The **Chairperson** then informed the Committee that the Delegation of Lithuania had requested to discuss the property of Teotihuacan.

**Pre-Historic City of Teotihuacan (Mexico) (C 414)**

1087. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked to see the report at an earlier date in 2008.
1088. The **Chairperson** asked whether the State Party had any comment.
1089. The Delegation of **Chile** wanted to ensure that the State Party concerned would be able to submit the requested reports on time, according to the new proposed Decision.
1090. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** confirmed that it would be able to submit all the reports required.
1091. The Delegation of **Peru** confirmed that the State Party would submit the documents on time, as requested.
1092. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.127** adopted as amended.

## AFRICA

### Rock-Hewn Churches, Lalibela (Ethiopia) (C 18)

1093. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, recalling the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission which took place in from 7 to 14 March 2007.
1094. La mission conjointe ICOMOS et du Centre du patrimoine mondial, demandée par le Comité, a eu lieu du 7 au 12 mars 2007 afin de s'assurer que l'Etat partie avait modifié le projet sur les abris temporaires. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a travaillé avec les autorités éthiopiennes et la commission européenne pour modifier le projet et rendre les abris réversibles. Les fondations ne seront plus creusées, mais reposeront sur la partie supérieure du substrat rocheux qui entoure les églises, avec un allègement des éléments composant la structure du toit. Selon le rapport de la mission, les travaux devaient démarrer en juin 2007 et se terminer en décembre 2007. La mission a demandé que le plan d'action pour la conservation des églises, élaboré en juin de 2006, inclue également les études historiques et archéologiques et les analyses sur les différentes techniques d'excavation de la roche, les mortiers, l'entretien. Dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre du plan d'action, un projet pilote de conservation de l'Eglise de Biet Mercurios, a été financé par le gouvernement de Norvège pour un montant de 300,000 dollars EU dans le cadre du Fonds en dépôt norvégien à l'UNESCO. Le Centre a été informé le 13 juin que le plan d'opération avait été signé par l'Etat partie, permettant sa prochaine mise en œuvre.
1095. **ICOMOS** warmly welcomed the Action Plan set up by the State Party and conveyed that, in particular, the land use around the churches and water-use was a good initiative.
1096. The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Centre for the work done. It said that the management plan should be the first thing to do and that it should include all the areas. It expressed concern that the conservation plan had come last in the Decision. It said that the planning and implementation by the State Party would be vital. It further stressed that the capacity building in implementing the management plan should be ensured.
1097. The Delegation of the **United States of America** concurred and offered drafting suggestions related to paragraph 6, as the existing language was somewhat circuitous.
1098. The Delegation of **Israel** concurred and congratulated both the State Party and the World Heritage Centre for the work undertaken to revise the design for the shelters. It suggested that it may be more appropriate for the Draft Decision to refer to a management mechanism rather than a plan.
1099. **ICCROM** supported the observations of the State Party on capacity building, noting that such efforts should concern both national and regional levels in Ethiopia. It noted



that the shelters were intended to be temporary and that it hoped the conservation work would proceed and that they could be removed when conservation work had been completed.

1100. The Delegation of **Israel** observed that the *Operational Guidelines* referred to 'management systems'.

1101. The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** affirmed that it had begun to address the issues raised by the Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) as soon as that session had ended. The construction of the shelter was on-going as a result of EU funding. It expressed its gratitude to the Government of Norway for the financial assistance it had provided. It also informed the Committee that the commencement of work on the re-erection of the Axum obelisk was imminent.

1102. The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that it had received proposed amendments from the Delegations of Kenya and Benin.

1103. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.46** adopted as amended.

**Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev)**

1104. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** a présenté le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien, en rappelant que l'Etat partie a soumis un rapport le 7 février 2007, mais celui-ci ne comportait pas les documents techniques demandés par le Comité dans sa décision de la 30e Session, qui montrent le projet architectural révisé. Pour rappel, ce projet de construction du Centre Ahmed Baba est en voie de réalisation à la limite de la zone tampon, face à la Mosquée Sankoré. Depuis la préparation de ce rapport, le Centre a écrit à l'Etat partie de recevoir les documents attendus par le Comité. Dans sa dernière lettre adressée le 20 juin au Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial, l'Etat partie informe le Directeur des dispositions qui ont été prises afin que l'ensemble des documents techniques soient transmis dans les meilleurs délais. Le courrier reçu mentionne la visite du Ministre de la Culture du Mali sur le site, en compagnie de son homologue sud africain, et que suite à cette visite, des instructions données par le Ministre de la Culture afin que la décision de la 30e session soit pleinement respectée ; et que soient prises en compte les recommandations de la mission du Centre du patrimoine mondial de mars 2006 relative à l'impact que pourrait avoir la construction du futur Institut.
1105. **ICOMOS** stated that the site was the repository of an enormous wealth of manuscripts. It warmly welcomed the idea of an archive centre to store and preserve them. It had expressed concerns about the potential impact of the design presented to the Committee at its 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) on the Sankoré Mosque and it would be important that the State Party submit the new designs so that ICOMOS could examine them.
1106. The Delegation of **Kenya** requested changes to the language of the Draft Decision which it found too strong. It noted that the property was one where the connection between the tangible and intangible heritage was evident. It expressed concern that an over emphasis on the fabric could risk alienating the local community and urged sensitivity on the part of the Committee.
1107. La délégation du **Bénin** partage les commentaires du délégué du Kenya, et demande au Centre d'envoyer une mission d'urgence sur le site. Il souhaite qu'il soit mentionné que le Gouvernement coopère afin que des solutions soient trouvées.
1108. The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment from the Delegation of Kenya to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision, urging State Party to collaborate with the World Heritage Centre.
1109. La délégation du **Chili** prend note des progrès réalisés dans le plan de conservation et de gestion.
1110. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.47** adopted as amended.

#### **Island of Mozambique (Mozambique) (C 599)**

1111. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a présenté le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien. Les nouvelles informations concernent les progrès réalisés dans le projet de réhabilitation de la Forteresse San Sébastien. Le cabinet d'architecture qui a été sélectionné après un appel d'offre international vient de soumettre les plans détaillés de la Forteresse qui serviront pour l'appel d'offre de sélection de l'entreprise qui sera chargée des travaux de prévention contre toute autre détérioration de la forteresse et de commencer de manière urgente les travaux de restauration.
1112. La délégation du **Mozambique** remercie les autorités néo-zélandaises pour leur accueil. Au nom de son gouvernement, elle remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial pour l'assistance apportée au Mozambique, et indique que le plan directeur et le plan de gestion avancent et que l'on disposera de tous les documents d'ici la fin de l'année.

Elle remercie le groupe des partenaires financiers du projet de restauration de la Forteresse San Sebastien et invite tous les membres à visiter l'île de Mozambique.

1113. The Delegation of **Israel** commended the State Party for its tenacity in dealing with challenges presented by this property, and in particular those related to the urban fabric. It observed that it was often very difficult to attract funding for vernacular architecture and proposed amending the Draft Decision to include a request to traditional donors to devote future funding to this area.
1114. The Delegation of **Kenya** agreed. It considered paragraph 12 of the Draft Decision to be too long and proposed deleting the reference to in Danger Listing, as it was important to give further encouragement.
1115. The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments it had received from the Delegation of Israel.
1116. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that the both Centre and UNESCO office in Maputo were closely involved in this project. He explained that funding was currently available for only 50 percent of the restoration of the fort and requested that the Draft Decision referred to the need to first address this and to devote future funding to the urban fabric.
1117. La délégation de **Madagascar** suggère la formulation suivante : Prie instamment l'Etat partie d'élaborer en priorité un plan d'action d'urgence.
1118. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.48** adopted as amended.

#### **Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173 Rev)**

1119. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a présenté le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien. Aucune information nouvelle n'a été reçue par le Centre, concernant le projet de réhabilitation de Malindi. Mais si dans le cas échéant, le Président souhaitait entendre l'Etat partie, son représentant est présent dans la salle. Celui-ci pourrait apporter des éclaircissements sur ce projet financé par la Commission européenne. Il rappelle qu'il s'agit d'un projet de remplissage des espaces vides des digues qui va conduire à la suppression des digues existantes.
1120. D'autre part, les informations promises par le consultant de la Commission européenne sur les détails des études d'impact environnementales à mener pour préparer le projet de réhabilitation, n'ont toujours pas été reçues par le Centre.
1121. **ICOMOS** noted that the project bore similarities to that of Lalibela, in that the availability of European Union funding appeared to encourage the State Party to do more than it may otherwise have done – i.e. to go beyond restoration. It also mentioned that it would be necessary to understand the reasons for the absence of an adequate Environmental Impact Assessment.
1122. The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the comments of ICOMOS and noted that similar issues would arise in other state of conservation reports. It proposed amending the Draft Decision to: "should request the Director-General of UNESCO to discuss with the World Bank, European Union and other donors the importance of coordinating their projects at World Heritage sites with the World Heritage Centre".
1123. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported this and proposed a further amendment to paragraph 2 to the same effect but seeking to take up the matter at Commissioner level within the European Commission.

1124. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification as to be whether a reply had been received from the European Commission on the points referred to on p218 of the working document.
1125. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial indique que le Centre n'a reçu aucune information au sujet du consultant qui travaille pour la Commission Européenne.
1126. The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed amending paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision so that it ended at 'value'.
1127. La délégation du **Bénin** souhaite qu'il soit ajouté au projet de décision que l'Etat partie demande à la Communauté Européenne de consulter l'UNESCO. Il indique que l'Etat partie semble être blâmé de ne pas consulter le Centre alors que les autorités de la ville ont demandé avec insistance la coopération avec le Centre.
1128. The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** assured the Committee that its primary objective was to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property prevailed. It affirmed that it was committed to resolving the issue and indicated that it would welcome a mission.
1129. The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to the Draft Decision, which was adopted, following further interventions by the Delegations of Kenya, Benin and Israel.
1130. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.49** adopted as amended.

#### **Old Towns of Djenné (Mali) (C 116 rev)**

1131. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Delegation of Canada had requested to discuss the property of Old Towns of Djenné.
1132. The Delegation of **Canada** requested that the date for the State Party to report back to the Committee be changed to 2008.
1133. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.51** adopted as amended.

#### **52. Ile de Gorée (Sénégal) (C 26)**

1134. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Delegation of Lithuania had requested to discuss the property of Ile de Gorée.
1135. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked for clarification as to whether a site manager had now been appointed.
1136. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique que sur la question du Mémorial et surtout du point de vue du Comité, l'ICOMOS pourra donner son avis quant à sa démolition, et précise que même si dans le rapport il est mentionné que l'Etat partie a décidé de créer des postes de gestionnaires pour tous les sites du patrimoine mondial, celui de l'Ile de Gorée n'est toujours pas nommé.
1137. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.52** adopted as amended.

#### **Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055)**

1138. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.50** adopted.

#### **Robben Island (South Africa) (C 916)**

1139. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.53** adopted.

## ARAB STATES

### Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193)

1140. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** informe le Comité des informations récentes fournies par l'Etat partie depuis la rédaction du document de travail, en particulier :
- Le relogement des familles installées sur le site, mentionné dans le rapport comme prévu entre 2007 et 2009, s'est effectué en mars 2007 selon les procédures nationales.
  - En ce qui concerne le renforcement des ressources, il apparaît que le cadre administratif de l'Etat partie ne comporte pas de structure financière et d'allocation de personnel spécifiques pour les sites, rattachés aux structures préfectorale et nationale. Il n'est donc pas possible d'évaluer le renforcement éventuel des ressources pour Tipasa.
  - Une seconde carte avec délimitation des zones centrales et tampon a été transmise au Centre du patrimoine mondial, mais il semble que des précisions sont encore nécessaires quant aux coordonnées géographiques. Par ailleurs, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a évoqué la nécessité de clarifier les notions de plans de gestion/plan de protection et autres plans d'action afin d'éviter les confusions.
1141. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** recalled that Decision **30 COM 7A.18** had been very explicit. It asked the World Heritage Centre to clarify whether the additional information that had just been provided meant that all the conditions of paragraph 6 of that Decision had been satisfied.
1142. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique que l'Etat partie a en effet fourni des informations complémentaires et revient sur les demandes de la décision de la 30e session. La plupart ont été entreprises, mais sont encore incomplètes, en particulier la réalisation du plan de protection et de mise en valeur, annoncée pour 2008. Le plan de gestion engagé n'est pas encore terminé.
1143. La délégation du **Maroc** tient à souligner que l'Etat partie a envoyé une lettre avec accusé de réception, le 31 janvier 2007, contenant des informations concernant le relogement, le périmètre et le plan de gestion. La délégation présente un projet de révision de la décision, au paragraphe n° 4, et propose que l'Etat partie apporte des précisions.
1144. The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred.
1145. The Delegation of **Spain** supported the proposition from Morocco and congratulated the State Party for the efforts deployed in implementing the tasks, notably in reinforcing human resources.
1146. The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with previous speakers. Regarding the main threats in (e) and the confusion relating to the concept of a management plan, it asked whether the State Party would consider requesting a mission to address these.
1147. La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique que l'Etat partie fait des efforts considérables et mérite d'être félicité. Elle exprime son accord avec le Maroc pour introduire les amendements requis au projet de décision.
1148. The Delegation of **Kuwait** concurred.

1149. The Delegation of **India** associated itself with the comments made by the Delegation of Morocco and congratulated the State Party for its considerable efforts over the past year.
1150. The Delegation of the **United States of America** also congratulated the State Party on the progress made. It expressed its wish that the Draft Decision be amended to reflect the fact that the property's removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger had been conditional and that it could yet be re-inscribed if not all the conditions had been met by the 32nd session of the Committee in 2008.
1151. La délégation du **Bénin** appuie le Maroc et l'Inde et félicite l'Etat partie pour ce qui a été fait.
1152. La délégation de l'**Algérie** (observateur) apporte des précisions concernant les limites du site. La législation prévoit une zone de protection de 200 m. Elle indique que des précisions ont été soumises il y a quinze jours au Centre. Le plan de gestion a été transmis mais son contenu doit être étudié. Il a été en outre demandé que le Plan de Protection et de Mise en valeur soit intégré dans le Plan de gestion. La délégation conclut, en disant que parce que ce qui est demandé n'est pas clair, une assistance technique d'urgence est demandée au Centre du patrimoine mondial.
1153. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to review the Draft Decision amended by Morocco paragraph by paragraph.
1154. Following interventions by the delegations of **Morocco, India, the Netherlands, United States of America, Lithuania, Israel, Kenya** and the **Rapporteur**, the amended Draft Decision was adopted.
1155. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.54** adopted as amended.

#### **54. Ancient Thebes with its Necropolis (Egypt) (C 87)**

1156. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** fait la présentation et précise que, le document de travail présenté en 2006 ne comprenant pas les résultats de la mission entreprise immédiatement avant le Comité, ces informations – et les commentaires de l'ICOMOS – sont énoncés dans le présent document. Aucune information supplémentaire n'est à signaler, à l'exception des constatations de la mission effectuée à la fin d'avril 2007, comme le risque de destruction du tissu urbain, les travaux effectués sur l'esplanade devant le temple de Karnak, et le projet de construction d'un débarcadère sur la rive occidentale.
1157. Following an amendment proposed by the Delegation of **Morocco**, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.55** adopted as amended.

#### **Islamic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)**

1158. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial indique qu'à la requête de l'Etat partie, une mission s'est rendue au Caire afin d'étudier le projet d'un centre financier d'un volume imposant à proximité de la citadelle. La mission a demandé à obtenir des plans détaillés et une maquette du site afin d'évaluer l'impact du projet sur le paysage urbain. La maquette devrait être réalisée prochainement par le promoteur.
1159. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.56** adopted.

#### **Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093)**

1160. Le Président donne la parole au Centre du patrimoine mondial pour sa présentation, mais la délégation du Maroc pose une question sur le point suivant et la décision est adoptée sans présentation.

1161. The Chairperson therefore declared Decision **31 COM 7B.57** adopted.

### **Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20)**

1162. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial présente le bien, et donne des informations nouvelles reçues depuis la préparation du document. L'Etat partie a transmis plusieurs courriers, indiquant que le projet de route et de destruction du quartier de la rue Malik Faisal serait suspendu en attendant l'envoi d'experts pour revoir le projet.

1163. Le délégué de la **Tunisie** propose aux membres du Comité de prendre en compte l'intérêt que l'Etat accorde à la protection de son patrimoine et apporte des amendements. Il informe qu'il a eu des contacts avec l'Etat partie qui indique qu'il ne fera rien pouvant porter atteinte au site et sans l'autorisation du Comité.

1164. The Delegations of **India** and **Kenya** supported the proposed amendments. The Delegation of Kenya noted that the property had recently been placed on the World Monument Fund's World Monuments Watch list of endangered sites. As a representative of the World Monuments Fund was present in the room, they asked the Chairperson to permit her to make a statement.

1165. The representative of the **World Monuments Fund** confirmed that the Ancient City of Damascus had recently been added to the World Monuments Watch, a list of the 100 most endangered cultural sites, considering that the property was in need of assistance and that the World Monuments Fund would welcome close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre in this respect.

1166. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

1167. The **Rapporteur** read out an amendment submitted by Morocco, the first one on paragraph 3, letter a), so as to read : "Toute route périphérique tracée autour du bien prene en considération l'intégrité de ce bien. He then read out nouveau paragraphe 4. Prie instamment l'Etat partie de n'entreprendre aucune démolition à l'intérieur du bien et de sa zone tampon, avec la suggestion formulé par Tunisie : à moins que ces travaux ne portent pas préjudice à l'intégrité du bien.

1168. The Delegation of **Canada** asked a clarification whether the new paragraph 4 as it was proposed by Morocco and Tunisia would have replaced the rest of the original paragraph as it was drafted in the Draft Decision, in particular concerning the reference to the implementation of the ring road and the Malik Faisal area urban project in the northern historical outskirts of the property.

1169. La délégation de la **Tunisie** confirme que la nouvelle formulation suggérée remplace entièrement le paragraphe tel qu'il avait été présenté dans le document de travail.

1170. **ICOMOS** clarified that the ring road works that were planned were located in the buffer zone and not in the core zone of the inscribed property and that therefore the proposed paragraph as it was currently drafted did not address the problem of setting and context that was under discussion.

1171. The Delegation of **Kuwait** recalled that the project was not implemented and that the new paragraph proposed by Morocco and Tunisia fully answered the concerns regarding any work that could affect the integrity of the property.

1172. The Delegation of **Canada** in view of the clarification given by ICOMOS as regards to the project of works insisting on the buffer zones, suggested to add the words "and its

buffer zone” in new paragraph 4, after the words “to refrain from undertaking any demolition work within the property”.

1173. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.58** adopted as amended.
1174. Before the **Chairperson** suspended the session, the Delegation of **Israel** thanked the Chairperson for his excellent work in guiding the Committee through what had been a difficult session, during which the Committee had addressed significant global issues. It requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare a note distilling the issues for discussion at the beginning of this agenda item in 2008.
1175. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur for an excellent job and suspended the session.

The meeting rose at 1. 00 p.m.

#### **FOURTH DAY – WEDNESDAY, 27 JUNE 2007**

#### **TENTH MEETING**

**02.30 p.m. – 06.00 p.m.**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

#### **ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continued*)**

1176. The **Chairperson** re-opened the session and requested the Committee to agree to re-open the property of Um er-Rasas in Jordan, as a draft amendment proposed by the Delegation of Israel had been overlooked.
1177. The **Rapporteur** sought clarification from the Delegation of Israel on the proposed draft amendment.
1178. The Delegation of **Israel** explained that it proposed to replace paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Draft Decision with a new paragraph, requesting to invite a mission.
1179. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.57** adopted with the proposed amendment submitted by the Delegation of Israel.
1180. The **Chairperson** recalled that three additional properties from the Arab region had been requested for discussion by members of the Committee.

#### **Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt) (C 86)**

1181. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the Delegation of Lithuania had requested to discuss the property of Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur.
1182. The Delegation of **Lithuania** sought clarification from the State Party on the suspension of the road project.
1183. The Observer Delegation of **Egypt** confirmed that the proposed road project had been halted and that another alternative route avoiding the property had been identified.
1184. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.61** adopted.



1185. The Delegation of **Lithuania** further clarified that it had withdrawn the requests for discussion for the two other properties.

1186. The **Chairperson** then went through the list of reports for adoption requiring no discussion:

**Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565)**

1187. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.59** adopted.

**Qal'at al-Bahrain – Ancient Harbour and Capital of Dilmun (Bahrain) (C 1192)**

1188. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.60** adopted.

**Tyr (Lebanon) (C 299)**

1189. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.62** adopted.

**Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190)**

1190. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.63** adopted.

**Ancient Ksour of Ouadane, Chinguetti, Tichitt and Oualata (Mauritania) (C 750)**

1191. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.64** adopted.

**Ksar Ait Ben Haddou (Morocco) (C 444)**

1192. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.65** adopted.

**Archaeological site of Volubilis (Morocco) (C 836)**

1193. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.66** adopted.

**Bahla Fort (Oman) (C 433)**

1194. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.67** adopted.

**Aflaj Irrigation Systems of Oman (Oman) (C 1207)**

1195. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.68** adopted.

## ASIA-PACIFIC

### Old Town of Lijiang (China) (C 811)

1196. The World Heritage Centre presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and noted that new information had been provided by the State Party but that it confirmed the issues raised in the report. It also mentioned that in view of these issues, a reactive monitoring mission had been proposed. It further drew attention to a typing error in the date of the Draft Decision, which should refer to 2008.

1197. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.69** adopted as amended.

### Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) (C 593)

1198. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, mentioning the issue of the lack of a functioning site management authority. It noted that a stakeholders workshop had been organised in 2006 which had resulted in some positive changes. However, the property had no adequate buffer zone nor appropriate land use regulations. It was noted that no further new information had been received.

1199. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.70** adopted.

### Meidan Emam, Esfahan (Iran) (C 115)

1200. The World Heritage Centre presented the report on the state of conservation of the property. It recalled that the issue here was the construction of a commercial complex in the buffer zone and mentioned that work was now in progress to lower the building as requested by the Committee. The UNESCO office in Tehran had reported that the two top floors had already demolished and that the State Party had also decided to use an alternative road for the planned metroline with less impact on the property.

1201. The Delegation of Lithuania requested the latest information from the State Party.

1202. The Observer Delegation of **Iran** reiterated that this had been a challenging case for the country but that the Government had stood firm and decided to implement the Decision of the Committee. As previously mentioned two floors had already been demolished and two more would follow. The metroline had been diverted at a high financial cost. The Observer Delegation also noted that this case was a success story and had greatly contributed to raising awareness on heritage conservation. It was also noted that Iran was interested in hosting one of the following sessions in the event that it would be elected to the Committee at the next elections.

1203. The Delegation of **Canada** congratulated the State Party and concurred that this was an interesting case study. It added that it would like to propose an amendment to paragraph 4 of the Decision, replacing visual integrity with wording referring to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

1204. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.71** adopted as amended.

### Nara (Japan) (C 870)

1205. The World Heritage Centre presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, and mentioned that although the route of the proposed highway crossed the periphery of the buffer zone, an impact study had revealed that the impact on the water table was minimal. It also mentioned that the State Party had provided information on the independency of the impact assessment process. The development of a traffic

management plan was also proposed. A revised Decision was prepared to reflect a change in the plans being developed for the celebrations of the 1300th anniversary of Nara in 2010.

1206. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.72** adopted.

#### **Luang Prabang (Laos) (C 479)**

1207. The World Heritage Centre presented the report on the state of conservation of the property and noted that the Centre had received information on the rapid development of settlements and the urgent need to define a buffer zone. It therefore suggested that the Committee request a monitoring mission to assess the situation, advise the government and organize a stakeholder meeting.

1208. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested adding a new paragraph 3 to the Draft Decision.

1209. The Delegation of **Canada** enquired why another mission was needed, given that the World Heritage Centre had mentioned in the report that three missions had recently visited the property.

1210. The **World Heritage Centre** replied that these missions had been undertaken in the framework of project activities of the Centre at the property but that they had no mandate from the Committee.

1211. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.73** adopted as amended.

#### **Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) (C 603)**

1212. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property, explaining that the Committee had voiced concerns over a planned large scale urban landscaping programme with major new road developments. A mission had visited the property and had been informed of a new management plan, which superseded the mentioned programme and addressed the concerns raised by the Committee. A new mission was proposed to support the implementation of the management plan.

1213. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.74** adopted.

#### **Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) (C 678)**

1214. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the report on the state of conservation of the property stating that a mission had visited the property to look at the issue of illegal buildings and had been informed that the State Party was planning to relocate these people. The mission noted that the property should be nominated as a cultural landscape to include the natural features around the property as they are contributing to its Outstanding Universal Value.
1215. La délégation du **Vietnam** souhaite apporter des clarifications sur le projet de décision 31 COM 7B.75. Elle informe le Comité que le plan de gestion est en cours d'élaboration dans le cadre d'un plan de développement de la ville. Elle note que la préparation d'un plan de gestion incluant les différentes zones notifiées, est un défi qui ne sera pas facile à relever. Mais elle réitère l'engagement du Vietnam à suivre toutes les recommandations apparaissant dans le projet de décision. Elle demande au Comité et au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'envoyer des experts internationaux pour les aider à préparer le plan d'action.
1216. The **World Heritage Centre** proposed to add into paragraph 5, a reference to the assistance by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS and to correct the deadline for the draft to 2009.
1217. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested clarification of the term geomantic
1218. The World Heritage Centre explained that it referred to the symbolic value of the landscape.
1219. The Delegation of **New Zealand** proposed a language correction in paragraph 4.
1220. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.75** adopted as amended.

#### **Champaner-Pavagadh Archeological Park (India) (C 1101)**

1221. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested to open the property for discussion and asked the State Party whether the management plan had been prepared.
1222. The Delegation of **India** stated that it had sent a letter on 16 June 2007 indicating that the management plan was being prepared and requested paragraph 4 to be corrected.
1223. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.79** adopted as amended.

#### **The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) (C 322)**

1224. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.76** adopted.

#### **Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707 ter)**

1225. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.77** adopted.

#### **World Heritage Properties in Beijing (China) (C 880 - C 881 -C 439bis)**

1226. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.78** adopted.

#### **Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) (C 251- C 252 - C 255)**

1227. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.80** adopted.

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

1228. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.81** adopted.

**Mahabodhi Temple Complex at Bodhgaya (India) (C1056 rev)**

1229. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.82** adopted.

**Prambanan Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 642)**

1230. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.83** adopted.

**Borobudur Temple Compounds (Indonesia) (C 592)**

1231. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.84** adopted.

**Historical Monuments of Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)**

1232. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.85** adopted.

**Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) (C 138)**

1233. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.86** adopted.

**Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz (Uzbekistan) (C 885)**

1234. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 7B.87** adopted.

**STATE OF CONSERVATION OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE LIST OF WORLD HERIAGE IN DANGER AND ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Items 7A and 7B)**  
*(continued)*

1235. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that three points remained open on items 7A and 7B. For 7B, the discussion of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary still had to be completed but this was to be addressed after item 8. For 7A, the Chairperson recalled that the item on Simien National Park (Ethiopia) was still open as the arrival of the Delegation had been delayed. The Chairperson invited the State Party to speak and added that there was a proposed additional Decision on the properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

1236. The Observer Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked the Committee, declaring it had no major problem with the wording proposed. Grazing, however, was an issue which related to the subsistence of the people and that finding alternative livelihoods may be the best solution. It noted that although corrective measures were underway, funding was still pending.

1237. The Delegation of **Israel** said that the Draft Decision needed an amendment to: “keep the site for another year on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to reconsider removal in 2008”.

1238. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported this motion with a slight change, to read “in view of removal” which was agreed to by Israel.

1239. **IUCN** stated that this was an important Decision which could be only taken on careful analysis which would require a mission.

1240. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee was in agreement, which the Delegation of Israel confirmed.
- 1241.
1242. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.9** adopted as amended.
1243. The **Chairperson** then recalled that a new Draft Decision referenced **31 COM 7A.32** had been prepared by Benin, Kenya and Israel concerning the Democratic Republic of Congo and requested Israel to explain the document.
1244. The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the purpose of the background was to broaden the basis of support for the Democratic Republic of Congo and to address the concerns raised at a different level taking on board advice received from IUCN and the representatives of the African Union following the lunchtime meeting with UNF.
1245. The Vice President of **IUCN** intervened and informed the Committee that the President of IUCN Mr. Valli Moussa, was enthusiastic about this initiative and hoped that it would help advance the cause.
1246. La délégation du **Gabon** (observateur) apporte son soutien à l'initiative prise par le Bénin, Israël et le Kenya, pour trouver une solution novatrice pour la conservation des parcs nationaux de la RDC. Elle signale que les mêmes problèmes existent dans les parcs nationaux de toute l'Afrique centrale. Elle suggère qu'en plus de l'Union Africaine, les organisations sous-régionales d'Afrique centrale soient également impliquées car certaines d'entre elles ont développé un mécanisme similaire.
1247. La délégation de la **Belgique** fait remarquer au Comité que la protection des sites du patrimoine mondial dans les pays en reconstruction, est une priorité pour la Belgique à l'UNESCO. Il saisit l'opportunité qui lui est donné pour remercier l'action du Centre du patrimoine mondial et celle du Secteur des Sciences de l'UNESCO.
1248. La délégation du **Bénin** suggère d'insérer dans le paragraphe 2 du projet de décision une référence, juste après « Union Africaine », aux organisations sous-régionales compétentes.
1249. The **Rapporteur** read aloud "together with representatives of the African Union and other appropriate organizations".
1250. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the Belgium statement and suggested a new paragraph to read "calls on the international community to support".
1251. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7A.32** adopted as amended.
1252. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Committee had now reviewed 161 Draft Decisions on state of conservation and commended the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the work achieved.
1253. The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Chairperson for his excellent chairmanship and requested information on the status of discussion on the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary.
1254. The Delegation of **Japan** explained that the informal working group was still in consultation to reach a consensus amongst the Committee.
1255. The **Chairperson** reminded that it was necessary to adopt the Decision on the proposed format for State Party reports in *document 7B.Add.2*.
1256. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** rappelle l'historique de l'initiative de la Lituanie de voir proposer un format de rapport sur l'état de conservation des biens à soumettre par les Etats parties.
1257. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** suggested a change in point 3 of the format to make it more compatible with natural properties.

1258. The Delegation of **India** raised a concern that this format would render it more complicated for developing countries. It further noted that the State Party should not change the timeframe set by the Committee and that the World Heritage Centre should consult the State Parties before the format is adopted.
1259. The **Chairperson** proposed to postpone the discussion until the next day.
1260. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** explique que le modèle présenté a été préparé avec la contribution des organisations consultatives. Il marque son accord d'engager des consultations avec les Etats parties. Il rappelle que le format a été conçu à titre consultatif dans l'intention de simplifier la rédaction des rapports soumis par l'Etat partie et de trouver une méthode commune permettant de vérifier si l'Etat partie a du mal à mettre en œuvre les mesures correctives
1261. The Delegation of the **United States of America** concurred with India and agreed with the proposed postponing.
1262. La délégation du **Bénin** soutien les remarques faites par la délégation de l'Inde.
1263. The **Chairperson** decided to suspend this discussion.
1264. The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** took the floor to share a reflection with the Committee and noted that it had received three missions this year and that they had been very helpful in making substantial progress.

**ITEM 8A: TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 31 MARCH 2007 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/8A

*Decisions:* **31 COM 8A.1**  
**31 COM 8A.2**  
**31 COM 8A.3**

1265. The **Chairperson** announced that as consultation was still ongoing on Item 8A.3, this would be discussed the following day.
1266. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced the document.
1267. The Delegation of **Israel** noted its policy on Tentative Lists and recalled the conclusions of the Kazan expert meeting on this issue, such as the need to limit the number of proposed sites, the importance of comparative analysis, the need for the Advisory Bodies to comment on the proposed tentative lists, the need to have proposals agreed at all levels of government and the need for assistance from the Centre.
1268. La délégation du **Bénin** souligne que dans le contexte de l'actuelle discussion, il est important de mettre en valeur les grandes potentialités de l'Afrique. De son point de vue, il y a une impérieuse nécessité de faire un effort particulier afin d'aider l'Afrique. Il souhaite par exemple que l'attention soit portée sur des pays comme la République Démocratique du Congo. Il fait remarquer au Comité une erreur qui s'est glissée dans le document 8A.Rev concernant le Bénin. Il précise que le Bénin possède en réalité 7 sites et non 5 comme actuellement indiqué dans le document. Il informe le Comité qu'il le notifiera officiellement afin que le correctif soit apporté.

1269. The Delegation of **Norway** also referred to the Kazan meeting and warned that State Parties should not overestimate their own sites, as inclusion on the Tentative List creates expectations of inscription. It was also noted that a mechanism was needed to remove sites from the Tentative Lists.
1270. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** concurred with Norway and Israel on the importance of Tentative Lists and proposed that a tool for evaluating Outstanding Universal Value be included in paragraph 2.
1271. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the Delegations of Israel and Benin on the question of representation of Africa and noted that it could end up with only one nomination the following year. It was noted that the Global Strategy seemed to be backsliding and announced that it would return to this issue at an appropriate time
1272. The Delegation of **Kuwait** noted that there was an error in the Tentative List of Oman as two sites already inscribed were still included.
1273. The Delegation of **India** requested clarification from the Delegation of the Netherlands on how to evaluate the Outstanding Universal Value of Tentative Lists.
1274. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** answered that this should be done by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.
1275. The **Chairperson** proposed to examine the draft amendments submitted.
1276. The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment by Israel.
1277. The Delegation of **India** requested whether comments could be provided in the proposed format and advised excluding the point on comparative analysis from the format.
1278. The **World Heritage Centre** noted that this was not a new point but had already existed in the previous format and was in accordance with the requirements of the *Operational Guidelines*.
1279. The **Chairperson** asked for any comments on 8A and the Draft Decisions and suggested dealing with both of them.
1280. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed several modifications to the draft decision as it was formulated in *document WHC-07/31.COM/8A*, particularly regarding the scope and the number of sites of the Tentative Lists. It requested to add some comments about the following: The number of sites permitted for the Tentative Lists; the role of the Advisory Bodies in enhancing the importance of transnational and serial sites; the need of the World Heritage Centre to facilitate the actions; and the importance of involving all the levels of government in the elaboration of the Tentative Lists.
1281. La délégation du **Bénin** a proposé d'amender le projet de décision comme suit :  
« [...] prend note [...] tel qu'amendé ».
1282. The Delegation of **Kenya**, supporting the comments of Israel and Benin concerning the representation, noted that it was sometimes necessary to deal with 98 villages to elaborate a nomination. It also suggested the modification of the Global Strategy, notably the point concerning the Tentative Lists.
1283. The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Kuwait for the remark and assured that they would remove the sites from the Tentative List soon.
1284. The Delegation of **India** asked the Netherlands for clarification and wondered about the Outstanding Universal Value of the Tentative List and who was supposed to express it: the World Heritage Centre or the Committee.
1285. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted henceforth that it should be carried out by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.



1286. The **Rapporteur** then read the first amendment made by the Delegation of Israel to modify paragraphs 1 and 2 of the *Document WHC-07/31.COM/8A*.
1287. The Delegation of **India** suggested starting the deliberation on the format for the submission of the Tentative Lists. It mentioned that the comparative analysis had to be done by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies. It also asked whether the properties which have similar Outstanding Universal Value to sites already inscribed had more possibilities of being nominated, urging the Committee to consider that very carefully and delete this point.
1288. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of India for explanation, to which it responded that it considered the comparison pejorative.
1289. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, remarked that this was not a new point and that it already existed. He noted that the only new point included was the p.155 of the *Operational Guidelines*: the clarification of the Outstanding Universal Value.
1290. The Delegation of **Kenya** observed that the comparative analysis in the Tentative List could therefore be a problem.
1291. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, clarified that the Tentative List is just a preliminary document, a tool for work.
1292. The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that the comparison will have to be done when the nomination dossier is prepared by the State Party and the fact of including the comparative analysis in the Tentative List ultimately would also facilitate its use by the Advisory Bodies when undertaking their evaluation.
1293. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31.COM 8A.1** adopted.
1294. The **Rapporteur** read the amendments proposed by Israel to add five new paragraphs to the two paragraphs of Draft Decision **31.COM 8A.2**. The first paragraph proposed was to “limit to a reasonable number the sites” of the Tentative Lists, as decided in the 29th session of the World Heritage Committee (Durban, 2005).
1295. The Delegation of **India** reacted by asking the Delegate of Israel to explain whether “reasonable” was in relation to the population of the country, the number of sites, etc.
1296. The Delegation of **Israel** replied that it should be in relation to both indicators so that it could reflect the real heritage of the State Party.
1297. The Delegation of **India** then asked for a review of this Decision as this language could have consequences for the people and the countries.
1298. La délégation du **Bénin** rappelle sa proposition d’amendement afin de rajouter dans la décision, la mention « tel qu’amendé ».
1299. The Delegation of **Israel** withdrew the amendment.
1300. The **Rapporteur** read the next amendment proposed by Israel which was a new paragraph highlighting the “importance of transnational nominations and the thematic studies developed by the Advisory Bodies”.
1301. The Chairperson declared paragraph 3 adopted without discussion.
1302. The **Rapporteur** read out the next amendment proposed by the Delegation of Israel: For the Advisory Bodies to comment on the Outstanding Universal Value, the integrity and the authenticity of the site regarding the geographic and thematic representation.
1303. The Delegation of **India** observed that this could delay the elaboration of the Tentative List and concluded that the Advisory Bodies were too busy. It considered that it wasn’t realistic for the present time and warned of the long-term implications of this amendment.

1304. The Delegation of **Israel** expressed disagreement with the views expressed by India and noted that the evaluation is important and that he had mentioned “comments” not “evaluation”.
1305. **IUCN** provided additional comments to this proposal:
- There were, indeed, resource implications of this measure.
  - IUCN could be involved in the elaboration of the Tentative List but it should be carried out in a way that wouldn't compromise the nomination process.
  - IUCN would continue to develop thematic studies
  - The best process to elaborate the Tentative List for the countries would be to adopt a systematic way of looking at the sites, as done by some countries.
1306. **ICOMOS** also provided some additional comments:
- It shared the IUCN's comments
  - It noted that the Tentative List was the key in the nomination process
  - It took into consideration some of the points already made
  - It noted their intention of continuing to improving the quality of the nominations
  - It mentioned the existing need for continuing development of thematic studies
1307. The Delegation of **India** expressed its accord with the comments from IUCN and ICOMOS and noted the difficulty of involving the Advisory Bodies in missions.
1308. The **Chairperson** indicated that the Committee would not support this new paragraph suggested by Israel, and the **Rapporteur** proposed to add: “recognize the importance of the Advisory Bodies' comments and the thematic studies”. The next paragraph suggested by Israel dealt with the implication of the relevant levels of government.
1309. The Delegation of **Kenya** criticized the Committee for making things more complicated rather than easing the situation. It said that if they wanted to make things easier they should move on and start taking decisions.
1310. The **Chairperson** agreed with Kenya's statement.
1311. The Delegation of **Israel** considered that the nominations process was too long and suggested to work further in elaborating the Tentative Lists so that “we can save time, frustrations and money”. It also said that it could be abandoned if necessary.
1312. The **Chairperson** agreed with the suggestion of abandonment.
1313. The **Chairperson** re-opened the session to present an amendment previously presented by Benin to add “tel qu'amendé” in the Draft Decision.
1314. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31.COM 8A.2** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.8B  
WHC-07/31.8B ADD REV  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.1  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.2

*Decisions:* **31 COM 8B.1 to 31 COM 8B.74**

1315. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee about the documents the participants needed to use for the next item. He also noted that they had received some letters from the States Parties informing the World Heritage Centre of factual errors in the nominations of: Canada: Rideau Canal; Israel: Baha'i Holy Places – Haifa and the Western Galilee; and Japan: Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape. He clarified that the Advisory Bodies would present the letters received and inform the Committee about the sites, excluding the ones which were not related to factual errors.

**I. CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

1316. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the section of the working document related to the proposed change of name of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and the following Draft Decisions:

**Gondwana Rainforest (Australia) (N 368bis)**

1317. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.1** adopted.

**Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89)**

1318. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 8B.2 adopted.

**Sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidaurus (Greece) (C 491)**

1319. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.3** adopted.

**Archaeological Site of Aigai, Vergina (Greece) (C 780)**

1320. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.4** adopted.

**Archaeological Site of Mystras, (Greece) (C 511)**

1321. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.5** adopted.

**Monasteries of Daphni, Hosios Loukas and Nea Moni of Chios (Greece) (C 537)**

1322. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.6** adopted.

**The Sassi and the park of the Rupestrian Churches of Matera (Italy) (C 670)**

1323. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.7** adopted.

**Auschwitz Birkenau: German Nazi Concentration and Extermination Camp (1940-1945) (Poland) (C 31)**

1324. La **Sous-Directrice générale pour la Culture** rappelle les antécédents de cette question, notamment la consultation internationale organisée par la Pologne avec l'aide du Centre du patrimoine mondial, permettant de parvenir à un consensus sur le changement de nom du bien. Quelques amendements, négociés par Israël et la Pologne, ont été apportés à la déclaration de valeur.

1325. The Delegation of **Israel** signalled that the statement of significance was not only a description but also the lesson that had been learnt. It went on to comment that this Decision had involved a lot of people and that both Israel and Poland had already left the history behind. It then suggested adopting the Draft Decision.

1326. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.8** adopted.

**II. EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

**Withdrawn nominations**

1327. The **World Heritage Centre** read the List of nominations withdrawn at the request of the State Party:

- **Foundational City Area of La Plata (Argentina) (C 979)**
- **Hand Paper Mill at Velké Losiny (Czech Republic) (C 1235)**
- **Paimio Hospital (former Paimio sanatorium) (Finland) (C 1251)**
- **Speleothems of French Limestone Caves, Outstanding Records of Karst Processes and Archives of Paleo-climates (France) (N 1045)**
- **The Mediterranean Shore of the Pyrenees (France/Spain) (C 1261)**
- **Valnerina and the Marmore Cascade (Italy) (C 1254)**
- **Gdansk – The Site of Memory and Freedom (Poland) (C 1241)**
- **Prince Edward Islands (South Africa) (N 1266)**
- **Darwin and Downe (United Kingdom) (C 1247)**

1328. The Delegation of **Spain** proposed to give the floor to France to enable it to speak about the withdrawal of the “Speleothems of French Limestone Caves, Outstanding Records of Karst Processes and Archives of Paleo-climates”.
1329. La délégation de la **France** (observateur) indique que le paragraphe 7 du projet de décision annulé en raison du retrait de la proposition d’inscription, chargeait l’UICN de réaliser une étude thématique mondiale des systèmes karstiques. Par lettre en date du 14 juin 2007, la France a demandé au Centre du patrimoine mondial de noter son souhait que cette étude soit faite et indique sa disponibilité à y être associée.
1330. The **Chairperson** announced that the Republic of Korea had asked if it would be possible to consider its nomination earlier as its delegation had to leave Christchurch on 28th June. He then introduced the Examination of Nominations of natural, mixed and cultural properties to the World Heritage List, explaining the *rules of procedure* and highlighting the need for efficiency. He also reiterated that the State Party could only take the floor after being invited by a Committee member and purely as a way to inform the audience, not to advocate on behalf of the nomination. He pointed out that the Committee must try to reach consensus and expressed his trust in the Committee’s objectiveness, which had acted in the framework of the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*.

## A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

### A.1 AFRICA

#### A.1.1 New nominations

1331. **IUCN** made a short presentation about its principles and the evaluation process and then it presented the nomination of the “Rainforest of the Atsinanana” (Madagascar).

#### **Rainforest of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)**

1332. The **Chairperson** thanked IUCN and opened the floor for comments asking for a consensus to be found quickly.
1333. The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that the biodiversity of Madagascar was exceptional on a global scale and that they approved this nomination and hoped to congratulate the State Party soon.
1334. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee agreed with Kenya.
1335. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its agreement and suggested replacing “developed” with “further developed” in the Draft Decision.
1336. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.9** adopted as amended and congratulated the State Party for the inscription of the property.
1337. La délégation de **Madagascar** dit à quel point le gouvernement et le peuple malgaches sont touchés de l’inscription de ce site, le 3e parc du pays, notamment car elle représente un cadeau pour la fête nationale du 26 juin, la reconnaissance internationale et qu’elle justifie la vision du Président malgache de tripler les zones protégées. La délégation remercie tous les membres du Comité et indique que les recommandations énoncées font déjà l’objet d’actions financées par un fonds fiduciaire pour la biodiversité et les aires protégées.
1338. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the next site in the document - Prince Edward Islands (South Africa) – had been withdrawn by the State Party.

## **A.2 ASIA / PACIFIC**

### **A.2.2 New nominations**

#### **South China Karst (China) (N 1248)**

1339. **IUCN** presented the nomination of South China Karst (China).
1340. The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated IUCN and made reference to the *Operational Guidelines* regarding the serial nominations. It asked if the part not included in the site for nomination by IUCN (the Wulong cluster of the South China Karst) was relevant or not for the whole site.
1341. **IUCN** replied that the site still had Outstanding Universal Value without this part, which is an area for potential nomination in the future, and suggested deferring its examination.
1342. The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the site constituted a great heritage and that, according to the reasons given by IUCN, it had to be inscribed.
1343. La délégation du **Bénin** pose la question de savoir si, dans le cas où le 3e site se trouverait au Bénin ou en Italie par exemple, il aurait une valeur universelle exceptionnelle, considérant que la comparaison ne doit pas être faite avec les deux autres sites.
1344. **IUCN** clarified that the recommendation was to defer, not to exclude the site and remarked that the proposed area had potential for nomination as a whole and could be extended.
1345. La délégation de **Madagascar** propose de donner la parole à l'Etat partie et indique son soutien à l'inscription des trois sites dès maintenant.
1346. The Delegation of **China** explained that the site was a serial property and interprovincial and that, according to the *Operational Guidelines*, it reflected the different stages which contributed to the formation of its geomorphology.
1347. The **Chairperson** suggested the Committee be in alignment with the Draft and to stay concentrated on paragraph 5.
1348. For the Delegation of the **Republic of Korea**, a "country neighbour of China which sympathized with its situation", the Wulong cluster was an integral part of the whole site. It remarked that in that way and, as China had noted, the government would be able to better protect the area.
1349. The Delegation of **Mauritius** concurred with the Republic of Korea arguing that, according to the report of IUCN, Wulong had potential for the criteria vii, to which Cuba and Chile agreed too.
1350. The Delegation of **Chile** stated that it thought along the same lines and that it considered the site of Wulong to qualify as the others.
1351. The Delegation of **Cuba** gave its support for the inscription of the property.
1352. La délégation du **Maroc** remercie l'IUCN pour son évaluation et indique son accord, précisant que l'évaluation de l'IUCN n'était pas très tranchée.
1353. The Delegation of **Israel** observed that in the case of inclusion of Wulong it would be also necessary to adjust the boundaries.
1354. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it agreed with the inclusion of Wulong in the serial property for inscription.
1355. La délégation de **Tunisie** proteste que le Président ne lui ait pas donné la parole et que les décisions soient adoptées avant la fin de l'interprétation. Elle indique que le site de Wulong fait partie d'un ensemble et que c'est l'ensemble qui doit être inscrit.
1356. The **Chairperson** consequently asked the members of the Committee whether they agreed with the inclusion of this cluster, to which the Delegation of Israel reacted by mentioning again the necessity of modifying the boundaries and paragraph 4.

1357. The **Chairperson** suggested modifying paragraph 5 and changing “inscribe” to “defers”.
1358. La délégation du **Maroc** indique que, la décision étant prise, il est maintenant nécessaire de modifier le paragraphe 4 de la décision.
1359. The **Rapporteur** asked IUCN about the modification of paragraph 4 proposed by Morocco and paragraph 5, and whether it was necessary to reconsider the Outstanding Universal Value.
1360. The Delegation of **India** then presented three suggestions: to inscribe three clusters with the same criteria, to delete the paragraph 4, and to delete the second part of the paragraph 7. It also asked the Delegation of China whether they agreed with the second sentence of the paragraph 8: “urges the states parties to ensure that this is considered prior to any further phase of nominations”.
1361. The Delegation of **China** then explained that it had already sent a letter to the Director of the World Heritage Centre, informing him that they would need representatives, dialogue and various conditions in order to start preparing the nominations.
1362. **IUCN** then made additional comments:
- It would be also necessary to modify paragraph 2
  - The Outstanding Universal Value would remain across the entire site
  - Paragraph 4 is about future phases and should be discussed
  - Both States, VietNam and China, should be comfortable with paragraph 8
1363. The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee about an amendment from the Delegation of India to remove paragraph 8.
1364. The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt paragraph 8 with the last sentence deleted, to keep paragraph 4 and delete paragraph 2.
1365. The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the name of the property was still valid, to which **IUCN** replied that it was just an anticipated name, not definitive.
1366. The **Rapporteur** considered paragraph 5 superfluous and suggested deleting the first part, but **IUCN** estimated that it was helpful to keep the consideration of the boundaries (at the end of paragraph 5).
1367. The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee whether it would prefer to work together with the IUCN on the Draft Decision at present in order to find a common text, or to postpone it until the following day.
1368. The Delegation of **Kenya** urged the Committee to make a decision at the present time and not to postpone it.
1369. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked to postpone the Decision so as to better draft the reference to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the **Rapporteur** responded by suggesting to postpone and to elaborate a revised text with regards to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value with IUCN to be debated before the end of the meeting and integrated within the Final Report.
1370. The **Chairperson** agreed and proposed to inscribe all three sites while the exact wording on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value will be integrated within the Final Report at the moment of the formal adoption of Decision the last day. He then declared Decision **31 COM 8B.11** adopted.
1371. The Delegation of **China** estimated that it was a historical moment and expressed its sincere gratitude on behalf of all the population living in the large cluster of properties being inscribed to all the members of the Committee for the appreciation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. It then thanked IUCN. It stated that it will



further raise the awareness of the local population and the commitment of the government for a sustainable conservation. It recalled that the inscription is only the first and beginning step in the long march towards conservation and let the audience know about the commitment of both the government and the people of China to implement the *World Heritage Convention*.

### **Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes (Korea) (N 1264)**

1372. The Chairperson turned to the natural site, which was presented by IUCN.

1373. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.12** adopted.

1374. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed its sincere gratitude to the World Heritage Committee, explaining that they were preparing measures for dealing with the recommendations and assured that they would made strong efforts. It also seized the opportunity to express their gratitude to the World Heritage Committee for their contribution to and conservation of the global heritage, and noted the possibility of inviting the Committee to Jeju at some future date.

The Meeting rose at 6.30 pm

## **FIFTH DAY - THURSDAY 28 JUNE 2007**

### **ELEVENTH MEETING**

**09.00 am – 11.00 pm**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**

## **ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)**

### **A.3 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA**

#### **A.3.1 New nominations**

1375. Following consultation with the members of the Committee, the **Chairperson** requested IUCN to first present its evaluation of the nomination of Teide National Park (Spain), considering that the representative of the State Party had to leave during the morning.

#### **Teide National Park (Spain) (N 1258)**

1376. IUCN presented the nomination of Teide National Park.

1377. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the very clear recommendation put forward by the Advisory Body.

1378. The Delegation of **Israel**, supported by the Delegations of the **Netherlands, New Zealand and Kenya**, noted that the site was clearly of Outstanding Universal Value. With reference to paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision, it suggested that this be rephrased to request IUCN to conduct a thematic study on volcanic sites, taking into account all

such sites currently on Tentative Lists, so as to provide guidance to States parties to the *Convention* in view of possible future nominations.

1379. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Israel if it could offer some wording to redraft paragraph 6.
1380. The Delegation of **India** suggested that the Draft Decision be adopted, since there was agreement on the substance, and that the final language of paragraph 6 could be determined later by the Rapporteur.
1381. The **Chairperson** declared the first five paragraphs of Decision **31 COM 8B.17** adopted.
1382. The **Chairperson** turned to the Delegation of Israel for suggestions on paragraph 6.
1383. Following the proposal for a new text by the Delegation of Israel, **IUCN** stated that, indeed, a thematic study on volcanic sites had been planned, as a development of its existing study on geological heritage.
1384. The **Chairperson** declared the full Decision **31 COM 8B.17** adopted as amended
1385. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the representative of the State Party of Spain for a brief statement.
1386. The Delegation of **Spain** declared that the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List was both a honour and a responsibility. It noted that this event would be of particular significance for the local community, whose identity was defined by the property itself. It further invited the members of the Committee to visit the site, as well as other World Heritage properties in the country in 2009, the year for which Spain had proposed to host the annual meeting of the World Heritage Committee.

#### **Ba Be National Park (Vietnam) (N 1249)**

1387. IUCN presented the nomination of Ba Be National Park.
1388. The Delegation of **Israel**, with reference to paragraph 5 of the proposed Draft Decision, asked whether deferral would not be more appropriate and to consider the submission of a revised nomination.
1389. The Delegation of **Kenya**, expressing its agreement with the Delegation of Israel, asked whether the Committee, from a legal point of view, could accept a future revised nomination, if it decided not to inscribe the present one.
1390. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that, in principle, if the proposed revised nomination was substantially different from the original, then it could be accepted by the Committee even if the latter had decided not to inscribe the first submission. It agreed, however, with the Delegations of Israel and Kenya that in this particular case a deferral might be more appropriate.
1391. The Delegation of **India** asked what timeframe could be provided to the State Party if the Committee opted for a deferral, and requested that the State Party concerned be given the floor to express its view on the matter.
1392. La délégation du **Vietnam** (observateur) remercie le Président et le Comité pour la parole qui lui est donnée. Elle est consciente des difficultés rencontrées dans le passé mais, ces difficultés sont maintenant résolues et le site se trouve maintenant en bonnes conditions. La délégation n'a pas de commentaire particulier si ce n'est qu'à son avis, les remarques défavorables de l'IUCN sont trop vagues.
1393. Le **Président** demande s'il est d'accord oui ou non avec l'ajournement de la proposition d'inscription.
1394. La délégation du **Vietnam** (observateur) fait savoir qu'elle est d'accord pour différer la décision, ce que lui permettra de se conformer aux observations faites au cours du débat et de présenter une version modifiée à la prochaine session du Comité en 2008.
1395. The Delegation of **Lithuania** agreed with deferral.
1396. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the IUCN if it agreed that the core zone of the current nomination could be the basis of a new nomination.
1397. **IUCN**, in reply to comments made by the Delegations of Lithuania and the Netherlands, confirmed that the Committee could decide on a deferral, since a future nomination would have to also include the area originally proposed.
1398. La Délégation de la **Tunisie** félicite d'abord le Président pour son anniversaire. Elle ajoute ensuite qu'elle est favorable au report de la décision afin de permettre à l'Etat partie de se conformer aux observations faites par l'Organisation consultative et recommandations du Comité.
1399. The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to provide suggestions on the main elements of a Decision for deferral that the Committee could agree on immediately.
1400. The **Rapporteur** proposed to add a paragraph relative to the Decision to defer the property, and noted that the existing paragraphs 3 and 4 could remain.
1401. The Delegation of **India** requested the World Heritage Centre to clarify whether it was necessary or not to delete the existing paragraph 2, referring to the non-inscription of the property.
1402. The **World Heritage Centre** confirmed that if the Committee opted for a deferral, then paragraph 2 would need to be changed.
1403. The Delegation of **New Zealand** suggested that a paragraph be added at the end of the Decision to request IUCN to undertake a thematic study on karst systems, considering that the need for guidance on the nomination of such sites had been highlighted by IUCN in some of its evaluations.

1404. **IUCN** agreed with this proposal.
1405. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that it was necessary for the Committee to indicate which criteria a revised nomination would have to concentrate on, in light of IUCN's evaluation.
1406. The **Chairperson**, noting a consensus among the members of the Committee on the deferral of the nomination, requested IUCN to assist the Rapporteur in drafting the appropriate language of a revised text, taking into account the comment from the Delegation of the United States of America.
1407. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.13** adopted as amended.

#### **The Dolomites (Italy) (N 1237)**

1408. **IUCN** presented the nomination of The Dolomites.
1409. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.15** adopted.

#### **Primeval Beech Forest of the Carpathians (Slovakia and Ukraine) (I 1133)**

1410. **IUCN** presented the nomination of Primeval Beech Forest of the Carpathians.
1411. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.16** adopted.
1412. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the representatives of the two concerned States Parties for a short statement.
1413. The Observer Delegations of **Slovakia** and **Ukraine**, expressing their sincere gratitude to the Committee and IUCN, noted that this was a historical moment for the site, culminating numerous years of studies and preparation in both countries.

#### **Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschorn (Switzerland) (N 1037)**

1414. **IUCN** presented the proposed extension of the Jungfrau-Aletsch-Bietschorn.
1415. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.18** adopted.
1416. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the representative of the States Party of Switzerland for a short statement.
1417. The Observer Delegation of **Switzerland** thanked the Committee for the inscription, on behalf of the community living within the site. The proposal for the extension had been the result of careful studies and long discussions between the authorities and the civil society and in that respect represented a model of participatory planning. The Committee was invited to share this experience by collecting a specific publication that was made available outside the meeting room.

### **A.4 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN**

#### **A.4.1 New nominations**

#### **Banco Chinchorro Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1244)**

1418. **IUCN** presented the nomination of Banco Chinchorro Biosphere Reserve.
1419. The Delegation of **Chile** noted that marine heritage was often not sufficiently emphasized in protected areas and suggested that the State Party of Mexico be given the opportunity to provide additional information on the property, before deciding not to inscribe it on the World Heritage List.
1420. **IUCN** reiterated its view that this site, by itself, did not possess Outstanding Universal Value. However, it could possibly constitute an extension to the World Heritage property of Sian Ka'an, which was only about 150 kilometers away.
1421. The Delegation of **Spain** commented that the site of Banco Chinchorro was very significant in many respects. Besides being very well protected, it displayed a great complexity and a noteworthy accumulation of coral reef and numerous other species within a relatively small area. Its isolation made it an interesting area to study biological evolution, and it was on the route of migratory birds. The Delegation noted that the area had also archaeological significance, and suggested therefore that the nomination be deferred to ask the State Party to return with a strengthened proposal for a mixed property.
1422. When asked whether it could do so, the **State Party** confirmed that it was ready to resubmit this nomination as a mixed site.
1423. The Delegation of the **United States of America** wondered if IUCN had considered the nominated site in the context of the meso-American coral reef, and supported the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Spain that the nomination be deferred.
1424. **IUCN** replied that if a revised nomination was submitted, then linkages with other sites along the meso-American coral reef could be explored.
1425. The Delegations of **Cuba, India and Japan** supported the statement made by the Delegation of Spain.
1426. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the State party of Mexico if it would consider proposing the site of Banco Cinchorro as an extension to the Sian Ka'an World Heritage property.
1427. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** replied that it would prefer to resubmit the nomination of Banco Cinchorro as an independent, mixed nomination.
1428. The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to suggest a final text, in consultation with IUCN, for the final adoption of the Decisions by the Committee the following Monday
1429. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.19** adopted as amended.

**B. MIXED PROPERTIES**

**B.1 AFRICA**

**B.1.1 New nominations**

**The Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape (South Africa) (C 1265)**

1430. **IUCN** presented the nomination of The Richtersveld Cultural and Botanical Landscape.
1431. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its deep disappointment for the recommendation proposed by IUCN, which appeared to revert the clock back to the 1960s, when any human presence was considered incompatible with the protection of natural heritage values. It noted that the evaluations of the two Advisory Bodies contradicted each other and called for the immediate inscription of the site as a mixed property. The Delegation felt insulted, as an African country, by IUCN's evaluation and strongly protested.
1432. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested clarification from IUCN on whether a balance could be found between the grazing activities and the conservation of natural values, and also if there was Outstanding Universal Value within the perimeter of the area proposed for inscription.
1433. **IUCN** explained that the value in the case of this site was related to the succulent karoo landscape. However, there were at least nine other areas in the region which possessed similar value, possibly to a greater extent. If combined with these others, the proposed site would have potential for meeting the criteria for Outstanding Universal Value. Intensity of grazing was indeed a problem that required careful management. It reiterated that deferral is a process that has been used successfully in the past to ensure successful inscriptions and gave the panda sanctuary in China as an example.
1434. La Délégation de **Madagascar** se joint à celles qui l'ont précédée pour féliciter le Président pour son anniversaire. Elle voudrait faire une proposition concrète dans le sens de modifier la formulation du projet de décision en mettant l'accent sur l'aspect culturel du site : la délégation propose de supprimer les paragraphes 2 et 3 du projet de décision et de retenir l'inscription du site par les critères iv et v. De cette façon, il n'y aura pas de problèmes de contradiction entre les formulations contenues dans les rapports des deux Organisations consultatives.
1435. In reply to the Delegation of Madagascar, which proposed to delete paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Draft Decision in order to avoid contradictions, the **Chairperson** noted that this would mean listing the sites under cultural criteria only.
1436. La Délégation du **Bénin** souhaite d'abord un bon anniversaire au Président. La délégation estime qu'en effet il y a un problème de méthodologie. Il s'agit d'un site mixte et dans ce cadre, les analyses doivent être intégrées. Elle est d'avis que dans ce cas l'IUCN n'a pas tenu compte dans son rapport des critères de transhumance. Pour la délégation, l'IUCN ne saisit pas ce concept, pourtant important. Elle ajoute qu'il faut maintenir le site en tant que mixte et qu'il ne faut pas superposer les rapports mais les intégrer.
1437. The Delegation of **Israel** requested clarification on the meaning of mixed property, since the two sets of criteria had now been now integrated into the latest version of the *Operational Guidelines*.
1438. The Delegation of **India** noted that IUCN seemed to have difficulty in understanding the concept of traditional management. Grazing had always been an issue between the two Advisory Bodies. It wondered if the State Party concerned would accept an inscription of the site purely as a cultural landscape.
1439. The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** stated that it would of course have preferred to see the site listed under both cultural and natural criteria, but that it would also accept an inscription for cultural values only.
1440. The Delegation of **India** stated that in this case it supported the proposals by the Delegation of Madagascar.

1441. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted some possible inconsistencies in the Draft Decision, in paragraphs 3 and 6, related to the issue of the legal protection of the site, and requested that these be clarified.
1442. **IUCN**, confirming that paragraph 3 should have been amended, suggested that the State Party concerned provided an answer on the subject of the legal protection.
1443. The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** informed the Committee that legal protection was automatically granted when registering a protected area.
1444. The Delegation of **Kenya**, reiterating its great disappointment, agreed to go along with inscribing the site as a cultural landscape, if the State Party envisaged no problem with this.
1445. The Delegation of **Canada** noted that the discussion was the result of the merging of the criteria, and commented that this would presently raise a number of issues including, for example, the nomination of cultural sites under criterion (vii). While recognizing that the focus of this nomination appeared to be on the cultural landscape of the succulent karoo, it encouraged the State Party to take the future ecological values into consideration.
1446. La Délégation du **Chili** fait savoir qu'elle soutient la proposition de Madagascar.
1447. Following the summing up by the Rapporteur of the various interventions, the **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether there were any objections to adopting the Decisions with these amendments.
1448. The Delegation of **India** proposed to delete paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.
1449. The Delegation of the **Netherlands**, supporting the proposal by the Delegation of Canada, asked the World Heritage Centre to develop a specific procedure for the evaluation of mixed nominations.
1450. The **World Heritage Centre**, with reference to the intervention by the Delegation of Israel, offered to prepare a reflection on the meaning of mixed properties for the consideration by the Committee at its following session in 2008.
1451. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.20** adopted as amended and expressed its congratulations to the State Party of South Africa.
1452. The Observer Delegation of **South Africa** stated that it was honoured to have this property on the World Heritage List. It was only two years since a land-restitution scheme had returned this area to the local community, which had realized its aspirations with the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List. It then gave the floor to a representative of the Nama people, the community living within the listed property, for a brief statement in his indigenous language.

The Meeting rose at 11.00 am

**FIFTH DAY - THURSDAY 28 JUNE 2007**

**TWELFTH MEETING**

**11.00 am – 01.00 pm**

**Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)**



**ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST  
(continued)**

**AFRICA**

1453. The **Chairperson** referred the Committee to Document referenced *WHC-07/31.COM/8B.Add.Rev*, and requested IUCN to present the following evaluation.

**Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lope-Okanda (Gabon) (C/N 1147)**

1454. **IUCN** presented the nomination of the Ecosystem and Relict Cultural Landscape of Lope-Okanda.

1455. **ICOMOS** presented its evaluation report of the property, concluding that inscription under several criteria was justified, the comparative analysis was satisfactory and that the conditions of integrity and authenticity were satisfied. Noting, however, that it had not undertaken a mission to the property since 2004, it recommended referring the nomination back to the State Party, exceptionally, to allow for a mission

1456. La délégation du **Maroc** constate que le dossier est présenté pour la troisième fois. Les raisons de l'ICOMOS de différer l'inscription ne sont pas motivées par la valeur exceptionnelle ni la qualité du dossier. L'argument d'ICOMOS de n'avoir pas fait de mission depuis 2004 n'est pas suffisant pour refuser l'inscription. Cette inscription permettrait aussi un rééquilibrage des sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial des régions sous-représentées.

1457. The Delegation of **India**, expressed with great concern, that Africa was not being given due consideration regarding World Heritage nominations. It said that long discussions had been held during the 30th Session of the World Heritage Committee (Vilnius 2006), on the issue of the under-representation of Africa on the World Heritage List and that special efforts needed to be made to address the under-representation. The delegation also noted its understanding of the procedural issue raised by ICOMOS

1458. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its appreciation to IUCN and ICOMOS for their good work.

1459. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if there were any objections.

1460. The Delegation of **Lithuania** proposed to inscribe the property as a mixed site and then undertake a mission to assess the boundaries and other conservation issues that would assist in managing the site on both cultural and natural values.

1461. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that the Decision had already been taken on the inscription of the property; however, further investigation of the property could be foreseen.

1462. The **Chairperson** asked the World Heritage Centre to comment on this matter.

1463. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded that there should not be any problem in providing financial resources for conducting the mission.

1464. **ICOMOS** explained that the issue was not the availability of resources but rather the referral or deferral of the nomination. If it were to be deferred, there would be a 15-month timeframe to assess the property. It stressed the need for sufficient time for experts to fully assess the site. Referring to the previous Decisions, it stated that in 2005 and 2006 the Decisions had been to defer. The purpose of the proposed future mission was to assess the management and conservation of the site.

1465. The **Chairperson** asked if the property should be inscribed or a mission undertaken.

1466. The Delegation of **New Zealand** asked for further clarification from the World Heritage Centre.
1467. The **Director of the Centre** stressed that a mission to the site would be necessary. He said that the criteria had already been identified; however the mission would assess the implementation of management and conservation plans.
1468. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it would provide the Centre with financial support to undertake the mission.
1469. La délégation du **Bénin** est d'accord avec cette décision. Il souhaite donner la parole à l'Etat partie pour que celui-ci puisse mettre au courant le Comité des derniers développements du site.
1470. The **Rapporteur** sought clarification on whether the Advisory Bodies were in agreement with regard to Outstanding Universal Value for both natural and cultural values.
1471. The Delegations of the **United States of America** and **Canada** supported the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.
1472. The **Chairperson** declared inscription of the site on the World Heritage List, and congratulated the State Party.
1473. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.54** adopted as amended.
1474. La délégation du **Gabon** remercie le Comité pour cette inscription. Ce site est le premier bien du Gabon inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle remercie l'assistance technique et financière fournies notamment par le Centre du patrimoine mondial. La déléguée remercie aussi l'UICN pour avoir fait une mission de qualité, ainsi que la délégation des Pays-Bas pour l'offre qui vient d'être faite.
1475. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee discuss the natural properties with minor modifications before starting the discussion on cultural properties.

Minor modification to the boundaries of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

## **LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN**

### **Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico) (N 1182 bis).**

1476. **IUCN** while presenting the extension of the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California, it expressed its satisfaction with the existing Outstanding Universal Value of the property and supported the extension of the property
1477. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.53** adopted.

## **C. CULTURAL PROPERTIES**

### **C.1 AFRICA**

#### **C.1.1 New nominations**

1478. Before proceeding with the presentation of nominations, **ICOMOS** made a brief presentation on its evaluation process, recalling that in the year 2007 it evaluated 43 nominations of properties to the World heritage List, recalling the wide range of categories of heritage being evaluated. It recalled that ICOMOS, in the same line of IUCN, undertook an external review of its evaluation processes, whose results will be presented to the next committee session. It then synthesized the evaluation process recalling the important documentary review and the missions sent *in situ* in

collaboration with the relevant State party. It recalled that in the current year, experts coming from 27 different countries were sent to the evaluation missions. It further recalled the expertise of the ICOMOS panel and the possibility of asking for additional factual information in some circumstances. It concluded by stressing that evaluations were the result of an extensive and specialized process which led to an independent and corporate assessment, further supported by the thematic studies that ICOMOS undertook over the years.

### **The Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests (Kenya) (N 1231)**

1479. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Sacred Mijikenda Kaya Forests.
1480. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the recommendations.
1481. **IUCN** expressed that the property was a good example of human and nature interaction. It declared that the State Party had not put forward a convincing argument; hence the property could not be included on the World Heritage List, on the basis of natural values, at this stage.
1482. The Delegation of **Israel** expressed concern over the use of International Assistance which had been provided by the Centre to the State Party to prepare the nomination. It said that further information from the State Party had not been requested on time by ICOMOS and asked the Advisory Body why the State Party had not been informed. It suggested the Committee consider inscribing the property under criterion vi.
1483. **ICOMOS** replied that there were substantial issues with regard to this nomination, one of which being the lack of legal protection. It had not informed the State Party due to time constraints, and realized that Kenya would not be able to rewrite the nomination in one-months time, as the evaluation had been completed in December.
1484. The Delegation of **Japan** expressed concern about the expectations being placed on the State Party wished to know from the State Party, the extent of the archaeological work completed, and whether there were any constraints should deferral be recommended.
1485. The Delegation of **Kenya** assured that the work had been done. It expressed that the site was sacred and that precautionary measures had to be taken into account when undertaking any archaeological work. Therefore, due to the above mentioned constraints, the work would require more time for completion.
1486. La délégation du **Bénin** considère que l'ICOMOS n'a pas bien compris la situation propre au site lors de son analyse. On ne peut pas demander que des fouilles archéologiques soient plus étendues dans un site qui est sacré. L'ICOMOS fait d'autre part la demande de classer ces sites à travers une protection nationale, or cette protection est déjà assurée à travers le plan de gestion en vigueur depuis 2006. Il y a aussi une grande contradiction avec le critère (iii), tout comme il est en quelque sorte reproché aux peuples africains d'évoluer. La délégation souhaite que le site soit inscrit sur la Liste.
1487. The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Benin for the comments. It asked whether the nomination be deferred or referred.
1488. The Delegation of Spain said that the report raises some doubts about the process and asked how the nomination could be reviewed better. It suggested that sufficient time was required to allow for a proper evaluation of whether the property satisfies criteria (iii), (v), and (vi). It concluded by saying referral would be appropriate.
1489. The Delegation of **Mauritius** expressed regret that there had been a lack of communication between the State Party and ICOMOS. It pointed out that the State Party might have been able to provide clarification on the issues had the Advisory Body

ensured communication, and that the site could have then been recommended for inscription.

1490. The Delegation of **Canada** wished to ask the State Party about a number of issues that had to be addressed as required by ICOMOS. It suggested that referral could be a wise choice by the Committee. In addition, legal protection was necessary, yet the site was sacred. Hence, it was not clear what kind of protection was required – legal or traditional?
1491. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed that both legal and traditional protection was required.
1492. Le délégué de **Madagascar** souhaite apporter des compléments d'information aux membres du Comité . L'histoire de cette proposition d'inscription date de 10 années. Ce site constitue une forêt sacrée, c'est-à-dire un site naturel qui a été anthropisé. La Liste du patrimoine mondial manque de cette catégorie de biens. D'autre part, il considère que l'on a déjà demandé beaucoup à un Etat partie africain, en appuyant la remarque faite par la délégation du Japon.
1493. The **State Party (Minister)** stated that the evaluation report by IUCN and ICOMOS, especially the pages from 99 to 102, was excellent. It said that some of the concerns raised in December had been resolved, and that the new Forestry Act, which included heritage protection, was operational.
1494. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed that it was not happy with the IUCN report which had not been officially published.
1495. The Delegation of **India** said that the State Party could have provided clarification in one month; hence there was a misunderstanding on whether the State Party could have been able to provide clarification on time. It asked whether the State Party could provide justification for criteria iii, v and vi if the Committee inscribed the property on the List and asked whether IUCN could make a presentation should there be different perspectives.
1496. The **Chairperson** recalled that IUCN had already made a presentation on this issue.
1497. In response to India, the Delegation of **Kenya** said it could provide the necessary information and reiterated that the site should be inscribed on the World Heritage List.
1498. The **Chairperson** expressed his view that there was no consensus on whether the site be inscribed or not and said the Committee could not get justification for the property's Outstanding Universal Value after inscription, since Outstanding Universal Value is the main criterion for inscription. He asked if a compromise could be made on this issue, and suggested that the site be deferred rather than referred so that the State Party would have sufficient time to provide additional information and clarifications.
1499. The Delegations of the **Netherlands** and the **United States of America and Lithuania** agreed with the Chairperson.
1500. The Delegation of **Israel** also agreed and suggested considering criteria vi in the nomination.
1501. Le délégué du **Bénin** considère que l'UICN n'a pas traité le dossier correctement. Il n'est pas question non plus de mettre une exigence réduite pour les états africains, en vertu d'une égalité de traitement entre les pays de la Convention du patrimoine mondial. La situation actuelle illustre la mauvaise compréhension des Organisations consultatives. La décision du Comité doit tenir compte du fait que le dossier a été mal traité par les Organisations consultatives.
1502. The **Chairperson** asked IUCN and ICOMOS to comment.

1503. **ICOMOS** explained that the criteria issue would be dealt with in view of the documentation and that there was no inventory of the property. Referring to archaeology, it stated that the interest was not in excavation, but in surveys and documentation of the property.
1504. **IUCN** clarified that its recommendations on the property had been submitted to ICOMOS so that the joint results of both the Advisory Bodies could be presented to the Committee.
1505. The Delegation of **India** commented that the situation was annoying. There seemed to be a lack of sensitivity in dealing with local communities as well as local traditions. It suggested that there was a need to discuss this issue further with the Advisory Bodies, including perhaps, ensuring greater geographical representation within the Advisory Bodies. It said that inventory in this vast region was not possible. Furthermore, it stressed that the Africa region should be treated differently to the Western countries. Reiterating the previous comments, it regretted that the Advisory Body had decided the State Party would not be able to supply the necessary information in time.
1506. Le délégué de **Madagascar** demande que l'Etat partie puisse encore prendre la parole pour s'exprimer devant le Comité afin de clarifier les limites du bien.
1507. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any questions and answers, or any further factual information.
1508. The Delegation of **Kenya** commented that the term Kaya mentioned by ICOMOS in the evaluation was unclear. It stated that ICOMOS had no idea of this term.
1509. The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the comments from India.
1510. The Delegation of **Lithuania** expressed regret regarding the ongoing debate, and noted that the State Party had been unable to complete the nomination despite the International Assistance from the World Heritage Centre.
1511. The **Chairperson** decided to postpone and conclude the issue of referral or deferral on Monday, 2 July. He informed the Committee that the Delegation of China had requested to discuss its nomination earlier due to their departure in the afternoon. However, it said that the nomination from China would be discussed after the nomination from Namibia.

#### **Twyfelfontein or /Ui-Ilaes (Namibia) (C 1255)**

1512. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Twyfelfontein or /Ui-Ilaes.
1513. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections against the inscription.
1514. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested that the property should be inscribed without having conditions in the Decision.
1515. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked ICOMOS to provide clarification on the given criteria.
1516. **ICOMOS**, responding to the Delegation of Kenya, stated that those were recommendations not conditions.
1517. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked if the State Party wished to comment on the recommendations.
1518. The Delegation of **Namibia** thanked ICOMOS. It expressed that most recommendations were being addressed through the implementation of the management plan, and that the National Heritage Act had been published. Furthermore, a joint Management Committee, established in 2005, included the representation of tour guides. It informed the Committee that the National Heritage

Council had provided funds to the joint Management Committee, as well as funds that had been received from the Participatory Programme of UNESCO.

1519. The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the cultural landscape or criteria 6 was being considered. It said that the buffer zone was protecting a large area but technical demarcations were not clear.
1520. **ICOMOS** responded and clarified that all criteria were assessed during the evaluation process. It further explained that the property could be a relic cultural landscape and that while the buffer zones could be better, they were adequate.
1521. The Delegation of **India** recalled that the State Party was addressing recommendations a and b, and suggested removing recommendations c, d, e, and f.
1522. The **Chairperson**, declared Decision **31 COM 8B.22** adopted as amended.
1523. The Delegation of **Namibia** thanked the Committee for inscribing the site on the World Heritage List. It said that Namibia had joined the global World Heritage family, and that this was a historical event for its people. Furthermore, it enthused that the inscription would be a great benefit for future generations. It reassures the Committee about its commitment to fully participate and contribute to the sustainable management of the property. It then stated that the National Heritage Act of 2004 would provide adequate protection to the property, and above all that the management plan would be implemented properly. It pledged to contribute USD 50,000 to the Africa World Heritage Fund.

### **Kaiping Diaolou and Villages (China) (C 1112)**

1524. ICOMOS presented the nomination of Kaiping Diaolou and Villages.
1525. The Delegation of **Israel** applauded that the property was an excellent representative of modern architecture. It asked the State Party what protection mechanism was in place for a wider setting.
1526. The Observer Delegation of **China** stated that there was no problem for the protection of the property.
1527. The Delegation of **Israel** thanked China. It proposed to mention protection rather than recommendation in paragraph 4.
1528. The Delegation of **Norway** expressed the view that tourists should respect the villagers, and for that purpose, a code of conduct had to be created.
1529. The Observer Delegation of **China** said that the management plan would address the issues concerning tourists.
1530. The Delegation of **Israel** asked to include new next which read as “request the protection in wider setting...”.
1531. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B. 25** adopted as amended .
1532. The Observer Delegation of **China** thanked the Committee for inscribing the property, and invited all Delegates to China to visit the inscribed property.

## **C.2 ARAB STATES**

### **C.2.1 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee**

#### **Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev)**

1533. **ICOMOS** presented the evaluation report of the property. It stated that either the site should be deferred or simultaneously inscribed on the World Heritage List and the In Danger List.
1534. The **Chairperson** expressed that the property was complicated and required discussion.
1535. La délégation du **Maroc** félicite ICOMOS pour son rapport et son analyse, compte tenu des circonstances exceptionnelles. La déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle est claire pour ce site. L'absence de mission peut être compensée par la bibliographie et les recherches existantes. L'Etat partie propose que le bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et ensuite sur la Liste en patrimoine mondial en péril. Cette inscription signifierait un signal de solidarité fort envers la population locale iraquienne.
1536. The Delegation of **Kenya** recommended the property for listing. It said that the inscription would be a present to the people of Iraq, and that they would not feel excluded.
1537. The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the comments by Morocco and Kenya. It referred to the site which was inscribed on the In Danger List in 2003, and reiterated that the inscription would be a gift for the Iraqi people.
1538. The **Chairperson** announced inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, and then on the In Danger List.
1539. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked for the State Party's consent on the In Danger Listing.
1540. The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** warmly accepted having the site inscribed on the List of World Heritage In Danger.
1541. The **Chairperson** declared to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage In Danger.
1542. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B. 23** adopted as amended.
1543. The Observer Delegation of **Iraq** thanked the Committee, and expressed its greetings on the occasion of the Chairperson's birthday. It stated that the Committee was recognizing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by inscribing the property. Above all, the landmark Decision would encourage the Iraqi authorities to protect the property. It commented that the Committee had fulfilled the mission of safeguarding the heritage of Iraq.
1544. The **Rapporteur** recalled the need for ICOMOS to work on the drafting of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value asked ICOMOS to draft the statement.
1545. ICOMOS confirmed its willingness to participate to the drafting of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, based on the proposed statement submitted by the State Party.
1546. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked to take into account the issues of integrity and authenticity while drafting the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.
1547. The **Chairperson** responded that the issue would be dealt with when drafting the Decision. He then recalled that negotiations between the States Parties of Cambodia and Thailand concerning the nominated property of The Sacred Site of the Temple of Preah Vihear.

The Meeting rose at 1.00 pm

FIFTH DAY – THURSDAY, 28 JUNE 2007

THIRTEENTH MEETING

02.30 p.m – 06.30 pm

Chairperson: Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)

**ITEM 8A: TENTATIVE LISTS OF STATES PARTIES SUBMITTED AS OF 31 MARCH 2007 IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES (continued)**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/8<sup>a</sup>

*Decisions:* **31 COM 8A.1**  
**31 COM 8A.2**  
**31 COM 8A.3**

1548. The Chairperson re-opened Item 8A for discussion and gave the floor to the Representative of the Director-General.

1549. The **Assistant Director-General for Culture**, representing the Director-General, informed the Committee that the French version of Draft Decision **31 COM 8A** needed amendment in order to conform with the original English draft.

1550. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8A** adopted as amended.

1551. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8A. 3** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.8B  
WHC-07/31.8B ADD REV  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.1  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.2

*Decisions:* **31 COM 8B.1 to 31 COM 8B.74**

**Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape (Japan) (C 1246)**

1552. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape. It recommended to defer the nomination of this property in order to allow for a more complete comparative analysis in its regional and global context, which would allow for a demonstration of the criteria under which the property was nominated and the establishment of its Outstanding Universal Value.

1553. The Delegation of **Chile** expressed its opinion that taking into account the global economic impact of the property and its contribution to the international exchange of technology, criterion (ii) had been met. It then commented that in consideration of the environmentally sustainable mining practices, criterion (v) had also been met.

1554. La délégation du **Maroc** souligne que ce bien n'était pas important uniquement du point de vue de la technologie minière mais également à cause de son rôle dans le développement des réseaux internationaux économiques de transport. Elle rappelle également que les pratiques minières durables et respectant l'environnement, présentes sur le site depuis le XVIIe siècle, étaient impressionnantes et devraient être



reconnues. Le Maroc avait une grande tradition minière, mais avait depuis toujours considéré le Japon comme le royaume des mines d'argent. La délégation indique que certains éléments n'avaient pas été mis en valeur dans la présentation. Elle partage l'avis de la délégation du Chili. Ce serait une perte de temps de ne pas inclure le site maintenant. Elle demande que l'on donne la parole au Japon.

1555. The Delegation of **Japan** took the floor and assured the Committee that the Government of Japan would continue to support research on the site and its regional and international impact.
1556. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its opinion that this property demonstrated Outstanding Universal Value in terms of its innovative technology, international technology exchange and environmentally sustainable management practices and therefore should be inscribed under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).
1557. The Delegation of **India** stated that it believed criteria (ii), (iii) and (v) had all been met. It said that it did not agree that further comparative study was needed and supported immediate inscription.
1558. The Delegation of **Israel** noted that it had received information that the State Party had submitted a letter containing the correction of factual errors in the ICOMOS evaluation, and requested the aforementioned Advisory Body to elaborate.
1559. **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that on 11 January 2007, a letter had been received from the State Party containing additional information about its willingness to conduct an additional comparative analysis.
1560. The Delegation of **Israel** asked the State Party when such a comparative analysis could be completed. It then suggested that ICOMOS undertake a thematic study on mines. The Delegation reminded the Committee that the World Heritage List should consist not merely of nationally important sites, but of sites of global importance. It expressed its support for deferral of the nomination.
1561. La délégation du **Madagascar** appuie les propos du Maroc, de l'Inde et du Kenya et demande à l'Etat partie d'expliquer ce qui a été accompli en matière de protection.
1562. The Delegation of **Japan** took the floor to explain the legal measures taken to conserve the forests and water of the site.
1563. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its opinion that the property should be considered a relic cultural landscape, not an industrial site. The Delegation also expressed its opinion that ICOMOS had not correctly applied paragraph 149 of the *Operational Guidelines*, in respect to additional information requested of the State Party. It proposed to inscribe the site under criteria (iii), (iv) and (v).
1564. **ICOMOS** stated that it had followed the procedures of the *Operational Guidelines* explaining that it had written to the State Party and received a response which had been reported to the Committee.
1565. The **Chairperson** asked if any Member of the Committee was against inscription of this property.
1566. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** submitted an amendment to the Draft Decision, calling for a comparative study.
1567. The Delegation of **Kenya** pointed out that the amendment proposed by the Republic of Korea did not impose the comparative study as a pre-condition for inscription and therefore did not affect the proposal to inscribe the property immediately.
1568. The Delegation of **Canada** stated that its initial assessment was that the property should be deferred, but that if the Committee was to decide upon inscription then it would support inscription under criteria (iii) and (v), but not under criterion (ii).

1569. The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to comment how Outstanding Universal Value may be understood in relation to criterion (ii).
1570. **ICOMOS** replied that it could not respond as it did not consider the site to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (ii) or any other criteria.
1571. The Delegation of **New Zealand** took the floor to argue in favour of inscription and also to support the suggestion for a global thematic study on mining sites.
1572. The Delegation of **Israel** supported inscription on the basis of criteria (iii) and (v).
- 1573.
1574. The Delegation of **India** stated that it found that criterion (ii) was also justified. The Delegation supported the concept of a comparative study but did not agree with the wording of the amendment to the Draft Decision proposed by the Republic of Korea. It subsequently proposed deleting the final phrase: “...and added to the inscription.” from the Korean amendment.
1575. The **Rapporteur** read the amendment proposed by the Republic of Korea.
1576. The Delegation of **India** clarified the wording it had objected to in the proposed amendment, stating that it proposed to delete the phrase “...and added to the inscription.”
1577. The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its opinion that because the Committee could be dealing (in the future) with the (extension of) the property as a transnational serial nomination, mention should be given of this in the Draft Decision. The Delegation suggested to change the amendment proposed by the Republic of Korea by (1) adding the words “...assisted by the Advisory Bodies”, (2) deleting the name of any country and substituting the words “...in the world and sub-region”, and (3) deleting, as suggested by India, the final phrase “...and added to the inscription.”
1578. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that the undertaking of a comparative analysis is the responsibility of the nominating State Party.
1579. On receiving this advice from the Chairperson, the Delegation of **Israel** withdrew its proposal to add the words “...assisted by the Advisory Bodies” to the Korean amendment.
- 1580.
1581. The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it agreed with both India and Israel and suggested that the wording of the proposed amendment to the Draft Decision be simplified by removing the phrase “...and added to the inscription.”
1582. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated its opinion that if the property were inscribed, there would be no further need or purpose for comparative analysis.
1583. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** explained that it was not proposing inscription, but rather deferral in order to allow for further comparative analysis.
1584. The Delegation of **India** requested the Delegation of the Republic of Korea to withdraw its amendment to the Draft Decision.
1585. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took the floor to explain the difference between a comparative analysis, which is the responsibility of the State Party as part of the nomination process, and a thematic study which is an assignment undertaken with the assistance of the Advisory Bodies.
1586. The Delegation of **India** requested clarification if the amendment proposed by Korea had been changed.
1587. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** stated that it agreed with the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

1588. The Delegation of **India** suggested: (1) to substitute the words “*thematic study*” for the words “*comparative analysis*” in the Korean amendment; (2) to put back in the words “*assisted by the Advisory Bodies*”; and (3) to delete the phrase “...and added to the inscription.”
1589. The **Rapporteur** re-read the Korean amendment.
1590. Au sujet de l’analyse thématique, la délégation du **Maroc** indique que ce n’était pas nécessaire de citer les pays spécifiques en parlant de « région » ou « sous-région ». Elle pense également que « détaillée et approfondie » est superflu, et que « détaillée » sous-entend « approfondie »
1591. The **Rapporteur** re-read the proposed amendment.
1592. La délégation du **Maroc** demande que la formulation de l’amendement soit simplifiée en éliminant les adjectifs.
1593. The Delegation of **New Zealand** urged that the thematic study proposed be a global study and suggested to add the words “*and in accordance with paragraph 147 of the Operational Guidelines*” to the proposed amendment.
1594. The **Chairperson** observed that New Zealand’s proposal for a global thematic study surpassed what was under debate (which concerned a regional study.)
1595. The Delegation of **New Zealand** stated that it accepted a regional thematic study, but still desired a reference to paragraph 147 of the *Operational Guidelines* in the amendment to the Draft Decision.
1596. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it was prepared to adopt the amendment.
1597. The amendment proposed by Korea was adopted, as amended by Israel, India, Morocco and New Zealand.
1598. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.26** adopted as amended and informed the Committee that the final text of the Draft Decision would be tabled on 2 July for approval by the Committee.
1599. The Delegation of **Japan** made a statement thanking the Committee and pledging continued support for the *World Heritage Convention* and the conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List even after the expiration of the mandate of Japan to the World Heritage Committee, by providing financial and technical means.
1600. The **Rapporteur** pointed out that a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was required in the Draft Decision and thereby requested assistance from the State Party, Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre in drafting this statement. The Rapporteur stated that similar assistance would be required for any other property which the Committee decides to inscribe but for which a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has not yet been drafted.

### **Sulaiman-Too Cultural Landscape (Sacred Mountain) (Kyrgyzstan) (C 1230)**

1601. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Sulaiman-Too Cultural Landscape and recommended to refer the inscription of this property until the buffer zone could be extended and the management plan completed. It further suggested that the name of the property be changed to “*Sulaiman-Too Sacred Mountain*.”
1602. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee agreed with the ICOMOS recommendation
1603. The Delegation of **Kenya** requested the State Party to comment.
1604. The **Chairperson** stated that the State Party was not present in the room.

1605. The Delegation of the **United States of America** raised a point of order, reminding the Chairperson that a State Party could not be invited to comment during the debate on the nomination of a property within its territory, but only to answer a direct question posed by a member of the Committee.

1606. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.27** adopted.

### **The Batanes Cultural Landscape (Philippines) (C 1184)**

1607. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Batanes Cultural Landscape, and recommended to defer the inscription of this property to allow for further survey and research on the evolution of the landscape and the relationship between nature and culture in this process; to allow for the intangible cultural associations to be included in the articulation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value; and to better integrate the cultural values of the cultural landscape into the management plan.

1608. The **Chairperson** asked if any Member of the Committee disagreed with the ICOMOS recommendation to defer.

1609. The Delegation of **Israel** drew attention to the letter from the State Party detailing alleged factual errors in the ICOMOS evaluation. The Delegation also asked for details on what International Assistance had been given to the State Party and why this assistance had not produced an acceptable nomination dossier.

1610. **ICOMOS** responded that it had interpreted the letter from the State Party as a letter of commentary and not of factual error.

1611. The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its opinion that the evaluation of this property by the Advisory Body showed that ICOMOS does not understand local culture. It asked ICOMOS how intangible associations of people to their surroundings could be proved, and what the applicable methodology for doing so would be. **ICOMOS** referred the Committee to the text of its evaluation in which it was stated that the continuation of cultural traditions is the important factor in linking intangible aspects of culture to the living cultural landscape of the Batanes archipelago. ICOMOS observed that the nomination dossier as currently drafted restricted its focus to the archaeology of graves and to structural remains which are only a small part of the story of the cultural landscape of Batanes.

1612. The Delegation of **India** stated that it believed criteria (ii) and (iii) applied to this property. It called attention to the complaint by the State Party that it had been denied due process in the evaluation. The Delegation of India associated itself with the concern expressed by the Delegation of Israel that the International Assistance provided by the Committee had not produced an acceptable nomination dossier.

1613. **ICOMOS** reiterated that it did not consider that the letter from the State Party concerned issues of due process.

1614. La délégation du **Madagascar** demande de donner la parole à l'Etat partie.

1615. The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of Madagascar to formulate a specific question to ask the State Party.

1616. La Délégation de **Madagascar** demande à l'Etat partie d'expliquer la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

1617. The Observer Delegation of **Philippines** took the floor and referred the Committee to the nomination dossier. It pointed out that the association of the property with Austronesian migration into the Pacific was verified by archaeological excavations of boat-shaped burials which have dated this movement to approximately 5-6000 years ago. The State Party also explained that architectural traditions introduced by Spain 500 years ago were still alive today.

1618. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its appreciation for this nomination and congratulated the State Party on the property's management plan. The Delegation observed that the management plan, however, needed a timeline for its effective application and commented that it supported the many recommendations made by ICOMOS to improve the nomination. The Delegation of the United States of America reminded the State Party and the Committee that a decision to defer a nomination did not constitute rejection of the nomination, but was rather an opportunity for the State Party to take advantage of additional assistance from the international community. It proposed that if the Committee did not want to defer the nomination, then it could consider referral as an alternative.
1619. The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its keen interest in this property. It supported the Delegations of India and the United States of America. It asked ICOMOS if the evaluation had been carried out by a member of the International Cultural Landscapes Committee and also requested ICOMOS' opinion on whether it was possible for the State Party to implement all of the recommendations, including page 71 of the evaluation, in one year
1620. **ICOMOS** was given the floor and subsequently asked the State Party that should the nomination be referred, could it complete the recommended action in one or two years without further assistance from the Advisory Bodies.
1621. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party which stated that it preferred immediate inscription.
1622. The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to answer the question it had been asked.
1623. The **State Party** assured the Committee that it could complete the action required within the stipulated time, but reiterated that it preferred immediate inscription due to the imminent threats to the property from infrastructure development.
1624. The Delegation of **Spain** repeated its question to ICOMOS and asked whether an ICOMOS expert had been involved in the recommendations.
1625. **ICOMOS** confirmed that the ICOMOS International Committee on Cultural Landscapes had been consulted on the nomination and had found the property to be most significant and that it undoubtedly had potential as a cultural landscape nomination to the World Heritage List. ICOMOS explained that the problem lay in the fact that the nomination dossier as currently formulated did not address the issues concerning the property's Outstanding Universal Value as a cultural landscape, but only addressed issues of archaeology and architecture. Therefore, although there is an expert consensus that the property is significant, this was not demonstrated by the nomination dossier and it therefore needs to be revised.
1626. La délégation du **Bénin** remarque qu'il y a un conflit évident d'interprétation entre l'ICOMOS et l'Etat partie. Il lui semble que ce qui est considéré comme des erreurs factuelles par l'Etat partie est finalement considéré comme étant des commentaires par l'ICOMOS. Elle demande donc à en avoir la liste afin de pouvoir statuer.
1627. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.
1628. The **State Party** explained that it considered it incorrect that the dossier contained no or insufficient information on the intangible traditions of the Ivatan people and cited the cooperative house-building tradition which is still alive on the islands today, as an example.
1629. The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that this was a test case and encouraged the Committee to "look at heritage with a local eye." The Delegation empathized with the State Party in wanting to inscribe the property as soon as possible as a way of countering threats to the site. It therefore suggested that a Decision to refer the nomination may be a solution.

1630. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked the State Party to explain what constituted the imminent threats to the property.
1631. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.
1632. The **State Party** explained that the most pressing threat derived from the planned construction of a golf course which would destroy a large tract of historic cultural landscape.
1633. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if they were in favour of referral or deferral.
1634. The Delegation of **New Zealand** in citing paragraphs 159 and 160 of the *Operational Guidelines*, asked the Advisory Body whether what was needed was simply more information, in which case referral would be appropriate, or, a more in-depth study and a revision of the nomination dossier were required, in which case deferral would be appropriate.
1635. **ICOMOS** responded that in its opinion deferral was the appropriate course of action.
1636. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it could agree on deferral.
1637. The Delegation of **India** stated that it preferred to refer the nomination.
1638. The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee if any Member was opposed to a Decision to refer the nomination.
1639. The Delegation of **Norway** stated that it supported deferral.
1640. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked of the Advisory Body that should the Decision be to refer the nomination, could the required work be accomplished in time.
1641. **ICOMOS** replied that a Decision to refer would not allow the Advisory Bodies to undertake another mission; while a Decision to defer would qualify for this further assistance from the Advisory Bodies. ICOMOS expressed the opinion that as a new dossier was required, a new mission by the Advisory Bodies would also be required, and therefore the Decision to defer would be the appropriate action.
1642. The **Chairperson** again asked if any Member of the Committee was opposed to referral
1643. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that, upon hearing the advice of the Advisory Body, it had changed its position to support deferral.
1644. The Delegation of **Canada** stated that it felt deferral would be appropriate.
1645. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its support for deferral.
1646. The Delegation of **New Zealand** concurred with the Netherlands.
1647. The Delegation of **Lithuania** approved deferral.
1648. The **Chairperson** remarked that the Committee wanted to assist the State Party as much as possible in producing an acceptable nomination and to safeguard this property.
1649. La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique être en faveur du renvoi de la proposition à l'Etat partie.
1650. The Delegation of **Spain** reminded the Committee that it had asked a question of the State Party, which had not yet been answered; and wished to know whether a one-year delay would be sufficient to implement the recommendations, and whether a two-year delay wouldn't be too long to ensure the protection of the property.
1651. **ICOMOS** stated that because of the timetable of the Committee, a State Party must in fact respond to a referral within nine months, but whether or not a State Party meets this deadline was up to the State Party themselves. ICOMOS observed that the legal

protection currently provided to the property should be adequate in protecting it from development threats such as the golf course.

1652. La délégation du **Bénin** se prononce en faveur du renvoi.
1653. The Delegation of **India** pointed out that in developing countries, World Heritage status often gives an added measure of protection to a site, where legal protection may be inadequate or not always enforced. It reminded the Committee that in the case of a referral, the State Party had up to two years to respond. The Delegation of India supported referral, and suggested a vote.
1654. The **Chairperson** observed that the Committee seemed to be divided and asked if a consensus on referral could be achieved.
1655. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** asked the State Party if they could accept a deferral, as this Decision would not imply any time constraints and it would allow the Committee and the Advisory Bodies to assist the State Party in revising the nomination dossier.
1656. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.
1657. The **State Party** reiterated that because of the imminent threats to the property, it preferred referral.
1658. The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed to a vote and reminded the Committee that a simple majority would decide the issue.
1659. The Delegations of **Chile** and **Cuba** supported the referral.
1660. The Delegation of the **United States of America** raised a point of order asking if voting would now proceed.
1661. The **Chairperson** clarified that he was still attempting to discover where the majority of Members stand on the issue, so that a consensus could be established.
1662. The **Chairperson** then suggested a vote by a show of hands.
1663. The Delegation of **Israel** stated that additional missions to the site by both ICOMOS and IUCN were needed, so deferral would be more appropriate. It urged the State Party to accept this, but to act quickly to return the nomination to the Committee.
1664. The **Chairperson** again suggested a vote by a show of hands.
1665. The Delegation of **Lithuania** took the floor to state that a vote was not necessary.
1666. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked the Committee to trust in the State Party and to refer the nomination, reminding the Committee that in any case they would have the opportunity to review the nomination when it is presented again.
1667. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee if it agreed to refer.
1668. The Delegation of **India** asked the Chairperson to clarify exactly what he was asking.
1669. The **Chairperson** asked if any Member of the Committee was against a Decision to refer.
1670. The Delegation of **Norway** stated that it supported a Decision to defer.
1671. The **Chairperson** asked for a show of name plaques, after which he announced that 14 Committee members were in favour of referral; 4 against referral and 3 abstentions. He then ruled that the Decision to refer the property carried. He then announced that the nomination of The Batanes Cultural Landscape was referred and stated that a new Draft Decision was to be tabled on 2 July.

## **Sarazm (Tajikistan) (C 1141)**

1672. ICOMOS presented the nomination of Sarazm and recommended to defer the consideration of this property, so that more research and comparative analysis could be undertaken. It then informed the Committee that it had received a letter from the State Party raising issues which were not concerned with any factual error in the evaluation.
1673. The **Chairperson** asked if any Member of the Committee had an objection to deferral.
1674. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked the State Party if this property had been proposed to the World Monuments Fund for listing among the World's 100 Most Endangered Sites, and if so, whether the property had any problem that might result in it being inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.
1675. The **Chairperson** observed that the State Party was not present in the room.
1676. **ICOMOS** observed that, in their evaluation, the threats to the site were minimal.
1677. The Delegation of **Israel** noted that this nomination was another case of a property which had benefited from International Assistance from the Committee, yet this assistance had not resulted in a nomination dossier acceptable to the Advisory Body. It suggested that the nomination be referred, as more information was what was required rather than a new nomination. The Delegation expressed its opinion that criteria (iii) and (iv) could be demonstrated relatively easily; criteria (ii) and (v) may take more time to manifest; while criterion (vi) appeared not to apply. The Delegation of Israel suggested that the property be referred and that the State Party be asked to present its nomination firstly under criteria (iii) and (iv) and later the Committee could consider examining the possibility of inscribing the site under the additional criteria (ii) and (v), if this could be justified.
1678. **ICOMOS** observed that without further archaeological investigation and a comparative analysis, no Outstanding Universal Value could be demonstrated for any of the criteria.
1679. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that it supported deferral as recommended by the Advisory Body.
1680. The Delegation of **India** asked for a response to the question on the effectiveness of International Assistance in the preparation of nominations.
1681. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that International Assistance is provided to a State Party and it is that State Party – not the Centre nor the Advisory Bodies – that executes the grant for the purposes approved. Neither the Centre nor the Advisory Bodies prepare nominations on behalf of States Parties as this would create a conflict of interest.
1682. The **Chairperson** stated that he understood the point made by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, but that the issue raised by India, Israel and Kenya regarding the effectiveness of this assistance was worth considering.
1683. The Delegation of **India** concurred with the Chairperson stating that it would raise the issue during the discussion on agenda Item 18: International Assistance
1684. The **Chairperson** asked if there was any objection to a Decision to defer the nomination.
1685. Noting consensus on the proposal to defer the inscription of the property, The **Chairperson** then declared Decision **31 COM 8B.29** adopted.

### **The Parthian Fortresses of Nisa (Turkmenistan) (C 1241)**



1686. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Parthian Fortresses of Nisa and recommended to inscribe the property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii).
1687. The **Chairperson** asked if any Member of the Committee objected to the Decision to inscribe the property.
1688. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** complimented the Advisory Body ICOMOS on its evaluation of this property, but questioned whether the issues of archaeological integrity and the state of conservation of the excavated remains had been fully considered in the evaluation. The Delegation proposed to defer this nomination to allow the State Party time to develop a strategy to better manage the excavated remains.
1689. The Delegation of the **United States of America** suggested an amendment to paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision by the addition of a new point (h) which would read: *“4(h) provide annual reports to the Committee providing information on the implementation of the management plan, for the next three years.”*
1690. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested ICOMOS to respond to the observations of the Delegation of the Netherlands concerning the conservation of the excavated archaeological remains.
1691. **ICOMOS** stated that its evaluation focused on the on-going excavations, not on any conservation or restoration work that may or may not have taken place in the past. ICOMOS pointed out that in their report they flag the issue that the management plan for the property is under-resourced, and thus not fully implemented.
1692. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** observed that archaeological values do not seem to have been fully deliberated in the evaluation of the property under consideration.
1693. **ICOMOS** responded by inviting the Committee to examine page 88 of the evaluation report, the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the recommendations of the Advisory Body, all of which focus on archaeological integrity and authenticity.
1694. **ICOMOS** also informed the Committee that it had received a letter from the State Party confirming that a conservation management office had been established.
1695. The **Chairperson** asked if there was any objection to inscribing the property and adopting the Draft Decision with the new paragraph 4(h) as proposed by the United States of America. There was no objection.
1696. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.30**, adopted as amended.

### **Sydney Opera House (Australia) (C 166 Rev)**

1697. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Sydney Opera House and recommended to the Committee to inscribe the property on the basis of criterion (i).
1698. The **Chairperson** asked if any Member of the Committee had an objection to the inscription of the property.
1699. The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the State Party. It then raised the issue of the mention of the architect's name in the statement of Outstanding Universal Value and suggested that if the architect's name is mentioned, then the name of the engineering firm should also be mentioned. The Delegation of Israel raised the question for discussion of whether the Committee's intention was to inscribe individual buildings or the corpus of the work of an architect.
1700. **ICOMOS** responded to the question of the Delegation of Israel by stating that, in the case of the Sydney Opera House, it is an iconic building that was being proposed for inscription.
1701. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked if the buffer zone includes the sea (harbour water) in front of the Opera House.
1702. **ICOMOS** confirmed that the buffer zone includes all of the sea visible from the Opera House.
1703. The Delegation of **Chile** expressed concern for the guarantees of authenticity of contemporary buildings after inscription, especially in the case where the architect is still living and can exercise a degree of influence over modifications to the building. The Delegation asked the State Party what guarantees of this kind are in place with regard to the Sydney Opera House.
1704. The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to take the floor.
1705. The State Party of **Australia** explained the management planning framework for the Opera House which includes the architect's "Design Principles" for conservation and management of the building. It further clarified that there is also a legislative planning framework in place which protects the property and that in addition, the property is listed on national and state protection registers.
1706. The Delegation of **New Zealand** made the observation that the 'passage of time' is needed in order to fully evaluate the Outstanding Universal Value of contemporary architecture. The Delegation expressed its support for the inscription of the property.
1707. The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the inscription of the property and congratulated the State Party, noting that this inscription was an example of a property that had first been deferred but subsequently returned by the State Party and successfully inscribed.
1708. Noting that consensus was reached, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.31** adopted.
1709. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** thanked the Committee and ICOMOS of its evaluation and observed that the inscription coincided with the 50th anniversary of the original design contest which had resulted in the construction of the Sydney Opera House. It recalled the collective vision, skill and innovation of the Danish architect Jørn Utzon and of the British engineer Ove Arup and the team of Australian architects and workers, and felt proud to share this gift with all humankind.

### **The Red Fort Complex (India) (C 231 Rev)**

1710. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Red Fort Complex the property, and recommended to the Committee to inscribe the property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi).
1711. The **Chairperson** asked if any member had an objection to the inscription of the property.
1712. The Delegation of **Israel** complimented the State Party on this nomination noting that it completed the series of Mughal Forts inscribed on the World Heritage List.
1713. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.32** adopted.
1714. The Representative of the State Party of **India** recalled the link of the inscribed property with history of architecture of India, recalling the influence the Red Fort Complex spread on the architectural style of buildings and gardens especially in the neighboring areas of Delhi, Agra and Rajasthan. It then thanked the Committee, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre for their support.
1715. The **Chairperson** reminded Members of the Committee, Representatives of States Parties and Observers that no press coverage of the Committee Meeting was allowed and that this prohibition included press "coverage" of the Committee Meeting proceedings broadcast on close-circuit monitor in the conference centre.

The meeting rose at 5.25 pm

FIFTH DAY - THURSDAY 28 JUNE 2007

FOURTEENTH MEETING

06.00 p.m – 07.00 pm

Chairperson Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)

ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST  
(continued)

C.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1 New nominations

**Bregenzerwald Cultural Landscape, Austria (C 1228)**

1716. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Bregenzerwald Cultural Landscape and noted that changes in building materials and construction had impacted on the authenticity of the overall building stock. It recommended that the potential for a series of sites or for several series also be explored and recommended that the examination of nomination of the Bregenzerwald Cultural Landscape, Austria, should be deferred.
1717. The **Chairperson** checked if there was quorum in the room to start the session. He verified that there was a majority of the members, then thanked the World Heritage Centre for having prepared a cocktail party.
1718. The **Chairperson** asked for any amendments to the Draft Decision. No amendment was presented.
1719. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.33** adopted.

**Mehmed Pasa Sokolovic's Bridge in Visegrad, Bosnia Herzegovina (C1260)**

1720. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Mehmed Pasa Sokolovic's Bridge in Visegrad and believed that the integrity and authenticity of the property was considered fragile and under threat from its condition, particularly its foundations. It then recommended that the nomination be referred back to the State Party.
1721. La délégation du **Maroc** note qu'il s'agit d'un très bel exemple d'un site dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est incontestablement attestée. Il lui semble exister suffisamment d'éléments permettant de justifier le critère (vi). Quant à la question relative au niveau d'eau, elle note qu'il y a des éléments fournis dans le rapport qui clarifient le souci exprimé par l'ICOMOS. Pour elle, ce pont est un symbole qui a une valeur emblématique pour les différentes cultures et les trois religions monothéiques. Elle propose que l'Etat partie de Bosnie Herzégovine donne des informations sur les éléments nouveaux qui justifieraient l'inscription immédiate sur la liste du patrimoine mondial.
1722. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked whether the State Party was in the room to explain what action it would undertake according to the ICOMOS recommendations.
1723. The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia Herzegovina** explained that since the ICOMOS visit, a list of measures in cooperation with the Serbian Minister of Energy had been implemented and good results subsequently obtained. It went on to state that a special agreement was being developed for the bridge restoration, and the Government was

working hard to implement measures with the support of the Council of Ministers. The Delegate thanked the Committee for having taken those measures into account.

1724. The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that this nomination had important historical value and requested further information concerning the reconstruction and the damages suffered during the wars. It then asked for more information on the location of the Mihrab.
1725. **ICOMOS** confirmed that the Mihrab is located on the bridge.
1726. The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that the memories associated with the bridge were as important as the heritage of the structure itself and suggested the decision should reflect this fact. The Delegation supported the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List.
1727. The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Kenya to confirm acceptance of the inscription.
1728. The Delegation of **Kenya** confirmed.
1729. The **Chairperson** requested the Delegation of Kenya to submit the amendment in written form and proposed to return to this issue on the Monday.
1730. The Delegation of **Kuwait** supported the inscription of the site according to the pertinent criteria.
1731. The Delegation of **Cuba** considered that this was an important site and agreed with the recommendations already made by the other members to inscribe the site. It asked why criterion vi had not been taken into account.
1732. **ICOMOS** considered that the bridge itself was not sufficient to apply criterion vi.
1733. La délégation du **Bénin** suggère que soit également prise en compte la valeur immatérielle associée au pont ainsi que sa résistance face aux différents événements au cours des siècles.
1734. The **Chairperson** explained that the Committee was currently faced with a dilemma: whether the site could be inscribed and the State Party finalize the pending tasks or vice versa. The Chairperson asked if there was any objection to inscription.
1735. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested to discuss only two of the criteria that had previously been considered.
1736. The **Chairperson** requested the approval of Morocco in removing its amendment to include criteria vi, and therefore inscribe the site.
1737. La délégation du **Maroc** en réponse à la question du Président, précise qu'elle n'aurait pas d'objection à se rallier au consensus si tel était le souhait du Comité.
1738. The **Chairperson** requested confirmation of whether the Committee agreed to include recommendations a) to e).
1739. The Delegation of **Lithuania** mentioned that two of them were already applied.
1740. The **Chairperson** summarized the situation in stating that the site could be inscribed with two criteria; recommendations c) and d) could be deleted; and a), b), c) would be maintained.
1741. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked for confirmation of whether the State Party agreed with c) and b).
1742. **ICOMOS** explained that additional information had been received but that there had been no time to verify the information.

1743. The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia Herzegovina** confirmed that the State Party would undertake all the measures proposed by the Advisory Bodies and the Committee.
1744. The **Chairperson** enquired whether it was necessary to read all the text.
1745. The Delegation of **Israel** requested that the text not be read again and proposed, as a matter of principle, to discuss the matter on the Monday.
1746. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.34** adopted as amended.
1747. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.
1748. The Observer Delegation of **Bosnia Herzegovina** expressed that the bridge was a symbol of the defense of culture and dialogue. This is the second bridge after Mostar, it continued, and both are considered the symbols which inspire their lives. The Observer thanked all the stakeholders who had worked hard on the preparation of the file, the Serbian Delegation at UNESCO and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre.

### **The Rideau Canal, Canada (C 1221)**

1749. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Rideau Canal and considered it as a significant North American exemplar of a slack water technology canal designed for military use, which had an impact on the development in its area and is still utilized today. ICOMOS considered that the nominated property adequately demonstrated integrity and authenticity and recommended that the Rideau Canal, Canada, was inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria i and iv.
1750. The **Chairperson** enquired whether there were any amendments to the Draft Decision.
1751. No amendments were proposed and the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.35** adopted.
1752. The Delegation of **Canada** recalled that in 2007 the canal was celebrating its 175th anniversary and underlined the importance of the inscription at such a moment. It then thanked the Committee and ICOMOS and invited all the distinguished Delegates to visit the site.

### **Bordeaux, Port of the Moon, France (C1256)**

1753. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Bordeaux, Port of the Moon and considered that Outstanding Universal Value had been demonstrated and that the nominated property met criteria ii and iv and recommended that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of such criteria.
1754. The **Chairperson** asked whether there was any objection to the Draft Decision.
1755. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.38** adopted.
1756. La délégation de la **France** souligne que la ville de Bordeaux attendait depuis longtemps cette décision très positive du Comité d'inscrire le « Port de Lune » sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle signale au Comité que celui-ci avait déjà eu un avant goût des valeurs de cette ville car, deux de ses monuments font déjà partie d'un autre bien français inscrit sur la Liste, à savoir les Chemins de Saint-Jacques-de-Compostelle. Elle souligne en outre que le résultat actuel couronne les efforts des autorités françaises et plus particulièrement de la ville de Bordeaux et de son maire, Mr Alain Juppé. Elle rappelle au Comité que l'un des symboles forts de cette ville est également la qualité de son vin, le Bordeaux, dont la renommée internationale ne fait plus de doute. Pour lui, cette inscription donnera l'occasion d'ouvrir de nombreuses

bouteilles à Bordeaux. Elle regrette de n'en avoir pas apporté de grandes quantités pour les membres du Comité mais promet une dégustation de la seule bouteille en sa possession par le Président. Elle remercie enfin le Comité pour sa décision unanime.

## FIFTH DAY - THURSDAY 28 JUNE 2007

### FIFTEENTH MEETING

09.15 p.m – 9.00 pm

Chairperson Mr Ole Briseid (Norway)

#### ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (*continued*)

##### Old Town of Corfu (Greece) (C 978)

1757. ICOMOS presented the nomination of the Old Town of Corfu.
1758. The Delegation of **Kenya** remarked that this was a great site with a management plan in place which had to be reviewed on a regular basis, but that it was full of tourists and it requested the Advisory Body's view on this.
1759. **ICOMOS** responded that a programme for heritage presentation and promotion had been put in place, which addressed tourism management issues, and that the old city had less tourism.
1760. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.40** adopted.
1761. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party.
1762. The State Party of **Greece** warmly thanked the Chairperson, the Committee and ICOMOS, and remarked by citing a poem that Corfu was a joy forever for all to enjoy. It recalled that Greece had been one of the great civilizations of ancient times, but that it had not brought any nominations forward recently, as it held the view that too many inscriptions would eventually devalue the List. It concluded that it hoped other Delegates would consider this line of thinking as well.

##### Baha'i Holy Places in Haifa and the Western Galilee (Israel) (C 1220)

1763. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Baha'i Holy Places in Haifa and the Western Galilee and mentioned that this was a complicated site, which may require further time for presentation. ICOMOS' evaluation concluded that, since the significance of the nominated property lay in its link to the Baha'i faith, there were no valid comparators for the purpose of a comparative analysis. With respect to criterion iii, it concluded that the nominated property did not warrant inscription on the List and therefore if the Committee wished to inscribe it, the decision would have to be based on criterion vi alone. It concluded that the conditions of integrity and authenticity were satisfied, but noted threats from urban development in the buffer zone and setting.
1764. The Delegation of **Cuba** stated that paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision mentioned the high quality of the maintenance, thus protection of the property was ensured and therefore this paragraph was not needed.
1765. The Delegation of **India** remarked that this was an interesting site for India, which had a Baha'i temple in New Delhi, and that inscription on the basis of criterion vi only

was possible. It further remarked that additional information on the legal protection was available, in which case the Draft Decision could be amended.

1766. The **Chairperson** explained that a letter on factual errors had indeed been received by the World Heritage Centre, which had been distributed to the Committee, and requested the State Party to respond.
1767. The State Party of **Israel** read out the statements made in the letter on factual errors.
1768. The Delegation of **New Zealand** requested clarification from the Advisory Body concerning a statement made in the second paragraph on page 177 of their evaluation report, which said that the nominated property constituted a “unique testimony”. The Delegation queried why it therefore did not justify inscription under criterion iii.
1769. **ICOMOS** replied that it had looked at the tangible evidence, rather than intangible associations, and that there was no architectural value justifying inscription under criterion iii, only perhaps under criterion vi.
1770. The Delegation of **Kenya** remarked that this site was also interesting for Kenya, since it too had followers of the Baha’i faith. The Delegation stated that the buildings alone definitely had merit, albeit more related to memory, similar to the property of Robben Island in South Africa, and that it therefore supported listing. As regards the factual errors in the document, the Delegation further urged that the State Party should not be victimized as a result and it concluded that the Outstanding Universal Value, management, and the State Party’s commitment were all apparent.
1771. The **Chairperson** then said that he felt that the Committee wanted to agree on inscription under criterion vi only, which would be acceptable as this had been recommended by the Advisory Body, and he asked if there were any objections to this interpretation. If so, this would leave the issue concerning criterion iii open and he thereby asked for clarification from the Advisory Body.
1772. **ICOMOS** replied that it had provided two options in its report and with regard to inscription under iii, it had argued in the text that the buildings did not encapsulate a particular cultural tradition, thus leaving it open to the Committee to take a different viewpoint on this issue.
1773. The **Chairperson** asked if there was agreement to inscribe the site under criterion vi.
1774. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed concern, stating that it was an important site in some respects, but that its buildings were scattered and not grouped together in a cohesive manner, with varying degrees of association and with recent constructions and modifications, which raised the question of how the Advisory Body had assessed the issues of integrity and authenticity?
1775. **ICOMOS** replied that the nomination dossier contained a series of buildings selected according to their relevance to the Baha’i doctrine and that the buildings and their associations formed one unit for the followers of that faith, which had been carefully considered by the Advisory Body, after which it had concluded that it was not qualified to make an assessment.
1776. La délégation du **Bénin** remarque qu’il est bon d’aborder des sujets nouveaux et que si le Comité se montre timoré, il risque de pénaliser le bien concerné. Elle indique qu’il s’agit là du début d’une tradition et qu’il y a visiblement « homologie », un lien entre la foi Baha’i et la pensée architecturale. En conséquence, le critère (iii) pourrait s’appliquer.
1777. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed concern that this could set a precedent in the way that the nomination of a property of any faith had to be judged according to what they believe to be significant, which was worth some consideration. It stated that it did not support inscription.



1778. After this intervention, the **Chairperson** asked for clarification whether the United States of America was against inscription, to which it replied in the affirmative, prompting the Chairperson to ask if there were more objections to inscription.
1779. The Delegations of **Norway** and **Tunisia** stated that they did not support inscription.
1780. The Delegation of **India** requested the Delegation of the United States of America to elaborate on its concern, in view of the fact that sites had previously been inscribed on the basis of criterion vi alone, which was also the advice of the Advisory Body, otherwise a vote would be needed.
1781. The Delegation of **Lithuania** stated that it also felt uncomfortable with the fact that the Advisory Body had left the decision-making on the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property to the Committee, as if they were experts on religious affairs. The Delegation considered this to be a big responsibility for the Committee, furthermore a difficulty which could indeed set a precedent.
1782. The **Chairperson** enquired whether the Advisory Body recommended to refer or defer the nomination, and stated that in the case of referral, it would mean that the property had Outstanding Universal Value.
1783. **ICOMOS** replied that in the evaluation report, “if” was mentioned, meaning that if the Committee found that Outstanding Universal Value was justified for criterion vi, the recommendation for referral would allow the State Party to establish stronger protection of the site. It further explained that reaching a conclusion had been difficult for the Advisory Body.
1784. The **Chairperson** commented that the Advisory Body de facto did not want to give the Committee clear advice on this
1785. La délégation de **Madagascar** souligne que le site est intéressant à plus d'un titre et qu'il est possible de mettre entre parenthèses l'appartenance à une foi particulière. Elle précise qu'il s'agit d'un lieu de mémoire, associant patrimoine tangible et intangible, et que l'authenticité et l'intégrité sont assurées. Enfin, la délégation annonce qu'elle est favorable à l'inscription de ce bien.
1786. La délégation de **Tunisie** s'inquiète du fait de considérer des croyances, soulignant la difficulté que le Comité rencontre déjà avec la culture, sans qu'il soit besoin d'y rajouter les croyances. Elle indique son refus de toute dimension religieuse.
1787. The Delegation of **Kenya** made an appeal for tempers to be contained and that it understood the concerns of the United States relating to the difficulty of assessment. It continued by remarking that this was a site with continuing development, as was the case with the Sydney Opera House that had just been inscribed. Furthermore it stated that the Committee was hereby dealing with a nomination brought forward by a State Party and was not dealing with a religion, and it recalled how many cathedrals had been inscribed on the List. It concluded by urging the Committee to move away from the issue of religion, as this site had a history, with tangible and intangible heritage, representing a faith with followers around the world, which thereby made it universal.
1788. The Delegation of **Spain** stressed that it agreed with the Delegations of the United States of America and Tunisia regarding their reservations.
1789. La délégation du **Bénin** précise que lorsque le Comité inscrit une cathédrale ou une mosquée, c'est pour leur architecture, mais également pour la foi qu'elles représentent. Elle ne comprend pas que l'on pénalise une religion parce qu'elle est nouvelle et reconnaît une continuité architecturale du bien.
1790. The Delegation of **India** recalled the inscription of Jerusalem representing three religions, as well as the cathedrals, which lie at the heart of Christianity. Here, it stated, the site comprises a Buddhist temple with a history of persecution attached to it and recommended that the Committee should not be prejudiced. As there was no issue

with religion, it remarked that it could not understand the discomfort with this nomination, and any uneasiness expressed should result in the Committee proceeding with a vote.

1791. The **Chairperson** confirmed this by recalling the need for a two-thirds majority to proceed with inscription and gave the floor to India who enquired whether the State Party of Israel was committed to voting under the *Rules of Procedure*.
1792. The **Legal Advisor** answered positively, but recalled that it could not provide any comments during the debate.
1793. The **Chairperson** noted a point of order from the United States of America who had requested continuing with the speakers list so all could be heard.
1794. The **Chairperson** remarked that there seemed to be a tendency towards a consensus, although no clear positions could be identified and he urged the Committee to try to reach a decision on this.
1795. The Delegation of **Kenya** stated that it was important to avoid a division within the Committee and that more time should be taken in reaching a consensus and to avoid voting.
1796. The Delegation of **Canada** stated that in its analysis of the evaluation of the site, criterion vi would mean that the 'belief' had Outstanding Universal Value, with individual buildings associated with it. It further recalled that other religious buildings had been listed under alternative, additional criteria, not under vi alone, so therefore another criterion would be needed.
1797. The **Chairperson** therefore added that this would be criterion iii, which had not been recommended by the Advisory Body.
1798. The Delegation of **New Zealand** asked the World Heritage Centre if any other religious buildings had been listed under criterion vi alone.
1799. The Director of the World Heritage Centre said that the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria was inscribed under criterion vi alone and that Lumbini, the Birthplace of Lord Buddha, was inscribed under criteria iii and vi.
1800. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested advice from the Advisory Body as to whether this nomination could be referred.
1801. The Delegation of the **United States of America** thanked the Chairperson for continuing this discussion and remarked 1) that it was the buildings that had to have Outstanding Universal Value, not the faith, and 2) that it was disappointed with the Advisory Body for making this exception to the rule with regard to allocating Outstanding Universal Value to faith. It concluded that the Advisory Body had not done a good job on this point resulting in the subsequent systematic breakdown and discussions, which should be a lesson learned.
1802. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** referred to Kenya's remark on Robben Island and requested the Advisory Body's view on this comparison. Furthermore, it concurred with Lithuania that the Committee could not rely on the ICOMOS evaluation and suggested that perhaps a referral could be a way out?
1803. La délégation du **Bénin** demande à réentendre ce que le Centre du patrimoine mondial a dit à propos du Monastère de Rila.
1804. **ICOMOS** apologized in relation to the comments put forward by the United States of America and explained that it had not felt confident in designating religious beliefs. As regards the comparison with Robben Island, it clarified that the site had been listed owing to much broader values than simply as a reference to local suffering and that it was related to events considered important for the history of humanity as a whole. The

difficulty, it concluded, rested with the designation of a belief, as the buildings themselves held no historic or architectural value

1805. Following this explanation, the Delegation of the **United States of America** requested clarification on whether it was correct that the Advisory Body had said that the buildings did not have intrinsic value.
1806. **ICOMOS** thereby replied positively referring to page 177 of their evaluation report.
1807. La délégation du **Bénin** remarque que l'on ne peut comparer le bien avec Robben Island et insiste pour connaître les raisons d'inscription du Monastère de Rila.
1808. The **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to provide information on the monastery that had been registered under criterion vi and commented on the difficult situation at hand with a difference of opinion among Committee members leading to two options: either a vote on the subject, or to refer it back to the State Party to provide it with another year to improve on the nomination.
1809. The Delegation of **Kenya** intervened by stating that Robben Island had international significance as it preserved a memory not necessarily connected to buildings, and that therefore this site could not be compared to this nomination. It proposed a compromise in asking the Committee to refer the nomination and requested whether the State Party could reflect on this suggestion.
1810. The **Chairperson** answered that this would be against the *Rules of Procedure* and overruled this request.
1811. The Delegation of **India** called for a point of order recalling that in the case of the nomination from the Philippines, the State Party had been asked the same question several times.
1812. The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that Kenya's question related to an enquiry about the State Party's feelings on this suggestion.
1813. The Delegation of **Lithuania** concurred with the Netherlands and the United States of America and expressed a preference for a deferral over a Decision against inscription.
1814. The Delegation of **India** referred to the question from Kenya and requested the State Party to respond to whether it favoured deferral or referral, in view of consistency with the case of the Philippines.
1815. The Delegation of **Kenya** reiterated the question and asked the State Party whether it favoured referral, deferral or listing.
1816. The Delegation of the **United States of America** called for a point of order recalling that the question put to the State Party of the Philippines concerned a technical question relating to a timeframe, upon which the **Chairperson** confirmed that indeed this context was different.
1817. The Delegation of **Chile** stated that it favoured deferral.
1818. The Delegation of **New Zealand** proposed either to vote or to defer the nomination and to establish a working group on this issue.
1819. The Delegation of **India** reiterated its question to Israel as to whether within the timeframe it favoured a referral or a deferral, or India's proposal for inscription.
1820. Before turning to the State Party with this technical question, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **World Heritage Centre**, which replied that after looking at the World Heritage List, only the Rila Monastery in Bulgaria had been listed under criterion vi, but as a symbol of the Bulgarian renaissance, not in relation to religious beliefs.
1821. The Delegation of **Israel** responded firstly that it had studied sites that had been inscribed under criterion vi, including Head-Smashed-In Buffalo Jump in Canada and Independence Hall in the United States of America, which had led it to conclude that

inscription under criterion vi was possible. Concerning India's proposal, it questioned what exactly the Committee would be referring back and it continued by reading out the statements put forward in the letter of factual errors. Finally, it concluded by asking whether beliefs could be referred, but that it would proceed in providing more information.

1822. The Delegation of **Lithuania** commented that it had understood that the State Party would be in favour of referral and pleaded for the Advisory Body to agree to this in order to close the debate.
1823. **ICOMOS** replied that referral was appropriate if the site's Outstanding Universal Value had been recognized and when only details had to be managed; however, with the question of Outstanding Universal Value still open, it recommended that deferral would be the appropriate way forward.
1824. The **Chairperson** remarked that the question of Outstanding Universal Value was problematic and that this nomination could be deferred to create more time or alternatively the Committee would have to go to a vote.
1825. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed regret over this unfortunate situation and commented that as the Advisory Body had not recommended deferral, how could the Committee then proceed with deferral? It argued that referral was therefore justified.
1826. The Delegation of **Canada** remarked that the situation was in fact different, since the Advisory Body had recommended referral only if the Committee believed it to have Outstanding Universal Value and would consider inscription; thus it was logical to proceed with deferral.
1827. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.41** adopted as amended.

The Chairperson, Mr Tumu te HeuHeu (New Zealand), resumed the Chair.

#### **Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (I 1224)**

1828. The **Chairperson** turned to the next nomination from Cambodia: Preah Vihear. He explained that this nomination had experienced some problems with the neighbouring country of Thailand, but that negotiations had taken place between different groups, including the Advisory Bodies, which had resulted in a Revised Draft Decision that had been distributed. He concluded by saying that this Draft Decision contained the consensus that had been reached between the two parties and requested the Advisory Body to present the nomination, after which he would make a statement.
1829. The **Chairperson**, declared Decision **31 COM 8B.24** adopted. He then noted that the adopted Decision meant the Committee had agreed that this Sacred Site deserved to be included in the World Heritage List and was looking forward to its formal listing at its next session in 2008. He requested that this statement be included in the final report of the meeting along with the Decision.
1830. La délégation du **Cambodge** (observateur) prend la parole et fait part des longues négociations ayant abouti à ce texte. Elle remercie tout particulièrement Madame Françoise Rivière et Madame Louise Oliver dont les interventions ont permis d'aboutir à un compromis. Elle indique que le processus de proposition d'inscription est en cours et aboutira en 2008. Elle remarque en outre que l'avenir est la coopération internationale qui permettra de sauver le temple, ainsi que la coopération mutuelle entre le Cambodge et la Thaïlande. Enfin, la délégation remercie vivement le Président pour sa sagesse et son sens de la modération, soulignant que le Comité a confirmé ainsi son image, et rapproché les peuples.

1831. The **Chairperson** asked whether Thailand wished to make a statement, which was declined by the State Party. He thanked the Committee and the Advisory Bodies for their work and handed the floor over to the Vice-Chair again.

The Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid (Norway), took the chair

1832. The **Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid** (Norway), thanked both States Parties for their agreement and the Chairperson, Mr Tumu te HeuHeu, for his long, hard work in reaching a consensus. He continued by mentioning that the State Party of Switzerland would be leaving the following day and that he had promised to have their site of Lavaux evaluated, on page 26 of the working document, which was accepted.

#### **Lavaux (Switzerland) (C 1243)**

1833. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Lavaux and recommended the inscription of the property on the basis of criteria iii, iv and v.

1834. The **Chairperson** declared Draft Decision **31 COM 8B.46** adopted.

1835. La délégation de la **Suisse** (observateur) remercie le Président et le Comité d'avoir accepté de discuter de ce site durant la soirée, et d'avoir effectué un choix unanime et rapide. Elle transmet les remerciements du gouvernement de la Suisse et des populations impliquées. La protection de ce site a permis de lutter contre la pression urbaine et incarne un savoir-faire vieux de plus de mille ans. Enfin, la délégation invite le Comité à une dégustation du vin de Lavaux. It continued in English by mentioning that both Switzerland and New Zealand were closely observing each other in relation to the America's Cup.

#### **ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES (continued)**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/7B

WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add

WHC-07/31.COM/7B.Add.2

*Decision:* **31 COM 7B.11**

#### **Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) (N 654) (continued)**

1836. The **Chairperson** reopened item 7B on the State of Conservation of properties inscribed on the World heritage List and proceeded with the remaining issue of the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary for which Revised Draft Decision referenced 7B.11 rev had been produced after a long consultation process. He requested the Committee to re-open this case, to which there was no objection.

1837. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.11** adopted as amended. The Arabian Oryx Sanctuary was thereby deleted from the World Heritage List.

The meeting rose at 9.00 pm

## SIXTEENTH MEETING

09.00 a.m – 11.00 a.m

Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu

### ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.8B  
WHC-07/31.8B ADD REV  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.1  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.2

*Decisions:* **31 COM 8B.1 to 31 COM 8B.74**

1838. The **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to make a house-keeping announcement. The World Heritage Centre informed the Committee that a book launch on the “World Heritage Convention and the Protection of Biodiversity Hotspots” was to be organized by the Delegation of the Netherlands during lunch time (starting from 13:00) in Room C.

1839. The **Chairperson** then invited ICOMOS to present its evaluation of the nomination of Sibiu Historic Town in Romania.

#### **Sibiu, the Historic Centre (Romania) (C 1238)**

1840. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Sibiu, the Historic Centre.

1841. The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections to the recommendation put forward by the Advisory Body in the Draft Decision.

1842. The Delegation of **Kuwait**, supported by the Delegation of **Chile**, noted that the property may be of Outstanding Universal Value and expressed its desire to encourage the State Party to carry out a comparative analysis as recommended by ICOMOS.

1843. La Délégation du **Maroc** intervient dans le même sens que les délégations du Koweït et du Chili mais avant de prendre une décision, elle voudrait que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat partie afin qu'il puisse s'exprimer et justifier ou confirmer la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site présenté.

1844. The Observer Delegation of **Romania** informed the Committee that it had sent the Chairperson a letter on factual errors contained in ICOMOS' evaluation report and further confirmed that the site met criteria (ii), (iii) and (v) in view of its value of extensive vernacular architecture and by regarding the site as an ensemble of baroque architecture in the region rather than single buildings.

1845. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested that the Committee might consider referring the nomination back to the State Party to give it opportunity for further work.

1846. La Délégation de la **Tunisie** déclare qu'après avoir écouté l'exposé de l'ICOMOS et les remarques de l'Etat partie, elle arrive à la conclusion que la recommandation de l'ICOMOS est très dure. Elle se demande alors qu'est-ce qu'il faut faire de plus pour démontrer les qualités exceptionnelles d'un site pour qu'il soit inscrit sur la liste. La délégation serait d'avis de reporter la décision en attendant d'autres éléments pouvant démontrer le caractère exceptionnel.

1847. **ICOMOS** informed the Committee that some letters had been received but they were judged as non-factual error letters according to the *Operational Guidelines*. While considering other sites such as those which had already been established on the List and other fortified villages in Romania, it was of the view that a thorough comparative analysis needed to be carried out by the State Party to strengthen the justification of Outstanding Universal Value.
1848. The **Chairperson** stated that, as it was difficult to define the Outstanding Universal Value, a possible solution for the Committee in considering this nomination would be to defer it.
1849. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed that this nomination could be examined when linked with other sites as a potential serial World Heritage nomination.
1850. The Delegation of **Israel** endorsed the proposal of Canada.
1851. The **Chairperson** concluded that this nomination would be deferred and declared Decision **31 COM 8B.44** adopted as amended.

### **Gamzigrad-Romuliana, Palace of Galerius (Serbia) (C1 253)**

1852. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Gamzigrad-Romuliana, Palace of Galerius.
1853. The Delegation of **Israel** congratulated the State Party on the excellent work in preparing this nomination. It asked ICOMOS whether the current nomination would stand alone to justify its Outstanding Universal Value, or should the site be considered with other similar sites as a serial and transnational nomination to justify its Outstanding Universal Value.
1854. **ICOMOS** confirmed that it was satisfied with the Outstanding Universal Value being proposed at the current nomination which is fully justifiable without a possible serial and transnational nomination.
1855. The Delegation of **Israel** requested how this could be turned into a serial nomination.
1856. The **Chairperson** indicated that a signal could be sent to the State Party.
1857. The Delegation of **Kenya** emphasized that the Committee should reflect on the positive aspects of serial, transboundary and transnational World Heritage nominations which could promote peace and good relations between countries. In this case, the Committee should encourage the State Party to consider a possible serial and transboundary nomination.
1858. La Délégation du **Maroc** apprécie ce dossier très bien présenté et voudrait en féliciter l'Etat partie. Elle propose d'adopter la décision d'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.
1859. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.45** adopted as amended.
1860. La délégation de la **Serbie** (observateur) remercie le Comité pour avoir adopté cette inscription, l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le support tout au long du processus de proposition d'inscription et ajoute que les qualités exceptionnelles de ce site est une preuve de pluralisme de la culture serbe. Elle a le plaisir d'adresser au Comité les salutations de la Serbie.

### **The Historic Centre of Berat (City of 25 Centuries Cultural Continuity and Religious Coexistence) (Albania) (C 568)**

1861. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of The Historic Centre of Berat and recommended that the Committee defer the examination of this nomination.

1862. The **Chairperson** noted the long process and extensive evaluation of this site. He informed the Committee that another proposal of a serial World Heritage nomination had recently been submitted by the State Party. He briefed the Committee that there were two Draft Decisions tabled for this nomination. One was included in the working document and another had been put forward by 15 members of the Committee in a French version. He then invited the Rapporteur to read out the text.
1863. Le **Rapporteur** donne lecture du texte de l'amendement proposé dans le sens d'une inscription en série avec Gjirokastra.
1864. **ICOMOS** clarified that the new World Heritage nomination relating to Berat had just been recently received. As this was a new proposal, ICOMOS could not comment on the quality of the nomination documentation according to the established procedure. There were still many points needing clarification, including the management plan and/or system for the nominated serial sites. ICOMOS stated that in brief, it was unable to evaluate the dossier at this stage.
1865. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee of the process for evaluating World Heritage nominations.
1866. While appreciative of the efforts made by the State Party, the Delegation of **Israel** considered the issue a matter of principle and that it would set the wrong precedent if the Committee decided to evaluate the serial nomination. It proposed that a referral could be a suitable solution in this case.
1867. The Delegation of **Kenya** requested the Committee to listen to the State Party's attitude towards the proposal for a referral of this nomination,
1868. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that the Committee should maintain its professionalism and stand by its mandate as regards the examination of nominations.
1869. The Delegation of **Canada** stressed that due process in this regard should be followed and confirmed its agreement with the views expressed by the Delegations of Israel, Kenya and the United States of America.
1870. The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Advisor to share its comments with the Committee. The Legal Advisor conveyed that there are established rules and procedures and that the case in hand did not follow these rules. However, according to Article 52 of the *Rules of Procedure*, the Committee may wish to suspend the application of the *Operational Guidelines* by a vote on the case. A two-thirds majority is required should the Committee wish to proceed, and the vote may be carried out in the form of raising hands.
1871. The **Chairperson** asked for the comments of ICOMOS.
1872. **ICOMOS** was of the view that a proper evaluation, including a field evaluation mission, should be carried out for the nomination. In this context, it suggested a deferral of this case so that an evaluation mission would be possible.
1873. La Délégation du **Maroc** déclare avoir bien compris les règles à appliquer mais que quinze membres de ce Comité ont cosigné cet amendement et qu'il faut en tenir compte. Par ailleurs, l'ICOMOS a bien dit lors de son exposé qu'une proposition d'inscription sérielle était possible. Elle ajoute qu'un expert, présent dans la salle pourrait intervenir. La délégation finit son intervention rappelant qu'il faut tenir compte de cet amendement proposé pour le Projet de décision.
1874. The Delegations of **Lithuania** and **India** asked the State Party to clarify whether it wished to accept the examination of this nomination as a referral, deferral or if neither, which other option would be possible. Further, Lithuania suggested that ICOMOS was partly responsible for the Committee's dilemma, as it had suggested in its evaluation



that a serial nomination was possible. Lithuania declared that it did not support a suspension of the *Operational Guidelines*.

1875. La délégation de l'**Albanie** (observateur) signale que l'expert de l'ICOMOS se trouve dans la salle et qu'il peut intervenir pour attester des qualités du site présenté. L'Observateur fait savoir clairement que son Gouvernement souhaite que le Comité adopte l'inscription immédiate en série du site sur la Liste.
1876. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the questions were not answered by the State Party. He asked the Committee whether it would like to vote for an inscription according to the Draft Decision put forward by 15 members or the nomination should be referred back to the State Party to allow an evaluation of the serial nomination. He indicated that a referral may save the credibility of the Committee.
1877. The Delegation of **India** asked the Rapporteur to read out the Draft Decision in French.
1878. La Délégation du **Maroc** déclare que le Comité était encore en discussion et qu'elle ne sait pas ce que l'on vient d'adopter. Elle demande au Rapporteur de relire le projet de Décision avant de passer à son adoption.
1879. La Délégation de la **Tunisie** souhaite rappeler qu'elle est francophone. L'interprète n'a pas eu le temps de traduire le contenu du texte à adopter que le Président l'avait déjà adopté. Avec tout le respect qu'elle a pour le Président, la délégation estime qu'il conduit les travaux de façon autoritaire.
1880. The Delegation of **India** suggested that the Rapporteur work on the Draft Decision in a modified language.
1881. The **Chairperson** decided to suspend the examination of this nomination, suggesting that a working group be composed to work on the Draft Decision to be adopted by the Committee.

### **Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape (Azerbaijan) (C 1076)**

1882. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of Gobustan Rock Art Cultural Landscape and informed the Committee that this was a deferred nomination from 2004. In conclusion, it recommended a referral.
1883. The Delegation of **Lithuania** noted that this was a deferred nomination from the previous Committee session and was of the view that the Outstanding Universal Value was justified as defined by criterion iii. In this context, it was in favour of an inscription. The Delegation of Kenya endorsed this proposal.
1884. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that criterion vi may also be justified. ICOMOS, however, confirmed that not enough information had been provided.
1885. The **Chairperson** concluded that a consensus had been reached on the inscription this site on the World Heritage List.
1886. The Delegation of **Norway** supported this.
1887. The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment to the Draft Decision proposed by Lithuania, deleting points a, b, c.
1888. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.49** adopted as amended.
1889. The Observer Delegation of **Azerbaijan** expressed its gratitude to the Norwegian Government for the support provided for the development of the Action Plan which was approved by the Ministry of Culture pending a special decree to be issued by the President of Azerbaijan to ensure protection of the site.

### **Heidelberg Castle and Old Town (Germany) (C 1173)**

1890. ICOMOS presented the nomination of Heidelberg Castle and Old Town and informed the Committee that this was a referred nomination.
1891. Taking into account ICOMOS's recommendation on this nomination, the Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the Advisory Body and the State Party of Germany should start a dialogue to identify the possibilities of serial and transnational nomination of university towns in other European countries. The Delegation of Kenya endorsed this proposal and further suggested the comparative analysis include all European cities of similar type.
1892. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested the deferral of this nomination with some rewording in the text of paragraph 2.a).
1893. The **Chairperson**, after consulting the Rapporteur, declared Decision **31 COM 8B.50** adopted as amended.

### **Central University City Campus of the Universidad Nacional Autonomous de Mexico (Mexico) (C 1250)**

1894. **ICOMOS** presented the nomination of the Central University City Campus of the Universidad Nacional Autonomous de Mexico and its recommendation for inscription on the basis of criteria ii and iv.
1895. The **Chairperson** clarified that there appeared to be a mistake in the documentation and that inscription under criterion i was not recommended.
1896. The Delegation of the **United States of America** congratulated the State Party and said that it was proud to support the nomination for inscription.
1897. The Delegation of **Israel** noted that the UNAM ensemble was a 'stupendous' piece of architecture of the twentieth century. That said, the Committee might wish to be more reflective about its approach to modern heritage. It suggested substituting 'Requests' for 'Recommends' in paragraph 4 and proposed amending the Draft Decision to request the State Party to identify those parts of the University with authentic interiors and to preserve them intact.
1898. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** considered this to be a very significant site, which filled a gap in the representation of modern heritage on the World Heritage List. It asked **ICOMOS** if it would consider recommending a serial nomination of campuses from this period.
1899. In reply, **ICOMOS** said that this would depend on the outcome of evaluative thematic studies and reflection by the Committee as to whether it considered serial nominations to be a useful means of explaining the purpose of the World Heritage List.
1900. The **Rapporteur** noted problems relating to the criteria under which inscription was recommended and sought further clarification.
1901. **ICOMOS** said that the State Party had proposed criterion ii iv and vi but that it recommended inscription under criteria i ii and iv.
1902. La délégation du **Bénin** exprime l'opinion que le critère (vi) pourrait éventuellement être appliqué, compte tenu de la nature du bien, lien par excellence entre l'Amérique et l'Europe, lieu de rencontre entre les cultures. Elle propose d'inscrire le bien immédiatement, ou l'année prochaine.

1903. **ICOMOS** said that it considered that although Nobel laureates had been closely associated with the University, this was not sufficient to warrant inscription under criterion vi.
1904. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed its support for the inscription and congratulated the State Party for its custodianship. It agreed with previous speakers that the Committee dealt with the issue of modern architecture in an ad hoc manner and formally requested that ICOMOS prepare an evaluative thematic framework in collaboration with DOCOMOMO and other relevant experts.
1905. The Delegation of **Chile** noted that, as a Latin American country, it was very proud of this nomination and thereby congratulated the State Party, recalling the role of the property in the development of the region.
1906. The Delegation of **Spain** indicated that it also supported the nomination and requested more information from the State Party on criterion vi. It highlighted the contribution of the University to intellectual development.
1907. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** agreed that it had considered criterion vi because of the contribution of the University to science, philosophy and other fields. It indicated its willingness to provide more information in the future.
1908. Summarising, the **Rapporteur** stated that amendments had been submitted by the Delegations of Israel and Canada but that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value remained as drafted. These were accepted by the Committee.
1909. The Delegation of **Cuba** indicated the need for an amendment to paragraph 2 of the Draft Decision.
1910. The Chairperson recalled that ICOMOS had provided clarification on the criteria for inscription and declared Decision **31 COM 8B.52** adopted as amended
1911. The Observer Delegation of **Mexico** expressed its gratitude on behalf of the Government and said that this was a great day for the Mexican scientists and teachers, and all those who had passed through the halls of the University. He reported that the site was exceptional in the way it integrated modern architectural features with the landscape. The site was also part of the intangible heritage, an icon and a major instrument in public education. Finally, the commitment of the authorities in implementing the recommendations of the Committee was reiterated.

#### **Minor modification to the boundaries of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List**

1912. **ICOMOS** and **IUCN** made short presentations of the following properties:

##### **The Royal Palaces of Abomey (Benin) (C 323 bis)**

1913. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.55** adopted.

##### **The Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956)**

1914. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.56** adopted

##### **The Archeological Site of Volubilis (Morocco) (C 836)**

1915. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.57** adopted.

**The Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) (C 707)**

1916. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.58** adopted.

**Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Iran) (C 1208)**

1917. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.59** adopted.

**Butrint (Albania) (C 570)**

1918. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.60** adopted.

**Piazza del Duomo, Pisa (Italy) (C 395)**

1919. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.61** adopted as amended.

**Monuments of Oviedo and the Kingdom of the Asturias (Spain) (C 312)**

1920. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.62** adopted.

**The Old Town of Avila with its Extra-Muros Churches (Spain) (C 348)**

1921. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.63** adopted as amended.

**Cistercian Abbey, Fontenay (France) (C 165)**

1922. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.65** adopted.

**The Abbey Church of Saint-Savin sur Gartempe (France) (C 230)**

1923. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.66** adopted.

**Vézelay, Church and Hill (France) (C 84)**

1924. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.67** adopted.

**Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80)**

1925. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.68** adopted.

**Roman Theatre and its Surroundings and the “Triumphal Arch” of Orange (France) (C 163)**

1926. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.69** adopted.

**Pont du Gard (Roman Aqueduct) (France) (C 344)**

1927. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 **COM 8B.70** adopted.

**Strasbourg Grande Ile, (France) (C 495)**

1928. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.71** adopted.

**Palace and Park of Versailles (France) (C 83)**

1929. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.72** adopted.

**Rock Drawings of Valcamonica (Italy) (C 94)**

1930. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.73** adopted.

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

1931. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.74** adopted.

1932. The **Chairperson** sought the Committee's agreement to a temporary suspension of item 8C of the agenda pending the finalization of the document in light of the Committee's Decisions. On receiving this agreement, he opened item 10, 'Global Strategy: Evaluation of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision.'

**ITEM 10: GLOBAL STRATEGY: EVALUATIONS OF THE CAIRNS-SUZHOU DECISION**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/10

*Decision:* **31 COM 10**

1933. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** announced that the information provided in the working document was intended to assist the Committee in evaluating the impact of the Cairns – Suzhou Decision. Attention was drawn to the data on page 4 of the working document which suggested that for the period 2003-2007, the Cairns–Suzhou decision had yielded little impact regarding regional representativity. There had been a positive impact on the numbers of natural properties inscribed, although there had been a reduction in the numbers of mixed properties. While the limit of 45 nominations in any given year had not yet been exceeded, the document outlined the selection process that would apply if this situation were to arise. Noting that this appeared to leave too much choice, the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with the Advisory Bodies, had taken the liberty of proposing a sequential priority list for discussion by the Committee.

1934. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the opportunity to discuss the impact of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision and noted that it had experienced some difficulties in applying the stipulation that one of the two permissible nominations must be natural. The statistics suggested that other countries had faced similar difficulties. Those for the Asia and Pacific region showed that the number of natural heritage nominations had not increased. The Delegation stated that the Decision discriminated against the interests of States Parties which were predominantly rich in cultural heritage and such States Parties should be permitted to choose which properties to put forward.

1935. The Delegation of **Lithuania** mentioned that the imbalance in the number of cultural and natural sites may reflect the different approach to Outstanding Universal Value taken by the respective Advisory Bodies. It pointed out a possible lack of logic between paragraphs 3a and 3f and proposed drafting amendments to correct this.

1936. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported moves to address the difficulties faced by developing regions and countries. It agreed with the Delegation of India that States

Parties should be allowed to choose, and requested that in taking forward the Global Strategy, particular attention should be focussed on Africa. It noted that a meeting for francophone countries on preparing nominations would take place in July 2007 under the Africa 2009 programme and requested that this be inserted into the budget for the biennium 2008-2009. It asked for confirmation of how many African properties had been nominated for inscription in 2008.

1937. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that two had been put forward but that one of these had been incomplete.
1938. The Delegation of the **United States of America** supported the Cairns–Suzhou Decision. It agreed with the sequence of priorities but suggested adding another to give priority to States Parties which had not put forward nominations for 10 years or more. It also asked whether the Committee would have the opportunity to further review the Decision at future sessions. It also noted that the reference in the Draft Decision to the *Operational Guidelines* was incorrect.
1939. The Delegation of **Canada** recalled that the Cairns-Suzhou Decision had been intended to assist the Committee in managing its workload. In that sense it had succeeded. But it had not succeeded in addressing concerns regarding representativity. The Delegation of Kenya was correct in flagging the central issue of capacity building. Addressing the points raised by the Delegation of India, it expressed concern that this would open the door for countries that were already well represented on the World Heritage List to put forward more nominations.
1940. La délégation du **Bénin** rappelle le travail de la commission présidée par Madame Cameron et souligne la nécessité du renforcement des capacités pour l'Afrique. Elle propose qu'une réunion régionale soit organisée pour discuter de ces problèmes, ainsi que de la question de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle en Afrique
1941. The Delegation of **Japan** favoured maintaining the current ceiling of 45 sites for consideration in any given year with priority being given to States Parties having no sites on the List, and to natural heritage. It proposed a regular review of the situation.
1942. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the comments made by the Delegation of Kenya, adding that a different approach to tentative listing was also a critical factor in correcting issues of under-representation. It supported the proposal of Japan and suggested that it might be timely to envisage a 5 yearly review of the situation.
1943. The Delegation of **Chile** noted that there were good ideas to debate in the Draft Decision and considered that priority should be given to countries with no sites, along with those which had not put forward nominations for a number of years.
1944. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its support for the Cairns-Suzhou Decision as an attempt to increase representation but agreed with the Delegation of Kenya that this could not be the only measure used to address the problem. It asked the World Heritage Centre whether it had considered giving priority to nominations that had been excluded from consideration by previous sessions as a result of the ceiling of 45 having been reached.
1945. In reply, the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** said it had not but that this was a very good idea, as was that of the United States of America to give priority to States Parties not having put forward nominations for over 10 years. It further noted that the priorities were to be applied sequentially.
1946. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. The Rapporteur read out a proposed amendment to paragraph 3 from the Delegation of India, introducing an element of choice, according to a State Party's priorities, history and geography as to what types of nominations to put forward.

1947. The Delegation of **Canada** said that it could not support this amendment, for reasons expressed earlier in the discussion. The Delegation of the United States of America concurred.
1948. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed that it was not ready to go along with the amendment. The figures presented in the document showed that there was a problem that needed to be addressed. The Delegation of **Norway** concurred.
1949. La délégation du **Bénin** indique son accord avec l'amendement proposé par la délégation de l'Inde.
1950. The **Chairperson** noted a split in the proposed amendment and invited the Committee to identify a compromise.
1951. The Delegation of **India** appealed to members of the Committee to consider the effect of limitation and to accept the amendment. It declared that geography could handicap a country. Indeed, India had itself been handicapped as such by the limitations.
1952. The Delegation of **Israel** sympathized but recalled the scope for abuse of an element of flexibility by better represented States Parties.
1953. La délégation de la **Tunisie** indique également son soutien à la proposition de l'Inde.
1954. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it might be possible to change the proposed amendment so that it encouraged States Parties to put forward nominations of natural sites.
1955. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** read out the provisions of the Cairns-Suzhou Decision.
1956. The Delegation of **India** proposed adding a line to its own amendment strongly recommending the maintenance of the current practice. It stressed that this would give States Parties the flexibility to put forward the best dossiers.
1957. The Delegation of **Japan** supported this, as did the Delegation of Kenya, on the condition that it be for a trial period of two years.
1958. The Delegation of **Canada** asked the Rapporteur to read out the proposal.
1959. The **Rapporteur** did so and informed the Committee that the amendment would read: 'While strongly recommending that the current practice of examining up to two complete nominations per State Party per year, provided that at least one of such nominations concerns a natural property, be maintained, that a State Party be permitted on a trial basis to decide on the nature of its nomination, whether natural or cultural, as per its national priorities, its history and geography'.
1960. The Delegation of **India** said that this reading rendered the amendment meaningless and requested the insertion of the words " decides nevertheless on an experimental basis"
1961. The Delegation of **Kenya** reflected that four years might be a better timeframe for the trial. The Delegation of India concurred.
1962. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that since the rationale was to increase regional representation, the proposed flexibility could be permitted only to State Parties with three or fewer sites on the List.
1963. The Delegation of **India** did not agree.
1964. The Delegation of the **United States of America** proposed that Group 1 countries and other countries with an imbalance of sites be excluded from the flexibility.
1965. The **Chairperson** commented that the situation was becoming very complicated.

1966. The Delegation of **Spain** indicated its support for the proposal of the United States of America and mentioned that countries that have many sites inscribed should be excluded from this flexibility.
1967. The Delegations of **Norway** and **Israel** supported the proposal of the Delegation the United States of America.
1968. The **Chairperson** noted that progress was being made and suggested suspending adoption of the paragraph until the afternoon in order to allow for further drafting to take place. The Committee concurred.
1969. The **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by the Delegation of Lithuania to paragraph 3f and another by the Delegation of Kenya which could be either a new 3c or a stand alone paragraph 4.
1970. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it was submitting an amendment covering the point it had raised concerning treatment of nominations previously excluded as a result of the ceiling having been reached.
1971. The **Rapporteur** recited and identified other amendments to the paragraph. The Chairperson then suggested that all amendments be read out and that the Committee reflect on them over lunch.
1972. The Delegation of **Israel** commented that the spirit of the proposal from the Delegation of the United States of America would provide a better opportunity for other parts of the world and may be the best way of addressing the issue.
1973. The Delegation of **India** requested all amendments to be read out. Regarding the proposal to place a focus on Africa, it suggested that in light of the severe under-representation of the Pacific region, the Delegation of New Zealand may wish to add the Pacific.
1974. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested that the revised Draft Decision be circulated in written format before adoption.
1975. Following interventions by the Delegations of **India**, the **United States of America** and the **Rapporteur**, the **Chairperson** suspended the item pending redrafting.

The meeting rose at 1:00 p.m.

**SIXTH DAY FRIDAY 29 JUNE 2007**

**EIGHTEENTH MEETING**

**02.30 p.m – 04.00 p.m**

**Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu**

**ITEM 11A: FOLLOW-UP TO THE PERIODIC REPORT FOR EUROPE**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/11 A.1  
WHC-07/31.COM/11 A.2

*Decisions:* **31 COM 11 A.1**  
**31 COM 11 A.2**

1976. The **Chairperson** suggested that item 22 of the agenda, the election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 32nd session of the World



Heritage Committee, be moved to the end of the meeting and then gave the floor to the World Heritage Centre for the presentation of item 11A.1.

1977. The **World Heritage Centre** reported that a publication had been prepared, which included datasheets for all the sites covered under this cycle. It went on to inform the Committee that three follow-up meetings had been organized in Western Europe, one in South East Europe, one in the Mediterranean and one for the Nordic countries. It further noted that assistance had been provided to States Parties in the post-conflict region of South East Europe in collaboration with the UNESCO Office in Venice. A proposal had been put forward by Poland for a meeting on Eastern Europe. The World Heritage Centre stressed that there was a need for strengthened collaboration on the follow-up and specifically on the review of statements of significance and Outstanding Universal Value. Overall, it concluded, 244 sites in the European periodic reporting needed updating, and this should have become a priority for States Parties of the region if the proposed deadline of 1 February 2008 was to be met.
1978. The **Chairperson**, noting that an amendment to the Draft Decision had been presented by the Delegation of Israel, asked the Rapporteur to read it out.
1979. The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment to paragraph 3.
1980. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 11.A.1** adopted as amended.
1981. The Delegation of **Israel** informed the Committee that harmonization work was in progress in the Mediterranean sub-region and that a second meeting was being planned by Greece.
1982. The Delegation of **Lithuania** noted that the reference to the Nordic countries' meeting needed to be included in paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision.
1983. The Delegation of **Kenya**, with reference to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, noted that since the meeting mentioned in the text had already taken place, the verb should have been change to the past tense.
1984. The Observer Delegation of **Greece** confirmed that it intended to organize a meeting for the Mediterranean region, possibly in February or March 2008.
1985. The Observer Delegation of **Finland** noted that a meeting of the Nordic countries had indeed taken place in May 2007.
1986. The Observer Delegation of **Germany** referred to the harmonization of Tentative Lists meeting that had recently taken place in Germany on natural sites and cultural landscapes, and thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their active participation.
1987. The **Chairperson**, noting that adjustments were necessary for the Draft Decision in light of the comments made by members of the Committee, requested the World Heritage Centre to present the second party of this item, 11.A.2, concerning the retrospective inventory.
1988. On Item 11A.2, the **World Heritage Centre** presented the results of the Retrospective Inventory of sites in the European region between 1978 and 1998, conducted in coordination with and parallel to the European Periodic Reporting Exercise. In response to letters written to each State Party following review of the individual dossiers, fifteen States Parties had responded in order to clarify the original intention of their nominations. These were listed in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Draft Decision. The World Heritage Centre noted that it had so far received only 15 clarifications and hoped to receive more by the end of the year.
1989. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked whether the reference to "Europe region" was appropriate in this case.

1990. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the information presented in the document and to which the Draft Decision referred concerned exclusively the European States Parties.
1991. Noting that there were no objections, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 11.A.2** adopted.
1992. The **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to present the following item, 11.B, the follow-up of the Periodic Report in Asia.

#### **ITEM 11.B: THE FOLLOW-UP OF THE PERIODIC REPORT IN ASIA**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/11B  
*Decision:* **31 COM 11B**

1993. The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that the Government of China had established a Regional World Heritage Training and Research Institute, and had requested the 176th session of the Executive Board of UNESCO to consider its possible approval as a category 2 UNESCO Centre. The World Heritage Centre was currently conducting a feasibility study, to be presented to the coming session of the Executive Board. Progress was also being made with some regional initiatives, such as a serial, transnational nomination for the Silk Roads, involving China and other Central Asian countries at the present stage. Other similar initiatives under way included the transboundary Natural Heritage nomination of the West Tien-Shan as well as a transboundary nomination for rock art heritage sites in Central Asia. Another major project concerned the development of resource tools for tourism management, including a Cultural Heritage Specialist Guide Training and Certification Programme, being carried out by the UNESCO Office in Bangkok. Reference was also made to several regional meetings that had taken place in Asia, as a follow up to the Periodic Report exercise.
1994. The Delegation of **Norway** noted the reference in the working document to the project for the training of heritage tourist guides, and stated that this should have been considered as a best-practice to be replicated in other regions.
1995. The Delegation of **India**, in congratulating the World Heritage Centre for the excellent report, stated that it was looking forward, together with all other States Parties of the region, to cooperating with the newly established World Heritage Regional Training and Research Institute in China. It also thanked the State Party of the Netherlands for its continuous support for conservation efforts in Asia and the Pacific.
1996. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee might consider the Draft Decision, noting that the paragraph having financial implication would be approved only provisionally, pending examination of the item on the budget.
1997. The Delegation of **Kenya**, noting the good work accomplished, suggested a minor modification to paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.
1998. The **Chairperson**, declared Decision **31 COM 11.B** adopted.

#### **ITEM 8B: NOMINATIONS OF THE PROPERTIES TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continued)**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.8B  
 WHC-07/31.COM/INF.8B.1  
*Decision:* **31 COM 8B.48**

1999. The **Chairperson** reopened the discussion on item 8B on nominations and informed the Committee that a working group had produced a revised draft for *Decision 31 COM 8B.48*, concerning the site of Berat, in Albania. He requested the Committee to consider this new text and possibly adopt it without debate, taking into account the long consultations required to arrive at this revised Draft Decision.
2000. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.48** adopted as amended.
2001. Le délégation du **Maroc**, après l'adoption de la décision, déclare au nom des 15 pays auteurs du projet de décision, que les signataires du projet n'étaient pas contre la procédure. Les membres du Comité souhaitent aider à l'inscription du site. Ils souhaitent que soit l'ICOMOS, soit le Centre aient pu donner des conseils. Ils demandent une assistance technique avec l'accord de l'état partie pour éviter de se retrouver dans la même situation qu'aujourd'hui.
2002. The **Chairperson** introduced item 11.D and requested the World Heritage Centre to present its contents.

#### **ITEM 11.D: REFLECTION ON THE PREPARATION OF THE NEXT CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/11D.1

*Decision:* **31 COM 11D.1**

2003. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique que le rapport périodique de chaque Etat partie devait être soumis avant tous les 6 ans. En 2006-2007, il y a eu deux réunions de réflexion sur le rapport périodique : la première du 9 au 10 novembre 2006 et la seconde le 24 janvier 2007. Les résultats de ces réunions se trouvent dans le document WHC-07/31.COM/11D.1. Le groupe de travail a travaillé principalement sur la simplification du questionnaire pour le Rapport périodique. Les résultats sont présentés par le gestionnaire du site de la Grande Barrière de Corail (Australie), Jon Day.
2004. Mr. **Jon Day** noted that the importance of the Periodic Report consisted not only in the product, but on the process itself. The group working on the revision of the format for the Periodic Report had set four main principles: good practice, efficiency, utility and sustainability. Two preconditions had to be fulfilled for the next cycle of the Periodic Report to be successful. First of all, States Parties had to provide updated Statements of Outstanding Universal value, whenever these were missing. Secondly, it was essential that the World Heritage Centre be provided the resources for the completion of the retrospective inventory. A road map for achieving these objectives was included in the working document.
2005. The Delegation of **Israel**, congratulating the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies for the significant progress made, requested clarification on two issues. Firstly, how would transboundary properties be dealt with in the questionnaire? and secondly, what were the specific implications of the stated intention to harmonise the Periodic Report exercise with similar reporting requirements under other Conventions? The Delegation further noted that, in view of the next cycle of the Periodic Report, the Advisory Bodies should have re-assessed the categories of each reported site. It then stated that the new proposed format appeared to be much improved and that it looked forward to testing it.
2006. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique que les biens transfrontaliers ou en série sont au cœur des débats et qu'un seul rapport devrait être fourni afin d'améliorer l'évaluation sur le terrain.

2007. The Delegation of **India** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and all those involved for an excellent presentation. It expressed understanding that extra funding was required to continue this important work and thereby stated its readiness to contribute to the effort.
2008. The Delegation of **Kenya**, with regard to paragraph 7, requested whether the mentioned amount of USD 10,000 was intended for all properties as a whole or for each of them. It also noted that a small adjustment to the proposed Draft Decision was required with regard to the African States Parties.
2009. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique que la révision de la déclaration de valeur universelle exceptionnelle devrait être rédigée par l'Etat partie directement. Le prochain cycle commence par la région arabe soit 64 biens dont 1 bien naturel.
2010. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** congratulated the World Heritage Centre and all those involved in the significant improvements made to the format of the Periodic Report.
2011. The Delegation of **New Zealand**, expressing its satisfaction with the revised format, noted the importance of the introduction of specific questions related to consultation with communities.
2012. The Delegation of **Lithuania**, adding its voice to other speakers in noting the progress made, asked how many site managers had been involved in the development and testing of this revised format for the Periodic Report.
2013. The **World Heritage Centre** replied that between 15 and 20 site managers had provided feedback on the new format, after testing it at their own sites.
2014. The Delegation of **Canada** noted that much progress had been achieved with respect to the original format of the Periodic Report. With regard to the Draft Decision, the Delegation queried whether the budgetary implications of the proposed activities were adequately reflected in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7. For instance, no funding provisions seemed to have been foreseen for the Advisory Bodies. It therefore enquired whether the World Heritage Centre could provide clarification in this regard.
2015. The Delegation of the **United States of America** enquired about the status of the retrospective inventory, and in particular whether it needed additional funding.
2016. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** ne voudrait pas avoir un budget trop lourd. Il envisage que l'expérimentation sur le terrain, en collaboration avec les Etats parties, soit une opération à coût zéro, mais ce serait difficile dans certains cas. Le budget de l'inventaire rétrospectif est prévu dans le Fonds du patrimoine mondial.
2017. The Delegation of **Canada** requested again to know if funds had been earmarked for the Advisory Bodies.
2018. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique la somme de 10, 000 dollars des EU tel qu'indiqué dans le document de travail.
2019. The Delegation of **India** noted that the question posed by the Delegation of Kenya had not been answered yet, and asked whether the World Heritage Centre could provide a figure that the Committee was requested to approve.
2020. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that USD135,000 had been proposed in the document for the approval of the Committee to support the process of the Periodic Reporting, in addition to funding provisions for the retrospective inventory. With regard to the question posed by the Delegation of Kenya, USD10,000 was indeed a small amount, but it was only meant to cover a desk study limited to sites in the Arab States.
2021. The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee if the Draft Decision could be adopted with an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Israel in paragraph 7, and asked the Rapporteur to read it out.

2022. The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed another minor amendment to the proposed text.
2023. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 11.D** adopted as amended.
2024. The **Chairperson** then asked the Rapporteur and the World Heritage Centre to make the necessary adjustments to the text in view of the final adoption of the Decisions by the Committee the following Monday.

#### **ITEM 11.D.2: PROPOSAL TO MAKE NOMINATIONS AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC ONLINE**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/11D.2  
*Decision:* **31 COM 11D.2**

2025. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced item 11.D.2, containing a proposal to make nominations available to the public online. This would only concern official nominations of inscribed properties, and would not include correspondence. The availability on the web of the nominations was a considerable step towards strengthened transparency and the credibility of the Convention. The World Heritage Centre also noted that nominations were an essential tool for fostering conservation at the sites and capacity building among under-represented regions, as well as for promoting awareness of World Heritage among the public in general.
2026. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported this initiative in principle, but requested clarification of two aspects. The question of the digital divide among regions of the world, and the need for ensuring the protection of sensitive properties from looters and traffickers of cultural heritage objects. It felt that this was particularly relevant to sites located in desert areas.
2027. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked if this concerned only nominations submitted after 1998, and expressed concern about the credibility of the information contained in the nomination, which sometimes did not correspond to the reality.
2028. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** noted that transparency was indeed important, but questioned whether Statements of Outstanding Universal Value would be also put online.
2029. The Delegation of **Israel**, expressing its support for this proposal, reiterated the concerns of the Delegation of Kenya as regards issues of security, and noted that consultations would be required between the World Heritage Centre and the States Parties concerned on the information to be disseminated.
2030. The Delegation of **Canada** asked what information would be provided on sites deleted from the World Heritage List, since they were also part of the history of the *Convention*.
2031. The Delegation of **India** suggested that a disclaimer be introduced on the material made available online, to address the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Lithuania.
2032. The Delegation of **New Zealand** agreed with previous speakers on the need to ensure the security of the listed properties. In the Pacific region, for example, this matter was relevant to burial grounds.
2033. The **World Heritage Centre**, in reply to the questions put forward by members of the Committee, noted that the proposed dissemination on the web of the nominations would be considerably less discriminatory than the current situation, when only persons able to travel to Paris or Gland had access to these documents. With regard to the issue of security, the World Heritage Centre would consult with the State Party

concerned to identify sensitive information that should not be made public. The World Heritage Centre confirmed that the proposal concerned all nominations and not just those submitted after 1998. As for the Statements of Outstanding Universal value, it was declared that these were in fact already available to the public on the current web site of the Centre. In relation to the suggestion of including a disclaimer with the nominations, the World Heritage Centre assured the Committee that this could be done. Finally, it confirmed that information on sites deleted from the World Heritage List would be limited to its name and the date and session of its delisting.

2034. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** took the floor and commented that, while every effort was being made by the World Heritage Centre to ensure the exactness of the information produced and disseminated, errors could always occur, and subsequently asked for the cooperation of the States Parties in identifying and correcting them.
2035. The Delegation of **Kenya** raised the issue of copyright and asked whether it would be possible for the Committee to take decisions concerning materials produced by States Parties
2036. The **World Heritage Centre** replied that the text of the nomination did not pose any legal problem. As regards the images, the World Heritage Centre had required a waiver in recent years from the States Parties submitting nomination, allowing it to use them for its promotional activities. The World Heritage Centre suggested that a copyright statement could be also added together with the disclaimer.
2037. Following the reading out by the Rapporteur of an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 11.D.2** adopted as amended.

## SIXTH DAY FRIDAY 29 JUNE 2007

### NINETEENTH MEETING

04.00 p.m – 05.45 p.m

Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu

## ITEM 12.A: PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/12A

*Decision:* **31 COM 12.A**

2038. The **Chairperson** opened agenda Item 12A, followed by a presentation by the **World Heritage Centre** of Document WHC-07/31.COM/12A, after which the **Chairperson** remarked that the Draft Decision on page 4 had been established through informal consultations and thereby called upon the Committee to adopt this Decision without any further debate.
2039. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 12.A** adopted.
2040. The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Committee for adopting the Decision and all who had worked on it and recommended that this Decision be taken on board by all, including UNESCO.

**ITEM 12.B: NOMINATION OF QHAPAQ NAN – MAIN ANDEAN ROAD FOR INSCRIPTION ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST**

Document: *WHC-07/31.COM/12B*

Decision: **31 COM 12.B**

2041. The **Chairperson** then moved to agenda Item 12B, remarking that this concerned an information document with a Draft Decision attached to it, after which the **World Heritage Centre** presented the project of the Nomination of Qhapaq Nan-Main Andean Road.
2042. After expressing that this was an exciting, transboundary serial nomination, the **Chairperson** opened the floor for comments.
2043. The Delegation of **Chile**, being one of the stakeholders of the project, reminded the Committee that this initiative had been launched by Peru and involved six countries. Barring all tension in the region, this project had created a regional dynamism involving biologists, engineers, archaeologists, even the army in providing maps, etc. It also indicated that the support received from the World Heritage Centre had been very important for the regional meetings.
2044. **IUCN** welcomed the report and congratulated the World Heritage Centre on the work. It requested information on what had been proposed for inscription: the whole 23,000km road network, the 8,000km main road, or just segments of it? It continued by stating that the project was led by the cultural heritage section of the World Heritage Centre with the involvement of specialists from the region, which was too limited, and it thus recommended involving local indigenous groups, not only in the preparation of management plans, but also in the project's conceptualization. Furthermore, it stated that legal studies for the harmonization of management regimes had been foreseen, which had not included the indigenous management systems; and that it was important that the communities which were going to be affected by this nomination be included. Finally, it recommended that a best-practise approach would be preferable over conducting legal studies, as there were currently 12 projects proceeding with a lot of field experience, and it concluded that a greater range of stakeholders be included at all levels, from the international, the inter-governmental, the non-governmental to the regional and local levels. IUCN proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.
2045. The Delegation of **Israel** remarked that it had recently had the chance to visit the region and congratulated all who had worked on this project. It further noted that the comments by the Advisory Body were important as a guidance in how to proceed. The Delegate continued by expressing that this was not an evaluation of a nomination, and that it was important to take a step back to consider the World Heritage implications, such as how to reorganize the sites that had already been inscribed in that region. The Delegate recommended examining it as a matter of best practise, as suggested by the Advisory Body, since several transboundary serial nominations were underway mentioning the borders of the Roman Empire, the inscribed property of the cultural route of Santiago de Compostela, and the work undertaken in the context of the nomination of the Great Rift Valley, which could all provide important guidance.
2046. The **Chairperson** remarked that there would be no discussion on these topics at the present time, but that it provided important guidance for further future work.
2047. The Delegation of **Peru** indicated that this multidisciplinary, transversal and very complex work had been continuing for the past four years, involving six countries of the region along with support from Spain. It thanked the World Heritage Centre and added that this project concerned both tangible and intangible heritage. It also indicated that this project was a national priority for Peru.

2048. The Delegation of **Spain** regretted that so little time had been allocated for this project which had involved 300 people over the past four years. It congratulated the concerned States Parties for this initiative, as well as the World Heritage Centre. It concurred with the comments made by IUCN and, added that this nomination should be considered as a model.
2049. The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of Argentina.
2050. The Observer Delegation of **Argentina**, on stating its awareness of the project since its initiation, indicated that it was very important to have a global vision of heritage, namely cultural, natural, the *World Heritage Convention* (1972), the RAMSAR Convention, the Convention on the intangible heritage (2003) as well as the 1970 Convention on illicit trafficking of cultural properties. Finally, it shared its hope that it would be possible to work across all these fields at once. It concluded by thanking the World Heritage Centre for having guided the project since 2003.
2051. The **Chairperson** turned to the Draft Decision on page 5, with three amendments having been received from the Committee, after which the Rapporteur explained that Chile had suggested a new paragraph 3: “recognizes Spain’s contribution to this project”, which was henceforth adopted. He continued by informing the Committee that Israel had proposed to remove paragraph 5 and that IUCN had also proposed an amendment to paragraph 3 referring to a need to involve both the cultural and natural heritage sections at the World Heritage Centre.
2052. The Delegation of **Israel** supported this motion from the Advisory Body and proposed to also add a reference to the best practise approach.
2053. The Delegation of **Chile** disagreed with the Delegation of Israel, commenting that this would make the nomination a cultural project.
2054. The **Chairperson** questioned whether an Advisory Body could bring amendments.
2055. The Delegation of **India** responded by explaining that during the Committee’s 29<sup>th</sup> session (Durban, 2005), it had been ruled that the Advisory Bodies could not assist in the drafting of Decisions.
2056. The **Chairperson** said that thereby IUCN’s proposal would be deleted, unless a Committee member was willing to take it up, upon which Israel responded positively.



2057. The Delegation of **Kenya** remarked that assistance from the natural heritage section could always be included later, and proposed to move forward with this cultural project. It queried whether paragraph 5 had been removed.
2058. The **Chairperson** explained that IUCN's amendments could not be used and he suggested proceeding by reviewing each paragraph.
2059. The Delegation of **Peru** expressed its wish to discuss a cultural nomination so as not to further complicate an already very complex project. It added that this nomination was not even half-way through yet.
2060. Upon adoption of paragraphs 1 and 2, the **Rapporteur** recalled the amendment to include a new paragraph 3 with reference to Spain's contribution to the project. For paragraph 4 Israel proposed a reference to best practise of other serial nominations, which was adopted, as well as paragraph 5. The Chairperson then explained that Israel had proposed to remove the old paragraph 5, which was also adopted.
2061. The Delegation of **Chile** requested the floor be given to the Delegation of Israel.
2062. The Delegation of **Israel** clarified that the proposal suggested encouraging the World Heritage Centre to coordinate the project and to delete the remainder considering the work had been successfully undertaken.
2063. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 12.B** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 14: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GLOBAL FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME FOR CAPACITY BUILDING ON NATURAL HERITAGE**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/14

*Decision::* **31 COM 14**

2064. IUCN presented the progress report.
2065. The Delegation of **Kenya** congratulated the Advisory Body for its work, but remarked that little was concrete concerning the budget. It continued with the importance of capacity building for the preparation of nominations, as well as the management of sites and it therefore welcomed the initiative, asking for focused attention from the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It further remarked upon the absence of the African Wildlife Institute among the institutes mentioned in the report, which had delivered many experts to the African region, and concluded with a plea to develop the capacity for a greater presence of experts from within the region, instead of from the outside.
2066. The Delegation of **Lithuania** drew attention to the title of 'Action Plan' and mentioned that throughout the document various terms had been used thus calling for consistency. Furthermore, it commented that in part 4 of the document, no action was mentioned in the text and it suggested changing the title to 'key considerations' or 'strategic recommendations', upon which the Chairperson requested a written text underlining this suggestion.
2067. The Delegation of **Canada** expressed that it had several comments and explained that it had been a little disappointed with the report, clarifying that at the Committee's sessions in Cairns and Helsinki a request had been made for an integrated training plan by IUCN and ICCROM. Nevertheless, it recognised that both Advisory Bodies were strong supporters of capacity building. With regard to the Annex, it explained that its comments were of a similar nature to those of Lithuania; that it supported a focus on regional institutions and further questioned what would happen to the requested

USD200,000 from the World Heritage Fund for the identified activities should the other sources mentioned fail to materialize.

2068. The Delegation of **New Zealand** supported the focus of the strategy and remarked that the Pacific region would depend heavily on it for success.
2069. The Delegation of **India** commended the valuable contribution by the Advisory Bodies and it offered the support of its Wildlife Institute in contributing to the proposed strategy. It further remarked that more guidance was needed on serial nominations and management plans to fully benefit the States Parties and concluded by stating that capacity building programmes needed to be adequately resourced.
2070. **ICCROM** welcomed the document and commented that work would continue on both cultural and natural heritage, and that it agreed with Canada that progress had not been made as rapidly as hoped for. It further welcomed more regular reporting, as capacity building had been mentioned several times during this Committee session, and it emphasized the importance of the Periodic Reporting process in order to understand the needs across regions at various levels. It concluded by referring to the AFRICA 2009 Programme as an example for integrating training and capacity building in periodic reports within the regions in order to achieve better success and it expressed agreement with Kenya for strengthening local capacities.
2071. **IUCN** also welcomed the comments by Kenya, and in response to Canada remarked that further and closer work with ICCROM would follow, but given the work load it considered itself more as a facilitator than an implementor. Finally, as regards the resources, the Advisory Body remarked that although they would never be sufficient, priorities would be defined and, as pointed out by ICCROM, that the Periodic Reporting process would indeed act as an important guidance.
2072. The **Chairperson** continued by referring to the Draft Decision on page 4, with several amendments, but the Delegation of Canada intervened mentioning that their question about the relationship between the World Heritage Fund and other identified sources had not been answered.
2073. **IUCN** answered that it was basically up to the Committee to decide on an appropriate course of action if other sources were not forthcoming, but that it had outlined 12 recommended actions in the report as a package.
2074. The **Rapporteur** then read out the amendments to the Draft Decision, with an amendment proposed by Morocco in French, which needed some clarification from the State Party, and another amendment from Lithuania, which was adopted.
2075. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 14** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 8C: UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/7<sup>a</sup>  
WHC-07/31.COM/7B  
WHC-07/31.COM/7B.ADD  
WHC-07/31.COM/7B.ADD.2  
WHC-07/31.COM/8B  
WHC-07/31.COM/8B.ADD REV

*Decisions:* **31 COM 7B.35**  
**31 COM 8B.23**  
**31 COM 7.A**

2076. The **Chairperson** moved on to agenda Item 8C, which included 3 Draft Decisions, after which the **World Heritage Centre** explained that it merely concerned a matter of housekeeping: there were now 30 properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger, with 3 new properties, 4 properties removed, and 27 maintained.

**Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1 bis)**

2077. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.35** adopted as amended.

**Samarra Archeological City (Iraq) ( C 276)**

2078. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.23** adopted as amended.

2079. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7.1** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 15: EVALUATION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PARTNERSHIPS FOR CONSERVATION INITIATIVE (PACT)**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/15  
*Decision:* **31 COM 15**

2080. The **World Heritage Centre** recalled that in 2002, the initiative had been taken to establish a new approach in dealing with public and private institutions to share the mission of World Heritage. It stressed that since then a lot of work had been done, as outlined and evaluated in document WHC-07/31.COM/15, to develop a highly successful strategy with elements of partnerships packaged in a coherent approach that provided the stability needed for a long term and trustworthy cooperation. Further to this, it mentioned that a high level of competence had progressively been built to manage legal and institutional matters. Further guidance was now sought from the Committee to allow for the execution of many innovative approaches it had begun to implement. Several partners and projects implemented through partnerships were highlighted. A special mention was made concerning the Our Place (New Zealand) project, the Tokyo Broadcasting system's contribution to World Heritage, the United Nations Foundation and the Friends of World Heritage initiative as well as others currently under development or consideration.

2081. The Delegation of **Israel** asked what guidance and formalities had been established to decide on matters such as choice of partners, finance or other elements for partnerships, and further recommended that care be taken in identifying partners of high international standing, such as Hewlett Packard, that could provide benefits at the local level.

2082. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed appreciation for the work done and commented that it was important not only for fundraising, but also for the sharing of information and creation of goodwill. It was pleased to see that the World Heritage Centre was open to all kinds of partnerships, including those with the private sector, which were necessary. While it supported the many activities, it nevertheless called for caution in further development.
2083. The Delegation of **India** commented that the Committee had traditionally supported partnerships, but that it was important to review with whom. It continued by recalling that at the 30th session of the Committee (Vilnius, 2006), it had expressed its reservations about a partnership with Jet Tours. It clarified by reminding the Committee that the Director-General had mentioned the progressive increase in the use of the logo, so even if Jet Tours was giving financial resources, questions still remained. It concluded by requesting that partners be selected according to the United Nations standards and that geographical representation was an important factor.
2084. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed two amendments: The first was on trademarking the two words 'World Heritage' to complement the protection given to the emblem (for which better tools were needed), and secondly to address the issue of partnerships and licensing in particular in the *Operational Guidelines*.
2085. The Delegation of the **United States of America** commented that the PACT initiative was a useful tool and that several American corporations, foundations and museums had already had good experiences with it and had found it a useful and serious initiative. The United States of America noted that it would be looking forward to more developments in the future. However, it expressed one concern: this being that the World Heritage Centre should be more expeditious in informing State Parties before establishing partnerships, as they were sometimes only informed afterwards.
2086. The **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Centre to reply to the comments and questions.
2087. The **World Heritage Centre** first thanked the Committee for the many expressions of support and continued with the question raised by the Delegation of Israel on the formalities by referring to the regulatory framework for partnerships that had been approved by the Committee during the 29th session (Durban, 2005), and which was based on the United Nations and UNESCO *Operational Guidelines*. As regards the benefits for sites, the World Heritage Centre replied that it was exploring new avenues and that a major inventory of site needs was under preparation with the collaboration of all States Parties in order to propose more partnership opportunities to partners. It noted the concerns about geographical representation and pledged that stronger efforts would be made to achieve this objective. Finally with regard to the speed of development of initiatives, it replied that due to the experimental nature of many of the projects, delays could be caused as a result of internal processes which would soon be improved.
2088. The **Chairperson** turned to the Draft Decision and the Rapporteur presented the amendments proposed by Canada and India. The **Chairperson** then declared Decision **31 COM 15** adopted as amended.

The Meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.

**SIXTH DAY FRIDAY 29 JUNE 2007**

**TWENTIETH MEETING**

**06.00 p.m – 08.00 p.m**

**Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu**

**ITEM 18: REFORM OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/18A  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF/18A  
WHC-07/31.COM/18B

*Decisions:* **31 COM 18A**  
**31 COM 18B**

2089. The **Chairperson** opened the evening session and recalled that item 19 would be taken up on 30 June 2007 that a new Draft Decision was circulating on the audit and that evening's session would examine items 18A and 18B first.
2090. The Delegation of **Israel** inquired whether there was a list of the newly inscribed sites and asked whether it could make a general statement on nominations at that moment which would be relevant for the 32nd session.
2091. The **World Heritage Centre** informed the Committee that there was no such document, but that item 8C covered the updated List of World Heritage in Danger.
2092. The Delegation of **India** suggested that Israel wait for the statement until more Delegates were in the room.

**ITEM 18A: EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS**

2093. The **Chairperson** opened item 18A and referred to the Working and Information documents.
2094. The **World Heritage Centre** presented the two International Assistance requests from India and Vietnam and referred to the combined Draft Decision and explained the procedures of approval.
2095. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested clarification of whether any of the requests concerned sites on the In Danger List.
2096. The **World Heritage Centre** said that this document only concerned requests above USD 75,000. It noted that other requests were dealt with by the Director and the Chairperson and that this information was contained in the Information Document.
2097. The **Chairperson** then asked whether the two requests on page 18 could be approved
2098. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 18A** adopted.

**ITEM 18B: REVISION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE FORMAT**

2099. The **World Heritage Centre** then explained item 18B and that the old system of International Assistance had been refined from 5 to 3 categories and this would need to be taken up in the next revision of the Operational Guidelines. Furthermore it referred to the categories of lower and higher income countries and noted that this affected, for example, Argentina on Iguazu.
2100. The Delegation of **India** noted that International Assistance was given as technical assistance to State Parties and that there was no conflict of interest. The reference to technical assistance could be incorporated into the Draft Decision.
2101. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that there was a normal process of granting assistance for projects to States Parties and that a quality check was made once the reports had been received. The World Heritage Centre added that technical experts were frequently suggested from the wider network of experts to ensure the quality of projects.
2102. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested clarification on paragraph 5(c) on the division between natural and cultural heritage and whether a more flexible approach was needed; and also on paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision concerning emergency assistance and who actually approves these requests. Concerning the panel procedure it noted that modern forms of communication could be used including e-mail consultations.
2103. The **World Heritage Centre** noted that requests beyond USD75,000 needed to be presented to the Committee and lower amounts approved by the Chairperson. Concerning the definition of emergency assistance, it referred to paragraph 241 of the *Operational Guidelines*. As regards 5(c) it noted that at the 19th session (Berlin, 1995) the division between natural and cultural heritage had been decided upon.
2104. The Delegation of **New Zealand** commended the work that had been carried out and also requested clarification of paragraph 5(c)
2105. The **World Heritage Centre** explained that normally more cultural heritage projects were received and that these funds were exhausted first.
2106. The Delegation of **Chile** supported the remark made by Netherlands. In addition, it had a comment on paragraph 4, relating to the State Parties of Latin America and the Caribbean. It noted that these States Parties could not submit any requests for International Assistance.
2107. The Delegation of the **United States of America** referred to paragraph 236 and the priority for sites on the In Danger List and further requested that paragraph 4 in the Draft Decision not supersede the *Operational Guidelines*. It expressed concern that paragraph 236 had not been implemented appropriately.
2108. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that paragraph 4 in the Draft Decision referred to paragraph 239 in the *Operational Guidelines* adding a layer of consideration. In reply to Chile, it noted that the rigid approach had been decided upon at the 30<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee (Lithuania, 2006) in order to give priority to developing countries. At the present time, only 68 out of the 184 countries could benefit, and to allow for more flexibility, 46 countries of lower middle income had been added.
2109. The Delegation of **Kenya** referring to paragraph 5(c) suggested that the current division between natural and cultural heritage be changed to 35% / 65% which would be more realistic. Concerning paragraph 4, the Delegation recommended that it should read "limited" and in 7 it suggested removing "really".
2110. The Delegation of **Canada** informed the Committee that it had provided wording for an additional new paragraph regarding the criteria applied. Concerning the last paragraph, it suggested that the revisions to the *Operational Guidelines* be referred to.

2111. The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** wished to point out that it had requested International Assistance for a project. It went on to state that it had already obtained these resources from other origins and would ask for more flexibility in the process.
2112. The **World Heritage Centre** noted the amendments proposed to the *Operational Guidelines* and alluded to item 16.
2113. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested clarification of a more flexible approach between natural and cultural heritage requests. The World Heritage Centre confirmed this approach applied specifically for mixed sites and cultural landscapes.
2114. The **Chairperson** then asked whether the Draft Decision could be approved with the amendment by Kenya in paragraph 4; the change of the ratio by Kenya in paragraph 5(c); the amendment by Canada on earmarking in paragraph 5(e); the new paragraph by India between 5 and 6 on the nomination dossiers and the two proposals by Kenya in paragraph 7. Another new paragraph was proposed before 8.
2115. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the criteria were mainly for the Advisory Bodies and could be found in Annex 9.
2116. The Delegation of **Canada**, however, requested that it should be reported at the next session how the criteria were applied.
2117. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 18B** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 10: GLOBAL STRATEGY: EVALUATION OF THE CAIRNS-SUZHOU DECISION (continued)**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/10

*Decision:* **31 COM 10**

2118. The **Chairperson** referred to the revised Draft Decision 31 COM 10 Rev which was distributed in the room.
2119. The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that its proposal had not been included and if India withdrew, it would do the same.
2120. The Delegation of **India** expressed its surprise as it had never been approached by the United States of America and that any amendment was out of the question.
2121. The **Rapporteur** clarified that he only worked with written amendments and that the proposal by the United States of America had been made orally.
2122. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its desire to proceed and requested the United States of America to join with the other countries.
2123. The Delegation of **India** noted the process of consultation and that it had been on an experimental basis for 4 years and that in this Committee no regions had been singled out as that would be in poor taste.
2124. The Delegation of the **United States of America** requested to drop the whole document and underlined that it had made many compromises.
2125. The Delegation of **Spain** responded to the comments made by the Delegation of India, in the spirit of a compromise. The State Party believed in the good faith of the members of the Committee. It wished the List to reflect the diversity of the regions and also wished to keep the Suzhou-Cairns Decision in order to ensure better representation on the World Heritage List.
2126. The **Chairperson** requested to adopt paragraph 2 and then moved to paragraph 3 with an amendment by Israel.

2127. The Delegation of **Israel** also stated that it felt inclined to abandon it as it was concerned about referred nominations which could be delayed considerably. The Delegation requested to add “this may be also waived for referred nominations...”.
2128. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** refused and then continued to comment on paragraph 3. It added that no one was happy with the Cairns Decision as this was not assisting the countries.
2129. The Delegation of **Kenya** requested that Israel’s proposal be repeated in simple English, to which the Delegation of Israel obliged and the Rapporteur read out the amendment.
2130. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to exclude it whereas the Delegation of the United States of America requested to replace the Indian text with the amendment from Israel.
2131. The Delegation of **India** asked whether the United States of America’s proposal was a serious one, as the Israeli amendment was an addition.
2132. The **Chairperson** moved to adopt paragraph 3 without the Israeli amendment. The paragraph was adopted.
2133. The Delegation of **Kuwait** noted that more cultural than natural nominations were submitted and referred to paragraph (f).
2134. La délégation du **Bénin** trouve la proposition déraisonnable. Les États parties qui n’ont pas site inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial doivent être prioritaires. Elle demande que le point a) soit laissé en premier et que les pays qui n’ont ensuite que 2-3 biens inscrits soient prioritaires.
2135. The Delegation of **India** stated that the intervention of Benin was clear to move (b) into (a), (h) into (b) and (a) into (c) in order to have consensus to which Kenya agreed and proposed to fit it in after (f).
2136. The Delegation of **Spain** agreed with the Delegations of Kuwait and Benin. The point a) was to be put after point f).
2137. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** said that it would go along with India and the Chairperson requested the Rapporteur to read the sequence.
2138. The **Rapporteur** read the whole paragraph with (b) moved to (a), (h) to (b) and (a) to (c) and the remaining unchanged. He also asked whether there were any views on the existing (h).
2139. The Delegation of **Cuba** asked for an explanation concerning States Parties with a site inscribed, which was then delisted. It wondered whether the Committee considered that the State Party had no site inscribed on the List. The Delegation of **Cuba** then had a request for the point f). If the priority is given to Africa and Pacific regions, then the Caribbean should also be included in the Decision, considering all the efforts made for many years to prepare new nominations for this region, which is underrepresented.
2140. The **Chairperson** requested clarification of whether this was an amendment.
2141. The Delegate of **Cuba** confirmed that it wished the Decision to be amended, and that the Caribbean region should be added to the list under point f).
2142. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that this was only a four-year experiment to which Kenya agreed.
2143. The Delegation of **India** wondered whether the four years should be mentioned in paragraph 5 and the Delegation of Canada insisted that the reference should stay as originally intended.
2144. The **Chairperson** confirmed this and moved on to the adoption of paragraph 7 with “after 4 years” added and the adoption of 8 and 9 without amendments.



2145. The Delegation of **Kenya** requested to add “decides to allocate USD 100,000 for training in Africa” but the Chairperson noted that this could only be done provisionally as the item on the budget was pending. The Delegation of the United States of America referred to paragraph 6.

2146. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 10** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 19: PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT ON THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/19A.Rev  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.19A  
WHC-07/31.COM/19B

Decision: **31 COM 19**

2147. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Draft Decision on the audit was pending and informed the Committee that a new Draft Decision 31 COM 19B Rev had been distributed.

2148. La délégation du **Maroc** informe que la décision présentée a été rédigée en accord avec 18 des membres du Comité. Il est très regrettable que 3 Etats parties n'aient pas été impliqués dans cette décision.

2149. The Delegation of **Israel** noted that this should not be brought to a vote but should be adopted by consensus.

2150. The Delegation of **India** requested a good night's sleep which would bring additional wisdom.

2151. La Sous-directrice générale pour la **Culture** prend la parole en indiquant qu'elle s'adresse aux membres du Comité au nom du Directeur général de l'UNESCO. Elle attire l'attention sur le fait que le paragraphe 10 comporte un problème. La formulation « invite » suppose que le Directeur général puisse être en mesure de décider d'accorder une autonomie fonctionnelle au Centre du patrimoine mondial. Or cette tâche n'est pas de la compétence du Directeur général, mais de celle de la Conférence Générale et de ses membres. Ce statut particulier suppose notamment qu'une allocation budgétaire soit déléguée par la Conférence Générale. La décision devrait donc être modifiée et « inviter les membres des Etats Parties de la Convention » d'accorder ce statut différent. Par contre, si la décision proposée suppose qu'une flexibilité administrative soit mise en place pour le Centre du patrimoine mondial, dans ce cas, le Directeur General peut intervenir. Il peut assurer que le Centre devienne une sorte de projet pilote en terme de flexibilité de gestion. Dans ce cas, le texte de la décision doit aussi être modifié car le libellé actuel du paragraphe 10 n'est pas applicable.

2152. The Delegation of **India** said that the procedure was illegal as a draft had to be presented first, signed by 19 countries.

2153. The Delegation of **Japan** noted that it had signed with a condition.

2154. The **Chairperson** asked to receive the inputs there and then and to discuss the Draft Decision the following day.

2155. The Delegation of **Norway** requested a point of order to which India agreed to close the session

The meeting rose at 08.00 p.m.

**SEVENTH DAY SATURDAY 30 JUNE 2007**

**TWENTYFIRST MEETING**

**09.00 a.m – 11.00 a.m**

**Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu**

**ITEM 19: PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT ON THE MANAGEMENT AUDIT OF  
THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE (*continued*)**

2156. The **Chairperson** re-opened the session and recalled that the Committee first had to finalize the discussion of Item 19, the management audit. This would be followed by other business, the budget, the General Assembly, climate change, strategic objectives, working methods, the election mechanism, the agenda for the next session and the election of the Bureau. He further proposed to the Committee to give the floor to the Delegation of Chile, as they had to depart early from the session.
2157. The Delegation of **Chile** wished to take this opportunity to congratulate the Chairperson on his way of conducting the debates, as well as the New Zealand authorities, the translators, the interpreters and the technicians. It commented that the debates had been very interesting, then added a few words on the relevance of the work of the Committee and indicated that it had been a privilege to contribute to ensuring the proper state of conservation of World Heritage properties. It expressed regret however, that there was still a long way before the full implication of local populations could be realized. It also indicated that the List of World Heritage in Danger shouldn't be seen as a sanction but as an opportunity to address the threats. Finally, it reminded the Committee of the need to have a geographical balance, and expressed that it was still very happy to cooperate in World Heritage matters, even if no longer as a Committee member.
2158. The **Chairperson** then reopened the discussion on item 19, turning straight to the Draft Decision.
2159. Après avoir pris connaissance du texte proposé, la délégation de la **Tunisie** s'y associe.
2160. De même que la délégation de la Tunisie, la délégation du **Maroc** s'associe à ce projet, avec toutefois quelques observations.
2161. The Delegation of **Cuba** sought clarification from the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Culture, but supported the project.
2162. The Delegation of **India** noted that the current meeting coincided with a congress of G77 States in Paris and that after consultation with the aforementioned States, it was able to announce that the Draft Decision had the support of the developing countries.
2163. The **Rapporteur** read the proposed amendment by the Delegation of Japan to paragraph 7, proposing to divide it into two. He proceeded to read another amendment by the Delegations of Canada and Japan to paragraph 10.
2164. The Delegation of **Chile** requested the Rapporteur to re-read the amendment.
2165. La délégation du **Maroc** soutient la proposition du Canada.
2166. The Delegation of **Japan** noted that the word "invite" should also be replaced by "recommends" in the second part of the Decision, to ensure consistency.
2167. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed a minor change to the wording, replacing "which reflects" with "reflecting".
2168. La délégation du **Bénin** fait part de sa gêne avec le mot « rétablit ». Elle indique que ce terme laisse entendre que cette autonomie existait dans le passé, qu'elle a été supprimée, et qu'il s'agit de la remettre en place. Elle souligne qu'il s'agit en fait de demander que le Directeur général fasse en sorte que cette autonomie existe.
2169. The **Chairperson** proposed to look for alternative wording, for example "secure".
2170. The Delegation of **India** noted that this was a problem of translation, as in English the word "reinstate" was used.
2171. The Delegations of **Tunisia** and **Kenya** agreed with the proposed amendment.

2172. The **Rapporteur** noted that he had received an amendment to paragraph 11 from the Delegation of Japan adding wording to ensure it was consistent with Article 27 of the *Operational Guidelines*.
2173. The Delegation of **Kenya** made a proposal for wording to join the two parts of the paragraph.
2174. The Delegation of **India** noted that to be consistent, “invite” should be replaced with “urge”.
2175. The **Rapporteur** noted that in the new paragraph 12, the reference to the previous paragraph needed to be corrected.
2176. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** recalled that the documents for the General Assembly had to be finalized by the end of July and that the request for an action plan was therefore not realistic. He proposed to present a preliminary report instead.
2177. The Delegation of **India** proposed to leave the text as it stood but give the flexibility to the Director to judge what was feasible in the time span.
2178. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** supported the proposal by the Delegation of India and expressed that it would prefer to receive a more substantial document at a later time.
2179. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 19** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 21: OTHER BUSINESS**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/21 A.  
 WHC-07/31.COM/21 B.  
 WHC-07/31.COM/21 C.  
 WHC-07/31.COM/20 A

*Decisions:* **31 COM 21 A**  
**31 COM 21B**

**ITEM 21A: COST-BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THE CURRENT SUMMARY RECORD AND AUDIO RECORDING**

2180. The **Chairperson** opened item 21, other business and asked the Delegation of New Zealand to introduce item 21 A.
2181. The Delegation of **New Zealand** recalled that this document, proposing an electronic Summary Record, had been prepared at the request of the Committee and that it proposed a way of improving the efficiency of the work of the Committee, allowing for money savings, time savings, greater accuracy and transparency, as well as increased the speed of the process and diminished opportunity cost. He further proposed to introduce the system for a one year trial period.
2182. The Delegation of **India** thanked the Delegation of New Zealand for this initiative but expressed fear that it would not bring about the expected results. It noted that the written record of the meeting was an important way of documenting the work of the Committee and also warned that this might put developing countries at a disadvantage.
2183. The Delegation of **Lithuania** concurred with the Delegation of India that hard copy summary records were important and user-friendly.
2184. The Delegation of **Chile** indicated that the Latin America and Caribbean Group had made it clear in Paris that it would not support the proposal.

2185. La représentante de la délégation du **Maroc** tient à apporter son témoignage en tant qu'ancienne Présidente du Conseil exécutif de l'UNESCO lors que le Conseil avait essayé de diffuser tous les documents sur CD-ROM. Elle indique avoir reçu de nombreuses protestations pour les raisons invoquées par la délégation de l'Inde, même si elle applaudit la proposition et les réformes en général. Elle propose la mise en place d'une « boîte aux lettres à suggestions » lors des sessions du Comité. Elle recommande également d'attendre en fonction de ce qui va découler de la décision **31COM 19B**.
2186. The Delegation of **New Zealand** stated it was not trying to impose this and withdrew its proposal.
2187. The Delegation of **Israel** proposed to retain both systems for a one year trial period in order to enable the Committee to make an informed decision.
2188. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique qu'avoir les deux systèmes en parallèle coûterait 14 580 dollars EU en plus des 23 455 dollars EU pour le Résumé des interventions traditionnel.
2189. The Delegation of **Kenya** proposed to re-consider this at a future meeting.
2190. The Delegation of **India** argued that this initiative could only work if the international community would be empowering the developing countries.
2191. La délégation du **Maroc** apporte son soutien à la délégation de l'Inde, indiquant que rien n'aura vraisemblablement changé en ce domaine d'ici la 32e session du Comité en 2008.
2192. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 21A** adopted as amended.

#### **ITEM 21B. COSTED, TIME-BOUND BUDGET FOR A NEW SERIES OF WORLD HERITAGE RESOURCE MANUALS**

2193. The **World Heritage Centre** then introduced item 21B, recalling that the Committee, at its 30th session, had welcomed the proposal for a new series of resource manuals and had requested a costed time bound budget. It noted that this was a joint project of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and that the working document included the proposed titles for the next biennium: Nominations; Management Planning for Natural and Cultural Sites; Tourism and World Heritage; and Management of Cultural Landscapes.
2194. The Delegation of **Israel** welcomed the proposal but enquired why the publication on the Management of World Heritage Cities, which was under preparation, had not been included.
2195. The Delegation of **Canada** also welcomed the initiative and proposed to combine the manuals on Management Planning for Cultural and Natural sites. It also requested the World Heritage Centre to prepare a list of future titles for discussion by the Committee at its 33rd session.
2196. The Delegation of **Israel** supported this proposal but expressed a preference to discuss it at the next session.
2197. **ICCROM** noted that the manual on Historic Cities was under preparation but would be published in the existing World Heritage paper series. It noted that the proposal to combine the Management Planning manuals for Natural and Cultural Sites had to be discussed with IUCN and that as a complement to the manual, a course on cultural landscapes had also been planned.

2198. **IUCN** supported the proposal by the Delegation of Canada for a joint manual along with the proposal for the planning of future titles. It noted that the manuals had to be accompanied by more focused training activities.
2199. The **World Heritage Centre** noted that a preliminary list was already included on page 2 of the document.
2200. The Delegation of **Canada**, supported by the Delegations of Israel and India, insisted on retaining its proposed amendment for a more comprehensive list and for a greater coordination between the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.
2201. The **Rapporteur** read the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Canada.
2202. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 21B** adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 21 C: WORLD HERITAGE PROGRAMME ON EARTHEN ARCHITECTURE**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/21 C

*Decision:* **31 COM 21C**

2203. The **World Heritage Centre** introduced item 21C on a proposed World Heritage Programme on Earthen Architecture.
2204. The Delegation of **Kenya** voiced strong support for the proposal but urged that African institutions should be closer engaged in it, to ensure enhanced capacity building.
2205. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the Delegation of Kenya and noted the importance of analyzing both the World Heritage List and Tentative Lists. It also stressed the importance of a reflection period between the phases.
2206. The Delegation of **Canada** supported the previous interventions and requested information on the overall budget and fundraising strategy.
2207. La délégation du **Bénin** apporte son appui ferme à cette initiative et à la proposition de la délégation du Kenya qui consiste à renforcer les capacités en Afrique.
2208. La délégation de **Madagascar** appuie également ce programme sur l'architecture en terre mais souhaite savoir si ce programme va s'appliquer uniquement aux biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, aux sites inscrits sur les Listes indicatives ou bien encore aux sites proposés par les Etats parties pour figurer sur leurs Listes indicatives.
2209. The Delegation of **Mauritius** also supported the programme.
2210. **ICOMOS** noted that while they supported the proposal, there was a need to examine cities. It noted that many cases had been presented under item 7B. It also added the importance of involving the local communities and requested that this be added to the Decision.
2211. En réponse à la délégation du Canada, le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** indique que dans sa 1ere phase, le programme essaiera de regrouper des représentants de toutes les régions du monde concernées lors d'une réunion de consultation. Concernant la question soulevée par la délégation de Madagascar, le Centre du patrimoine mondial précise que ce programme ne concerne que les biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et les sites figurant déjà sur les Listes indicatives ; et qu'il est donc très important de conduire une analyse des biens inscrits sur les listes comme suggéré par la délégation d'Israël. Enfin, il ajoute qu'un séminaire sur la

question d'un projet très détaillé pour déterminer les coûts du programme est prévu dans le cadre de la 1ere phase du programme.

2212. The **Rapporteur** read amendments to paragraph 2 by the Delegation of Lithuania, paragraph 6 and 7 by the Delegation of Kenya and to the old paragraph 6 by the Delegation of Canada.

2213. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 21C** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 20A: REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2006 TO 2007 BUDGET**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/20 A  
*Decision:* **31 COM 20A**

2214. The **Chairperson** opened item 20 and explained that Document 20A concerned the implementation of the 2006-2007 budget while 20B dealt with the budget for 2008-2009.
2215. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that the item had already been presented. He added that several Decisions taken by the Committee would have implications for the 2008-2009 budget and that this would be adjusted by the close of the meeting on Monday 2 July. He recalled that the Committee had only approved the overall budget and not the detailed budget.
2216. The Delegation of **Japan** voiced concern about whether the UNESCO regulations allow for the flexibility requested in *Document 20A*. It also enquired whether the question of the contingency reserve had been adequately addressed and what had been the basis for this issue.
2217. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** replied that a contingency reserve of USD 700,000 had been established in order to accommodate the new regulations imposed by IOS and to bridge the time gap at the start of the Biennium when contributions by the States Parties had not yet arrived.
2218. The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that the flexibility on the management of the World Heritage Fund could be decided by the Committee.
2219. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 20A** adopted.

**ITEM 20B: PROPOSAL FOR THE WORLD HERITAGE FUND BUDGET FOR THE 2008 TO 2009 BIENNIUM**

*Document:* WHC-07/ 31 COM 20B  
*Decision:* **31 COM 20B**

2220. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented Document 31 COM 20B and noted that that several Decisions taken by the Committee would have implications for the budget, including Decisions on periodic reporting, capacity building in Africa, resource manuals and the programme on earthen architecture. He also drew attention to the budget line "other resources" in Table 1 which was still blank as these contributions could not be predicted.
2221. The Delegation of **Canada** asked for clarification of the purpose of the budget lines in Attachment 1 on evaluation, reactive monitoring and properties on the In Danger list.
2222. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the budget for evaluation would be used to follow up on previous audits but also included a reserve for possible future evaluations. The reactive monitoring mission budget was needed to support the reactive monitoring process, including for expert missions. He further explained that the specific budget line for sites in danger had not been very successful and had to be reduced because of budgetary constraints.
2223. The Delegation of **Israel** enquired if all budgetary implications of the Decisions had already been included, including provisions for the work on the Democratic Republic of



- Congo. He further noted that other thematic programmes, such as modern heritage and the Africa Great Rift Valley programme also needed to be integrated.
2224. The Delegation of **Lithuania** asked why no budget had been planned for the Forest and Small Island Programmes and if this meant no activities were planned for these programmes.
2225. The Delegation of **India** enquired whether funds for the capacity building programme for Africa and the reinforced monitoring mechanism had been included in the budget.
2226. The Delegation of **Canada** responded to the reply of the Centre, noting that mission costs should be considered as general operating expenses and thus be paid from the ordinary budget of UNESCO. It further requested that an audited statement of the 2006/2007 biennium be presented at the next session.
2227. The Delegation of the **United States of America** voiced its concern that the budget reserved for sites on the In Danger list had not been used and requested that the World Heritage Centre send a letter to the States Parties concerned.
2228. La délégation du **Bénin** se déclare déçue qu'il n'y ait pas plus de fonds dédiés au renforcement des capacités, malgré toutes les discussions à ce sujet.
2229. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the Delegation of Benin.
2230. The Observer Delegation of **Argentina** reminded the Director of the World Heritage Centre of the Decision which had been adopted regarding the properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (**31 COM 7A.32**).
2231. The Delegation of **Spain** expressed its concern while analyzing the budget in its entirety. It indicated that short-term and long-term payments, as well as extrabudgetary funding had not been consolidated and it was impossible to identify their source. It requested a better global vision for the budget and stressed that the two elements had to be kept separate, for clarity, and consolidated at a later stage.
2232. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded to the different questions. He noted that the Decision to merge the different categories of International Assistance resulted in the fact that training activities were less visible in the budget. Nevertheless, more than 50 % of the funds for International Assistance were attributed to training activities. He further explained that this was a statutory document and therefore only detailed the budget of the World Heritage Fund, but that an overall budget showing also extrabudgetary funds could be found in another document. He reiterated that the detailed budget would be reworked to include the Decisions with budgetary implications. On the question of the thematic programmes without allocated budgetary resources, he replied that the main source of funding for these programmes came from extrabudgetary resources and that the fact that no budget was allocated to them did not mean that the Centre was not implementing them. The resources requested were intended as 'seed' money to develop new programmes at their earliest stage. While he concurred with the remarks on mission costs by the Delegation of Canada, he explained that in occasional cases, this budget line was sometimes also used for urgent missions. He noted that additional expenses for the reinforced monitoring mechanism would probably also have to be covered in part from this budget. He supported the excellent suggestion by the Delegation of the United States to send a letter to all States Parties with a property inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger but, citing the properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo as an example, also noted that these often received significant support from extrabudgetary resources.

The meeting rose at 11.00 a.m.

SEVENTH DAY SATURDAY 30 JUNE 2007

TWENTYSECOND MEETING

11.00 a.m – 01.00 p.m

Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu

ITEM 20A: REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2006 TO 2007 BUDGET  
(continued)

Document: WHC-07/31.COM/20 A

Decision: **31 COM 20A**

2233. The **Chairperson** invited the Delegation of Canada to comment.
2234. The Delegation of **Canada** asked whether the World Heritage Centre was investing in other evaluation processes, and whether the funds could be used for other purposes.
2235. La Délégation du **Bénin** souligne la nécessité d'accorder plus de visibilité dans les documents du budget au « renforcement des capacités » en lui réservant un chapitre spécial.
2236. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that past evaluations had been of great benefit, and that if any funds were to go unused, these would be reallocated for other purposes. En poursuivant en français et en répondant à la question posé par la délégation du Bénin, il rappelle que suite à la réforme de l'assistance internationale, le Comité avait supprimé le chapitre spécial dans le but de permettre une certaine flexibilité. Il exprime sa perplexité vis-à-vis de mesures qui pourraient réintroduire une certaine forme de rigidité que le Comité avait voulu réformer.
2237. The Delegation of **India** noted that the Director of the World Heritage Centre had remarked that funds for reinforced monitoring would not be utilized for staff travel, however that discretionary funds sometimes had to be used for this purpose. India asked whether the Director should not seek additional funding for this purpose rather than using other funds for purposes for which they were not intended.
2238. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded that the matter raised by India would be put to the Committee. He noted that the reinforced monitoring programme might create unforeseen expenses, that funds would be put to the best possible use, and that additional funds – including extrabudgetary resources would be sought where needed [making up a quarter of the total resources for the activity].
2239. En faisant référence aux biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en plus en particulier aux biens de la République démocratique du Congo, la délégation de la **Belgique** (observateur) rappelle les efforts accomplis grâce aux financements de la société civile internationale, notamment de la Communauté Européenne et particulièrement la Belgique et de la Fondation des Nations unies. Elle regrette qu'à cause de la situation d'extrême difficulté, le pays n'ait pas pu présenter une demande d'assistance et conclut en demandant que la République démocratique du Congo puisse bénéficier d'une attention renforcé de la part du Centre du patrimoine mondial dans une perspective de renforcement des capacités tel que cela a été demande par la délégation du Bénin.
2240. The Delegation of **India** remarked that such a letter should be addressed specifically to the developing countries concerned.
2241. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider Draft Decision **31 COM 20B**.

2242. The **Rapporteur** read and the Committee adopted a proposed amendment of paragraph 3 submitted by Canada.
2243. The **Rapporteur** read and the Committee adopted a proposed new paragraph 4 submitted by the United States of America.
2244. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider the full, revised text of Draft Decision 20B.
2245. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 20B** adopted as amended.
2246. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 20A** adopted as amended.
2247. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider item 6 on the agenda, the upcoming 16th General Assembly of States Parties scheduled for October 2007.

**ITEM 6: SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (UNESCO OCTOBER 2007)**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/6  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.6

*Decision:* **31 COM 6**

2248. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that Document *WHC-07/31.COM/6* contained a brief account of the main results of the Committee since the last General Assembly. He provided a brief outline of the document.
2249. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider the Draft Decision relating to the above Document. He asked the Committee whether it wished to consider paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision (which concerns the provision for a reserved seat on the Committee for States Parties without a property inscribed on the World Heritage List) at the present time, or whether to defer this matter to later in the day.
2250. The **Delegation** of India remarked that it did not appear likely that the input from the 31st session of the Committee would be included in the final edition of the report presented to the General Assembly. The Delegation stated that this was unfortunate, and asked whether a mechanism could be established to allow inclusion of proceedings from the current session of the Committee in the document. India further noted that at the Committee's 30th session (Vilnius, 2006), the Committee had requested that the General Assembly play an active role in the work of the *Convention*, helping to secure a better balance of membership of the Committee, not merely to elect its members. India remarked that this issue, as well as several other Decisions of the Committee, were nowhere to be found in the document. Finally, India asked whether a final decision was ever reached on the exact number of seats to be reserved for States Parties with no sites on the World Heritage List.
2251. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** responded that, as it represents a brief summary only, the document cannot possibly refer to all discussions of the Committee. He did note, however, that some key issues would be raised, such as the attainment of a more balanced Committee. The Director then suggested that a paragraph to this effect could be added to the document. With regard to the reserved seats issue, he noted that the *Operational Guidelines* simply refer to "a certain number of seats". As per standard practice, this has been interpreted as one seat.
2252. The Delegation of **India** recalled that Kuwait and Mauritius had been elected through a second round of voting, and asked whether they were elected to reserved seats.
2253. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that this was indeed the case.
2254. The **Chairperson** recalled the need to include results of the 31st Committee meeting at the 16th General Assembly.
2255. The Delegation of **Norway** requested that the 16th General Assembly be notified of the progress on the implementation of the Global Strategy.
2256. The Delegation of **Israel** concurred with Norway, and requested that an item referring to the Global Strategy reflect on the global state of conservation of the World Heritage List.
2257. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to note down their suggestions and pass them to the Rapporteur in order for them to be reflected in the minutes of the session.
2258. The Delegation of **Kenya** commended the World Heritage Centre on its work, in particular with regard to publications such as those on climate change issues. Kenya asked the World Heritage Centre to continue with this work. Referring to the issue of reserved seats on the Committee, Kenya noted that Kuwait was about to complete its term, while Mauritius now had a site on the World Heritage List. It asked the Committee how this would impact on their original election to reserved seats.
2259. The Delegation of **Lithuania** remarked that the second round of voting in the elections for the Committee was put into place due to the volume of States Parties standing for election. Lithuania noted that more information should go into the Committee's report to the General Assembly as many States Parties do not attend Committee meetings.

2260. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed its agreement with the Delegation of India, asking that a summary of the proceedings of the 31st session of the Committee be included in the report to be presented to the General Assembly.
2261. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Delegation of India would like to submit a draft amendment on this matter.
2262. The Delegation of **India** noted that the inscription of a World Heritage Site belonging to a State Party originally elected to a reserved seat did not pose a problem, however noted the importance of ensuring that all regions were adequately represented on the Committee.
2263. The **Chairperson** noted that this particular issue would be dealt with in an upcoming session and asked the Committee whether this was acceptable. He then asked the Committee whether it would like to consider the Draft Decision at the present time.
2264. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that the World Heritage Centre would be happy to include proceedings of the current Committee meeting in the documents for the General Assembly, whilst reminding the Committee of the fact that UNESCO General Conference regulations limit the length of the document to a total of 6 pages.
2265. The **Chairperson** asked whether the Committee was in agreement on paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Draft Decision. The paragraphs were subsequently adopted by the Committee.
2266. The **Rapporteur** read out the text of a proposed new paragraph 3 to be inserted into the Draft Decision, submitted by the Delegation of India and the amendment was adopted
2267. The **Rapporteur** read out the text of a proposed new paragraph 5 to be inserted into the Draft Decision, submitted by the Delegation of India and the amendment was adopted. He then noted that a further proposed amendment had been received from the Delegations of Norway and Israel, but that the contents of this amendment related to an agenda item to be considered later in the agenda. The Rapporteur read the text aloud, asking the Committee to decide when it would like to consider its content.
2268. The Delegation of **Norway** noted that it would not object to a later consideration of its proposed amendment, however remarked that the later agenda item did not carry a Draft Decision with it.
2269. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it would be in a position to decide on the number of reserved seats to be elected at the upcoming General Assembly, asking whether the Committee would agree to set the number at 1.
2270. The Delegation of **Kenya** expressed unease at this suggestion, considering it too restrictive. Kenya suggested either to set a higher number of seats, or to not set a number at all.
2271. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it would prefer to postpone a Decision on the number of seats.
2272. The Delegations of **Kenya** and **Israel** expressed their agreement with this proposal.
2273. The Delegation of **India** asked whether the number of seats had always been interpreted as 1.
2274. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** confirmed that this had always been the case in the past.
2275. The Delegation of **India** noted that if such a precedence had been set, this should be supported in order to avoid the risk of further exacerbating imbalances on the Committee. India noted that it was becoming increasingly difficult for States Parties to

be elected to the Committee and added that an increase in the number of reserved seats would further limit the number of seats open for election.

2276. The Delegation of **Lithuania** suggested that the Decision be taken now, and expressed support for the setting of the number of reserved seats at 1 in consideration of the declining number of States Parties without properties on the World Heritage List.

2277. The Delegation of **Kenya** noted that if the Committee really wished to act on the basis of tradition only, then it would not object.

2278. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed agreement with the adoption of the Decision at the present time, noting that there would always be two Committee members elected to reserved seats due to the elections being held every two years.

2279. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee whether it would now adopt the full, revised Draft Decision. There were no objections.

2280. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 6** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 7.1: ISSUES RELATED TO THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES: THE IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE ON WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/7.1

*Decision:* **31 COM 7.1**

2281. The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider item 7.1 on climate change.
2282. The **Deputy-Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced item 7.1, outlining the document and drawing the attention of the Committee to the work undertaken by the World Heritage Centre on this issue since 2005.
2283. The **Representative of UNESCO's Assistant Director-General for Science** remarked upon the significance of climate change issues for the sector and noted that a Task Force on Climate Change had now been created by the UNESCO Director-General. The Representative explained that the Sector for Natural Sciences works in two areas relating to Climate Change – the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission works on climate change and sea level rise, while the Division of Ecological and Earth Sciences has created a network of mountain Biosphere Reserves to serve as climate change monitoring laboratories, many of which are also World Heritage sites. The Sector expressed it was looking forward to engaging in further work in this important area.
2284. The **Deputy-Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked Committee members to focus their comments on the documents to be submitted to the 16<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly rather than on the strategy and action plan previously adopted at the 30<sup>th</sup> session.
2285. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** commended the Deputy Director of the Centre on his introduction to the topic, noting the great significance of climate change to the Netherlands and also expressed its pleasure in having been able to support the work of the World Heritage Centre in this area. The Netherlands noted its preference that climate change considerations be built into the tools of the *Convention* such as state of conservation reporting. The Netherlands offered to contribute with a new paragraph reflecting both this motion and the need for research and discussion on climate change.
2286. The Delegation of **New Zealand** thanked the World Heritage Centre for its presentation, remarking on the significance of climate change for the Pacific region. New Zealand noted that climate change may threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of Pacific island nations before these have even been considered by the Committee, asking the Committee to confront this all-encompassing threat. New Zealand further remarked that the 31<sup>st</sup> session of the Committee was a carbon-neutral conference, offsets funded 11.5% by voluntary participants' contributions, and 88.5% by the Government of New Zealand.
2287. The Delegation of **Kenya** thanked all speakers for their contributions, remarking that Kenya and Africa are also affected by climate change, as evidenced by the snow melting from mountains and the increased unpredictability of seasonal weather patterns. Kenya further requested the World Heritage Centre and the wider community to "put its own house in order", referring to the more than 100 missions to World Heritage Sites taken each year and the carbon emissions these generate. Finally, Kenya asked for the Committee to expand its discussions to other partners, referring to the presence at the meeting of representatives of the World Monument Fund and their work on climate change, and asking the Chairperson whether this organization might be allowed to make a statement to the Committee.
2288. The Delegation of **Israel** expressed its support for the documents provided and statements made, however it also asked for the Committee to recognize the fundamental difference between climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation. Israel asked that the Committee restrict itself to dealing with adaptation, which falls within the scope of work of the Committee. The Delegation then read aloud some amendments to the text to reflect this consideration. Finally, Israel asked that linkages be established with other Conventions dealing with climate change such as

the Conventions on Biological Diversity and Desertification, and that climate change issues be considered part of the requirements for state of conservation reporting.

2289. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** expressed the view that climate change had global implications. It encouraged States Parties to document those sites affected by climate change. The Delegation asked UNESCO to take precautionary measures in addressing this issue, stating that cultural sites in the Asian region in particular were greatly affected by the effects of climate change, such as monsoons.
2290. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested that the World Monuments Fund should be listed, amongst others.
2291. The Delegation of **India** welcomed the policies on climate change. It stated that both cultural and natural properties were being affected by climatic events and that the changes had greater implications for biodiversity. Referring to India, it informed the Committee that a study on the impacts of climate change on livelihood in Nanda Devi World Heritage Site was being carried out. It complimented the Centre for documenting case studies of World Heritage sites and for applying the corrections suggested by India, and thanked the United Nations Foundation for providing financial support in this regard. It noted, with great concern, that rising sea levels were a threat to coastal areas.
2292. The Delegation of **Japan** said that the State Party was dedicated to addressing climate change. It expressed that several issues relating to this, including threats to heritage, were being addressed by the Kyoto Protocol. Regarding carbon control, it supported the initiatives by New Zealand.
2293. The Delegation of **Canada** commented that paragraph 4 was not appropriate. It recalled the list mentioned by the World Heritage Centre and said that there should be criteria for identifying sites affected by climate change, and that participation of States Parties had to be ensured. It proposed to have the General Assembly adopt the policy document. Thanking New Zealand for the carbon neutral policy, it regretted that only 11% participants had contributed to the carbon neutral scheme.
2294. The Delegation of **Norway** noted that the Government of Norway had carried out comprehensive work on climate change and asserted support for the Centre's work on this point.
2295. The **Chairperson** asked the Observers if there were any comments.
2296. **IUCN** expressed the view that climate change could have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of sites. It noted that coastal areas and glaciers were more vulnerable to climatic fluctuations. It proposed that there should be linkages to Biosphere Reserves and further added that plant and animal species were being threatened by climate change. It recommended that practical guidelines to address the issue be provided to States Parties. It continued by acknowledging other agencies and organizations that were playing a vital role in combating climate change. Above all, it concluded, lessons should be drawn and strategies be developed. It fully supported the Centre's initiatives on climate change.
2297. L'**ICOMOS** salue avec satisfaction l'initiative du Comité et rappelle que, suite aux instructions de la dernière Assemblée générale de l'ICOMOS qui s'est tenue en Chine en 2005, l'ICOMOS s'est donné une stratégie de mise en œuvre d'actions en matière d'effets du changement climatique et son conseil scientifique a établi des actions prioritaires à ce sujet. Il rappelle que la journée du patrimoine organisé du 18 avril dernier a été consacrée aux paysages et monuments de la nature. En citant la déclaration de Delhi, il conclut en soulignant que l'ICOMOS est prêt à travailler en étroite collaboration avec l'IUCN et l'ICCROM pour rédiger un rapport sur l'ensemble des activités portées à terme au sujet des effets du changement climatique et le



présenter à la prochaine session du Comité du patrimoine mondial au Canada en 2008.

2298. **ICCROM** encouraged the continuation of developing strategies on climate change. It noted that it not only had a material impact, but also had a major influence on life and living communities that should be included in the policy document. It proposed to link climate change with disaster reduction initiatives by UNESCO.
2299. The Observer Delegation of **Greenpeace** thanked the Centre for the latest development on climate change. It mentioned the release of a report by Greenpeace on climate change which provided clear guidelines and further stated that the G8 countries had also alluded to the issue during their recent meeting. It noted that the case studies produced by the Centre provided a few examples and that there were even more cases worldwide. Concerning World Heritage sites, it feared that many more sites would be affected in the future, and that all States Parties were obliged to join together in efforts to address the problem.
2300. The Observer Delegation of the **World Monuments Fund (WMF)** commended the Centre for taking the initiative on climate change. It referred to the 2008 Watch List of the WMF sites and noted that the Centre and WMF had common goals and strategies in addressing the issue. It called for the concerned parties to work together on reducing 'carbon footprints' and underlined that preservation of cultural heritage would contribute to sustainable development. Finally, it pledged to work with the Centre and Advisory Bodies in addressing climate change. It thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak on behalf of WMF.
2301. The Observer Delegation of the **Climate Justice Programme** expressed appreciation for the work of the Centre on climate change. It thanked the G8 countries for their commitment to addressing the issue. Referring to World Heritage sites, such as the Great Barrier Reef and Belize Barrier Reef, among others, it noted that climate change was continuing to cause deterioration to outstanding sites. It supported the carbon neutral policy, and committed itself to addressing the problem in cooperation with NGOs and Advisory Bodies.
2302. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** noted that there was a greater focus on legal analysis than on legal research on page 6 of the report. It supported the comments by ICCROM, and expressed that cultural sites were also vulnerable, especially regarding communities and intangible heritage. It continued by asking for a Statement on Outstanding Universal Value of those sites considered vulnerable to climate change.
2303. The Delegation of **Israel** supported the proposal by Canada.
2304. The **World Heritage Centre** thanked the Committee for the comments. It recalled the proposal by the Netherlands (page 4) to use World Heritage as iconic sites to create awareness on the subject. In addition, it suggested that synergies were being developed by working with international conventions such as CBD, Ramsar etc, and that India was already conducting research on a World Heritage site. Responding to the Delegation of Israel concerning mitigation and adaptation, it said that there would be a focus on adaptation since mitigation came under the United Nations convention program on climate change and that this issue had been clarified on pages 36-37 of the report, published as World Heritage series N° 22. It noted that the Reforestation program, although a small element, could contribute to mitigating climate change. It referred to page 3 of the policy document focusing on state of conservation reports for climate change. Responding to Canada on participation of States Parties, it said that the Centre was trying to build upon this. It went on to clarify that the suggestion from ICCROM on linkages was covered in paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision and that proposals from civil society would be reflected in the policy document. It expressed that the policy document would be revised and circulated to the Committee for approval, before being finalized for the General Assembly. The World Heritage Centre underlined

that staff and funds needed to be provided in order to carry out further work, and mentioned that some States Parties had already committed funds in this regard.

2305. The **Chairperson** proceeded to review the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. The Committee adopted paragraphs 1, 2, and 3.
2306. The **Rapporteur** noted that paragraph 4 required discussion as Canada had proposed new text. In this case, paragraph 4 became paragraph 5.
2307. The **Committee** adopted the amended paragraph 4.
2308. The **Rapporteur** explained that due to changes in paragraph 4 there was a new paragraph 5.
2309. The **Committee** adopted the new paragraph.
2310. The **Rapporteur** recalled the proposal from Israel, and reiterated that the current paragraph 5 would become paragraph 6.
2311. The **Committee** adopted the new paragraph 6.
2312. The **Rapporteur** stated that paragraph 6 became paragraph 7. He noted the proposal from the Netherlands to redraft the text.
2313. The Delegation of **India** asked to include Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity in the paragraph.
2314. The **Rapporteur** read out the proposal from the Netherlands “urges States Parties to participate in United Nations climate change meetings with a view to achieving post Kyoto agreement”.
2315. The Delegation of **Israel** stressed that the Committee’s own forums should be used such as the UNESCO Forum Universities.
2316. The **Chairperson** asked Israel to provide proper text.
2317. The **Rapporteur** presented the proposal by India “encourage the Centre to sensitize States Parties to deal with policy on climate change”.
2318. The Delegation of the **United States of America** expressed that the statement by India was vague. It asked for clarification.
2319. The Delegation of **India** clarified that the statement concerned developing countries. The intention was to help them with developing mechanisms in implementing the policy, and that an interdisciplinary approach was required. It said that the statement could be withdrawn if the Delegation of the United States of America wished so.
2320. The Delegation of the **United States of America** asked India to withdraw the statement.
2321. The Delegation of **India** explained that the statement was not addressed to Washington directly, but to developing countries. It asked if the United States of America was in agreement with the statement.
2322. The Delegation of **Kenya** commented that there was no difference between developed and developing countries, and that they were not two different species. All States Parties should be requested equally to address climate change.
2323. The **Rapporteur** read out the revised text which was subsequently adopted by the Committee.
2324. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the comments by Israel.
2325. The Delegation of **India** stressed that the World Heritage Centre should not be involved in other issues that were being dealt with by other agencies, and asked that it to focus on World Heritage sites. Agreeing with Kenya and Israel, it asked to be specific in the Decision.

2326. The **Rapporteur** read out the revised text.
2327. The **Committee** adopted paragraph 8 and asked if there were any comments on paragraph 9.
2328. The **Rapporteur** noted that Israel was making an appeal to partners.
2329. The **Chairperson** asked if there could be an additional paragraph between 8 and 9.
2330. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** proposed to use the existing text.
2331. The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that Norway had suggested revising paragraph 9 in a number of ways. He also informed the Committee of the proposal from Israel.
2332. The Delegation of **Israel** asked if the term mitigation could be mentioned in the beginning.
2333. The Delegation of **Kenya** was concerned that all World Heritage sites were mentioned rather than only In Danger sites. However, it said that due to a lack of time the text should not be reviewed another time.
2334. The Delegation of **India** expressed the view that only In Danger sites should be mentioned not normal sites and that it supported the comments by Kenya.
2335. The **Rapporteur** read out the revised text.
2336. The **Committee** adopted paragraph 9 excluding comments by India and Kenya.
2337. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7.1** adopted as amended.

The meeting rose at 1.00 pm

**SEVENTH DAY SATURDAY 30 JUNE 2007**

**TWENTYTHIRD MEETING**

**02.30 p.m – 04.30 p.m**

**Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu**

**ITEM 13 : EVALUATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

*Documents:* **WHC-07/31.COM/13A**  
**WHC-07/31.COM/13B**

*Decisions:* **31 COM 13A**  
**31 COM 13B**

2338. The **Chairperson** recalled the Budapest Committee session (2002) and the 4C's adopted there along with the questionnaire sent.
2339. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained the document and stated that 42 replies had been received underlining the utility of the 4Cs as a tool. He explained that credibility and conservation were rated highest, whereas capacity-building and communication had received slightly lower rates. Capacity building was also considered quite difficult to assess at an early stage. The conclusions were presented in the final part of the document and included training on Outstanding Universal Value and the need to further link it to development issues. He continued by stating that the 4Cs needed to be translated into actions. Finally, he referred to the issue of the proposal for adding a 5<sup>th</sup> C on communities, prepared by New Zealand.
2340. The Delegation of **Japan** commended the World Heritage Centre for the work done and welcomed the proposal by New Zealand. It considered that it was not a good idea to establish a definition but rather to encourage interaction between the different Cs in a dynamic way. The establishment of a working group would be an option.
2341. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its dedication to the 4C's as an important framework. It expressed regret over the lack of reference to the Periodic Reporting mechanism as a way of evaluating the 4Cs. It further commented that it was not convinced by the idea of a working group, as the result of the evaluation of the Periodic Reporting was awaited.
2342. La délégation du **Bénin** accueille favorablement le 5e C, car en Afrique, il n'y a pas de valorisation de la communauté. Le délégué insiste sur l'implication à tous les niveaux des communautés. Le 5e C est couvert avec les autres conventions de 2003 et de 2005. L'adhésion va renforcer la contribution sur le plan conceptuel ce qui très important.
2343. The Delegation of **India** congratulated the Delegation of New Zealand and welcomed the integration of the communities. It said that a working group could be established at a later stage. It further stated that on item (d) the wording concerning twinning was tricky.
2344. The Delegation of **Kenya** recalled past Decisions of the Committee and concerning item 4, it noted that Africa was lagging behind in the implementation of the Global Strategy. The Delegation reminded the Committee that sites on the Danger List required special attention and capacity building was needed, and explained that many institutions in Africa were involved in twinning. It welcomed the addition of communities, as they, very importantly, interact with World Heritage.
2345. La délégation du **Cuba** estime que le terme des communautés est très important, et félicite la Nouvelle-Zélande pour l'initiative et la soutient absolument.
2346. The representative of **ICCROM** emphasized that capacity building drives the improvement of the other "Cs" and a lot of activities were underway; however there may have been a lack of awareness raising. The sub-regional programmes had been very active in the Periodic Reporting and it furthermore voiced its support for the 5<sup>th</sup> C of communities.
2347. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** noted that concerning the twinning issue, the word institutionalize should be replaced with "promote".
2348. The **Chairperson** then referred to the Decision, pages 11 and 12 and the Delegation of India asked the Committee to add communities to paragraph 5 and to remove the reference to a working group from paragraph 6.
2349. The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee to keep item 13A open and turned to 13B.

2350. The Delegation of **New Zealand** presented the document 13B and underscored that communities were one more element in making the *Convention* sparkle. It was understood that the notion included local communities and indigenous people. This was based on a broad consensus in the Pacific and New Zealand specifically. The document was based on a large number of reference documents from other organizations and institutions ranging from the Earth Summit of 1992 to the Johannesburg World Summit 2002, and from the Ramsar Convention to the MAB programme. The Delegation pointed out that all of these instruments recognize communities and groups, and also have the collective knowledge necessary to make conservation a success in the long-term. It additionally referred to the high number of state of conservation reports related to community issues and that in light of this, the Draft was proposed for consideration.
2351. The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee to turn to the decision on page 7 of document 13B.
2352. On thanking New Zealand, the **Rapporteur** noted an amendment by Benin with an addition to paragraph 5.
2353. La délégation du **Bénin** insiste sur sa rédaction proposée, ‘accueillir favorablement’ ne veut pas dire ‘remercier’. Il faut reconnaître la contribution en tant que contribution spécifique
2354. The Delegation of **India** proposed to amend it to “warmly welcome ... and thanks...”.
2355. La délégation du **Bénin** n’est pas d’accord avec la proposition du délégué de l’Inde, car l’importance d’ajouter un 5e C mérite un paragraphe à part
2356. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 13B** adopted as amended.
2357. The **Chairperson** then returned to item 13A and moved to the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 4.
2358. The **Rapporteur** noted that community was added to paragraph 5 but that it should read “and adds communities” taking into account Decision 13B.
2359. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested adding a new paragraph “recognising communities and therefore...”, and the Delegation of **Israel** expressed its wish to add to this “continue the efforts with communities”.
2360. The **Rapporteur** summarized the new paragraph 5 of draft decision 31 COM 13A, where “communities” was added as the 5th C; he then read a new paragraph which included the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Netherlands as to consider the establishment at the 32nd session of the Committee of a working group to study the implementation of the strategic objectives. He then read new paragraph 6 which should read: “Establish a working group after the examination of the implementation of the strategic objectives for examination by the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2008.”
2361. The Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 13A** adopted as amended.

## **ITEM 16: WORKING METHODS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE**

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/16  
 WHC-07/31.COM/16ADD  
 WHC-07/31.COM/INF.16

*Decisions:* **31 COM 16A**  
**31 COM 16B**

2362. The **Chairperson** opened item 16 and referred to the relevant working and information documents.
2363. The **World Heritage Centre** made a brief presentation of the documents and informed the Committee that a number of changes to the *Operational Guidelines* needed to be taken into account. This also included results of future meetings such as that on buffer zones proposed by Switzerland and Israel.
2364. The **Chairperson** drew the Committee's attention to page 4 of the Draft Decision.
2365. The Delegation of **Norway** suggested that any inconsistency be checked by the Chairperson prior to publication of the *Guidelines* and gave a text to the Rapporteur.
2366. The Delegation of **India** noted that it had difficulties with the adoption of the whole of paragraph 9 at the present time and that what was suggested by the World Heritage Centre was not reflected in the Draft Decision.
2367. La délégation du Bénin demande un point d'ordre sur le fait que le projet de décision ne devrait être discuté que lorsque tous les éléments auront été discutés préalablement.
2368. The **Chairperson** noted that there were 3 different themes and only one Decision, which the Delegate of India confirmed.
2369. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** reprend donc la présentation concernant la division des responsabilités entre l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties et le Comité, en précisant que les *Orientations pour la mise en oeuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial* ne rentrent pas suffisamment dans le détail à ce sujet. Il a souligné le fait qu'une nouvelle règle avait déjà été évoquée pour prévoir l'abstention de proposition d'inscription de la part des nouveaux membres élus au Comité lorsqu'ils siègent.
2370. The Delegation of **India** expressed that it had no difficulties with the Draft Decision.
2371. The Delegation of **Israel** quoted that "Britannia rules the waves and the Committee waived the rules" underlining that the World Heritage Centre needed at least 3-4 months and that the *Operational Guidelines* could not enter into force immediately.
2372. The Delegation of **Canada** agreed with Norway and expressed concerns about varying versions of the *Operational Guidelines*. It said that a good distribution of the revised *Operational Guidelines* and effective awareness raising needed to be ensured.
2373. **ICCROM** drew attention to paragraphs 13 and 14 and stated that it also had a code of ethics as it was an Intergovernmental Organization with standards of conduct on international civil service.
2374. The **Chairperson** referred to page 4 of item 16 and the Rapporteur informed the Committee that the last part of paragraph 3 had been deleted (starting from "updating") and that Norway had submitted a new paragraph 4. With these amendments paragraphs 3 and 4 were adopted.
2375. The Delegation of **Canada** along with **Norway** requested clarification and the Rapporteur read out the paragraph "Requests the Chairperson to ensure consistency..." which the Delegation of India wished to change to "In order to ensure consistency, seek the guidance of...".
2376. The Delegation of **Israel** referred to the question by Canada concerning the regular update and suggested 1 October every year which was taken up by the Rapporteur.
2377. The Delegation of **Canada** noted that 1 January every year would be better, and this was subsequently adopted.

2378. The **Rapporteur** read the proposal and included reference to paragraph 9 of the working document on page 2 to include 9a, b, c and d from the text into the Decision and the Delegation of Israel inquired why e and f were not included.
2379. The Delegation of **India** noted that it was already sufficient and that the General Assembly's role should not be diminished.
2380. The **Rapporteur** read the amendments including the earlier proposal from Norway and Israel for the agenda and asked whether the reporting on Global Strategy and state of conservation should be included.
2381. La délégation du **Bénin** s'est demandée s'il était vraiment approprié d'inclure le point f: mise en oeuvre des résolutions de l'Assemblée générale, parmi les sujets sur lesquels le Comité pouvait souhaiter formuler des recommandations. La délégation était de l'avis que ce point était assez évident et ne méritait pas de directives.
2382. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** précise que cet exercice vise à proposer des points de discussion et non à formaliser l'ordre du jour de l'Assemblée générale.
2383. The Delegation of **India** specified that it had understood and suggested that paragraph 5 needed to take the strategic themes into account .
2384. The **Rapporteur** read the amendments with a, b, c, d and f of paragraph 9.
2385. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 16A** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 16B: TRAINING PROGRAMME ON OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE FOR NEW COMMITTEE MEMBERS, COMPLETE WITH A FULLY COSTED BUDGET**

2386. **ICCROM** introduced the proposed training on Outstanding Universal Value and procedures for new Committee members and explained that it would take place for one day before the next session of the Committee and that the only funding required was for the use of the venue.
2387. The Delegation of **Kenya** welcomed this attempt but noted that the agenda was too loaded. It also suggested that the term "introduction" or "orientation" would be better than training.
2388. The Delegation of **Canada** strongly supported the proposal as a useful tool and noted that it should also be open to heads of Delegations and should be reduced to the basic needs of the Committee.
2389. The Delegation of **Israel** supported this and suggested that it could be for both Delegates and experts underlining that each Delegation should consist of natural and cultural heritage experts as required in the *Operational Guidelines*.
2390. The Delegation of the **United States of America** said that it had provided an amendment referring to paragraph 3 to include the Chairperson and the Advisory Bodies.
2391. The **Rapporteur** read paragraphs 4 "Recognizing the benefits for collegiality, invites the current members of the Committee..."
2392. The Delegation of **Lithuania** wondered about the timing and noted that some countries were only represented by diplomats, in particular during the General Assembly, and not by experts as required.
2393. **ICCROM** agreed on "Orientation session" as suggested and was happy to work with the Committee towards a lighter agenda and the Rapporteur noted that this would take place prior to the 32<sup>nd</sup> session.



2394. La délégation de la **Tunisie** a salué cette initiative et remercié le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Elle était de l'avis d'inclure une discussion approfondie sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle qui est un concept sur lequel les avis sont partagés et pour lequel il faut mettre en place des critères très précis. Cette question est obscure et il est difficile de préciser quels sont les sites qui ont une valeur universelle exceptionnelle.
2395. The **Rapporteur** noted the USD 8,000 foreseen for this purpose; the changes in paragraph 3 and the new paragraph 4 proposed by the United States of America.
2396. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 16B** adopted as amended.

#### ITEM 17: REFLECTION ON THE ELECTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

*Documents:* WHC-07/31.COM/17  
WHC-07/31.COM/INF.17

*Decision:* **31 COM 17**

2397. The **Chairperson** opened the item and noted that it could be a difficult debate and that 6 options were presented, in particular, (a) to keep the current system with improvements such as electronic voting or (b) move to a new system with groups. He also mentioned the possibility of a working group.
2398. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** introduced the document and apologized that the document had only been available on 15 June, later than the deadline due to reasons beyond the control of the Centre. He also noted that only 19 responses had been received, which amounted to only 10% of the States Parties.
2399. The Delegation of **Norway** noted that this was an item of broader interest and not an easy question. It voiced its support for equitable distribution and for simplification of the procedures. It noted its support for options A.2 and B.2.2.
2400. The Delegation of **India** commented that it was a complicated subject and agreed with Norway. It referred to the current representation of groups in the Committee and that Africa should have 5 seats and the Arab Group 2. It suggested that comparisons with the 2003 and 2005 *Conventions* and the new systems in place there may help.
2401. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** also referred to equitable distribution indicated in article 8 of the *Convention* but noted that it had had no time to review this document carefully as it had been distributed too late. The 19 responses received, of which only 3 opted for a change, was too little to base the discussions on. It therefore welcomed a working party as the best way forward.
2402. The **Chairperson** explained that the composition of the working group had not yet been decided on and asked the Delegates to follow the discussion attentively so as to be able to compile the main points to guide further discussions.
2403. The Delegation of **Cuba** expressed the importance of looking at this item seriously. It also noted that the question of an equitable distribution and voting system was necessary to be debated in this session.
2404. The Delegation of **Japan** stated that in order to provide efficiency in the process and to enhance cultural diversity, its Delegation was in favor of options A.2 and B.2.2.
2405. The Delegation of **Lithuania** confirmed that all the Members of the Committee were tired and underlined that the most important element for the functioning of this Committee was its professionalism, which is why regional electoral groups would not be the best option. It also stressed that its group was the least represented. It noted

that a real rotation system worked at this Committee, since the Members were kindly invited to reduce their mandate to 4 years, and that the system had a lot of advantages. The Delegation requested a cautious approach in this case. It further noted that the current system could be improved but should not yet be replaced. The essential matter, it stated, was to ensure that the Committee carefully select the best experts.

2406. The **Chairperson** read the List of speakers and added the Observer's countries. He requested the Delegates to limit their intervention to two minutes.
2407. The Delegation of **Kenya** explained that the current system worked as described in page 3 of the document. It supported the statement of Lithuania, taking into account that only 19 countries had answered. The first option would guarantee a good representation but since there were insufficient arguments to be able to choose between one of the two proposals, he stated that time was needed for a more in-depth discussion on this item in Canada.
2408. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** proposed a working group for consensus.
2409. The Delegation of **Israel** expressed that the time was short for consultation. It supported the statements from Lithuania and Kenya and also requested a cautious reflection. It furthermore expressed its support for the need to select the best skilled experts on World Heritage.
2410. The Delegation of the **United States of America** was concerned by the fact that only 19 countries were in favor of changing the current system and expressed astonishment at having to discuss this issue so rapidly. The composition of the Committee should assure a world presence, it continued, and the regional group perspective could erode that dimension. The Delegation considered that the essential issue was to receive the support and the advice of all the regions of the world and since the document had not been received in due time, it was not possible for the Delegation to fix a position on that matter.
2411. The Delegation of **Spain** shared the observations made by the previous speakers. It wished to make two important comments regarding the item. First, that the item being discussed could have a serious consequence for the *Convention* and it was therefore important to give time to States Parties to read the document and to allow them sufficient time to comment on it before taking any decision. Second, it suggested that the working group proposed takes it into consideration as it was extremely crucial to consult all the State parties represented in the Committee.
2412. La délégation du **Bénin** rappelle que cette discussion n'est pas nouvelle au Comité. Pour elle, le système de répartition actuel est injuste et non représentatif. Elle rappelle qu'il y a actuellement une surreprésentation de certaines régions et qu'en toute honnêteté les membres du Comité devraient le reconnaître. Elle signale que l'objectif du débat est d'avoir un Comité représentatif de tous les groupes régionaux car il faut l'égal respect de toutes les cultures du monde et cela conformément à la Convention. Elle partage également l'avis selon lequel la réflexion doit se poursuivre avant que toute décision soit prise.
2413. The Delegation of **Canada** supported the intervention of Spain. It underlined the need to maintain international co-operation and the professionalism of the members of the Committee, who should be skilled in conservation on natural and cultural heritage, as a way of assuring that the items are discussed technically and not politically. It expressed surprise by the low number of answers received. The Delegation recommended the Committee exercise caution and the creation of a working group. The current system, it stated, is not perfect but the advantages and disadvantages of all the scenarios should be reflected upon in a deep way.

2414. La délégation de la **Tunisie** considère qu'il est important de respecter la représentation. Elle considère également que les 19 Etats parties qui ont répondu ne constituent pas un échantillon suffisant qui reflèterait le point de vue de tous les Etats parties. Elle est d'accord pour laisser du temps à la réflexion et souhaite que celle-ci avance pas-à-pas. Pour elle également, un groupe de travail serait bienvenu dans ce contexte.
2415. The Delegation of **Chile** recalled that all members of the Committee share the same interest in analyzing the values of properties. It considered that the idea of having a working group, which was put forward by Lithuania, Canada and the Netherlands was an excellent proposal.
2416. The Delegation of **Peru** stated that the subject being discussed was not an easy one and therefore needed a thorough thinking through. It disagreed with the choice to apply percentages because this would lead to situation whereby there would be a winner and a loser. It considered that doing so would definitely not help the Committee to efficiently deal with the matter. It also supported the proposal for a working group.
2417. The Observer Delegation of **Italy** complained about the delay in sending the document. It supported Canada and declared that Italy was not in favor of a system that could render the work of the Committee more political. Any Decision which ensured and improved the functioning of the Committee should be found, it stated.
2418. The Observer Delegation of **Greece** expressed deep concern and wondered why the World Heritage Centre had submitted a document which only reflected 1.5% of the Committee's opinions. It thanked the mature and wise comments formulated by the members of the Committee since this was a matter that couldn't be discussed in black or white as it had a lot of dimensions. It further commented that it required time for a working group to study and reflect in detail all the scenarios in the following months and to submit a proposal at the Committee's next plenary session.
2419. La délégation de la **Belgique** (observateur) souhaite appuyer les interventions faites par la Lituanie, le Canada et le Chili. Elle souhaite rappeler que le Comité n'est pas un organe politique, mais plutôt technique. Elle affirme en outre que les pays occidentaux partagent l'avis exprimé par le Bénin. Pour elle, l'amélioration du système actuel ne peut passer que par un renforcement des activités extrabudgétaires. Elle propose que les pays qui ont déjà des biens sur la Liste s'imposent un moratoire et s'abstiennent de ne pas présenter de nouvelles propositions.
2420. The Observer Delegation of **Brazil** informed the Committee that it had submitted its candidature to become a member of the Committee acknowledging how difficult both the process and the task to be undertaken are. The Representative suggested that the main issues to be discussed were related to the role and task of the Advisory Bodies, the relationship with other UNESCO Conventions and agreed with the Decision to continue the discussion on the typology of the electoral groups at the session of the General Assembly.
2421. The Observer Delegation of **Australia** expressed appreciation for the debate and underlined the need to keep the best experts involved and to improve the skills of the Members of the Committee as a way to apply the Outstanding Universal Value to all the working methods of the Committee. It stated that it was not possible to fix an opinion without the advice of experts. It also underlined the need to carefully study the task given to the members of the Committee.
2422. La délégation de l'**Algérie** (observateur) considère elle aussi que le système actuel est complexe et n'est pas satisfaisant. Tout comme l'Inde et le Bénin, elle considère qu'une représentation équitable est plus que nécessaire mais que cela ne signifie pas la création d'une scission. Elle rappelle l'esprit de l'article 8 de la Convention et souhaite qu'un équilibre soit trouvé entre le besoin d'une représentation équitable et le souci de garantir l'esprit de travail technique du Comité.

2423. The **Chairperson** concluded the debate and presented several scenarios:
- It was necessary to analyze the scenarios in a deeper way - it was time to stop and reflect;
  - In the case of the Committee not taking any Decision, the World Heritage Centre should prepare an information document, without the inclusion of any opinion;
  - Other members expressed concern because the current representation of the Committee didn't assure a geographically equitable distribution;
  - Some members mentioned the need to avoid regional representation since the scope of the *Convention* should be universal;
  - The need to reflect on other electoral systems which are less time-consuming and less complicated;
  - The importance of a guaranteed rotation within the Committee;
  - The need to guarantee the expertise and skills of the Members of the Committee.
2424. After reading all the above mentioned points the **Chairperson** requested the Committee's opinion on the following issues:
- Whether this item of the Agenda should be set aside, and in this case the Committee would not emit any opinion;
  - Whether a working group could be set up to determine the main issues to help the work of the World Heritage Centre before the next General Assembly Session (he suggested that it is the responsibility of the General Assembly to establish another working group in case more time is needed);
  - Whether it would be possible to prepare a Draft Decision on principles by the Monday 2 July, without expressing any comment on the type of groups' distribution.
2425. The Delegation of **Netherlands** considered that the reflection couldn't be finalized by Monday 2 July. The timeframe was insufficient to allow State Party consultations. It could be appropriate to prepare a Draft Decision based on the conclusions provided by the Chair and thereby set up a working group to prepare a Draft Decision for the next Committee session.
2426. The Delegation of **Kenya** supported the comments of the Netherlands and presented an amendment text which underlined the need to submit a Draft Decision to the Committee in Canada.
2427. The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee Members that the General Assembly had requested that this point be debated in the next General Assembly session, in October 2007.
2428. The Delegation of **India** thanked the Chairperson for his appropriate proposal and suggested that he should write a Draft Decision with a preamble to explain the way in which the Committee has decided to proceed. It asked if the working group should be opened or not. It further requested that the Delegate of Kenya submit the proposal in written form either at that time or on Monday.
2429. The **Chairperson** proposed to work on this item on Monday morning.
2430. La délégation de la **Tunisie** soutient le point de vue exprimé par les Pays-Bas, l'Inde et le Bénin. Elle insiste une nouvelle fois sur l'importance de poursuivre la réflexion.
2431. The **Chairperson** requested the advice of the Legal Adviser.
2432. The **Legal Adviser** after having listened to the views of some members of the Committee stated that the Committee was not yet ready to make a Decision on the matter and that it should continue its discussion at the 32nd session in 2008. The

Legal Advisor explained to the Committee that the matter concerning the election of the members of the Committee falls under the responsibility and the prerogative of the General Assembly. In this context, the Advisor reminded the Committee of the resolution of the General Assembly of States Parties taken at its 16<sup>th</sup> session (2005), whereby it decided to discuss possible alternatives to the present election system at its 17<sup>th</sup> session (2007), and requested the World Heritage Centre to propose to it less time-consuming and less complicated election mechanisms at that session, which would also ensure balanced geographical and cultural representation in the Committee. She further stated that, although the Committee may adopt a Decision to continue its reflection at its 32<sup>nd</sup> session in 2008, the General Assembly meeting in the fall of 2007 might, and was within its power to, make its own Decision on this issue and amend its *Rules of Procedure* concerning the method of election.

2433. The **Chairperson** asked the Legal Adviser to re-read the General Assembly Decision and stated that the new Chairperson could collaborate with the World Heritage Centre in the process with an opened working group. He further proposed to prepare a draft mandate for the working group by Monday and opened the floor again for opinions.
2434. The Delegation of **Israel** explained that according to the debate there were two parallel situations; one was the work of the Committee and the other the work of the General Assembly. These two projects should be connected in some way and he suggested to organize a one-day meeting before the General Assembly meeting in Paris to submit a Draft Decision to the General Assembly, since it was not possible to fix a position with the *document WHC-/31.COM/17*.
2435. The Delegation of **India**, after listening to the opinion of the Legal Adviser, stated that it was not difficult to follow the suggestion of the Chairperson and therefore send a document to the General Assembly without formulating any opinion. It requested a wide system of consultation since some complaints had been received from a few colleagues against the holding of all the meetings at the Headquarters of UNESCO.
2436. The Delegation of the **United States of America** stated that the Chairperson should start a process of discussion, saying that a document with a related Decision was not needed. It suggested preparing an information document for the General Assembly. The presence of technical experts should be required. It proposed informing the Chairperson that a more substantial reflection is necessary and that according to further discussion, a document would be submitted at the next working session of the Committee.
2437. La délégation du **Bénin** note que la proposition des Pays-Bas y compris celle faite par les Etats-Unis permettrait de trouver une voie de sortie idéale du débat. Elle considère que la proposition du Président, de former un groupe de travail jusqu'à lundi, ne sera pas efficace. Par contre, elle propose que le Président résume les débats menés, ce qui permettra de montrer que le Comité n'est pas encore prêt pour une solution qui satisfait tous les groupes régionaux. Pour elle, c'est au Président de transcrire les résultats du débat de cette session, dans un rapport qui fera ressortir les principales réflexions. Elle considère son résumé verbal très satisfaisant.
2438. The **Chairperson** concluded the debate with the following remarks:
- The Chairperson would prepare a summing up of the debate to be submitted to the Committee on Monday;
  - The Committee would discuss the proposal. The updated proposal could be submitted to the General Assembly, perhaps requesting more time. The Draft Document could be submitted to the Committee in Canada.

2439. The **Chairperson** asked if this conclusion would be acceptable to the members of the Committee.
2440. The Delegation of **Israel** agreed but suggested including that only the 9% of the countries answered.
2441. The Delegation of **India** stated that the World Heritage Committee could only make recommendations to the General Assembly.
2442. The Delegation of **Netherlands** agreed with India and suggested the word “recommenden [...]”.
2443. The **Chairperson** confirmed that the correct wording was “recommends...” and stated that the working group would be no longer needed.

**ITEM 7B: STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES  
(continued)**

**Document:** WHC-07/31.COM/7B

**Decision:** 31 COM 7B.2

**Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 39)**

2444. The **Rapporteur** read the amendment proposed by India.
2445. The Delegation of **India** withdrew the amendment.
2446. The **Rapporteur** read the amendment proposed by the Netherlands related to the format for the World Heritage sites in Danger.
2447. Noting consensus, the **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B 2** adopted as amended.

**ITEM 6: SIXTEENTH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES (UNESCO OCTOBER 2007) (continued)**

**Document:** WHC-07/31.COM/6

**Decision:** 31 COM 6

2448. The **Chairperson** started the discussion on the Provisional Agenda of the General Assembly of the States Parties. The Chairperson asked whether there were any suggestions by members to include additional items for discussion.
2449. The Delegation of **Israel** introduced some remarks but mistook the document and referred to the Provisional Agenda of the next Committee Session.
2450. The **Chairperson** thanked him for his intervention but invited him to make the suggestion when the related Item was to be discussed.
2451. La délégation du **Maroc** suggère que soient rajoutés une discussion sur la répartition des sièges, et un bilan des activités des organisations consultatives inspirée de l'article 13 de la Convention. Quant aux divers, elle suggère d'inclure un document d'examen des plans de gestion et de conservation concernant la région arabe. Elle informe le Comité de l'organisation d'une réunion régionale sur cette question pour les pays arabes.
2452. The **Chairperson** requested any further suggestions.
2453. The Delegation of **India** requested the inclusion of the reflection on the election of the members of the World Heritage Committee as an Item of the Agenda.
2454. La délégation du **Maroc** précise que le point 3 de l'agenda n'est pas la suite de la réflexion qui a été demandée.
2455. The Delegation of **India** requested the Legal Adviser to re-read the title of the Decision.
2456. The **Chairperson** stated that the Draft Decision was not ready and started the discussion on the Item 23 on the Provisional Agenda of the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (June-July 2008), and gave the floor to Israel in order to repeat its comments.

**ITEM 23: PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 32ND SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (JUNE-July 2008)**

*Document:* WHC-07/31.COM/23

*Decision:* **31 COM 23A**



2457. The Delegation of **Israel** suggested that the points 7 and 8 could raise an overview of the main conservation concerns discussed over the last years. He suggested compiling some state of conservation reports by subject, such as rock art and urban planning to provide a deeper and coherent discussion during the session. He suggested to include in the Global Strategy item a special discussion on the state of progress of all the transnational/serial nominations and recommended including one additional day to discuss these issues. Other important issues were related to the management plans and buffer zones.
2458. The Delegation of **India** requested that the Director of the World Heritage Centre update the agenda to be discussed on Monday.
2459. The **Chairperson** thanked all the members of the Committee and gave the floor to Mr Tumu Te Heu Heu, Chairperson of the 31st session. He thanked him for his commitment and the work behind the scenes in achieving consensus on difficult issues. He expressed his thanks for the opportunity to head the Committee. He stated that despite a very complex agenda, the Members had successfully fulfilled the task.
2460. **Mr Tumu Te Heu Heu** thanked the Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid (Norway), for his leadership over the last 8 working days and began the debate on the elections of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (June-July 2008). In relation to the election of the President, he gave the floor to Lithuania.
2461. The Delegation of **Lithuania** presented the professional profile of Dr Christina Cameron as a well-known expert on the *Convention*, former Director-General of the National Historic Sites in Canada, lecturer and researcher on World Heritage theory and practice, and as having a deep knowledge of management of cultural landscapes in the framework of the *World Heritage Convention*.
2462. La délégation du **Bénin** en sa qualité de membre du Bureau pour le groupe Afrique remercie les membres du Comité pour le travail effectué ensemble et les assure qu'elle poursuivra ses contributions au Comité même en tant qu'observateur. Elle informe le Comité de la proposition du Groupe Afrique de voir le Kenya remplacer le Bénin dans le Bureau. Elle propose également le Dr. George Abungu de la délégation du Kenya comme l'un des Vice-présidents. Elle décrit le parcours professionnel du Dr Abungu dont l'investissement a permis aujourd'hui de faire avancer l'approche de la conservation du patrimoine en Afrique.
2463. The **Chairperson** gave the warmest congratulations to the new Chairperson, Kiu roa for her election to a second mandate as Chairperson of the Committee. He suggested that the Committee suspend the election of the Rapporteur since a significant number of the Committee members would be finishing their mandates on the Committee at the end of this session and suggested to proceed to the election of the Rapporteur following the next General Assembly meeting in Paris. He requested the opinion of the Committee and invited the Delegates to take the floor and to present candidatures for the Bureau.
2464. The Delegation of **Japan** submitted the candidature of the Republic of Korea.
2465. The Delegation of **Norway** submitted the candidature of Israel.
2466. The Delegation of **Chile**, on behalf of the Latin America group, proposed Peru as a member of the Bureau.
2467. The Delegation of **India** noted that there was no member for the Group 2 and raised the necessity to ensure the geographical balance in the composition of the Bureau of the Committee and requested the advice of the Legal Adviser.

2468. The **Legal Adviser** confirmed that Rule 13.3 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the Committee requires that the Committee, in electing its Bureau, is required to ensure “an equitable representation of the different regions and cultures of the world”.
2469. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre**, however, recalled that there was no geographical grouping in the Committee and therefore the Committee did not, in practice, elect the members of the Bureau from the electoral groups established within UNESCO.
2470. The Delegation of **Lithuania** requested the possibility to have another representative of Group 2 in the room.
2471. The Delegation of **India** requested that the cultures represented by the Group number 2 should be in the Bureau.
2472. The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the newly elected Chairperson of the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee, Dr. Christina Cameron.
2473. **Dr Christina Cameron** thanked for the trust of the Committee and congratulated the Chairperson for his leadership of the session. She stated that the Canadian team was ready to do its best to prepare the next Committee session according to the high standards established and the lessons learned from her immediate predecessors Ina Marciulonyte, Ole Briseid and Tumu te Heuheu. She stated that she was afraid that the Agenda in Canada could be even more complicated. She then invited the Members of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the representatives of UNESCO to Quebec, 2-10 July 2008, and explained that the Committee session would coincide with the 400th anniversary of the city and recommended that delegates booking their hotel rooms as soon as the relevant information was provided by Canadian organizers. Finally, she invited the meeting to watch a video prepared to present the 32nd Session of the World Heritage Committee.
2474. The **Legal Adviser** then took the floor following the general agreement of the Committee to suspend a part of Rule 13.1 of the *Rules of Procedure* and not elect a Rapporteur for the 32nd session. She explained that since the Committee had agreed to elect a Rapporteur immediately after the election of new members of the Committee at the 17<sup>th</sup> session of the General Assembly of States Parties (2007) and before the next ordinary session of the Committee, the Committee would need to convene an Extraordinary session for that purpose. Given that an Extraordinary session could be convened only at the request of at least two-thirds of the members of the Committee, she advised that the Committee adopt a Decision to that effect at this current session.
2475. The **Chairperson** explained that a special gift had been prepared by the People of Tonga which conveyed a special symbolic meaning since this was the representation of all the people of the Pacific. He invited the Chorus (including the World Heritage Centre) to sing a traditional *waiata* (Maori song) called “Maranga”, which evoked the rising and uplifting of the spirit of the meeting in view of its transmission to the future.
2476. The **Rapporteur** recalled that the Extraordinary session of the Committee for the elections of the Rapporteur would take place immediately after the General Assembly session.

**EIGHTH DAY MONDAY 2 JULY 2007**

**TWENTYFIFTH MEETING**

**03.00 p.m – 04.00 p.m**

**Chairperson: Mr Tumu te HeuHeu**

**ITEM 24: ADOPTION OF DECISIONS**

*Document: WHC-07/31.COM/24*

2477. The **Chairperson** opened agenda Item 24 in welcoming all Delegates after a day of rest to formally adopt the Decisions taken and congratulated the Rapporteur and the World Heritage Centre with the work undertaken on document WHC-07/31.COM/24, which consisted of 3 sections. He then asked the Rapporteur to briefly explain.
2478. The **Rapporteur** explained that 2 parts of the Draft Report *WHC-07/31.COM/24* had been produced and distributed, and that part 3 was now being photocopied. He noted that it had been a huge working effort throughout the night and he thanked the World Heritage Centre for its cooperation. He continued explaining the integration of all amendments, the issues of interpretation, translation and concordance checking, and he thanked the members of the World Heritage Centre responsible for translation for their work. Then he proceeded with reading out a statement concerning the preparation of Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for sites which were discussed by the Committee, but changed during the process, to be used by the Committee in its decisions, which should read “Requests the State Party in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft Statement of Outstanding Universal Value including the conditions of integrity and authenticity, for examination by the Committee and also requests the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to develop a draft statement of desired state of conservation for the property based on its Outstanding Universal Value”.
2479. The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur and turned to Part 1 of the Draft Report asking the Committee for reasons of efficiency to identify factual or typographic errors upfront, and the points raised would then be noted by the Rapporteur.
2480. La délégation de **Maurice** suggère que, dans le paragraphe 3 de la **décision 31 COM 5.1**, l’expression « mais aussi » soit remplacée par « et en outre ».
2481. The **Rapporteur** explained that he would speak to Mauritius about Decision 5.1 paragraph 3.
2482. The Delegation of **Canada** noted Decision **31 COM 7A.3** paragraph 14 and requested the Committee adopt “the principles” in order to leave some flexibility as regards further fine-tuning of this issue.
2483. The Delegation of **India** invited the Committee to note the Decision **31 COM 7A.27** on Dresden, paragraphs 6 and 7, where no mention had been made as regards the need to retain the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger, which should be inserted. The **Rapporteur** agreed and mentioned using the standard text for that. After this intervention, the Delegate of **India** proposed to verify this for the Decision on the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary as well (covered in Part 2 of the Draft Report).
2484. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted Decision **31 COM 7A.30** on Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru), page 38, where a reference to the site’s Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, its authenticity and integrity needed to be inserted; as well as Decision **31 COM 7A.10** on Air and Tenere Natural Reserves (Niger), page 18, paragraph 9, where “maintain” should be replaced by “retain”; and Decision **31 COM 7A.26** on The Walled City of Baku, where the need for a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should also be inserted .
2485. **ICOMOS** noted Decision **31 COM 7A.22** on Bam and its Cultural Landscape (Islamic Republic of Iran), paragraphs 4b and 5b, where mention should be made of the need

for adequate protection as discussed. This was confirmed by the World Heritage Centre, mentioning that 'legal protection' was the appropriate term as proposed by Canada.

2486. La délégation de **Tunisie** attire l'attention du Comité sur une erreur située dans le paragraphe 5 de la **décision 31 COM 7B.13**, demandant un rapport à l'Etat partie avant le 1er février 2008 alors que le projet de décision indiquait la date de 2009.
2487. La délégation du **Maroc** signale que dans la **décision 31 COM 5.2**, au paragraphe 5, il y a une différence entre les versions anglaise et française, cette dernière indiquant « exceptionnel et précis » alors que l'anglais utilise le terme « spécifique ».
2488. **IUCN** noted the Decision on Ichkeul and recalled that reports were needed for sites that have been taken off the List of World Heritage in Danger (Part 2 of Draft Report).
2489. The Delegation of **India** asked the Rapporteur whether the intervention by Tunisia was not referring to Part 2 of the Draft Report, while commenting that the intervention by IUCN, although in Part 2, was indeed correct.
2490. La délégation de **Tunisie** revient sur sa demande de changer la date indiquée dans le paragraphe 5 de la **décision 31 COM 7B.13**.
2491. The Delegation of **Kenya** asked to first finalize Part 1 of the Draft Report, before turning to Part 2. The Delegations of India and Canada agreed with the proposal, assuming, no further changes were proposed.
2492. The **Chairperson** on receiving no objections, adopted Part 1 of the Report and turned to Part 2 asking the Committee to indicate number of Decision and page for interventions, which would then be dealt with subsequently.

The Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid (Norway) took the chair.

2493. The Delegation of **Japan** indicated: Decision 7B.11 on page 12 – The Delegation of **Norway** indicated: Decision 7B.95 on page 78 – The Delegation of **Canada** indicated: 7B.89 on page 73 and 7B.94 on page 78 – The Delegation of **India** indicated: 7B.16 on page 16 – The **World Heritage Centre** indicated: 7B.13 on page 14, which had not been closed yet. The **Chairperson** proceeded with taking them one by one following the order 11, 13, 16, 89, 94 and 95.
2494. La délégation de **Tunisie** revient sur le paragraphe 5 du projet de décision indiquant 2009 pour la remise du rapport.
2495. The Delegation of **Japan** noted Decision **31 COM 7B.11** on the Arabian Oryx Sanctuary (Oman) and asked about the reference to "the duty of the international community" in paragraph 3, to which the Rapporteur explained that this was meant to recall the obligation of the international community under the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, but that it was a syntax-issue that needed some reworking.
2496. The **Chairperson** proposed that this would be done by the Rapporteur, to which Japan agreed.
2497. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.11** adopted as amended.
2498. The **Chairperson** turned to Decision **31 COM 7B.13**.
2499. La délégation de **Tunisie** réitère la question de la date du rapport pour le Parc de l'Ichkeul en indiquant qu'elle n'a pas le souvenir d'une discussion à ce sujet.
2500. The **Rapporteur** explained that the records of the Committee's discussion showed that a change had been made from 2009 to 2008, which had been proposed by India and IUCN, which was confirmed by the Delegation of Lithuania, who mentioned that it had proposed this change.

2501. La délégation de **Tunisie** s'interroge de savoir pourquoi certaines décisions demandent un rapport en 2009 et d'autres en 2008.
2502. The **Chairperson** stressed once more that the Committee had changed this date according to its discussion, to which the Delegation of Kenya intervened, recalling this discussion and proposed change by Lithuania, and asked whether Tunisia could accept this.
2503. La délégation de **Tunisie** accepte la décision telle que modifiée, demandant le rapport de l'Etat partie avant le 1er février 2008.
2504. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.13** adopted as amended.
2505. The **Chairperson** turned to Decision **31 COM 7B.16** on Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) on page 16.
2506. The Delegation of **India** reminded the Rapporteur that a draft text for changing paragraph 5e had been given and the Rapporteur replied that he had "strengthen... and review and develop the zoning systems", upon which India further remarked that the last part of that paragraph "and to complete..." had to be kept.
2507. The **Rapporteur** thanked India for this clarification and read aloud the changed Decision, to which the Delegation of Japan intervened by recalling this suggested change by India.
2508. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.16** adopted as amended.
2509. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** requested to also review Decision **31 COM 7B.26** on the Volcanoes of Kamchatka (Russian Federation) on page 24 and remarked that the mission that was requested by the Committee was not in the Decision.
2510. The **Rapporteur** thanked the World Heritage Centre for the extra information and explained that at the 30th session (Vilnius, 2006) the Committee had asked for a mission, which it noted had not taken place yet but would occur shortly.
2511. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.26** adopted.
2512. The Delegation of **Canada** noted Decision **31 COM 7B.89** on the Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey), on page 73, and remarked it had suggested to change "visual integrity" in paragraph 6c into "important views to and from the property".
2513. La délégation de **Tunisie** demande à revenir sur la **décision 31COM 7B.44**.
2514. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 7B.89** adopted.
2515. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed minor modifications to paragraph 6 of Decision **31 COM 7B.94** by deleting reference to the Vienna Memorandum. The proposal was also endorsed by the Delegation of Norway.
2516. La Délégation de la **Tunisie** attire l'attention sur la Décision 44, à la page 37 de la version française, où il faudrait harmoniser le texte du paragraphe 3 qui dit : « Note avec satisfaction la proposition de l'Etat partie français d'organiser le Festival de Gavarnie dans un autre lieu et d'envoyer une mission d'experts internationaux pour faire l'évaluation de ce nouveau lieu et de la gestion d'ensemble du bien ». Ce texte n'est pas cohérent avec le suivant, le paragraphe 4 qui dit : « Demande à l'Etat partie français d'inviter une mission Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS/IUCN... »

The meeting was suspended at 04.05 p.m for the Delegates to read through Part III of the Decision Report

The session reopened at 04.30 p.m

2517. The Chairperson reopened the session and continued adoption of Draft Report of Decisions (Part III). He announced that three main steps may be taken to facilitate the process: 1) The Delegates need to immediately point out factual errors contained in Part III; 2) Decisions on agenda items such as 31 COM.17 (Election system), 31 COM 23.A (Draft Agenda of General Assembly) and 31 COM 23.B (Draft agenda of 32nd session of the Committee) would be dealt with at end of the discussion; and 3) once completed, Part III of the Draft Decisions would be adopted as a whole. The Chairperson then invited the Delegations to take the floor.
2518. La Délégation du **Madagascar** demande d'inclure sur la liste la décision 8B.9, à la page 7 de la version française.
2519. The Delegation of the **Republic of Korea** informed the Committee that it would comment on Decision **31 COM 8B.12** paragraph 5.
2520. The Delegation of **Kenya** wished to comment on Decisions **31 COM 8B. 22, 30 COM 8B.29** and **31 COM 8B.33**.
2521. The Delegation of **Canada** wished to comment on Decisions **31 COM 8B.26** on page 25, **31 COM 8B. 35** on page 35, **31 COM 8B.32** and 8B. on page 74.
2522. The Delegation of **New Zealand** wished to comment on Decision **31 COM 19** on page 73.
2523. La Délégation du **Maroc** demande d'inclure sur la liste la décision **31 COM 8B.34**, aux pages 35 et 36 de la version française et aussi la décision **8B.48** à la page 44 de la version française.
2524. The Delegation of **Cuba** wished to comment on Decision **31 COM 8B.51** on page 44.
2525. **ICOMOS** wished to comment on Decision **31 COM 8B.39** on page 37.
2526. The **Chairperson** then invited the Delegations to start their interventions in a sequential order. He then gave the floor to the Delegation Madagascar.
2527. La Délégation du **Madagascar** signale qu'il y a simplement un problème de traduction sur le critère (x) de la décision 8B.9, à la page 7 de la version française. En effet, elle suggère de remplacer « est un des pays les plus « megadivers » par une meilleure formulation pour évoquer l'aspect de la mégadiversité. De la même façon, d'améliorer la traduction du mot « remaining » à la fin du paragraphe.
2528. The **Rapporteur** suggested that the Delegate provide him with corrections in writing.
2529. The Delegation of **Republic of Korea** proposed that in paragraph 5 of Decision **31 COM 8B.12** the name should be changed to **Jeju Island Biosphere Reserve**.
2530. The Delegation of **New Zealand** proposed one minor modification to Decision **31 COM 19**.
2531. The Delegation of **India** noted that there was an information document on the General Assembly but no Agenda was attached.
2532. La Délégation du **Maroc** se demande comment s'assurer que les propositions faites ont bien été intégrées dans cette décision. Elle demande si l'ensemble des décisions seront disponibles bientôt. Elle demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'apporter des éléments sur cette question.
2533. The **World Heritage Centre** clarified that the agenda of General Assembly would be sent out together with an invitation letter.
2534. The Delegation of **India** recalled that during the Committee session in Durban, South Africa, there had been an agenda for the General Assembly in 2005.

2535. The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that the agenda of the General Assembly would be attached to the circular letter to be sent to all States Parties.
2536. La Délégation du **Maroc** rappelle son intervention pour savoir comment s'assurer que les propositions faites ont bien été intégrées dans cette décision car le Centre du patrimoine mondial va commencer à préparer l'Ordre du jour selon les thèmes qui seront abordés. Elle souhaite avoir quelques précisions.
2537. The **Chairperson** suggested that the World Heritage Centre could prepare a provisional agenda of the General Agenda and put it on screen for review by the Committee.
2538. The Delegation of **India** had understood that there was one complete document with the Rapporteur on this subject.
2539. The **Chairperson** then suggested that this item could be further reviewed at a later stage.
2540. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested that, in Decision **31 COM 8B. 22** (page 20), a sentence should be modified as "A buffer zone has been established and proclaimed". Regarding Decision **31 COM 8B. 29**, it pointed out that Decisions regarding all deferred properties needed to be harmonized such as the first sentence of paragraph 2 in this Decision.
2541. The **Chairperson** suggested that the Rapporteur look into this issue and polish the wording as pointed out by the Delegation of Kenya.
2542. The Delegation of **Canada** suggested that a clear procedure on the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be introduced.
2543. The Delegation of **Canada**, referring to Decision 31 COM 8B.26 on page 25, expressed the view that the procedure of crafting a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would be difficult. It continued that paragraph 3 was inconsistent regarding criteria and statement and thus proposed a change to this paragraph.
2544. The **Chairperson** declared Decision 31 COM 8B.26 adopted.
2545. La délégation du **Maroc** signale une erreur qui s'est glissée dans la décision concernant l'intitulé du Ministère. Elle précise qu'il s'agit plutôt du Ministère des Mines et de l'Energie.
2546. The Delegation of **Canada** noticed that the factual error concerning **31 COM 8B.35** on page 35 had already been mentioned in the letter to the State Party. It proposed a change to paragraph 3, as it should read "historic canal regulations" instead of "registration".
2547. La délégation du **Maroc** a été chargée par 15 Etats parties de s'assurer que la déclaration faite a été prise en compte dans le projet de décision. Elle informe le Comité qu'elle possède une copie de cette déclaration afin qu'elle soit annexée aux débats (le texte de cette déclaration est disponible en annexe de ce document).
2548. The Delegation of **Cuba** brought to the Committee's attention that the proposal to include criterion (vi) had in fact been made by the State Party for consideration by the Committee when examining the proposal.
2549. The Delegation of **Kenya** said that the matter had been raised by Israel and Benin.
2550. The **Rapporteur** asked whether this was to seek another criterion, and if so then a new nomination stating the case would be required.
2551. The Delegation of **India** expressed that the case was getting complicated, and proposed to adopt the proposal from the Rapporteur.
2552. The **Chairperson** recalled that the Decision also concerned renomination. It suggested leaving this matter with the State Party.

2553. La délégation du **Bénin** apporte confirmation de l'information selon laquelle le Bénin et Israël avaient bel et bien posé la question à l'Etat partie. Elle précise en outre que celui-ci avait donné une réponse positive et que le Comité n'avait pas eu d'objections particulière.
2554. The **Chairperson** clarified that the Committee was not asking the State Party again, but rather recommending to the State Party.
2555. La délégation du **Bénin** précise une nouvelle fois que l'Etat partie avait déjà répondu à cette question du Président. Elle considère qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de la reposer dans le projet de décision.
2556. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.48** adopted as amended.
2557. The Delegation of **Canada**, referring to the very last paragraph of **31 COM 8B.52**, expressed that the thematic study was already underway.
2558. The **Rapporteur** suggested having a new paragraph 6 recommending the State Party to renominate the property under criteria 6.
2559. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.52** adopted as amended.
2560. **ICOMOS** suggested replacing State Party with State Parties in **31 COM 8B.39** as the property was transboundary.
2561. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 8B.39** adopted as amended.
2562. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to include the statement of significance and statement of Outstanding Universal Value in both **31 COM 8B.73** and **31 COM 8B.74**.
2563. The **Chairperson** declared Decisions **31 COM 8B.73** and **31 COM 8B.74** adopted as amended.
2564. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to review the document *31 COM 19* on page 72.
2565. The Delegation of **New Zealand** noticed that paragraph 8 had been incorporated into paragraph 7 in the previous Draft Decision.
2566. The **Rapporteur** concurred with New Zealand and said that the change had been submitted as a note.
2567. The Delegation of **New Zealand** said that the beginning of paragraph 8 was acceptable.
2568. The **Rapporteur** clarified that the Delegation of New Zealand had asked to replace "considers" with "requests".
2569. The Delegation of the **United States of America** concurred with New Zealand.
2570. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 19** adopted as amended.
2571. The Delegation of **Mauritius** referred to **31 COM 10** on page 60.
2572. The Delegation of **Kuwait** remarked that the Decision was 31 instead of 30.
2573. The **Chairperson** concurred with Kuwait. It invited the Committee to review the document *31 COM 17* on page 70 and commented that there had been a long discussion on the formulation of this Draft Decision. Equitable representation from different cultures of the world in the Committee had been proposed and in addition, a less time consuming voting system was recommended. Professional expertise, both cultural and natural, was envisaged. It was further stressed that the Committee should not establish a working group or consultative body at this stage. This could be done after or on the last day of the General Assembly. He pointed out that the General Assembly would need to decide on this matter rather than the Committee.



2574. The Delegation of **India** proposed to go through the Decision paragraph by paragraph.
2575. The **Chairperson** agreed with India and moved to adopt paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.
2576. The Delegation of **India** referring to paragraph 4 suggested to mention “limited” comments instead of only comments.
2577. The Delegation of **Canada** proposed to have limited “States Parties” instead of limited “comments”.
2578. The Delegation of **India** supported Canada.
2579. The **Rapporteur** read out the Decision as “taking note that 19 out of total number of Parties commented on...”
2580. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested to mention only 19.
2581. The Delegation of **Japan** concurred with Kenya.
2582. The **Chairperson** declared paragraph 4 adopted as amended.
2583. The **Chairperson** invited comments on paragraph 5.
2584. The Delegation of **Japan** suggested that “many States Parties...” could be more accurate.
2585. The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that paragraph 5 would be the new paragraph 9, then read out the revised paragraph.
2586. The **Committee** adopted paragraphs 6 and 7.
2587. The Delegation of **India** remarked that paragraph 8 was not clear, the wording had been ‘tailored’ correctly, and that the impression was wrong. It asked to retain the emphasis on geographical representation in the Committee whilst ensuring professional expertise.
2588. The **Rapporteur** revised the Decision accordingly.
2589. The **Committee** adopted paragraph 9 and the Chairperson declared Decision **31 COM 17** adopted as amended..
2590. The Delegation of **Kenya** referred to paragraph 10.
2591. The Delegation of **Japan** said that the Committee could not make a Decision at that stage, and proposed to discuss the issue after the General Assembly, as the consultative body had not yet been established.
2592. The Delegation of **India** concurred with Japan stating that the current Decision prejudged.
2593. La délégation du **Maroc** intervient pour attirer l’attention sur une petite contradiction qui apparaît dans le paragraphe 8. Elle souhaite savoir le sens de « carrière stable » telle que libellé dans la décision. Elle a le sentiment que le terme « développer » qui est dynamique ne s’accorde pas avec le terme « stable » qui lui est plutôt statique.
2594. The **Chairperson** said that the consultative body could also discuss with other States Parties, besides the Committee. The subsidiary body would only draw members from the Committee; hence it would be better to use “consultative” body.
2595. The Delegation of **India** suggested to use “open ended” consultative body.
2596. The Delegation of **Japan** stressed that the General Assembly could establish a consultative body, and there was no need to prejudge.
2597. The Delegation of **India** clarified that this discussion would be considered by the General Assembly.

2598. The **Rapporteur** read aloud the revised Decision.
2599. The **Chairperson** reiterated that there was no need to prejudge and that the General Assembly would decide.
2600. The Delegation of **Japan** repeated that it was unable to decide without having listened to the General Assembly.
2601. The **Rapporteur** suggested to merge the comments from both Japan and India.
2602. The Delegation of **India** suggested as “decides to discuss if appropriate...”
2603. The **Chairperson** asked if Japan was in agreement with India.
2604. The Delegation of **Japan** expressed its agreement with the change by India.
2605. La délégation du **Maroc** est gênée par l'impression de défi qui apparaît au paragraphe 10 du projet de décision. Elle propose « suggère la création ». Elle souhaite en outre savoir si l'on parle de création d'un organe consultatif ou d'un groupe de travail ? Elle considère que ce serait problématique si cet organe était uniquement composé de nouveaux membres élus à la prochaine Assemblée générale et que les membres qui ont discuté de cette question à la 31e session ne soient pas associés. Ce serait dans ce cadre qu'elle appuierait la création de ce groupe de travail.
2606. The **Chairperson** requested further clarification from the Delegation of Morocco.
2607. La délégation du **Maroc** précise qu'elle n'a pas compris le sens du paragraphe, tel qu'actuellement rédigé. Elle précise qu'elle n'a pas compris que l'on ferait appel aux Etats parties qui ont suivi la discussion, et que cette situation avait bel et bien besoin d'être clarifiée.
2608. The **Chairperson** invited a review of paragraph 11.
2609. The Delegation of **Kenya** suggested to use “request” instead of “encourage”.
2610. The **Chairperson** stated that “encourage” would be better, as the Director-General may be concerned with “request”.
2611. The Delegation of **Kenya** concurred with the Chairperson.
2612. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 17** adopted as amended.
2613. The **Chairperson** invited to review **31 COM 23.B** on page 78.
2614. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** présente l'ordre du jour provisoire revu avec tous les amendements intégrés. Il attire l'attention du Comité sur quelques points importants qui apparaissent suite aux précédents débats, notamment les points relatifs au rapport sur l'état d'avancement du Fonds du patrimoine mondial, des études thématiques, et du rapport d'audit.
2615. La délégation du **Maroc** intervient sur le point 14. Elle précise qu'il s'agit plutôt de poursuivre la réflexion car elle est déjà entamée.
2616. The Delegation of **India** asked whether an item on the Pacific World Heritage Fund could be added after item 6, concerning the item 14 and the exact language that needed to be used. Furthermore, it believed that items 15 and 16 needed to reflect the debate, and item 7 did not include the reinforced monitoring mechanism.
2617. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the latter was for 2009.
2618. The Delegation of **India** asked whether the Rapporteur needed to originate from one of the Vice-chair countries and the Legal Advisor explained that the Rapporteur was nominal and not one of the 5 vice-chairpersons.

2619. The Delegation of **India** noted that in the future an explanation of the World Heritage Centre or the Legal Advisor on these procedures would be welcomed and regretted that the Committee would have to wait for the Extraordinary session for a Rapporteur
2620. The Delegation of **Japan** referred to item 17 and asked whether the amendments had been completed. This was summarized by the Chairperson and Rapporteur.
2621. The **Chairperson** declared Decision **31 COM 23** adopted as amended. Moving to the provisional agenda for the General Assembly, he asked whether the Committee had any comments.
2622. Le **Centre du patrimoine mondial** informe les membres du Comité que la version française de l'ordre du jour provisoire de l'Assemblée générale ne reflète pas tous les changements et les amendements proposés. Une explication et une correction peuvent être faites directement.
2623. La délégation du **Maroc** précise que le point 3a doit être formulé différemment. Concernant le point 5, il convient de modifier le texte et de préciser que « c'est le bilan des activités des organisations consultatives ». Les changements pour le point 10 ont été déjà intégrés.
2624. The Delegation of **India** referred to the four issues to be added under item 8 from the INF. document.
2625. The Delegation of the **United States of America** noted that the item on the Management Audit was missing.
2626. The **Chairperson** said that these comments would be taken into account and declared Decision **31 COM 19** adopted.
2627. The **Chairperson** declared the **Report** adopted.
2628. The Delegation of **India** thanked the Chairperson for his extraordinary work.
2629. The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegate and the Committee for the kind words and the Vice-chair for his support.
2630. The **Vice Chairperson** from Norway thanked the Committee for the tremendous support and constructive work along with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. He stated that he was amazed by the efficiency and dedication of the team as well as by the commitment of the Rapporteur. He thanked the Chairperson for his support and cooperation and noted that the organization of the Committee by the authorities of New Zealand had set very high standards.
2631. The **Rapporteur** thanked the Committee for its cooperation and expressed his thanks to the authorities of New Zealand. He gave particular thanks to the staff of the World Heritage Centre for its dedication, excellent work and professionalism and most particularly to Anna Ferchaud, Marianne Raabe, Céline Fuchs, Jane Degeorges, Richard Veillon, Guy Debonnet, Alessandro Balsamo, David Martel, Lodovico Folin Calabi and Anne Lemaistre from the UNESCO Secretariat and Anne Sauvetre and Sabine de Valence from the translation team. He then thanked the committee, the Chairperson Mr Tumu Te HeuHeu for his wise consult and support, and to the Vice-Chairperson, Mr Ole Briseid. He finally thanked the newly elected Chairperson, dr. Christina Cameron, with whom he had the privilege to work during the past ten years and reminded the Committee that the next session would begin in exactly 365 days.
2632. The Delegation of **Kuwait** thanked the Chairperson for his extraordinary work, the Rapporteur for his services and the World Heritage Centre for its excellence as a flagship in UNESCO.
2633. The Delegation of **India** thanked the Chairperson and noted that it had been a privilege to serve on the Committee and, in particular, as it took place in Asia-Pacific

- region. It further expressed its gratitude for the inscription of the Red Fort, which was considered so important in the independence of the Indian people. It declared that it was looking forward to the leadership of Canada.
2634. The Delegation of the **Netherlands** expressed its gratitude to the Chairperson, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their efficient and hard work. It stressed that the *Convention* was a truly global framework and Outstanding Universal Value was the essence of the *Convention*. It continued by noting that the 4Cs, to which another had been added at this session, would guide future work and further suggested that another “C” could be added which was of growing importance: climate change. It urged that the *Convention* not be used separately, but rather together with other international instruments to reduce the workload. It noted that it was an honour for the Netherlands to have served on this Committee.
2635. The Delegation of **Norway** commended the authorities of New Zealand for the memorable Committee session and the Chairperson for the great task carried out. It furthermore thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their hard work and pledged that it would continue to support World Heritage in the future even though its membership on the Committee was coming to a close.
2636. The Delegation of **Lithuania** congratulated New Zealand, the Rapporteur and the World Heritage Centre. It noted that it had been a privilege to serve on the Committee and that it hoped that other countries would keep the promise to only serve for four years and to maintain the rotation. It underlined that a professional Committee was needed, comprising experts in natural and cultural heritage. It welcomed the innovations derived from the Vilnius meeting, including the timer and the informal sessions.
2637. The Delegation of **New Zealand** expressed that it had been a wonderful experience to work for the Committee and that a great journey had commenced for the Pacific. It was pleased to have hosted the 31st session and it thanked all participants for their support.
2638. The Delegation of **Japan** said that it had had its happiest moment with the inscription of the Iwami Ginzan Silver Mine and its Cultural Landscape and that the saddest moment was in leaving the Committee. It hoped to return under a new electoral system. The *Convention* was one of the best international instruments for collaboration and peace and needed more than ever in the 21st century. It hoped for a close cooperation with the European Union in heritage protection, nation building and intercultural dialogue.
2639. La délégation du **Bénin** remercie la Nouvelle Zélande, son gouvernement et ces ancêtres, qui sont un élément très importants pour les peuples africains. Il remercie aussi les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour les années d'apprentissage passées au Comité. En tant qu'africain, il est reconnaissant du fonds africain créé ces dernières années et qui a permis beaucoup de projets de voir le jour. L'Etat partie considère que le Comité du patrimoine mondial est ce que l'UNESCO a de plus précieux et que les changements à apporter à ce Comité doivent se faire avec sagesse. Le Bénin continuera à soutenir le Comité dans les prochaines années.
2640. The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** expressed his gratitude for all the support received throughout the Committee for the work carried out by the World Heritage Centre. A strong World Heritage Centre also meant a strong Committee. He thanked the Chairperson for his dedication and the Vice-chairperson for the hard work in close cooperation with the World Heritage Centre. The Rapporteur, he further noted, was more than a function – his devotion to World Heritage was evident. He then, accompanied by a Powerpoint presentation, thanked all his staff for the motivation and strong commitment and welcomed the new Chairperson to the team.

2641. The **Chairperson** then gave his closing speech (the full text of the speech is reproduced at the following Web address: <http://whc.unesco.org/archive/2007> and then asked the new Chairperson to join him on the Podium. After having declared the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee closed, the Chairperson invited the Chorus, the Committee, all observers and participants and the World Heritage Centre to sing the traditional Maori song called "Maranga".