



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

42 COM

WHC/18/42 COM/INF.18

Original: English/French

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

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

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

**Forty-second session
Manama, Bahrain
24 June – 4 July 2018**

SUMMARY RECORD

RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

The text contained in the present document is a transcription of the debates of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee held from 24 June to 4 July 2018 in Manama (Bahrain). It is therefore to be considered as a verbatim.

Le texte contenu dans le present document est une transcription des débats de la 42^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial tenue à Manama (Bahrein) du 24 juin au 4 juillet 2018. Il doit donc être considéré comme un verbatim.

AGENDA OF THE 42nd SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

OPENING SESSION

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

REPORTS

4. Report of the Rapporteur of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee (Krakow, 2017)
5. Reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies
 - 5A. Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities and the implementation of the World Heritage Committee's decisions
 - 5B. Reports of the Advisory Bodies
6. Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage-related category 2 Centres

EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

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

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

8. Establishment of the World Heritage List and of the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8A. Tentative Lists submitted by States Parties as of 15 April 2018
 - 8B. Nominations to the World Heritage List
 - 8C. Update of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger
 - 8D. Clarifications of property boundaries and areas by States Parties

- 8E. Review and approval of retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value

GLOBAL STRATEGY FOR A REPRESENTATIVE, BALANCED AND CREDIBLE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

- 9. Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List
 - 9A. Progress report on the reflection concerning the Upstream Process

PERIODIC REPORTS

- 10. Periodic Reports
 - 10A. Progress report on the preparation of the Third cycle of Periodic Reporting

WORKING METHODS AND TOOLS

- 11. Progress report on a Draft Policy Compendium
- 12. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods and outcomes of the ad-hoc working group
 - 12A. Follow-up to Recommendations of Evaluations and Audits on Working Methods: outcomes of the ad-hoc working group
 - 12B. Follow up and implementation of the recommendations of the Working Group on Governance as endorsed by the General Conference

FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES

- 13. International Assistance
- 14. Presentation of the final accounts of the World Heritage Fund for 2016-2017, implementation of the World Heritage Fund under the biennium 2018-2019 and follow-up to Decision **41 COM 14**
- 15. Other business

CLOSING SESSION

- 16. Election of the Chairperson, Vice-Chairpersons and Rapporteur of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee (2019)
- 17. Provisional Agenda of the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee (2019)
- 18. Adoption of Decisions
- 19. Closing session

INTRODUCTION

N.B: *The languages used for the verbatim of the sessions of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee are English and French. Presentations and comments made originally in another language are indicated by ^[English interpretation] or ^[French interpretation] at the beginning of the intervention.*

The 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee was held from 24 June to 4 July 2018 in Manama, Bahrain.

The 21 Members of the World Heritage Committee were present: Angola, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Norway, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

The elected Members of the Bureau of the 42nd session of the Committee were:

Chairperson: Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa (Bahrain)

Rapporteur: Anna E. Zeichner (Hungary)

Vice-Chairpersons: Azerbaijan, Brazil, China, Spain, Zimbabwe

The following 99 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers:

Albania; Algeria; Andorra; Armenia; Austria; Belgium; Belize; Benin; Botswana; Bulgaria; Cambodia; Cameroon; Canada; Central African Republic; Chile; Colombia; Costa Rica; Croatia; Cyprus; Czechia; Côte d'Ivoire; Democratic Republic of the Congo; Denmark; Ecuador; Egypt; Eritrea; Estonia; Ethiopia; Finland; France; Georgia; Germany; Greece; Haiti; Holy See; Iceland; India; Iran (Islamic Republic of); Iraq; Ireland; Israel; Italy; Jamaica; Japan; Jordan; Kazakhstan; Kenya; Latvia; Lebanon; Lesotho; Libya; Lithuania; Malaysia; Mauritania; Mexico; Mongolia; Montenegro; Myanmar; Namibia; Nepal; Netherlands; New Zealand; Niger; Nigeria; Oman; Pakistan; Palestine; Panama; Papua New Guinea; Poland; Qatar; Republic of Korea; Republic of Moldova; Romania; Russian Federation; Rwanda; Saudi Arabia; Senegal; Serbia; Singapore; Slovakia; Slovenia; South Africa; Sri Lanka; Sudan; Sweden; Switzerland; Thailand; the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; Turkey; Ukraine; United Arab Emirates; United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; United States of America; Uzbekistan; Viet Nam; Yemen; Zambia.

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

The full list of participants is available [here](#).

The session was conducted in two languages: English and French - the two working languages of the Committee -, with additional interpretation in Spanish provided by the Kingdom of Spain. Thanks to the generous contribution of the Sultan Bin Abdulaziz Al-Saud Foundation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia interpretation in Arabic was also made available. Furthermore, thanks to the authorities of China, interpretation in Chinese was available from 29 June to 2 July.

The World Heritage Centre of UNESCO provided the Secretariat for the meeting.

Sunday 24 June 2018
OPENING CEREMONY

The Opening Ceremony of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee was held at the Bahrein National Theatre on Sunday 4 July 2018. The ceremony was organized by the Bahrain Authority of Culture and Antiquities under the patronage of His Majesty King Hamad Bin Isa Al Khalifa, King of the Kingdom of Bahrain.

Speeches were delivered by the following dignitaries:

- H.E. Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa, Chairperson of the 42nd Session of the Committee
- H.E. Shaikha Mai Al Khalifa, President of Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities
- H.E. Mr Lee Byong Hyun, President of Executive Board of UNESCO
- H.E Ms Audrey Azoulay, Director General of UNESCO

A cultural performance and a reception followed at the Bahrein National Museum.

FIRST DAY – Monday 25 June 2018

FIRST SESSION

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Your Royal Highness, Excellency Sheikha Mai Al Khalifa, President of the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities,
Excellency Mrs. Zouhour Alaoui, President of the UNESCO General Conference,
Excellency Mr. Byong Hyun Lee, President of the UNESCO Executive Board,
Excellency Mrs Audrey Azoulay, Director-General of UNESCO,
Excellency Ministers, Ambassadors, Permanent Delegates to UNESCO
Honourable Members of the World Heritage Committee,
Honourable Delegates from States Parties to the UNESCO 1972 World Heritage Convention,
Honourable Members of the Advisory Bodies,
Representatives of specialised NGO’s and Private Institutions dealing with World Heritage,
Ladies and Gentlemen,
Dear Guests,

It is indeed a great honour for me to greet you all today at the opening of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee, which is held in Manama, the Capital of my country, the Kingdom of Bahrain, under the High Patronage of His Majesty, King Hamad bin Isa Al Khalifa, and to welcome you very warmly in making every effort to ensure that your stay is as enjoyable and fruitful as possible.

I want to express my deep gratitude to H.E. Sheikha Mai Al Khalifa and also to H.R.H. Emir Sultan Bin Abdulaziz for the assistance kindly provided by their Institution for the Promotion of Arabic Language and the contribution made for the Arabic interpretation in all sessions of our Committee.

I would like to reiterate, on behalf of H.E. Sheikha Mai Al Khalifa, President of the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities, my gratitude and my deep appreciation for choosing my country as a host to the 42nd session of our World Heritage Committee. As you all know, Bahrain has two sites inscribed on the World Heritage List and I hope that our busy agenda will allow you to visit them. As was stated at the United Nations International Year for Cultural and Natural Heritage, ‘*World Heritage is our bridge from the past to the future*’.

The credibility of the process must be absolute at all stages—from the work of the advisory bodies to the decision by the States Parties, who hold prime responsibility. It is vital to remember that the World Heritage Convention is an extraordinary normative instrument which has provided, since its adoption, a global standard and has contributed to international cooperation for heritage protection and promotion of better understanding of cultural diversity.

However, I must also stress that after 42 years of implementation, the World Heritage Convention stands at a critical point, since a number of issues have been already identified by previous Chairpersons, such as the concern about interpretation of requirements and the criteria for inscription on the World Heritage List within the context of cultural diversity and values. Furthermore, the question of appropriate conservation and management for inscribed World Heritage sites is regularly raised, together with threats to heritage such as pressures for badly planned economic development and urban speculation. In addition, the recent increase in regional and national conflicts and natural disasters are posing serious problems

to the international community when funds and technical capacity are lacking in order to face the essential rehabilitation for both the suffering populations and the essential reconstruction of many sites inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger.

We can see in many regions of the world, and particularly in the Middle East, the fragility of this cultural heritage in times of conflict and the challenges we face to ensure its protection and preservation. We are often reminded that no single country, however powerful, can tackle these challenges alone. We must move forward together and this is UNESCO's role with its World Heritage Committee.

As your Chairperson, I would like to stress one important point in our future discussion: the credibility of the process for the implementation of the Operational Guidelines that you have approved and which must be respected at all stages - from the work of the Advisory Bodies to the decision made by the States Parties. We are all responsible for ensuring the sustainability of the Convention and its credibility.

I would like to take this opportunity to recall that the overall goals of the Convention are to identify and protect properties of Outstanding Universal Value and to mobilise international support. At the heart of the system is the identification of eligible properties. The selection of such sites of Outstanding Universal Value has proven to be a very complex process. This objective has been expressed, in all your meetings, as well as the achievement for a credible, balanced and representative World Heritage List, but it is also my responsibility as your Chairperson to evoke it and mention this again.

Le but ultime de la Convention du Patrimoine mondial est, bien entendu, une fois inscrits, l'obligation de protéger et de conserver ces sites culturels et naturels exceptionnels et extraordinaires au bénéfice des générations présentes et futures.

Au cours des premières années de sa mise en œuvre, le système du Patrimoine mondial insistait plus particulièrement sur la réalisation de la « Liste ».

Les instruments de gestion et de suivi n'ont émergé que lentement et seulement à partir du moment où le Comité a été confronté de façon évidente à des situations de sites en difficulté. L'inscription toute seule a prouvé qu'elle était insuffisante pour garantir la survie et la bonne gestion des sites du patrimoine mondial.

C'est pourquoi je compte réellement sur votre compréhension et votre assistance pour faire de nos délibérations un exemple de qualité, de transparence et de professionnalisme.

Ce que nous avons en commun, c'est notre mandat visant à appuyer les responsabilités officielles des États membres ainsi que l'engagement des communautés dans le partage des pratiques et en conjuguant les efforts pour une meilleure protection et une résilience du patrimoine culturel et naturel dont nous avons hérité.

C'est la raison pour laquelle, au cours de vos précédentes sessions, vous avez invité le Forum des Jeunes Professionnels du Patrimoine à participer à l'ouverture de vos travaux et nous avons fait de même cette année 2018 pour donner la voix aux jeunes générations.

Nous avons bien écouté la précédente proclamation des Jeunes qui déclarait "la forte détermination des jeunes de transmettre, avec énergie et passion, le patrimoine mondial aux générations futures comme composante significative de la communauté".

La déclaration des Jeunes s'appliquait aussi à considérer le besoin d'un mécanisme pour les communautés locales et les jeunes afin qu'ils puissent être engagés dans le patrimoine mondial et le tourisme durable, en soulignant l'importance de la promotion du patrimoine local vivant.

Oui, la Convention du patrimoine mondial et sa promotion représentent un grand défi pour nous tous et c'est vers cet idéal de dialogue, de connaissance de l'autre et de paix qu'il nous entraîne tous, en dépit de nos différences de langues, de cultures ou de passé, nous partageons les mêmes rêves, et les mêmes espoirs pour un meilleur futur.

Je vous remercie de votre aimable attention.

Now, Ladies and Gentlemen, before considering the admission of the observers, I would like to give the floor to the director, Ms. Rösler, for some general announcements."

Ms. Rössler:

"Thank you and good morning to everyone. It is a pleasure to serve you Madam Chair and the whole Committee. First of all, let me recall that the World Heritage Committee at the 35th session decided that the World Heritage Committee should be live-streamed on the Internet. Therefore, the debates of our session will be live-streamed through the windows, which hopefully will appear on the screens now. It is also available on the website of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee.

Secondly, allow me to indicate that UNESCO gratefully acknowledges Sultan Bin Abdulaziz Al Saud Foundation of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for its generous contribution in support of the Arabic interpretation for this session.

We would also like to thank the Kingdom of Spain for providing Spanish interpretation for the duration of the meeting. Furthermore, many thanks to the authorities of China for the interpretation in Chinese, which will be available from the 29th of June until 2nd of July.

In this regard, and this is very important for you, I would like to invite Spanish, Arabic and Chinese language speakers to choose in which working language, either English or French, that they would like to see their interventions being reflected in the summary records of the session. Your choice should be indicated orally at the time of your first intervention. It should also be transmitted in writing to the Secretariat before the end of our working session this morning.

Thank you very much Madam Chair and you can proceed to item two."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much, Madam Director. We now turn our attention to the admission of the observers, which you will find in document 2, in accordance with Article 8 of the Rules of Procedures. For your information, this is a bilingual document. I would like to ask the Rapporteur whether she has received any amendments on the draft decision procedure."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Madame Chair, and I would like to take this opportunity to wish good morning to all colleagues. I have not received any amendments on the draft decision so you may wish to proceed to its adoption. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much to the Rapporteur. Dear colleagues, I have to ask you now if

you agree to the presence of these observers throughout the session. Cuba has asked for the floor, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Madam Chair. We understand that this Committee has a rather busy agenda and we know that any amendments to draft decisions need to be submitted, but we would also like to refer to the fact that there are some areas where discussion will be merited and there could be discussions on modifications of paragraphs.

We would like to reserve the right to discuss that. For example, maybe the Secretariat could give us more information on this. When there is a need to discuss a certain paragraph and when a discussion does need to be opened on an item that initially has not been flagged for discussion, we would like to know what the procedure will be and we will beg your indulgence to make sure that the discussion could be held for it. We would like the paragraphs concerned to be duly reflected on the screens at the time.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. Please, Director, you have the floor.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. I would like just to comment on the question of Cuba, it is actually under item 3 and I wanted to come back to this procedure because there were some discussions on it in the Bureau. With your permission, I would like to go to Item 3.”

The Chairperson:

“We move now to Item 3. We move to the review of the agenda and timetable of our session; items 3A and 3B. I would like to invite Ms. Rössler, the Director, to present the agenda and the timetable for this session, as contained in documents 3A and 3B. These documents should be read in conjunction with document INF3A, reference 3 which contains the provisional list of documents for our session. Thank you.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. I would like to make a few comments on Items 3A and 3B. Concerning the agenda of our session, let me indicate two points. First, it was decided to include the report on thematic studies in document 5A. In the past years you had two separate documents: the Secretariat’s report and thematic studies. I will make the presentation together for a more coherent report.

Furthermore there was a slight change to the original agenda approved by the Committee at the last session regarding Item 5C on the World Heritage Convention and sustainable development. Indeed, as the Committee has decided to examine this matter in 2019, this item will be included in the next session, the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee.

You will have also noticed that document 3B.Rev has been issued recently because

that was only a slight change for the hours of the opening session which occurred last night. Madam Chair, we all enjoyed the opening session yesterday.

To come back to the question from Cuba, I would like to inform you that yesterday, the first Bureau meeting was held and a member of the Bureau requested to open for discussion another State of Conservation report in addition to those already included in document INF7.Rev. The additional report is on Stonehenge Avebury and associate sites in the UK. Consequently, the Secretariat will issue document INF7.Rev2 shortly. There was also a discussion on another site but apparently this is not open for discussion.

With regard to Cuba's question, I would like to refer to the Operational Guidelines that you have in front of you. It is actually Rule 23 in the Rules of Procedure. Rule 23.1 provides for: *'At the request of any member of the Committee, supported by two other members, discussion of any motion, resolution or amendment may be suspended until the written text is circulated in the working languages to all Committee members present'*. Also, 23.3: *'New draft decisions/proposals and amendments thereto should, whenever possible, be submitted to the Secretariat at least 24 hours before the discussion of the agenda item concerned. The Rapporteur shall work with the Secretariat to distribute such draft decisions/proposals and amendments to all Committee members in a timely manner.'*

Allow me Ladies and Gentlemen to recall that due to the number of items on our agenda and the time constraints, Rule 22.2 of the Rules of Procedures provides for the following: *'The Chairperson may limit the time allowed to each speaker if the circumstances make this desirable.'* The time for interventions will be limited to three minutes for Committee members and two minutes for Observers.

In this regard, please note that we have a musical timer. I am not sure about the music Madam Chair but we shall see, to gauge intervention and it will interrupt speakers exceeding the recommended time limit. Concerning interventions by observers from civil society and NGOs, we strongly advise if they wish to take the floor on the same topics, to consult among themselves in order to prepare and to deliver one single intervention.

In order to save as much time as possible, we also appeal to you not to repeat, if possible, what other delegations have already said or elaborated on to make long-congratulatory statements; that is mainly under item 8.

Furthermore, official statements or declarations should be transmitted to the Secretariat in writing, hopefully electronically, as soon as they have been delivered in order to integrate them into the summary records of the session. For us it is very important to have a truthful record of this session in the summary record.

We would also like to recall that the timing of the session should be respected: in the morning from 10:00 am to noon, and restarting at 3:00 pm. Please note that as indicated in the timetable, the meeting of the Bureau will be held every morning from 9:30 am until 10:00 am, as of this morning, because today we did not have a Bureau session as we had one yesterday.

Furthermore, dear participants, allow me to remind you that bilateral consultation should take place outside the main conference room and not during the debates. Some Committee members specifically requested this last year. Also, I would like to kindly ask you to switch off mobile phones or put them in silent mode so as not to disturb the proceedings.

Please, also be informed of the very important information that there are no specific coffee breaks, but tea and coffee will be available throughout the day in the delegate lounge just outside of this room.

Last but not least, as it was indicated in the Bureau meeting yesterday, I would also

like to remind the Committee members that all amendments to draft decisions have to be submitted in advance, well before the discussion to the Rapporteur. Her name is Anna E. Zeichner, whom I greet here on the podium. It should be in writing using the blue form, preferably the electronic version, to the following email address. I hope it is behind me on the screen, if not, 'worldheritage-rapporteur@unesco.org'.

The blue form template to be used will be sent to all Committee members by email by the Secretariat. In this regard, we will consult each Committee member delegation to get one email address to which the electronic version of this form can be sent for easy use. The electronic submission will facilitate and speed up the integration of text to the relevant draft decision at hand for your consideration. This blue form is available in the room in both French and English; it includes the email address I just mentioned.

I would also like to encourage you, as much as is possible, to avoid submitting substantial amendments immediately before the discussion of an item, to allow for transparent and informed discussion. Therefore, Committee members should ensure that amendments are provided sufficiently in advance and at least 24 hours ahead of the examination of the concerned item as provided in the Rules of Procedures, which I just read, to allow time for dissemination in paper copies and online on the website of the World Heritage Centre and to also ensure translation, which is very important for the process.

Thank you very much Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you Ms. Rössler. If you have any comments please, you are welcome. I saw Cuba, with Australia following."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much Madam Chair. Indeed rule 23.3 of the Rules of Procedure provides for the need to submit 24 hours prior when possible. It means that it does not actually negate the possibility of a modification to be made that could actually be done. That is our question. Are we able to apply 23.3 with a little flexibility? It does say '*whenever possible*' in the wording which means that it could actually be possible when it was not possible to respect the 24 hours prior. That was the reason for my intervention."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Now Australia."

Australia:

"Thank you your Excellency. Firstly, Australia congratulates you on your election as Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. We thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its generosity in hosting this Committee meeting and we very much look forward to experiencing the culture of your people while we are here in Manama.

I think this is the right time, looking at the agenda, for Australia to suggest the Committee might make a small and important modification to the way it conducts its business under agenda Item 8, the establishment of the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

In recent years, we have observed the very positive approach of the Committee to the operation on agenda Item 7 regarding the State of Conservation of World Heritage properties. The general decision under Agenda 7 has enabled more strategic discussion and decisions on matters of the utmost importance to the World Heritage Convention. Things such as climate change, the illegal wildlife trade and emergency situations resulting from conflict to name just three.

In a similar way, we believe there would be value in creating a place on the agenda for more strategic discussions about matters related to the nomination and inscription processes for the World Heritage List and for the List of World Heritage in Danger. In making this point, I foreshadow that Australia will be submitting a draft decision in the next day or two for consideration by the Committee to establish a general agenda item, as I have just outlined.

It will be based on the points I have just made and it would enable the Committee to look more strategically across the issues arising from the nomination and in-danger listing processes and to discuss them, rather than through case-by case, as an example. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bosnia.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Tout d’abord nous voudrions remercier à travers vous, madame la présidente, le Royaume de Bahreïn pour votre magnifique hospitalité et l’excellente organisation de notre session. Puisque c’est la première fois que la Bosnie-Herzégovine prend la parole en sa qualité d’Etat membre de ce Comité, nous aimerions répéter encore une fois à quel point la Bosnie Herzégovine est honorée de faire partie et de participer à cette instance prestigieuse de l’UNESCO.

Nous entamons notre participation aux travaux du Comité avec beaucoup d’humilité et de modestie, mais aussi avec un grand sentiment de responsabilité. Pendant notre mandat, nous ferons de notre mieux pour apporter notre petite pierre à cette magnifique construction qu’ est la Convention pour la protection du patrimoine mondial.

Nous voudrions terminer en soutenant la proposition de nos collègues de l’Australie. Merci beaucoup ».

La Présidente :

« Je vous remercie et donne la parole à la Norvège ».

Norway:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. As Norway takes the floor for the first time, I would like to congratulate you on your election as Chair. I would also like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its warm welcome. Norway welcomes and strongly supports Australia’s proposal, as it will strengthen important discussions on nominations. Thank you, Madam Chair”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much, Madam. First and foremost, we would like to congratulate you for your election as a Chairperson. We are certain that under your able leadership our Committee will have very fruitful deliberations. We also would like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its very warm hospitality and the first-class organisation of our meeting.

Hungary, as a newly elected member of the World Heritage Committee, pledges to support your work and that of the Bureau and will look forward to working closely in the spirit of co-operation and in full alignment with the scopes of the Convention with the other Committee members, States Parties and all of the stakeholders. As a result of this final statement, I would like to support on behalf of the Hungarian delegation the proposal of Australia to have a general decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. I join my colleagues in congratulating you on your election as Chair and thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for the warm hospitality and welcome. One of the key problems that we face in terms of management and in terms of state of conservation is to realise that there are now common challenges that we have in different areas. Some of these solutions are better drawn up by collective work and collective reflection. Therefore, in view of that, we support the proposal of Australia to have more thematic discussions on key areas that affect the World Heritage sites, particularly under Item 8 of the nomination.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Madam the Director to reply.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. The answer to Cuba is yes, of course, because it states ‘*if possible*’. I just want to clarify, following the interventions by Australia and the other delegations that these are not amendments to the agenda which is in front of you. Australia made a suggestion to have a discussion and a draft decision under item 8 or maybe 8B depending on when you come to this point under item 8, to have general decisions like they do for item 7 on the agenda. That is just to clarify the point on the agenda and I think that there are no further interventions, Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite you to adopt the Draft Decisions 42 COM 3A and 42 COM 3B. Before that, I give the floor to the Rapporteur in case she has any amendments or has received any from the members.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. I have not received any amendments on the draft decisions. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If you do not have any objections, we can adopt the Decision. The Decision is adopted.

We now move to item 4. Ladies and Gentlemen, let us now examine item 4 of our agenda. As you know, Mr. Muhammad Juma was the Rapporteur of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee, which was held last year in Cracow, Poland. Therefore, I have now the pleasure to invite him to present his report which will highlight the main issues discussed during our last session. The floor is to Mr. Juma. Thank you very much.”

Mr. Muhammad Juma:

“Chairperson, dear members of the Committee, Ambassadors, delegates of State parties, delegates from the Secretariat, Advisory Bodies and participants of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee, good morning,

Madam Chair, allow me also to convey my greetings to friends of the World Heritage sites and colleagues who are watching and listening to the discussion of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee through the streaming which has been taking place for the fifth continuous year now.

Madam Chairperson, it is with great pleasure that today, I present my report of the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee, which was generously hosted by Poland in the beautiful City of Cracow from the 2nd until the 7th of July, 2017.

Distinguished Committee members, it was an honour and indeed a pleasure that you allow me to serve as Rapporteur of the 41st Session. I deeply thank you for having entrusted and elected me as Rapporteur, which was a challenging, important and enjoyable job. I would also like to thank the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for the professional advice and support accorded to me, which facilitated the smooth proceedings of the session. Special thanks to Director of the World Heritage Centre, Dr Rössler, and her extraordinary team for their earnest efforts which made the 41st Session and thus, implementation of the 1972 Convention, a success.

Madam Chairperson, the 41st Session was chaired by Professor Jacek Purchla, whose passion, kindness, tolerance and wisdom were part of the success of the 41st Committee’s Session. The Session was attended by 2921 participants in total, including 792 representatives of States Parties, NGOs and observers. Apart from 21 committee members, 103 delegates from States parties also joined the session. For ten days of intensive discussions, the Committee deliberated on 235 decisions covering conventional diverse topics including the activities of the Centre, the state of conservation of properties on the World Heritage List, nomination, the vision of Operational Guidelines and others.

Madam Chairperson, as for the activities of the Centre, the Committee took note with appreciation that the World Heritage Centre successfully continues implementation of activities in line with the mid-term strategy of 2014-21 and approved by it. It took note of the concrete results of time in ensuring tangible heritage is identified, protected, monitored and sustainably managed by member States, in particular through the effective implementation of the 1972 Convention.

Furthermore, the Committee welcomed the proactive role of the Centre for enhancing the Cultural and Biodiversity-related Convention. It also congratulated the Advisory Bodies for their efforts to mobilise addition funds but also requested ICOMOS and IUCN to continue engaging in appropriate dialogue without consultation with the States Parties to further enhance the overall transparency and decision-making in the workings of the Committee.

The Committee also took note of the support provided by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to States Parties in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. It also called upon the States Parties to ensure that sustainable development principles are mainstreamed into their national processes related to the World Heritage in full respect of the Outstanding Universal Value.

Regarding capacity building, the Committee commended the progress made so far in the implementation of the World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy to start combining the World Heritage Capacity Building Programme with the capacity-building activities carried out in 2016 and the beginning of 2017. It welcomed the progress made by the Category 2 Centres and called upon interested stakeholders to support their activities.

Madam Chairperson, the Committee discussed a total of 47 State of Conservation reports out of 154 submitted. An additional two properties, Hebron/AI-Khalil's Old Town and the Historical Centre of Vienna were added to the List of World Heritage properties in Danger whereas others were removed, namely: Comoé National Park, Côte d'Ivoire, Gelati Monastery Georgia, and Simien National Park, Ethiopia. Thus, to date, the World Heritage List in Danger comprises of 54 properties, of which 38 are cultural and 16 are natural.

Madam Chairperson, the Committee took a broad decision related to the List by recalling the importance of paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines deploring conflict situations prevailing in several countries, arguing States Parties to include risk mitigating measures, but also reiterating the need to promote better understanding of the implication of inscribing properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Committee also took note, with appreciation, of the initiative of the Chairperson for the 41st Session of fostering a structural dialogue with civil society.

Madam Chairperson, at the 41st Session the Committee also decided to inscribe on the List of World Heritage 21 new properties and extended the boundaries of 8. The Committee members were particularly happy with the fact that the Republic of Angola had its first property inscribed on the List in that session following fruitful discussion in Cracow; the World Heritage List now has a total of 1073 properties of which 832 are cultural, 206 natural and 35 mixed.

Distinguished Committee members, the Committee also adopted the decision to launch the third cycle of Periodic Reporting 2017-2022, following a two-year reflection period, 2015-2017. This launching captured earlier recommendations of the working group on this item, led by Mr. Christopher Young, on improving the modalities of periodical reporting to update in line with the various involved sectors such as sustainable development. The third cycle of Periodic Reporting is now set up, to start with the Arabic region in 2018.

Madam Chairperson, the Committee also endorsed the revised operation guidelines and the proposed budget of the World Heritage Fund for the biennium 2018-2019. This

decision was guided by the recommendation of the two *ad hoc* groups; the first group, chaired by Mr Jad Tabet, the distinguished delegate from Lebanon, revised the paragraph 68, Chapter 5, on the Operational Guidelines related to the Tentative List.

The second group, led by Mr. Hendrik Garcia , distinguished delegate of the Philippines, deliberated on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund by integrating a set of short, medium and long-term measures and actions that would lead to a more desirable level of funding and efficiency.

Madam Chairperson, such an enormous amount of work would not have been possible without the remarkable dedication and effort of the Secretariat and Committee members. Madam Chairperson, allow me once again to register my gratitude to the Committee members, the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies as well as States Parties to the Convention for their support, which facilitated the successful accomplishment of my responsibilities as Rapporteur of the 41st Session.

Finally, Madam Chairperson, allow me to take this precious opportunity to congratulate and recommend my successor, Ms. Hanna Zeichner, from the delegation of Hungary, for her appointment as Rapporteur of the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee. I ensure her of my full support during the execution of this honourable responsibility which I have no doubt, without reservation, that she will accomplish successfully.

I wish all the members of the 42nd Committee success and thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its wonderful hospitality and a warm welcome for this session. Thank you very much. In Tanzanian, Madam Chair, I would say, *Hassan tesana*.

The Chairperson:

“Mr. Juma, thank you very much for your excellent and very clear report. I invite for comments if there are any. It seems that there are none. The Committee takes note of the report of the Rapporteur of the 41st Session. Are there any objections? No. We adopt.

Thank you very much. I now close item 4 of the agenda. I now give the floor to Ms Rössler regarding the constitution of the consultative body for the review of the budget.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. As you will remember, the Committee established, by decision 35 COM 12.B, a standing consultative body for a review of the Committee’s bi-annual budget in conformity with Article 20 of the Rules of Procedure. This consultative body is open to all States Parties including States non-members of the World Heritage Committee. I would also like to recall that the Advisory Bodies will have the possibility to attend this working group as observers.

Furthermore, based on last year’s practise and in a view to avoiding heavy agendas, it is suggested to the Committee to reduce the length of this working group to four days in view to improving the efficiency of the Committee’s work, instead of being held for the duration of the whole session. Therefore, if the proposal is agreeable to the Committee, we can propose that the working group will meet from Tuesday the 26th of June until Friday the 29th of June.

Thank you, Madam Chair. I think you need now to designate a president for the group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, are there any objections to the proposal? Furthermore, as per rule 20.2 of the Rules of Procedure, it is of the responsibility of the working group to elect a Chairperson. However, I understand that some consultation has already taken place in this regard. Therefore, I would like to know if a delegation would like to make any participation. I now give the floor to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Our delegation would like to nominate Mr. Rashad Baratli, from the delegation of Azerbaijan, as the Chairperson of the Budget Working Group, thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia has the floor now.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. Since Indonesia is for the first time taking the floor, I would like to join other delegations in congratulating you, as Chairperson of this important Committee, and also thank for their hospitality the government of Bahrain, rendered to all delegations. I would like to echo Hungary’s proposals on the nomination of Mr. Rashad Baratli of Azerbaijan as the Chair of the Budget Working Group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. That’s fine. I also congratulate Mr. Rashad Baratli: I know his work; he is excellent and he deserves it. Thank you very much.

Dear colleagues, I would now like to give the floor to the Director of the Centre who will give us some indication related to the work of the Consultative bodies. The floor is now to Ms. Rössler.”

Ms Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. The proposal, as said, is that the Budget Working Group meets from Tuesday the 26th of June until Friday the 29th of June, from 2:00 until 3:00 pm for the first three days, and on Friday from 1:30 pm until 2:30 pm, because you do not have a morning session on Friday. That will take place in the Bureau Room.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, we will move on to our next agenda item. We turn our attention to the opening of item 12A, which concerns the follow-up on recommendations of

evaluation and audits on working methods. The relevant document is document 12A. Allow me to give the floor to Ms Rössler on this matter.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As you will remember, the Committee at its 38th session in 2014 decided to establish an *ad hoc* working group to examine the issues related to working methods of the evaluation and decision-making processes of nominations. Since this date, the Committee has met between sessions, examining different matters in this framework and I think you worked very hard between the sessions. Therefore, since our last session in Krakow, the *ad hoc* working group pursued its reflection on the implementation of the roadmap for the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund as well as on the definition of the Upstream Process and the effectiveness of the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you Madam Rössler. In this regard I would like to give the floor to the Chair of the working group, Sheikh Khalifa Al Khalifa and Mr. Baratli, who will report on the work of the group. Thank you.”

Sheikh Khalifa Al Khalifa:

“Thank you. Through its Decision 41 COM 9A and 41 COM 12A, the World Heritage Committee extended the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group composed of members of the Committee and up to two non-members per electoral group to review the definition of the Upstream Process in view of improving the effectiveness of the Global Strategy as well as discussing in consultation with the World Heritage Centre’s Advisory Bodies, as appropriate for relevant stakeholders, the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund and to report to the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee, including recommendations on the following issues:

Elaboration of a comprehensive resource-mobilising and communication strategy, further examination of the proposal to establish an informal core group on research mobilisation including its mandate and modalities; study on how to examine the impact and scope of the form of partners; analysis of the recommendations of the internal oversight service; comparative mapping study and the development of proposals in view of optimising the use of resources of the World Heritage Fund, and discussion of the definition of the Upstream Process and the effectiveness of the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List.

The *ad hoc* Working Group commenced its work on January 15th of this year. It was agreed to divide the mandate of the working group into two sub-groups, one on the review of the definition of the Upstream Process and the other on the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund. Subsequently, meetings took place on February the 5th of March, the 5th and 28th of April, the 16th and 23rd of May and June the 4th. Open-ended meetings for all States Parties were held on May 18; representatives of the World Heritage Centre and of the Advisory Bodies participated in the meeting.

In reference to the review of the definition of the Upstream Process, the *ad hoc* working group took note of the background information and online survey results and recalled the Upstream Process pilot projects. Some resulted in an inscription on the World

Heritage List and two were phased out and the remaining five are advancing at different paces. Regardless of the results, all pilot projects improved the dialogue. The group highlighted that even though the Global Strategy has reached the mature age of 24 years, almost nothing has changed in terms of the statistics of the general distribution of World Heritage Sites and of the cultural sites over the natural or mixed ones. The only tangible change, although not increasing the credibility of the World Heritage List, was the elaboration of new types of heritage categories. Nevertheless, Upstream Processes can be effective tools to support the Global Strategy. If the number of Upstream Process requests exceeds the capacity of the institutions involved in implementing them, the prioritisation system as set out in paragraph 61 of the Operational Guidelines should apply.

The group considered that Upstream Processes would be more beneficial at the start and the earliest stage of the nomination process. Any consultation after the submission of the nomination file should not be regarded as upstream but rather as midstream. It is a voluntary and advisory process. For the credibility of the World Heritage Convention, States Parties are strongly encouraged to respect the advice resulting from the Upstream Process. The advice provided during the Upstream Process should be an institutional opinion rather than an individual expert's opinion. The group aimed at having a general definition adopted, thus increasing the effect and efficiency of the Upstream Process.

A drafting group was created to work on the definition, taking into consideration all the above discussions. The group proposes the below definition of Upstream Process to be included in the footnote of paragraph 122 of the Operational Guidelines, which states:

'In relation to the nomination of sites for the inscription on the World Heritage List, Upstream Processes include advice, consultation and analysis that occur prior to the submission of a nomination and are aimed at reducing the number of nominations that experience significant problems during the evaluation process. The basic principle of Upstream Processes is to enable the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to provide guidance and capacity building directly to States Parties, throughout the whole process leading up to the preparation of a possible World Heritage nomination. For the upstream support to be effective, it should be undertaken from the earliest stage of the nomination process, at the moment of the preparation or revision of the States Parties' Tentative List.'

The purpose of the advice given in the context of a nomination is limited to providing guidance of the technical merit of the nomination and the technical framework needed in order to offer the State Parties the essential tools to enable them to assess the feasibility and/or action necessary to prepare for the nomination. Requests for the Upstream Process should be submitted through the official format annex 15 of the Operational Guidelines. Should the number of requests exceed capacity, then the prioritisation system as per paragraph 61.c will be applied.

The group would insist on its desire to improve the quality of nominations. The Upstream Process can become an effective tool to decrease the amount of Committee decisions deviating from the Advisory Bodies advice. In order to achieve this objective, the potential of re-evaluating the nomination process should be explored. Contributing to the improved quality of nominations, Upstream Processes could be integrated within the multiple-stage nomination process and could be considered as the first stage.

The scope of the Upstream Process can be further extended to be a capacity building school. The Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre may involve UNESCO field officers and Category Centres when needed. The *ad hoc* advises the mandate of the *ad hoc* Working Group to be extended to evaluate the nomination cycle, the results of which will be presented in the committee during the 43rd Session.

Furthermore, the group would like to highlight the importance of the global strategy

for a balanced and representative World Heritage List and the Committee may wish to extend the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group further to re-evaluate the Global Strategy overall, with its successes and failures.

I now leave it to my colleague to express the other subgroup.”

Mr. Rashad Baratli:

“Thank you so much. As it was mentioned earlier in our subgroup on Sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, we had mainly four items on our agenda. With your permission I will go one by one.

The first one: Operational and Comprehensive Research Mobilization Communication Strategy; since beginning the discussion, the group has decided the most efficient way to approach this issue was with a two-phase approach. First, to operate a kind of guidance framework, strategy document; on a second phase, to upgrade to a more concrete and operational document. During the discussion, it was agreed that the group would work on the resource, mobilisation and communication strategy framework document. I am glad to say here that the group was successful in preparing the draft of the document.

The speculative outcomes under this item from the Committee are possibly to endorse the prepared framework document of the strategy and to invite the Secretariat to a close co-operation with State Members and Parties and stakeholders to prepare resource mobilisation and a communication plan to be developed for the 43rd session of the Committee to be held next year.

Also, I would like to emphasise that during the whole thorough discussion, the group referred to the Road Map on sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, which was approved by the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee held in Cracow in 2017, last year.

The second item on our agenda was further examination of the proposal to establish an informal core group on resource mobilisation, including its mandate and modalities. The group has discussed this point, of course, and it was mentioned by several members of the group that through creation by the decision of the Committee it would already give certain formal structure to this group. It would be very difficult to avoid a formal structure of the group and to keep it really informal. After a long discussion, it was suggested that instead of creating such an informal core group, it would be more useful to invite States Parties actively assisting the Secretariat, then UNESCO in the World Heritage, raising awareness and raising funds. That’s why the expected outcome within this item is to invite States Parties to assist the Secretariat in fund-raising activities. This is, by the way, included in the Draft Decision, which has been prepared by the group and proposed outcomes, which are also included in document 12A.

The third point discussed within our group was study on how to maximise the impact and scope of the forum of partners. We had a long discussion on this item. Several issues were addressed, such as who the target audience is, what should be the appropriate venue for such a big event, who should be invited to such an event and, of course, what are the main goals and outcomes of this event? After long discussion, it was agreed, we need first a guiding document, which, in our case, is a strategy on mobilisation and communication. In the first place, it is more efficient to have this strategy approved with its operational plan and then we can think of a big event with formal partners where we have all modalities clearly defined. At the same time, the group has mentioned that in parallel we can think of smaller-scale events based on the market place, which are prepared by the Secretariat and which we find very useful.

The final point on our agenda was the analysis of the recommendations of the

internal site survey analysis, IOS, the comparative mapping study and the development of the proposals in view of optimising the use of the resources of the World Heritage Fund. As you may know, mapping studies have mainly four recommendations in their final document. Our group decided to address each recommendation separately.

The first recommendation was concerning the overhead cost. After listening carefully to all the present stakeholders, Advisory Bodies and others like the Secretariat, the group decided that reducing or avoiding overhead costs has not contributed to any meaningful savings. In this regard, the outcome of the recommendation is to keep the current practise of overhead costs and the contract of the Advisory Bodies; as I mentioned early it does not have any meaningful savings contribution. Secondly, reducing this can somehow have a negative impact on the current work of the Advisory Bodies as well.

The second recommendation was legal advice and sourcing advisory services. The *ad hoc* working group requested the Secretariat to present us a legal opinion on this issue. The legal office of UNESCO has prepared a summary of legal advice on this point, which was presented to the group and I just want to present some parts and advice. Neither the Convention nor the Operational Guidelines compose the Committee to use only ICCROM, IUCN or ICOMOS to provide advisory services. This is just part of the summary advice which is attached as an annex to our final document, 12A. After long discussions on this point, a majority of the group, taking into account the argument of the service provided and the long period of experience of partnership from the Advisory Bodies, proposed to continue the services of the current three Advisory Bodies. A majority of the group was in favour of this idea. At the same time, we had some ideas from some members of the group that they need further discussions on the modalities for use of services that are suitable for hire. The outcome of the recommendation is to continue to use the services of the current Advisory Bodies; if possible there will be discussions on this item in the future.

The third recommendation was about defining Committee decisions deviating from Advisory Bodies' advice, procured at a significant cost to the World Heritage Fund, and taking action to address them. Since the very beginning of the discussion, the group has concluded and had a consensus beyond the point that it would be very difficult over a short period of time to come up with possible solutions and address these problems. However, we discussed the main root causes and identified three main ones; they are: a) political interests and pressure, given the huge financial and human investment in the preparation of nominations; b) a complicated nomination preparation process; and c) differences in scientific opinion.

The group discussed several ways and solutions on how to address and solve those issues. Again, with a short period of time, we did not come out with a solid solution to the problem. It is recommended in the final recommendation that the Committee may wish to extend the *ad hoc* committee working group and may wish to include this item on reform and change on the nomination process to the agenda of the extended *ad hoc* working group for further discussion in the Committee.

The final recommendation was on modalities and changing working methods to generate more efficiency. The three points coming out are: 1) the nomination process, 2) international assistance and 3) Reactive Monitoring missions. As I said earlier for the first, it was concluded that it is better to discuss a possible extended mandate of the *ad hoc* working group. Regarding the two others, the group has come up with certain recommendations. In short, we have one proposal for international assistance which we expect to discuss during the subgroup on budget in the following days. The other one is a recommendation on the Reactive Monitoring mission and using regional experts where necessary, and it does not have a negative impact on the quality of the service provided. This is also reflected in the final outcome document.

Just to finalise my presentation, I want to emphasise that we had a proposal from the

delegation of Norway during our discussions. In short, cross-sharing modalities for evaluation of nominations; this is widely reflected in our outcome document. The brief idea is the payment of an upfront fee to the World Heritage Fund by all States Parties submitting newer nominations. Of course, there are certain modalities to address which are still being worked on. There are, of course, in the idea exceptions for certain categories of State which are mentioned in the final outcome document. It is projected that possible savings out of this proposal could approach \$US700,000, if this can be implemented.

I think this was a short outcome of our study. Thanks a lot Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much to both speakers for your information and reports. I now give the floor to Ms. Rössler to give us further information in this regard.”

Ms. Rössler:

“It is now proposed that we will leave Item 12A open to allow for further discussion and consultation, notably on matters to be discussed during the Working Group on the Budget that you have just have constituted. This will allow time to prepare and adopt an agreed decision on Tuesday the 3rd of July, as foreseen in our timetable.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this explanation. Item 12A will remain open and we will go to the next item, which is for item 5A. The next item concerns the Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities, which is contained in document 5A. The Director of the Centre will introduce the Report of the World Heritage Centre on its activities. I would like to give the floor to Ms. Rössler to give us an idea of the item. Please, Madam, you have the floor.

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much, Madam Chair. As I said in the beginning, it may be this year a little bit longer, because we also have integrated the report on the thematic programme. It is a pleasure for me to give you an overview of what we have been doing since the last session of the World Heritage Committee.

I just would like to recall that the Centre comprises five Regional Units supporting the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. At the beginning of 2018, a new unit, called the World Heritage Nature, Sustainable Tourism and Outreach Unit (NTO) was established following the creation of a new post to strengthen the Centre’s capacities in the field of natural heritage. That was actually one of your requests to us.

The number of posts—financed through regular and extra-budgetary funding sources—has decreased over the last few years while the number of properties has increased on the World Heritage List (1073 properties currently), and the tasks for the World Heritage Centre have constantly increased. We are now facing a situation that is no longer sustainable, as explained already during the Information Session on 17th of May 2018.

In this regard, I would very much like to thank the delegations and governments of

Germany, Hungary, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, Sweden, Turkey and Qatar for their staff support with secondments, junior professional officers/associate experts and non-reimbursable loans.

The activities of the World Heritage Centre are fully in line with the Medium-Term Strategy (2014-2021) and the approved programme and budget for 2016-2017.

As you know, for the World Heritage Convention, one expected result was established: *'Tangible heritage identified, protected, monitored and sustainably managed by Member States, in particular through the effective implementation of the 1972 Convention'*.

Five clear performance indicators have been developed to track progress and achievements for this expected result. While the performance indicators focus on quantitative information, this presentation will provide concrete examples to illustrate how the World Heritage Centre has worked with States Parties, Advisory Bodies and many other stakeholders to identify, protect, monitor and sustainably manage World Heritage.

On the governing bodies; the key outcomes of the 41st session are as follows: World Heritage Committee prepared 47 documents. The Committee adopted 238 Decisions. The Committee examined 154 State of Conservation reports and inscribed 21 new properties on the World Heritage List. The Decisions report and the video recordings are fully available on the website of 41.COM as well as the summary records.

As you know, two working groups met during the 41st session of the Committee. I do not need to go into detail.

I would like to highlight that we continue to have briefing orientation sessions for the newly elected Committee members in November 2017, the orientation session held in conjunction with the information session in May 2018 and the following orientation session yesterday that were prepared by the Centre and the Advisory Bodies to support Committee members and States Parties in the preparation of this session.

Capacity-building activities were implemented in all regions and I will only highlight a few: In Africa, the partnership between the Centre and the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) has been further developed. A workshop was organised on the development of World Heritage curricula in African educational institutions in April of 2018, in Zimbabwe, with over 30 participants from universities in English-speaking African countries.

In the Latin America and the Caribbean, a capacity-building strategy was adopted by the States Parties of Mexico and Central America on various priority areas defined in the Action Plan for World Heritage in Mexico and Central America (PAMAC), 2018-2023, such as communities, tourism and sustainable approaches to heritage management.

Nominations: With the 21 properties that were inscribed by the Committee at its 41st Session, the World Heritage List reached 1073 properties of which 832 are cultural, 206 natural and 35 mixed. There are currently 54 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Centre continuously supports States Parties in the process of updating Tentative Lists and provides advice and information on good practices concerning the elaboration of nomination files.

In the Arab region, a regional workshop was organised on the World Heritage nomination process, in Djerba, Tunisia, to strengthen capacities of heritage managers and professionals in the preparation of nomination proposals.

For Europe, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies continued to provide upstream

assistance on the framework of the Upstream Pilot Project Natural and Cultural Heritage of the Ohrid region (Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia). In this regard, one Transboundary Platform Meeting was organised on finalising the management planning documents for the existing World Heritage property and the proposed extension of the property.

The Centre also provided support to the IUCN-led project Identifying potential marine sites of Outstanding Universal Value in the Arctic region. The publication *Natural Marine World Heritage in the Arctic Ocean* was launched in 2017.

On sustainable development: You will recall that the General Assembly adopted at its 20th session the Policy for the integration of a sustainable development perspective into the processes of the World Heritage Convention (Resolution 20.GA.13). I think this is a very important document for all of us.

The Centre endeavours to mainstream sustainable development in all its activities. For example, the revised Periodic Reporting format has fully taken on board the principles of the World Heritage-SDP and the 2030 Agenda and embedded them throughout the questionnaire, as well as in the proposed monitoring indicators list and the analytical framework.

In Africa, further to the Operational Action Plan resulting from the International Conference Safeguarding African World Heritage as a Driver for Sustainable Development held in Arusha in 2016 and the Ngorongoro Declaration, several community-based heritage conservation projects have been developed. They included sites such as the city of Saint-Louis in Senegal, the Cliff of Bandiagara in the Land of the Dogons in Mali and the Royal Palaces of Abomey in Benin.

In February 2018, UNESCO launched a publication entitled *World Heritage for Sustainable Development in Africa*, which aims to present and analyse different experiences from African World Heritage sites that demonstrate the extent to which they serve as motors for development.

Sustainable development policies and approaches have also been mainstreamed into the Centre's activities in the Arab region. In particular, focus was given for the integration of sustainable development policies in the management of sites facing urban growth pressures such as Petra in Jordan and sites facing social and economic challenges. To this end, we organised an International Expert Meeting for the Conservation and Revitalisation of the Kasbah of Algiers jointly with the Algerian Ministry of Culture, in Algeria in January 2018.

On Conservation: as you are well aware, this Convention is about conservation, and during this session, the Committee will examine 157 state of conservation reports that were prepared by the Centre with the Advisory Bodies, including 54 related to properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

All state of conservation reports are integrated into the online World Heritage State of Conservation Information System. This information system now offers over 3,600 state of conservation reports on 564 properties and is receiving growing attention. It has just exceeded 1,000,000 page views.

Conservation projects are ongoing in many States Parties in Africa and International Assistance was provided to Sukur Cultural Landscape (Nigeria), Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal), Cidade Velha, Historic Centre of Ribeira Grande (Cabo Verde) and Kunta Kinteh Island and Related Sites (The Gambia) for conservation and management activities.

As for the Asia-Pacific Region, in September of 2017, UNESCO convened a three-day technical meeting followed by a public Symposium in Tokyo, Japan, entitled The Future

of the Bamiyan Buddha Statues: Technical Considerations and Potential Effects on Authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value. While no final decision was made at the meeting concerning the possible reconstruction of any Buddha statues, it marked an important step forward in the international, technical discussion on questions of the reconstruction of deliberately damaged World Heritage properties. On Item 7 we will come back to the matter of reconstruction.

In the Latin American and Caribbean region, after the severe earthquakes of last September in Mexico, Emergency International Assistance requests were approved for three of the most affected properties in the country, which are Historic Centre of Puebla, the Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco, and the early 16th-Century Monasteries on the Slopes of Popocatepetl.

Thematic priorities: Following Decision 41 COM 5A point 4 thematic studies on criterion (vi) and memory sites were conducted through the financial support of Germany and the Republic of Korea. Two reports were prepared by working groups including experts from different regions of the world and diverse expertise on: Guidance and Capacity Building for the Recognition of Associative Values Using World Heritage Criterion (vi) and Interpretation of Sites of Memory. These, including specific recommendations, were made available on-line on the webpage of the Centre and a whole afternoon was dedicated to the presentation and discussion of the results and recommendations on the 17th of May, 2018 after our information meeting at UNESCO. I am very grateful to the delegations for their attendance and the discussions we have had so far.

In this regard, and in response to concerns that a number of World Heritage nominations might be submitted in the near future related to sites associated with memories of conflicts, and in the absence of clear parameters for how such sites relate to the World Heritage Convention, ICOMOS prepared a discussion paper on Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts. This was also presented and is available online on the website. You also have the opportunity to learn more at a side event during this Committee to have further discussion meeting at the Advisory Bodies' space. On this, I would like to mention that a publication was made by the delegation of Poland after the meeting we had on the conference and this mainly concerns the discussion on education and memory.

In 2017, the Executive Board noted with satisfaction the development of the UNESCO Policy on engaging with indigenous peoples as living documents. The Policy includes specific references to the World Heritage Convention and provisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee and the General Assembly. I believe there will be further discussion on this not only tonight in the side event by the indigenous people but also during our future policy compendium.

Awareness-raising: Currently, there are 115,000 members registered with the World Heritage Centre website. The World Heritage website is the most visited UNESCO site: it receives more than 1,000,000 visits per month. This figure, which amounts to 39 per cent of all visits of the UNESCO website, demonstrates growing global interest in World Heritage issues.

The 2017-2018 World Heritage Map was produced in collaboration with National Geographic Maps in English, French, Spanish and Arabic. I would also specifically like to thank Bahrain for their support regarding the production of the map.

Social media is being integrated more and more into the communication and outreach activities of the Secretariat. Twitter, Facebook and Instagram are being used not only as vehicles for disseminating information about World Heritage news, activities, competitions and calls for proposals, but also as platforms for capacity building. For example, with the aim of drawing attention to protecting the oceans from climate change, over 60 video messages

from 30 World Heritage marine sites were developed and shared across the UNESCO and World Heritage sites' social media platforms using the hash tag #MyOceanPledge. Such practices will be further developed and enhanced.

As you know, the quarterly magazine *World Heritage* has a thematic focus for each issue and is available in print, app, and online versions. I hope you enjoy reading it.

As part of the awareness-raising activities related to illicit trafficking of cultural objects, the May, 2018 issue of the *World Heritage Review* was dedicated to Fighting Illicit Trade, which also included an article on the collaboration of the World Heritage Convention and CITES (the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora).

On gender equality: gender is one of the Global Priorities of UNESCO. The gender equality dimension is consistently integrated in the implementation of all activities carried out within the Centre, also following the sustainable development policy.

One example of this approach is the Policy Compendium Working Group, for the establishment of which the criteria included gender parity, in addition to balanced geographical and cultural/natural expertise representation. The same approach is applied with regard to multimedia and animation products, with a balanced representation of female/male characters, such as the animated videos prepared as training material for the third Periodic Reporting cycle.

On synergies with other conventions: the Centre has further enhanced the synergies with other conventions and programmes. At its 41st Session, the Committee adopted the revised Periodic Reporting format, which mainstreamed, for the first time, the synergies between the World Heritage Convention and other cultural and biodiversity-related conventions and programmes, by integrating relevant questions in this regard, further to a consultation with the Secretariats of all relevant Conventions and programmes. The Centre has also developed a new platform on the web page in order to better reflect the synergies with the other culture and biodiversity-related conventions and programmes (linking UNESCO's designated site).

The Culture Conventions Liaison Group (CCLG) met regularly to review working methods, plan for statutory meetings and coordinate funding and resource mobilisation. In operational terms, in the European and North American region, for the first time a joint mission was carried out within the framework of two cultural conventions; the World Heritage Convention and the 2001 Convention on the Protection of the Underwater Cultural Heritage, to the Ancient City of Nessebar in November 2017.

On Biodiversity-related Conventions: The Centre participated in the meeting of the Biodiversity Liaison Group (BLG), in September of 2017, in Rome. We also supported the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands by joining the 2018 World Wetlands Day dedicated to Wetlands for a sustainable urban future on the 2nd of February, 2018 and also worked in close collaboration with the CITES Secretariat to celebrate World Wildlife Day on the 3rd of March on the theme of Protecting Big Cats. It was a pleasure for me to collaborate more closely with CBD and its Executive Secretary, Ms. Palmer, with whom I had a working meeting just a few days ago, on the 14th of June.

The Centre continued its contribution to a joint project with the Ramsar Convention Secretariat, which was concluded through the publication of the report Ramsar and World Heritage Conventions Converging Towards Success. The report illustrates through case studies how conservation of cultural and natural values can benefit from dual designations under the Ramsar and World Heritage conventions.

The Centre is also strengthening cooperation and synergies with the Food and

Agriculture Organization's (FAO) Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems around activities to safeguard agricultural heritage. A joint workshop, you can see it here, between UNESCO and FAO was organised with the Centre at the UNESCO Headquarters in January 2018.

Under item 5A I also report now on the World Heritage Thematic Programmes and Initiatives that are being implemented by the Centre in close collaboration with the Advisory Bodies : World Heritage Cities Programme (2001); World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme (2012); Small Island Developing States Programme (2005); World Heritage Marine Programme (2005); Thematic Initiative on Astronomy and World Heritage (2005); Initiative on Heritage of Religious Interest (2011); and World Heritage Earthen Architecture Programme (WHEAP) (2007).

The World Heritage Cities Programme has contributed to the elaboration and implementation of the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL), which is an important tool for strengthening UNESCO's action in the field of urban heritage conservation. In this regard, I wish to recall the August 31st, 2018, deadline for reporting by all UNESCO Member States on the HUL recommendation, which enables us to prepare a consolidated report for 2019, for a general conference.

As an example of our work, a workshop was held in Šibenik, Republic of Croatia, in March of 2018, which focused on the means to implement the 2011 Recommendation on HUL within World Heritage properties with the significant presence of historic walls, fortifications and fortified urban areas. New publications on HUL were also produced, such as the one here by WHITRAP in China.

The World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme has created an international framework for the planning and sustainable management of tourism at World Heritage properties in order to protect the Outstanding Universal Value and achieve sustainable economic development.

Some of the activities conducted within the Programme are: World Heritage Journeys of the European Union (also financing this project), Sustainable Tourism and Visitor Management Assessment Tool, Sustainable Tourism Toolkit, and UNESCO Seabourn Cruise Line partnership.

As you know, I reported to the Executive Board in April of 2018 on the follow-up to the Muscat Declaration on Tourism and Culture: Fostering Sustainable Development of December, 2017, which strengthens synergies between tourism and culture. We also provided information on the outcomes of the pilot phase of the Sustainable Tourism Management Assessment Tool. I am very happy to inform you that a number of sites are test sites for the tourism tool and the draft tool will be presented here, while the public launch of the tool will take place in September of 2018.

The World Heritage Programme for Small Island Developing States (SIDS) coordinates and develops World Heritage-related activities on the islands of the Caribbean Sea, and the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Oceans. We organised, for example, a capacity-building workshop on Heritage/Environmental Impact Assessments for the Pacific Island States jointly with the Category 2 Centre (WHITRAP) in Suva and Levuka, Fiji, in November of 2017.

The World Heritage Marine Programme has a mission to establish effective conservation of existing World Heritage marine sites and marine areas with potential Outstanding Universal Value (currently there are 49 marine properties around the globe). The programme led the first global scientific assessment of climate change impacts on World Heritage coral reefs and communicated the assessment's results during several events. The programme was instrumental in establishing a new, AUD13 million project to develop climate

adaptation strategies across five initial marine World Heritage properties (countries involved: Australia, Palau, France, Belize) expected to be launched in July of 2018. Children from 12 World Heritage marine properties addressed world leaders at the United Nations General Assembly (the 8th of June, 2017, New York) to reduce climate emissions and step up ocean conservation. The event was part of the high level celebrations of the 2017 United Nations Oceans Conference.

I think it may be one of the most successful of the thematic programmes in terms of funding, as it raised US\$1.2 million in 2017 alone, mainly from the private sector, including high net worth individuals and the governments of France, Monaco and Flanders. Preparations also started to develop scientific research about World Heritage as part of United Nations Decade for Ocean Science (starting in 2020).

The Thematic Initiative on Astronomy and World Heritage aims to identify sites related to astronomical observations across all geographical regions. Following the Memorandum of Understanding between UNESCO and the International Astronomical Union (IAU) of 2008, we continue now through the official partnership (consultative status) established between UNESCO and the IAU in 2015.

Among the activities are information and publications such as the IAU/ICOMOS thematic study on the Heritage Sites of Astronomy and Archaeoastronomy in the context of the World Heritage Convention (2017).

The Initiative on Heritage of Religious Interest is an example of a thematic approach in heritage conservation that is proposing new forms of action to promote social cohesion and peaceful interaction among cultures. A number of expert meetings took place in the Mediterranean and Eastern Europe, and the Asia-Pacific region in 2017 and 2018. The meetings discussed guiding principles for the elaboration of the thematic paper.

An International Expert Meeting on Astronomical Heritage and Sacred Places took place just now, which actually links the two initiatives organised by the Government of the Canary Islands with the support of the Ministry of Culture of Spain in May of 2018 (results already uploaded on our web pages).

Finally, The World Heritage Programme on Earthen Architecture (WHEAP) focuses on the state of conservation and management of earthen architecture sites worldwide. The Centre provides support to the main partner of the Programme, the International Centre for Earthen Architecture (CRATerre), for the implementation of the Programme.

Within this context, the international congress Terra 2016, organised in July 2016 in Lyon (France), gathered 755 participants from 70 countries and mainly focused on issues dealing with sustainable development, particularly in urban areas. The outcome which you see here on the screen has just been published.

As mentioned at the beginning, there are five Annexes in the document, which are also important to look at. First of all Annex 1: results-based report on the activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre in pursuit of the 5 'Cs' (covering the period from July of 2017 to June of 2018). Then Annex 2, Follow-up on the Decisions adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its 41st session (Krakow, 2017). Annex 3: World Heritage Expert and other Meetings, January 2018 – December 2018, including the meetings planned through the year. Annex 4 Report on the authorisation of use of the World Heritage emblem (February 2017 - February 2018). The last Annex provides for the 5 Inventory of World Heritage Partnerships.

The Table provides an overview of partnerships with the private sector. Since the last report to the Committee, five new partnerships have been signed and three have been renewed, while four partnerships were terminated.

I would also like to inform you that Table 2 of this new partnership with the inventory of envisaged World Heritage partnership as of February 2018, contains a partnership which has just been signed, which covers the production of a series of 75 45-minute films about World Heritage sites and conservation challenges. I think this is very important for awareness-raising.

I conclude on this positive note and thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Director. This is an extremely useful report that gives us an overview on the work last year and also that forthcoming. Do you have any comments or feedback? We have a very long list. We will start with Norway, you have the floor, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you, Chair. I would like to start by complementing the Secretariat on their hard work and achievements despite this unpredictable and challenging situation. There are two important points we should all keep in mind during this meeting. First of all, if there is no Outstanding Universal Value there is no World Heritage. As members of the World Heritage Committee, we bear a heavy responsibility in making sure that the Outstanding Universal Value is defined and protected in all our decisions. Taking care of the Convention and the List is our responsibility.

Last year two thirds of the decisions concerning nominations disregarded the scientific advice of our Advisory Bodies. This year our sincere hope is that we can do better. Every discussion and conclusion by the Committee must therefore be based on objectives and scientific considerations, as stated in section 23 of our Operational Guidelines. By being true to this you will also be more in line with the Global Strategy goals of a more representative and balanced List. First of all, it will enhance its credibility and the relevance and respect for the Convention. This is the starting point of Norway’s work in this Committee.

This leads me to my second point on conservation before nomination. One of Norway's greatest concerns is that an unacceptable amount of human and financial resources are spent on reacquiring nominations. This means that the resources are taken from much-needed protection first and that there is a limited support for nominations by States that are currently underrepresented on the List. Conservation is key to the Convention. We hold our global responsibility to manage our unique and shared heritage in the best way possible through actions and taking care of properties. That is how our money should be spent and that is why we should choose conservation before nomination.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much and now the floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you Madam Chairperson. Since this is the first time I take the floor, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Madam Chairperson for assuming this very important and yet challenging duty. I would also like to thank the host country, the Kingdom

of Bahrain for the generous hospitality and warm welcome extended to us all; we wish the conference every success.

Thank you Madam Director for the comprehensive report on the World Heritage Centre. China highly appreciates the effort and all relevant activities undertaken by the World Heritage Centre for the better implementation of the World Heritage Convention and the World Heritage Committee's decisions. As a committed State Party to the Convention, China attaches the utmost importance to the core values of the Convention, preservation and promotion of cultural and natural heritage and has always been a strong supporter of the 1972 Convention.

With the aim of better fulfilment of its mandates as a member of the World Heritage Committee, China stands ready to make greater contributions to support under-represented geographic regions in preparing nomination files to continuously raise public awareness of heritage conservation and sustainable tourism, to further develop collaboration projects on the promotion of World Heritage sites in accordance and in co-ordination with the World Heritage Centre and to explore a better mechanism through the common efforts of the Committee member and the World Heritage Centre to effectively implement the Committee decisions.

Among the many important accomplishments in the report, China takes note of the hopeful results of thematic studies on the interpretation of Sites of Memory and criterion (vi) for the development of the World Heritage Programme. We hope that these outcomes can be well-utilised by Member States.

Madam Director I would like to confirm that the Chinese delegation would like to have the interventions recorded in English. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Indonesia."

Indonesia:

"Thank you, Madam Chair. Indonesia thanks the World Heritage for the report of its activities in furthering the goals of the World Heritage Convention. We appreciate the capacity-building activities organised by the World Heritage Centre, noting in particular the importance of capacity-building activities to make sure that states have the necessary capacities to preserve World Heritage in their respective territories in accordance with the Convention.

An increased capacity of States in preserving World Heritage will ease the work of the Advisory Bodies in the preservation of World Heritage as well as their financial pressures. We also take note on the discussion of interpretations of Sites of Memory. We are of the view that it is necessary to continue further discussion to develop effective methods of interpretation and deliberations in particular on the related cultural sites.

From our side, Indonesia is pleased to host two training activities with respect to the preservation of the philosophical value of Sumba, Bali and the enhancement of comprehensive management of Komodo National Park. We therefore encourage the World Heritage Centre to continue prioritising capacity- building activities and express Indonesia's hope of strengthening co-operation with the Centre on this latter. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Tanzania, please, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Tanzania’s delegation, speaking for the first time, wishes to join the delegates on congratulating you for being elected chair of this session. Tanzania’s delegation is committed to working with you under your guidance. The delegation of Tanzania also thanks the government of the Kingdom of Bahrain for their hospitality and the excellent facilities that have been put at our disposal.

Excellence Chair, the report of the World Heritage Centre informed on the main activities conducted by the Centre and the results since the 41st Session of the World Heritage Committee in Cracow, Poland. This delegate commends the World Heritage Centre for an informative and instructive report, particularly the attached annexes that clarify the report.

The republic of Tanzania notes with appreciation the involvement of Category 2 Centres and their activities and undertakings, and encourages them to continue this involvement and especially those in developing countries, because this is where the young generation is. Excellency Chair, the World Heritage Centre on nominations, among others, reports that the Committee at its 41st Session in Cracow, in 14 cases, did not follow the recommendations given by World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as per the report. Seven referrals became inscriptions, one referral became an inscription, one deferral became a referral and four non-inscriptions became referrals and one non-inscription became a referral.

Excellency Chair, the Republic of Tanzania, first and foremost, commends the work of the Centre for the successful implementation of the main activities undertaken and the results since the last session of the World Heritage Committee. The use of the format introduced since the 37th session of the World Heritage Committee in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, in 2013, particularly complimentary annexes, the creative role for enhancing synergies between the World Heritage Convention and other cultural and biodiversity-related Conventions.

Also, Tanzania commends the World Heritage Centre for the increased collaboration among the related conventions through joint activities and statements and awareness-raising and the initiative on the undertaking of thematic studies on the Outstanding Universal Value using World Heritage criteria (vi) and the interpretation of Sites of Memory.

Excellency Chair, it is the opinion of the Republic of Tanzania’s delegation on the nomination decision process of the Committee that the reported scenario by the World Heritage Centre can have impacts not only on the credibility of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, but also on the Committee itself. For example, seven referrals became inscriptions, one referral became an inscription, one deferral became a referral and four non-inscriptions became referrals and another non-inscription became a referral. We are taking note of the disparities in the decisions on inscriptions proposed by the World Heritage Committee and we invite the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to critically study this trend with the objective of developing better guidance for using these disparities approved by the Committee.

Chair, I submit.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe’s delegation.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. Zimbabwe commends the World Heritage Centre for the impressive work done in following up on the decisions of the Committee and ensuring the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. We are particularly impressed by the number of activities that have been held to strengthen the States Parties in Africa in the area of conservation as well as building capacity.

We would like to particularly underline that Zimbabwe attended a meeting of tertiary educational institutions in Africa from the English-speaking group to look at how they have a common curriculum on World Heritage. This should be complemented by the work that has been done with the francophone group so that we have a common curriculum in World Heritage within the African continent. This would help us to have a pool of experts that we can work with and that can also be absorbed within the World Heritage Centre itself and the Advisory Bodies.

We complement the Centre for the creative partnerships that it has entered into, especially with Category 2 Centres as well as with the private sector. We also thank those State Parties that provided budgetary support for enhancing activities of the Centre.

Finally, we urge the Centre to develop more conservation and capacity-building programmes to follow up recommendations for the many thematic papers and workshops that it has hosted.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much. Madam Chair, First of all, I would like to join my voice with those of my colleagues to congratulate you for your election as Chair of this meeting. I would also like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its warm hospitality. I would also like to congratulate the World Heritage Centre for its wonderful job in a difficult situation. I believe that all members fully appreciate this. I would also like to express my satisfaction for the reference made to sustainable development documentation.

In Spain, for the past 30 years, we have been highlighting the fact that cultural World Heritage sites are fundamental for sustainable development. This is why the work we do in terms of conservation and decisions taken by this Committee should also focus on the sustainable development communities concerned. This is why, when we talk of conservation before a nomination as the Director General was saying, this has to do with our identity: The possibilities offered to communities for sustainable development.

I would like to join my voice with those of Tanzania and Zimbabwe as to the need to increase technical assistance and capacity-building because it is thanks to that type of work that we will improve representativeness in terms of the number of countries and also we will be able to provide specific assistance for better preservation of our sites whether they are

listed as World Heritage or not.

I would also like to reiterate my thanks to the World Heritage Centre for the organisation of the Thematic Meetings and notably that on Sustainable Tourism and a recent one in the Canary Islands on Astronomy and Sacred Places. Finally, I would like to once again highlight the importance of cultural heritage and sustainable development and we will in November hold a summit on this very issue. I would also like to congratulate the World Heritage Centre for this wonderful web page which makes it possible to follow the state of conservation. It is the most useful tool for all the people working in this field.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now the floor is to the representative of Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme c’est la première fois que notre pays prend la parole, nous aimerions vous féliciter pour avoir été élue présidente de cette session et nous vous souhaitons un grand succès dans la conduite de nos travaux.

Nous remercions également le Royaume de Bahreïn pour avoir accepté d’abriter cette 42^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. L’Angola reconnaît et félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le travail accompli ces derniers mois et surtout les activités développées dans le cadre de la mise en œuvre des décisions de nos différents travaux au niveau du Comité.

Nous aimerions en particulier renforcer ce qu’ont déjà évoqué le Zimbabwe et la Tanzanie et d’autres États membres pour ce qui concerne le renforcement des capacités. L’Angola appuie les initiatives dans ce sens afin que le Centre avec tout son réseau de partenaires puisse continuer à développer ces activités pas seulement au niveau de l’Afrique, mais de toutes les régions du monde. Nous aimerions qu’il mette l’accent sur cette nouvelle initiative du programme concernant le patrimoine et les institutions éducatives, comme l’a souligné le Zimbabwe, un atelier a eu lieu à Harare.

Nous encourageons le Centre pour tous ces efforts au niveau d’autres régions en ce qui concerne les pays francophones et lusophones d’Afrique, car nous savons qu’avec ce programme, certainement, nous allons renforcer durablement l’expertise sur le terrain en impliquant de plus en plus des jeunes professionnels du patrimoine, des jeunes chercheurs sur la gestion des sites du patrimoine et d’autres types de bien du patrimoine. Nous pensons qu’une telle innovation pourrait également inspirer d’autres régions en développement pour pouvoir embrasser ce genre d’activités.

Nous félicitons une fois de plus le travail accompli par le Centre pour mettre en œuvre les décisions prises par le Comité.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much dear colleague. As you know, the representatives of the Youth Professional Forum are with us this morning to present the declaration taken during their meeting. I would suggest suspending our current discussion to listen to them. We will come

back to item 5A immediately at the beginning of our afternoon session. Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Assistant Director General.”

Assistant Director General:

“Thank you Chairperson. Comme vous le savez, les jeunes sont les acteurs du changement par leur énergie, leur inventivité, leur capacité de mobiliser leurs pairs.

Les jeunes seront les décideurs de demain et seront responsables de l’avenir de notre patrimoine immense et diversifié. Les jeunes sont des acteurs importants dans la vie des communautés qui sont conscients du fait que le patrimoine culturel n’appartient pas seulement au passé, mais aussi au futur et qu’il est un élément essentiel pour l’identité.

L’UNESCO considère les jeunes comme partenaires et parties prenantes. L’éducation des jeunes est une priorité pour l’UNESCO par sa stratégie opérationnelle pour la jeunesse 2014 -2021. L’UNESCO favorise la construction d’un esprit critique et d’une identité ouverte à la compréhension de l’autre en faveur, de la protection, la préservation et la conservation du patrimoine mondial auprès des jeunes. L’importance de cette jeunesse et le rôle de l’éducation sont reconnus par l’article 7 de la Convention concernant la protection du patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel de 1972.

Le programme, dont on est en train de voir aujourd’hui le résultat, est né en 1994 et c’est le Programme d’éducation du patrimoine mondial de l’UNESCO. Cette année, 30 jeunes de 30 pays différents ont pris part à ce Forum des jeunes où ils ont eu la possibilité de faire des ateliers, des tables rondes, des visites et des activités pratiques, écouter des présentations d’experts et échanger avec eux, organiser des débats et aussi une simulation du Comité. Ces jeunes ont représenté les membres du Comité pendant une formation dont, nous a-t-on dit, les résultats ont été très surprenants.

Les résultats de tout ce travail de cette semaine et les recommandations des jeunes professionnels ont été formulés sous la forme d’un message qui va être rendu par deux participants qui représentent le groupe. Une participante des Philippines et un du Zimbabwe.

Félicitations une fois de plus pour l’engagement de ces jeunes et pour ce travail avec l’UNESCO. Merci ».

Young participant from Philippines:

“As participants of the UNESCO World Heritage Young Professionals Forum 2018, Protecting Heritage in an Ever-Changing World, we would like to express our gratitude to the Kingdom of Bahrain, Shaikha Mai Bint Mohammed Al Khalifa, the President of the Bahrain Authority for Culture and Antiquities (BACA), Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa, Chairperson of the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee, Ms. Audrey Azoulay, Director-General of UNESCO and Ms. Mechtild Rössler, Director of the UNESCO World Heritage Centre. We would also like to thank the organising team from Diadrasis and the local and international experts who shared their valuable insights. Our thanks also go out to the people of Bahrain who shared their warm hospitality. This declaration has been informed by the interaction between young professionals from across the world.

The world is undergoing rapid change and there has never been a better time to actively involve young professionals in the management and protection of World Heritage than today.

Globalisation and rapid change have made the protection of heritage a challenge. However, we, as young professionals, also view this as an opportunity to reflect on diversity as a tool to celebrate our shared heritage.

Education and communication are key parts of heritage protection and can help foster peace. It is important to consider the multiplicity of stories inherent in our heritage, document them in an engaging manner, and communicate them to communities in powerful ways so as to make them come alive in the minds of people across the world. This will also help secure the universal human right to culture.

Since heritage conservation depends on our capacity to manage change, we call upon increased collaboration between institutions addressing climate change and those addressing cultural and natural heritage. We would like to express our concern about climate change and how the international community responds to this change at a national and global scale. There is a need for sustainable development in which heritage can be a source of economic growth.

We encourage the World Heritage Committee to strengthen their efforts to promote the inscription of natural heritage sites to the World Heritage List due to the lack of their representation. We believe the protection and conservation of our natural heritage will lead to a better understanding of impacts of climate change on culture and nature through heritage interpretation and education.”

Young participant from Zimbabwe:

“We are hopeful that States Parties will continue to adopt new technologies to mitigate the effects of climate change and that they will utilise the traditional knowledge of local communities in this regard.

The use of technological tools must be promoted to enhance the potential to share heritage globally and to improve its availability for conservation, documentation, and research. New technologies can help us to promote our shared heritage in more engaging ways. However, technology should not displace or replace heritage.

We recognise that the involvement of youth and local communities is vital for the sustainability of the Convention and the successful long-term conservation of heritage. We encourage the Committee to manage the impact of tourism whilst simultaneously recognising its benefits.

There is room for increased community engagement and involvement, taking into account the diversity of these communities, at every step of the decision-making process of the World Heritage framework. The World Heritage Centre and the States Parties need to increase awareness of processes for the inscription and conservation of World Heritage Sites.

We must emphasise the human element in the protection of heritage and engagement. Non-governmental organisations and individuals from all the countries in the world should be able to communicate with UNESCO and share their concerns and their ideas for enhancing heritage protection and conservation.

The Young Professionals Forum recognises that heritage is an ever-expanding and dynamic concept which has shaped the Convention over the years and that we must be prepared to adapt to these changes.

We believe in the need for a more global understanding of heritage and recognise the values of cultures outside the protection of the World Heritage List.

We emphasise the need for inclusive education encompassing traditional knowledge to holistically achieve the objectives of the Convention and keep it relevant worldwide.

We are confident that the Convention will continue to inspire generations to protect and uphold the integrity of cultural heritage, if communities, experts and the youth continue to work together in this ever-changing world.

Thank you.”

Assistant Director General:

« Nous allons voir une vidéo de deux minutes sur le conseil des jeunes ^[vidéo]. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you to the young people. Now, before we close our morning session, I give the floor to the Secretariat as they have some announcements to make. We will resume at 3:00 pm; thank you very much.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Today is the first day of our Committee and we are also beginning the marathon of side events besides the main session. Side events for today’s lunch time break, there are two of them; one, in the Advisory Bodies space, Manama room, 1:10 pm until 2:00 pm is a presentation on the World Heritage Leadership Programme, which is a capacity-building programme on people, nature and culture. It is organised by ICCROM, IUCN and Norway, Manama Room, Advisory Bodies Space 1:10 pm.

Another event will take place at 2:10pm in the same room on raising awareness on nature-culture linkages: Tsukuba University and ICCROM are organising this event. There are two exhibitions—you can see them on the screen. That first is the Young Professionals Forum Exhibition; you just heard their inspiring message to you. They have worked during this Forum to create an exhibition that is presented in the main lobby. There is a second exhibition the day after, Shadows of Heritage, organised by the Chargé d’office of ICCROM and which is also in the exhibition area. With that we have no more announcements to make for the time being.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much.

FIRST DAY – Monday 25 June 2018

SECOND SESSION

3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“As we agreed before the break, we will now resume our discussion on item 5B. I now have the following list from the Committee members, Azerbaijan, Hungary, Brazil, Australia, Cuba, Tanzania, Tunisia and Guatemala; from the observers, the Republic of Korea, Belgium, Sweden and Chile. Are there any other members or observers who would like to speak on this matter? NGOs maybe?”

We will start with Azerbaijan. You have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. First of all, I would like to congratulate you and the government of Bahrain for their successful hosting of the World Heritage Committee session. I would like to wish every success to you in your important task of leading us during these days.

We would like to thank the Secretariat for this detailed report and I would like to highlight some points in this regard. We once more emphasise the importance of two global priorities of UNESCO, namely support to Africa and gender equality and the attention given to the youth and the Small Island Developing States.

We also commend the Secretariat for success in implementation of the performing indicators, but we have some reflections that I would like to point out. First, when it comes to capacity building: of course, we emphasise the importance of the capacity-building activities in each session of the World Heritage Committee and we will present maybe more detailed views on this issue during the consideration of item 6. Here, I would like just to point out several components that we deem important.

The capacity building should focus rather on preservation and conservation issues. With this, in order to attain sustainability this training of trainees programme should be further developed and introduced. We have one question regarding the selection of the countries. This question I would like to ask to the secretariat is based on which criteria some pilot countries were chosen by the Secretariat in certain regions.

Then, I would like to focus on sustainable development and its performance indicators. When we talk about sustainable development in relation to communities and the involvement of the communities in these natural settings and we commend and encourage the Secretariat to continue its work in involving communities in discussions. Here, I would like to make references and emphasis to the synergies between other conventions; the 2003 Convention fits to this idea, this Convention deals with income-generating activities which are contributing to sustainable development.

Later, I would like to also comment when we will speak about synergies. I want to commend the activities of the Secretariat, but I would also encourage more activities to be

done according to the 1954 The Hague Convention for the Protection of Heritage and Properties in the Event of Armed Conflict. There are several instruments and mechanisms which can be very useful for the 1972 Convention on Enhanced Protection and we would hope that the Secretariat would further explore the possibilities of making more synergies with the 1954 Convention.

Of course, biodiversity is also very important. There is an untapped potential which also needs to be explored by the Secretariat, especially on approaches to sustainable development and the involvement of communities as well. We have also taken note with appreciation of the implementation of the World Heritage Thematic Programmes and initiatives, as well as the introduction of the World Heritage statutory approach to evaluate the work in this area.

When it comes to the programme itself, the World Heritage Cities Programme is very important in terms of paying attention to the old historical landscape. In this regard, I would like to mention that the Old City of Baku is hosting, this October 23-24, a Board of Directors of the Organisation of Old Heritage Cities, which will be another additional platform to discuss the management and the development of historic urban landscape.

Also, specific attention should be given to world tourism, the World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme and the collaboration with UNWTO. Here, I would like to emphasise the work on the Silk Road. Azerbaijan, as an active partner on the Silk Road, pays particular attention to the work on this programme with UNESCO and is supporting the online platform within UNESCO.

Last but not least, I would like to point out the thematic studies on the recognition of associated values using World Heritage criterion (vi) and on interpretation on Sites of Memory. We believe and understand that these are recommendations but we still encourage States Parties concerned to engage in dialogue in order to find solutions to certain outstanding issues.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. The Hungarian delegation wishes to commend Dr Rössler and the Secretariat for preparing this very comprehensive report and for its formidable and professional work despite the budget constraints. When talking about money, one has to know that financial situation continues to be of utmost concern. But all the while, we should not forget that World Heritage is the flagship programme of UNESCO.

We are very alarmed by the fact that 26 positions are now being financed through extra budget report-in-kind resources at the World Heritage Centre and also take into account that there are only 28 established through the regular programme.

Hungary also wishes to draw attention to the fact that a staggering almost 50 percent of the sites inscribed on the World Heritage List are from Europe and North America, although the regional unit is comprised of only a few people. This means that a small team of very dedicated professionals is responsible to more than 500 sites; a very heavy burden. In our view, this imbalance of human resource distribution and mismatchment of workload needs to be acknowledged. We understand that this is easier said than done. The attention

of the States Parties needs to be drawn to this serious issue. It is noted in the report as part of the awareness-raising activities of the Centre.

The Hungarian government has contributed financially to the development of Heritage experts for African States Parties, Burkina Faso, Cameroon and Ghana. Hungary is very keen on supporting other initiatives and programmes of this kind, to demonstrate that even small donors can contribute to projects that have big impacts on the ground. We urge the States Parties to contribute towards the implementation of the Convention and towards the implementation of the Committee decisions no matter how much they might be able to give.

Once again we take note of the excellent report drafted by the Secretariat on its activities and especially the Thematic Programmes. Hungary would like to have more information on the resources dedicated to the implementation of the Thematic Programmes with special respect to the World Heritage Cities Programme.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. Allow me, first of all, to express to you and to the government of Bahrain, our most sincere gratitude for your warm hospitality. At the same time, I would like to congratulate you for the excellent organisation of this 42nd meeting of the World Heritage Committee.

In this morning’s session, we paid close attention to the presentation of the report of the *ad hoc* Working Group and to the activities of the World Heritage Centre. In this sense, I would like to thank you, for your direct and competent involvement on the review of the Upstream Process definition. Thank you very much.

I would also like very much to congratulate the director of the World Heritage Centre for her report, which reflects her leadership and the dedication of her competent team devoted to the noble cause of protecting and conserving our World Heritage in the perspective of sustainable development.

At this point I would like to remark that Brazil’s delegation share the comments made by the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan when it comes to sustainable development and we do hope that we can later on in the debates come back to this very important topic which would also affect some sites that we have already on the List.

Despite all the efforts that we have made so far, when reading the report of the *ad hoc* working group, I was very impressed with the observation stating that little has changed in terms of the regional distribution of World Heritage sites and in the relation to the domination of cultural sites over natural and mixed sites. I was very pleased that the Youth Professional Forum highlighted this morning the willingness of the younger generations to see more natural sites in the List. I hope we can work in that direction.

The challenges we have ahead of us justify the importance of the *ad hoc* Working Group in support of the World Heritage Centre and ultimately to the benefit of heritage sites of States Parties. Brazil commends all the efforts aiming at addressing capacity building and is ready to contribute to enlarging its cooperation in this area, especially through Category 2 Centres. I should come back to this topic later on in our discussion.

Thank you very much Madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to the representative of Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. First, I most strongly endorse your wise opening comment this morning about the criticality of upholding the integrity of the World Heritage Convention. We thank you for those remarks and I hope they are taken on board during this meeting. I wish to thank Ms. Rössler, her staff and partners for the extraordinary work they all do with limited resources. Just imagine how much could be achieved with a more substantial budget focused on conservation of the outstanding universal places that we are collectively charged with protecting.

Australia is pleased to have been elected again to the World Heritage Committee and we look forward to fulfilling our mandate focused on the five ‘Cs’ of the Convention: Conservation, Community, Capacity Building, Communication and very importantly the Credibility of the World Heritage List. You heard us, as mentioned before by Australia, that we see a sixth ‘C’ being added to the five ‘Cs’, and that sixth ‘C’ is Climate change. We look forward to working with the Committee States Parties, Advisory Bodies and civil society on this issue, which is so fundamental to the integrity of our World Heritage places.

These are challenging times for the World Heritage system as it grapples with challenges on so many fronts. We are all too familiar with the series of financial constraints on the World Heritage system, as the List grows and scarce resources flow less and less to conservation. We must remedy this problem. A pathway has been laid under the leadership first of the Philippines and more recently of Bahrain and Azerbaijan through the *ad hoc* working group and now we have to walk the path that has been laid.

All studies have stated that States Parties have a duty to provide the resources needed to support a functional and effective system. We must all reach deep into our pockets—if we don’t, who else will?

There are more, severe problems to tackle too. The increasing trend of the Committee setting aside the sound technical advice of the Advisory Bodies on nominations and state of conservation matters is undermining the credibility of the Convention. As custodian of the Convention the Committee can and must do better. During our term on the Committee Australia will be an advocate for upholding the technical integrity of the Committee; we will place great weight on the analysis and advice of the Advisory Bodies, we will be consistent in our approach and transparent in our appraisal of individual properties’ dossiers. I will be clear now that we will not support an inscription placed on the World Heritage List where the advice before us is that it should not be inscribed.

The World Heritage List is not a beauty contest and should not be a place where States Parties compete for numerical supremacy. To do so is contrary to the spirit and intent of the Global Strategy for a representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Madam Chair. We would like to thank the Secretariat for the report that has been presented. On behalf of my delegation, I would like to pay tribute to the work done by the World Heritage Centre in a time of financial crisis that is encountered by UNESCO, which has certainly had a significant impact on the work of this Committee in a time of crises where issues such as climate change, emergency situations, conflicts, deliberate destruction of heritage and an increase in the risks for the protection and conservation of heritage are presenting new challenges for the work of this Committee.

If we can face these global challenges, then our Convention will be more credible. It will have to move with the times and I am particularly glad of issues mentioned by the Youth Forum paying attention to climate change, lack of representation on the World Heritage List and work with the communities and the work necessary on more dynamic new concepts. We believe that the credibility of this Convention and of this Committee depends on it and not only on the List itself.

We also would like to refer to the need to continue work for capacity building and to continue the implementation of the Action Plan for Latin America and the Caribbean which will enable us to improve the conditions for a third cycle of Periodic Reports. The strategies developed for Sites of Memory are also particularly interesting to us, especially those that are related to development. We believe that this Convention should work hand in hand with other programmes of the organisation.

Finally, I would like to refer to the need for dialogue between member states here in the Committee as well as the evaluation of this. I believe that this is one of the issues that can be most problematic in the work of the Committee. Without a dialogue we will not have conservation or preservation, due to a lack of communication which has happened elsewhere. We would like to call upon the Secretariat to play a fundamental role in this necessary dialogue for the protection of heritage in times of crises, conflicts and difficult financial situations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

[Interprétation en français] « Je vous remercie madame la présidente. Avant toute chose, je voudrais, madame la présidente, m’adresser à vous personnellement. Je vous félicite d’avoir été élue présidente de ce Comité. Je félicite également le royaume du Bahreïn pour l’accueil qui nous a été réservé à tous. Je voudrais également m’adresser à madame Rössler, directrice du centre du patrimoine mondial. Je voudrais la remercier justement pour le rapport qu’elle nous a présenté et dans lequel nous avons très bien vu le travail effectué au niveau du Centre. Je voudrais également l’a remerciée pour l’approche qu’elle a adoptée dans le travail du Centre.

Par rapport à la Tunisie et en ce qui concerne la formation des jeunes, c’est un sujet qui nous intéresse au premier chef et en particulier les femmes dans notre société. Il faudrait absolument que cet objectif soit au centre des discussions, et il l’est depuis plusieurs années, afin de donner aux femmes en particulier tous les moyens nécessaires et les compétences en matière de préservation du patrimoine.

Cette année nous entamons notre troisième année comme membre du Comité. À ce titre je voudrais insister sur la nécessité contrairement aux années précédentes que cette année nous puissions mettre sur la table en toute sérénité les problèmes de ces dernières années afin que nous puissions, comme je l'ai dit, en toute sérénité trouver des solutions à ces problèmes. En particulier, ce qui a émaillé les travaux du Conseil exécutif lors de sa dernière réunion.

Dans ce sens, la Tunisie pense qu'il faudrait quand même trouver l'équilibre nécessaire entre le travail de toutes les institutions qui travaillent au sein de notre organisation de l'UNESCO. Il faudrait également faire en sorte que le travail des instances de l'UNESCO soit également en conformité, je dirai même en accord, avec la volonté des pays membres. Ceci également s'applique aux États parties à la Convention du patrimoine mondial. Je voudrais encore une fois remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial et la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Tunisia. I now give the floor to the representative of Guatemala.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Madam Chair, before anything else, we should like to congratulate you on your election and also extend our thanks to the organiser of this session of the Committee. The hospitality that has been given to us is outstanding. I also wanted to add my voice to all of those that, before me, expressed their congratulations and thanks to the Heritage Centre for their work last year, particularly given the adverse financial constraints it is facing.

Notwithstanding any achievements of the last year, I want to focus on the Category 2 Centres and all of the work done as bolstering efforts for the Convention as a whole. In Zacatecas, we have a Category 2 Centre which recently managed to set up its border administration and came up with the plan for the sub-region. There is also a sub-regional plan for the safeguarding of the World Heritage. This is another achievement that goes hand in hand with the capacity building underway in the sub-region, and it attests to the commitment on the part of this Member State to the Convention.

Along the same line, we would like to mention to the Secretariat and the Centre our full commitment to all of their efforts and to encourage them to continue working along these lines. We are convinced that it is by bolstering and encouraging the creation of Category Centres that we are going to ensure our goals of reaching the balance of the representative List.

I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Centre when it comes to ensuring synergies of the conventions and to engage youth and indigenous people, as well as other sectors of society, very often directly involved with conservation and sustainable management of World Heritage, particular here at the local level.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Bosnia.”

Bosnie :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Tout d'abord, nous voudrions féliciter la directrice du Centre du Patrimoine mondial pour cet excellent rapport, à notre avis, qui est aussi en même temps très complet. Dans ce sens, nous voudrions souligner trois aspects que nous jugeons assez importants.

Le premier aspect, nous parlons ici hélas de notre propre expérience, la nécessité de continuer à soutenir les États membres où des zones qui ont subi la destruction de guerre et où le patrimoine culturel surtout a été détruit ou endommagé. Ici, à notre avis il s'agit d'un problème très complexe qui va au-delà de la simple question de la reconstruction ou de la conservation du patrimoine.

Il s'agit aussi de la grande nécessité de continuer avec les activités de renforcement de capacité, mais dans un contexte encore plus large, y compris bien sûr continuer la formation.

La deuxième chose qui est pour nous très, très importante, et certains collègues en ont déjà parlé, la question de la conservation. Cette question est très, très importante et nous pensons qu'au même niveau est la question de l'inscription. Pourquoi ? On pense surtout aux États membres qui sont sous-représentés et qui ont des problèmes matériels. Le fait pour eux d'avoir une inscription représente une impulsion très importante pour les activités majeures de conservation. Pour cette raison, nous pensons qu'il faut mettre au même niveau les questions de la conservation et de l'inscription, car comme je l'ai dit nous pensons que l'inscription peut servir de moteur très important pour les activités de conservation.

Une troisième chose pour nous aussi, et c'est ce que les autres collègues ont déjà mentionné, la question des pays qui sont sous-représentés sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Il faut continuer à les soutenir en essayant d'établir un meilleur équilibre entre les différentes régions du monde et on finira par nous féliciter des activités du Comité du patrimoine mondial dans le domaine de l'établissement d'une synergie encore plus importante entre notre Convention et les autres conventions de l'UNESCO.

Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci beaucoup. I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Korea.”

Republic of Korea:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. I congratulate, you, Madam Chair, on your election and for your able leadership. I would also like to extend my sincere appreciation to Dr Rössler and her team for their excellent and hard work throughout the year.

Among the many meaningful accomplishments in the report, I would particularly like to express my gratitude to the World Heritage Centre for commissioning the study project on “Interpretation of Sites of Memory”, which was conducted by the International Coalition of Sites of Conscience.

Interpretation of our World Heritage properties is becoming more significant than ever. In this regard the study project was well carried out in a timely manner, focusing on

places with memorial aspects, including those properties with divergent and controversial interpretations. The study recognises that when developing the interpretation of a site, differing perceptions of a site of memory could exist and this should be taken into note.

Hence, it recommends that States Parties develop an interpretive framework to embrace the whole context such as the site's historical past as well as its present-day meanings. Therefore, it is very important to widely disseminate and share the fruitful outcome of this study on the interpretation of World Heritage. I also believe the results of this study will provide good guidance to all the States Parties and to future decisions of the Committee.

In concluding, I would like to reiterate the readiness and willingness of the Republic of Korea for its continuous cooperation with the Centre to promote the importance of the interpretation of a World Heritage property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Belgium.”

Belgium:

“Thank you very much your Excellency. Since this is the first time we are taking the floor, we also wish to congratulate you for your election as Chairperson and thank the authority of the Kingdom of Bahrain for their hospitality and the excellent facilities they have provided to us.

On behalf of my delegation, I wish to make the following observations regarding paragraphs 84 until 89 of the report concerning the expert meetings and thematic studies on Sites of Memory. We firmly believe that Sites of Memory are not by definition negative and divisive and that, on the contrary, they can act as powerful vectors of peace, dialogue and reconciliation. This is one of the pillars and one of the *raison d'être* of this organisation. The mention has been widely recognised also by the Committee.

We do understand the wish for the development of further guidance regarding Sites of Memory and are willing to contribute to this. We do believe that the Committee should encourage States Parties to take into account a few principles. For example, certain historical perspectives of the study on interpretation and recommendation 16 mention the need for an inclusive and balanced interpretation framework and a pacified consensual nature of the proposed properties.

We would caution for a stand-still, as we believe that the Committee does dispose of the tools and mandates to examine all nominations, also those with a memorial dimension, thereby fulfilling its essential functions. In the end the work of the Committee comes to assess the Outstanding Universal Values of properties and to ensure their protection, conservation and transmission for future generations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. First of all, we would like to thank the host country for its warm welcome. We are confident that this will be a successful session of the Committee under your leadership. Thank you also for giving us the opportunity to speak as an observer.

We would like to comment on the important role of civil society in the implementation of the Convention during this Committee session. We thank the former chair for opening up the floor to observers in Cracow last year. It was enriching to hear more voices, especially from the NGOs present and we hope that this practice will continue at this session.

Sweden looks forward to continuing discussion on how to engage with NGOs in a more productive and inclusive manner during the Committee meetings. We thank the World Heritage Centre for the report; we particularly welcome the effort to integrate Agenda 2030 and gender equality in the work of the Convention.

The report highlights the growing trend in the Committee to deviate from the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies, especially regarding nominations to the World Heritage List. This is problematic since it threatens the legitimacy of the Convention, the Committee and the List. The Outstanding Universal Value including protection and management is a precondition for the credibility of the List. The Committee’s *ad hoc* working group is looking into this question. We encourage continuing work on these issues since they are of fundamental importance for the sustainable future of the Convention.

Increase cooperation, transparency and dialogue between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies in Upstream Processes and World Heritage nomination is a good example of progress but more can be done. As for the nomination process, there is room for further improvement regarding the preparation of the nomination files before they are presented to the Committee. This would require substantial changes to the nomination and evaluation process and we believe that such changes are not only possible but absolutely crucial.

Finally, the sustainability of the World Heritage funds must be resolved. Conservation should be at the core of the work. Furthermore, we can see that current actions should be complemented with more cost-saving measures. Additional resources to the funds are also urgently needed and this is why Sweden, on a voluntary basis, has redoubled its financial contribution. We strongly encourage other States Parties to do the same.

Thank you Madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Chile.”

Chile:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Above anything else, congratulations on your election and we would like to extend our thanks to the host country for its outstanding hospitality. Thanks also to the Kingdom of Spain for having enabled us to express ourselves in our own language. Thanks to the World Heritage Centre for all the efforts they make and, as several delegations have already mentioned, in a period of financial difficulty.

We also wanted to refer to Mexico and Chile’s experience as reflected in the report when it comes to the safeguarding and capacity building related to World Heritage. This kind of initiative should be repeated I think, as it was very valuable for the participants, particularly

as concerns the safeguarding. We do think that implementation of the Committee decisions was a very important aspect of its work and also more needs to be done in this regard.

Thank you”.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, I now give the floor to the representative of Mexico.”

Mexico:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Madam Chair. As the Committee members have mentioned, we would like to extend our thanks for having given us the floor. Since it is the first time we are talking the floor, we would like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its hospitality and the magnificent organisation of this meeting.

Our thanks also go to the Director of the World Heritage Centre for the very detailed and thorough report that we received and in particular for all endeavours to keep us up to date as to the implementation of the Committee’s decisions. We welcome the connections between the locally initiated programmes which go a long way to forming a policy of prevention maintenance and safeguarding of our heritage sites.

Our thanks also go to the Spanish government for making sure our language can be heard here in the Committee session. We, furthermore, wanted to reiterate our unwavering commitment to UNESCO and to the Convention, especially when it comes to the consolidation of the work done in the institute Zacatecas which will go a long way towards crystallising the political will and all the efforts already undertaken. This can be particularly seen in the presentation of our neighbouring country of Cuba.

We also would like to thank the authorities of Bahrain. Final thanks to all of those working in the Centre, particularly when it comes to international assistance funds when, in September of 2017, the 2000 monuments and sites are going to benefit from the assistance provided.

Thanks again.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the NGOs.”

NGOs:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. I am speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous People’s Forum on World Heritage which was established last year in Cracow by the delegates of the indigenous people present for the 41st Session.

Through the Indigenous Forum we aim to coordinate the constructive and effective participation of indigenous people in all processes of the World Heritage Convention. We very much appreciate the decision by the 41st session of the Committee which notes the importance of the Indigenous People’s Forum as an important platform on the involvement of indigenous people in the identification, preservation and management of World Heritage properties.

The World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy includes special sections on the need to ensure respect for indigenous people and their rights in World Heritage processes. To be effective, however, the policy will need to follow up with changes to the Operational Guidelines and other measures to translate its principles into actual operational procedures.

In that respect we note that there is a report of the World Heritage Centre to be considered here that does not mention the implementation of Decision 39 COM 11 on the revision of the Operational Guidelines, in which the Committee reiterated its decision to re-examine the recommendations of the 2012 experts' workshop on World Heritage and indigenous people in Copenhagen following the results of the discussions by the Executive Board on the UNESCO policy on indigenous people. The policy was adopted by the Executive Board in October 2017 and repeated that UNESCO is committed to the full realisation of the United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous people. We therefore kindly request this Committee to take a decision on re-examining the aforementioned recommendation, possibly through the establishment of a working group to be convened in the intercessional period.

Madam Chair, we kindly invite all States and organisations here to a formal launch event of the Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage tonight at 6:30 pm in room 33 or Hawar. At this event we will provide an overview of our provisional strategy for the stronger engagement of indigenous peoples with the World Heritage Convention, including the work of the Advisory Bodies, who have warmly welcomed the establishment of the Forum.

Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Ms. Rössler to share with us her comment on your questions, although before we would like to listen to Costa Rica's comments."

Costa Rica

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much Madam Chair. The Costa Rican delegation would like to extend its thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain and to all of those who organised this meeting, as well as to Spain, which has made sure that thanks to interpretation services we can speak in our mother tongue.

We feel that the regional centres are of the utmost importance when it comes to sharing, experiencing and promoting the safeguarding of Heritage in our region. When it comes to implementing in the region they play an important role. This is why in Zacatecas we were delighted that we came up with the Action Plan for our region. We also designed a series of projects which will be aimed at further safeguarding natural and cultural sites in our region. In Costa Rica, the national representatives, who took part in the Zacatecas meeting, identified the Action Plan, which is going to give us a holistic approach to safeguarding natural and cultural heritage sites. We should like to thank the regional institutes as well as the Centre for having offered their support to this project.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is now to Ms. Rössler."

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you Madam Chairperson. Let me first thank all the Committee members and all observers for the rich debate on this item from the report of the Secretariat and also our Thematic Programmes. Thank you for your great support we are very grateful, as are the whole team sitting behind me and in the offices.

There were some specific questions and comments. I would like to answer them here and refer to the intervention of Norway. It is absolutely clear that the Committee can only inscribe sites on the World Heritage List where the Outstanding Universal Value is clearly established through the criteria of the Operational Guidelines, as per your guidelines, which you have in front of you. This was also reinforced by the audit of the *Cour des Comptes* of the Global Strategy in 2011, which was presented to this Committee.

Australia also referred to the credibility of the List and the functioning of the system and both Bosnia and Australia referred to the key point of this Convention and others as well: the conservation of the sites.

A number of countries commented that more reflection and study of criterion (vi) and the one on interpretation of Site of Memory is required, including China, Indonesia, Azerbaijan and Cuba, as well as the observers and Korea and Belgium. As I said during the presentation, we will have the possibility for more discussion on this, including a side event hosted by the Advisory Bodies and the authors of this study.

I would also like to thank Tanzania and Azerbaijan, specifically to recall the necessary synergies among the cultural and biodiversity-related conventions. I would like to inform you that the Secretariat of the biodiversity related conventions will meet in July in New York at a high level political forum and in September 2018 at UNESCO.

There was also reference made by Azerbaijan and also by Bosnia on the relations to the 1954 Convention. I am pleased to inform you that the 1954 Convention was very closely involved in revising our format for the Periodic Reporting. We try to increase the synergies whenever possible. In this regard, I would also like to thank Sweden because they provided support not only for the 1972 Convention, but actually two other conventions for which my deputy, Mr. Lazare Eloundou, is responsible.

I would also like to thank Spain for recalling the importance of the Sustainable Development Policy and Agenda 2030, which was also further elaborated on by Azerbaijan and Brazil. For us this is very important. We try to mainstream sustainable development, but I think it is even more important that the policies are taken seriously in the development of national policies and at the site level. We are here to really support you.

Hungary and a number of others mentioned budgetary issues and understaffing. We are fully aware that one team in the Centre is dealing with 500 and more sites, but we really hope that in Europe sites have fewer problems as World Heritage properties than in many other regions where the resources are less than in Europe and North America. I am very grateful to Hungary for seconding excellent staff to the Europe team.

You also requested some information on the Cities Programme. I can not give you some figures because we are running all the thematic programmes exclusively through extra budgetary resources. The Cities Programme is working on cities on the World Heritage List, of course, collaborating with the organisation of World Heritage Cities and also working on Historic Urban Landscape and we are very grateful for extra budgetary support from China in this regard.

A number of you mentioned capacity building including Cuba, Guatemala, Chile and

Costa Rica; I will come back under item 6 on Category 2 Centres and capacity building.

Finally, the questions by the NGOs on the Indigenous People's Forum. We were very pleased to see the decision of the World Heritage Committee last year. The decision relates not only to the Forum but also the integration of indigenous policy which was adopted at UNESCO and introduced this morning as a living document. The question is here, the integration into the Operational Guidelines. And, as you know, the Operational Guidelines are not being discussed at this session, they will be discussed at the next session which is the 43rd Session next year.

Thank you very much Madam Chair and please excuse me if I forgot anyone."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Ms. Rössler. Dear colleagues, I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 5A, which is contained in the document 5A. Before that, I ask the rapporteur whether she has any comments."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Madam Chair. We have not received any amendments to the draft decision. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions from the floor? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 5A adopted. Cuba would like to say something."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much Madam Chair. It is an issue regarding the procedure. Can we take a look on the screen at the draft decision even if we have adopted it? I believe it was not put up on the screen. Even if we approved its entirety, normally I believe that the procedure requires that the text of the decision adopted should be on the screen in both languages.

Thank you Madam Chair."

Ms. Rössler:

"Thank you very much Madam Chair. The screens are to facilitate your work, but in case decisions have not been changed there are in the documents given to you as a full set. We are happy to upload it in case it facilitates your work. No problem.

Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Are there any more comments? No. Thank you very much; our next item is the report of the Advisory Bodies on their activities. These reports are presented in document

5B. I now invite the representative of ICOMOS to briefly present its report.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. ICOMOS would like to express its deepest gratitude to the State Party of Bahrain for the organisation of this session of the World Heritage Committee and for the warm welcome in the sunny city of Manama.

This presentation will be a short summary of ICOMOS’ activities. The full report is available among the working documents.

To begin with, I would like to emphasise that ICOMOS emphasis on quality. ICOMOS believes that the value of the World Heritage Convention admired by millions of people and communities all over the world can be maintained all within services of the highest quality.

It has been of the utmost importance for ICOMOS to rigorously apply its World Heritage Code of Conduct throughout the evaluation process. ICOMOS has followed the evaluation scheme introduced last year. Hence, for the 2018 cycle, the World Heritage panel of ICOMOS met in November of 2017 and March of 2018 at ICOMOS’ International Secretariat. The composition and overall information on the panel is available on the ICOMOS website. All panel members work on a *pro-bono* basis through the entire process. The November panel was divided into three sessions. The first one was devoted to the presentation and discussion of nominations. The second one was the meeting with States Parties, where issues identified by the panel were presented. The third was to agree on provisional decisions and identifications of questions and issues to be included in our interim reports.

Then, exchanges with the nominated States Parties took place between January and February of this year. ICOMOS would like to thank the States Parties for their kind availability to attend the meetings and provide additional information. All final decisions on evaluation were taken in March. After receiving and assessing additional information provided by States Parties, ICOMOS carefully read and assessed all the information received, even in the cases where additional information had not been requested. This said, ICOMOS strongly feels that the time available under the current calendar to conduct dialogue with the States Parties is far too limited especially for States Parties that are not familiar with the nomination process, but we tried to do our best.

Additionally, I would like to mention that several upstream reports were also presented at the World Heritage panel in March for its review, according to the scheme that ICOMOS is implementing to strengthen and develop upstream assistance. .

Madam Chair, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The cultural heritage of the world is facing new and difficult challenges. To cope with these difficulties and challenges, new scientific and theoretical tools are needed. ICOMOS has been contributing to the World Heritage system also on these aspects. To name a few, beside the paper on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts in item 5A, ICOMOS has been contributing to discussions on the recovery and reconstruction of cultural heritage. Our most recent contribution is a matrix to conduct global case studies on the recovery on reconstruction. It is available on our website with some case studies given as examples. We will develop this and expand a number of case studies.

The ICOMOS working group on Climate Change and Heritage has been very active since its establishment in December of 2017. It will have its first physical meeting, here in Manama, thanks to the hospitality of Bahrain National Museum.

ICOMOS has been closely collaborating with IUCN and ICCROM for several important projects, for instance: capacity building courses with ICCROM and Nature-Culture Journey in cooperation with IUCN within the framework of the European Year of Cultural Heritage. ICOMOS is also coordinating a project on quality principles for conservation within the EU. It is hoped that the outcomes could become a reference for conservation activities beyond EU's borders.

ICOMOS is organising next month an event on sustainable development goals in New York City, in cooperation with UNESCO and a number of civil society stakeholders. ICOMOS is engaged to advance its mission of working for the protection of cultural heritage, to build up bridges, and to foster understanding among people and cultures as a means of contributing to peace, security and equality around the World.

ICOMOS reaffirms its commitment to serve the World Heritage Committee and assist, protect and conserve all World Heritage of the world and transmit it to future generations. ICOMOS would like to express its sincere gratitude to the States Parties of the Convention to the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICCROM and other partners and organisations for all the common work and the constant support for ICOMOS' activities.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for your thoughtful report and presentation. Are there any comments or shall we just move on? I would now like to invite the representative of ICCROM to briefly present its report. Actually, before this China would add a comment. Please, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson. I would like to start by expressing my appreciation to the Advisory Bodies for the important contribution they have made to the protection of World Heritage, for their endeavours to maintain professional and ethical standards and for taking measures for this purpose. However, we noticed the recent change, increasing divergences between World Heritage Committee decisions and ICOMOS recommendations. We need to reflect on this for the forward-looking outlook of our common cause of World Heritage protection.

The World Heritage Convention has entrusted us, the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies with these responsibilities. We need to work to the standards that are stipulated in the Convention and to the expectation of the States Parties whose diverse cultures have enriched the World Heritage List.

However, there have been cases in recent years that demonstrated arbitrary and inconsistent application of criteria in its evaluation reports. These were misunderstandings or misleading and biased recognition of serial properties as a whole and failure or prejudices in judging authenticity and integrity in the context of cultural diversity. The main cause comes from the current evaluation process as a whole, but also from the ICOMOS evaluation system itself.

We would like therefore to suggest that ICOMOS takes measures to stick to the principle of transparency, impartiality and professionalism. Firstly, we believe it is important to ensure the impartiality and its recommendation by not being a player and a referee at the same time. The definitions of thematic studies should be inclusive of all those done by

Advisory Bodies as well as research done by the other institutions. Secondly, increasing the diversity of its panel members, desk reviewers and a few of the mission experts and expanding the pool of its advisors. Thirdly, reflection respecting the role of its many scientific committees and the research outcomes of external bodies. Finally, exercising open and inclusive debate to ensure fair and professional recommendations.

I sincerely hope that they will help a healthy development of ICOMOS and the World Heritage protection in a more diverse world.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? I see none. I now invite the representative of ICCROM to briefly present his report.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson. As this is the first time ICCROM takes the floor, I would like to express ICCROM's thanks to you and the government of Bahrain for the warm welcome and hospitality accorded to all the people attending this conference and related meetings.

Chairperson, ICCROM is pleased to have the opportunity to say a few words about its activities over the past year in favour of the World Heritage Convention. The full report of ICCROM's activities can be found in document 5B.

This year ICCROM continued its role in the Reactive Monitoring process, taking part in four Reactive Monitoring missions and one Advisory Mission in Africa, Europe, the Arab States and Asia and the Pacific. Our participation in these missions not only helped to contribute to better conservation at the sites involved, but it also contributed to our gaining knowledge, which helped us to better prepare our capacity-building activities. We also actively participated in the ongoing work of the reflection we have for the Periodic Reporting process. We are looking forward to working with the regions that are now beginning the third cycle of Periodic Reporting.

Taking note of Committee decision 18.A from the 39th Session, ICCROM was invited by ICOMOS to attend the ICOMOS World Heritage Evaluation Panel as a non-voting member. While attending the first panel in November of 2017; due to budgetary constraints in 2018 we could not attend. In agreement with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS we did not attend this panel of discussion. This decision was taken in recognition of the Committee's stated goal of prioritising state of conservation over nomination. Nonetheless, we remain available to participate in future meetings of the ICOMOS World Heritage panel as originally foreseen in the 2018-2019 budget.

I am particularly pleased to reiterate ICCROM's commitment to its role as focal point for capacity-building activities within the Convention. In the past year, the new World Heritage Leadership Programme, a joint programme of ICCROM and IUCN has increased its implementation with two international courses on interlinkages in the management of cultural and natural heritage and people-centred approaches to conservation. A new course combining these two themes will take place in Zambia this year, in August. In addition, we have begun working on an online learning platform which will provide information on approaches to management on cultural and natural heritage and including other subject areas such as disaster risk management and impact assessments.

World Heritage Leadership is carried out in close collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS and with a very generous financial support of the Ministry of Climate and Environment of Norway. The two courses had also a significant contribution from the government of Switzerland. ICCROM would like to thank Switzerland and especially Norway for their generous contributions to our capacity-building effort, even more importantly for realising that capacity-building carried out today will improve the state of conservation of World Heritage properties for many years to come.

I also ask other States Parties to discuss with ICCROM and IUCN the possibility of joining in support of World Heritage Leadership or other capacity-building activities. ICCROM will continue to collaborate with both Category 2 Centres and universities around the world on capacity-building activities. We have also coordinated several orientation sessions for committee members. The most recent one took place yesterday in this very venue. You will hear further results on capacity-building in the presentation on item 6 later on today.

As we meet today in the Arab region, I would also like to highlight the work of the regional office in charge. Several activities have been implemented over the past few years, including a series of short courses on conservation and documentation of built cultural heritage. An Arab Country Heritage Forum was held in February of 2018. An expert meeting on Strengthening Cultural Heritage Protection in the Arab Region was also carried out in 2017 in the framework of the 41st Session of the World Heritage Committee session in Cracow and follow up activities to that meeting are currently underway.

I would also take this opportunity to mention that ICCROM and other Advisory Bodies will be holding a series of side events and two of them have already taken place at lunch time. I already mentioned the one today; we also have an exhibition and the Leadership Programme.

Finally, as this is the first time that I have the opportunity to address this Committee as director of ICCROM, I would like to ensure the Committee of ICCROM's ongoing commitment to deliver the highest quality advisory service to the Committee States Parties and other partners. We take this commitment very seriously. We must work together to protect the credibility of the Convention and to ensure that heritage of Outstanding Universal Value is transmitted to future generations. I pledge ICCROM's continuous commitment to achieving this goal.

Thank you again, Chairperson, for the opportunity to present ICCROM's activities to the World Heritage Committee."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you, very much for this important report. Before I give the floor to the rapporteur, are there any comments, questions, etc.? Bosnia, please."

Bosnia Herzegovina:

"One very short comment. I would like to emphasise the importance of reducing differences and to harmonise the relationships between experts who are preparing nominations and expert assessing nominations. Because, on the one side we have thousands of people working to prepare one file, spending a lot of time and money and we have referees who are coming, spending a very short time and making very quick evaluations. I believe there should be a mechanism to harmonise this relationship and more transparency in this process and to have continuity in the process of evaluation, such as a much longer period. Thank you"

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? I see none. I now give the rapporteur the floor to let us know whether there are any amendments. Actually, I am sorry, first the floor is to the representative of IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Since this is the first time I take the floor, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election and thank the host country, the Kingdom of Bahrain, for the generous organisation of this meeting.

In fact, it has been ten years since IUCN began collaborating with Bahrain on World Heritage to support the exceptional effort to create the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage and our joint regional programme on nature in the Arab States, Tabe’a. We have seen Bahrain’s approach to World Heritage, which is marked by professionalism, quality and attention to detail and we look forward to supporting you and the Committee during the coming days. My colleague Peter Shadie sits at the IUCN desk at the back of the room; he is here with the team at your service.

Madam Chair, this year is the 70th birthday of IUCN and our historic relationship with UNESCO. We were born in 1948 out of the initiative of UNESCO’s first Director General as an intergovernmental organisation with a unique DNA of State and civil society members, NGOs and indigenous peoples and a global network of 100,000 experts and close to 1,000 staff. Our instrumental role in supporting the creation of the World Heritage Convention in 1972 is one of our most highly regarded achievements in that long history, as is our work as the official Advisory Bodies on nature since the Convention’s adoption. It has been a constant commitment to rigorous and constructive technical advice to the highest standards of current practice.

Our work on World Heritage is part of a much larger IUCN programme committed to providing the knowledge and tools to ensure that human progress, economic development and natural conservation can take place together. It is the intersection between nature and culture that defines our sense of identity and place. The quality of conservation of World Heritage sites is therefore a litmus test of global conservation efforts- If we cannot achieve the greatest excellence and equity in conservation of World Heritage sites and their contribution to society, what does that say about potential to secure our future on a thriving planet?

Madam Chair, IUCN’s report on our activities is before the Committee. I will not seek to repeat the content in it. I would like to just note, and with thanks to the Republic of Korea, that the final draft of the long-awaited volcano theme studies is now with us and we expect to finalise that thematic studies in the second half of this year.

I would just like to emphasise three points that seem to us to be crucial in underpinning the future of the Convention and we hope these are points that will be addressed during the course of the coming days. In fact, some have already been partly broached in item 5A.

The first is the challenge of securing the conservation of all World Heritage sites in the face of growing challenges. Our report refers to this document, which is the IUCN World Heritage outlook. We published the second edition of it in 2017. It is a global assessment of all natural sites that shows that one third of natural World Heritage sites have a conservation outlook that is not yet what we would like it to be, critical or with significant concerns. We know from the state of conservation reports that although the natural sites cover only 19 per

cent of the listed properties, they count for nearly one third of the sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

For the first time the repeat of the World Heritage outlook allows us to assess trends. The picture is one of increasing threats coupled with some slipping of conservation effectiveness. Climate change in particular is growing rapidly and is in fact relevant in a greatly growing number of sites; invasive species and tourism are also topping the list of current threats.

The Committee must redouble its efforts, and we must all redouble our efforts to support the conservation efforts of all World Heritage sites.

The second point is the challenge of the continued lack of balance in the World Heritage List which continues to favour the best-represented regions and countries. We see that the vast majority of the nominations in the current cycle are from high and to upper middle countries and from countries already well-represented on the World Heritage List. It is welcome to see that the call for support for the Upstream Process, to see a growing set of requests from countries that are not adequately represented. This new process still remains chronically under-resourced and we need a more effective strategy to meet the challenge to achieve a balanced World Heritage List.

The third key challenge is the need to see World Heritage engaging fully along the ground to the benefit of local communities and indigenous peoples. In this regard it is welcome to see the strengthened civil society participation in the Convention, the success of the second Site Managers Forum hosted here in Bahrain and the launch in particular of the World Heritage Indigenous People's Forum that has been referred to. But a future where World Heritage represents the best in conservation for culture, for nature and for communities requires a much more ambitious approach to providing the resources and capacities needed on the ground. We see the need for radically different approaches and partnerships to enable sites to lift their conservation performance and also show the leadership what World Heritage sites should stand for.

Our joint work with ICCROM, which the Director General referred to, and ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre and the funding support of Norway to launch the World Heritage Leadership Programme is one significant step in changing that dynamic, as is the growing portfolio, of work on projects that are about celebrating the linkage of nature and culture.

Madam Chair, may I close by saying that IUCN is committed to extending further our efforts to secure a better outlook for natural World Heritage and a brighter future for the World Heritage Convention. We look forward to the opportunities of this meeting to strengthen our effort together.

Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much for this report. I now open the floor in case you have any questions, comments, etc. Cuba, please, you have the floor."

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] "We take the floor partly in light of what has been said by the Ambassador of China and the concern for the issue on transparent dialogue between the evaluation process and the States Parties to the Convention. If this dialogue is not fruitful

then it could be very difficult to ensure the preservation and protection of our sites and the Reactive Monitoring mechanisms. We also frequently observe in our resolutions that the language used is not exactly cordial and many States can feel offended by such language. I believe that the Secretariat should ensure that the language used is respectful.

I believe that any use of excessive language, even sometimes slightly aggressive, is not acceptable. We should keep a harmony between protection and the right to develop of many States, particularly the States that are in difficult economic situations. We believe that there is some disconnection with regard to Agenda 2030, which supports sustainable development. I do not find that harmony within the decisions taken by these parties. This is language accepted at the international level.

For sustainable development I believe that World Heritage plays an important role and so do natural sites. As for the limitations to development to which each State has the sovereign right, we would appeal to all of you to try to strike the right balance on the basis of a dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties to this Convention.

We have other examples where there has been a rupture of dialogue and the results have always been terrible and we have seen it in the past, where the Advisory Bodies had to renounce their functions. I believe this is not what this Committee wishes.

Once again, we call upon the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat to seek for more constructive dialogue thinking about the mechanism that should enable that dialogue to take place before the deliberations of the Committee and member States to find a point of agreement.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. My brief comments concern all the three Advisory Bodies and some concerns to express. First of all, the Advisory Bodies are very important in order to secure the quality and neutrality of the work of the World Heritage Committee. The Advisory Bodies are keepers of an institutional memory which is of invaluable importance to the implementation of the Convention. The Advisory Bodies are in many ways the base on which we rest the construction of our work. This cooperation is built on trust and reliability and we must continue to seek solutions and processes that can build this relationship.

The Norwegian delegation has read the reports of the Advisory Bodies with interest and we see with appreciation that the Advisory Bodies have been able to execute substantial numbers of tasks given by the Committee. We would like to draw your attention to one specific paragraph of the report, namely paragraph 72, which States that in some cases it has not yet been possible to reconcile these statements with the decisions of the Committee and the requirements of the Convention. This is a critical piece of information and it should be taken due note of in our further deliberations and decision-making. Namely, provisional statements of Outstanding Universal Value must be avoided.

This is a topic that can be clarified and discussed further during the general debate under item 8, which was proposed by Australia earlier today.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. L'Angola reconnaît et félicite les organisations consultatives pour le travail qu'elles mettent en œuvre en étroite collaboration avec les États parties de la Convention et les Centres de catégorie 2 et d'autres institutions et parties prenantes sur le renforcement des capacités, sur la préparation des dossiers d'inscriptions et sur le développement d'études sur de nouvelles thématiques.

L'Angola a bien pris note du document de réflexion développé par l'ICOMOS sur les évaluations des sites associés aux mémoires des récents conflits, mais nous aimerions toutefois avoir, si possible, certaines informations complémentaires sur les experts qui ont été impliqués dans l'élaboration de ces documents.

Compte tenu de certains points qui méritent d'être approfondi à cause de la complexité de cette thématique, l'Angola encourage l'ICOMOS à poursuivre ces discussions en impliquant un large éventail de parties prenantes intéressées par ces thématiques afin de permettre dans un avenir proche l'enrichissement de la diversité des sites inscrits sur la liste du patrimoine mondial et d'équilibrer cette liste du point de vue géographique.

L'Angola a soumis des amendements sur le projet de décision que nous soumettons à l'appréciation des autres membres du Comité.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“We thank the Advisory Bodies for their report. The Republic of Azerbaijan is of the view that the World Heritage Committee should preserve its expert nature. In this regard, the role of the Advisory Bodies as expert institutions is of crucial importance for us. We also take note, with appreciation, of the activities done by the Advisory Bodies in such important areas as capacity building, preservation of heritage and many others.

However, we want to draw your attention to several important issues and concerns. As I previously mentioned, the core role and added value of the Advisory Bodies is to bring expertise to our Committee. This implies that this expertise should be away from the considerations of other natures which can be derived from other considerations like imposing limits to possible inscriptions and many other issues or predictions of outcomes from the decision of the Committee.

Secondly, with time passing, we observe several relatively new approaches and methodologies in evaluation and implementation of the 1972 Convention and the decisions of the Committee introduced by Advisory Bodies without prior consultation with the Member States and other stakeholders. However, we believe that it is very important that this new tendency is discussed and approved among all stakeholders, members of the committee,

World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies, site managers and national committees.

Thirdly, we think that the issue of reliability of the source of information is important. We see that information provided by States Parties are verified by certain NGOs and other organisations. But not all, if any, information provided by NGOs are verified by the States Parties. There should be an equal approach in this regard and we believe, with due respect to the NGOs and organisations, that this verification of information should be the other way around.

Another matter of concern is divergences between the decision of the Committee and the subsequent evaluation by the Advisory Bodies. We often see cases when the Committee takes a decision and then the evaluation of the Advisory Bodies are completely different or neglect a previous decision taken by the Committee. We do invite the Advisory Bodies for a dialogue and to respect the decisions taken by the Committee.

Finally, as we are living in a time when sustainable development is a key issue in the United Nations' global agenda, and I saw that the issue was also raised by the delegation of Cuba, I would like to remind you that we have to be more balanced in the issues related to preservation versus living heritage and sustainable development.

Of course, preservation of the Heritage is the main goal of the recommendation; however, the balance with sustainable development must be kept in mind while approaching several cases before us. We believe that such balance can contribute both to the preservation of heritage and the well-being of humans simultaneously.

Given the importance of this issue for all of us, I am wondering whether there are any serious studies prepared by the Advisory Bodies of the World Heritage Centre on this issue. If not, I invite the Advisory Bodies jointly with the World Heritage Centre to prepare some guidelines for the member States and site managers to deal with this very important issue.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor is to the representative of Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Tanzania appreciates the informative and detailed activity reports submitted by the Advisory Bodies which cover various thematic areas relevant to the implementation of the Convention. We commend the Advisory Bodies for the excellent work that they have undertaken to further the aspirations of the Convention.

However, we are concerned with the issue of excessive workload for the Advisory Bodies, especially when processing nomination dossiers faced with limited resources and time lines, such as the timing of fixed evaluation timetables provided for in the Operational Guidelines. We are worried, Madam Chair, that this long time concern might have already started to impact the speed and even the quality of evaluation. We recommend that the World Heritage Centre works closely with the Advisory Bodies to further explore this issue by way of improving the situation.

Madam Chairperson, at this juncture, Tanzania would also like to join hands in the submission by the distinguished delegate of Angola in proposing that the paper on sites associated with memories of recent conflict currently available be further improved by broadening the participation of interested stakeholders in their review.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. Zimbabwe would like to comment on the activities of ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN in ensuring the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. We recognise the efforts of the bodies in working together in achieving the key objectives of this important Convention. We also recognise efforts in creating a balanced and representative World Heritage List which includes, among other initiatives, the Upstream Process and collaborations with the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) in the Africa region World Heritage nominations and support for them.

We urge the Advisory Bodies to constantly work together with States Parties to ensure that the objectives of the Global Strategy are met. Let me also take this opportunity to congratulate IUCN and ICCROM on the new partnership with Norway on World Heritage Leadership and we hope it to be a success in enhancing natural and cultural conservation. This support from Norway in funding IUCN and ICCROM activities is also noted and appreciated.

We join others in commending the Advisory Bodies’ partnership with the AWHF in capacity-building, such as Risk Preparedness workshops. However, we continue to be concerned that the Advisory Bodies are not utilising the African expertise enough in their work. We are proud to note that the new Director General of ICCROM is from Africa. AWHF is also currently working on a database of experts which we believe should go a long way in making our experts more visible.

Madam Chair, Zimbabwe also wants to support the draft amendments to the draft decision submitted by Angola, so that it also enhances and incorporates some other experts that have been left behind in the current draft of the proposals. Madam Chair, Zimbabwe also supports the recommendation by the Chinese delegation and many others for dialogue between the Committee and the Advisory Bodies to avoid the situation where there is a discord between the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. I just want to make a couple of comments with regard to the discussion so far. Firstly, our observation is that the Advisory Bodies are continuously looking to improve their engagement with States Parties and the transparency of their processes. We have been a free giver of feedback on how that can be improved both with IUCN and ICOMOS. That feedback has hopefully been received.

Perhaps there are occasions where communications could have been better and the rationale for recommendations better. Based on our experience and observations these

remain rare exceptions. The problem the Advisory Bodies face is one of resources, finances and time available in the nomination process. You see in the ICOMOS paper that the nomination process could be extended officially by 12 months and this would help the dialogue with States Parties.

The Advisory Bodies and the Committee therefore also face unacceptably late provision of information by States Parties, sometimes only once they have seen their aspiration for an inscription on the World Heritage List, which may not be realised.

On the question of sustainable development, I would say the World Heritage system has worked very well in embracing the sustainable development goals, but I must make the observation that World Heritage is World Heritage and the place is only on the World Heritage List at the nomination of the State Party, nobody else brings forward nominations. When listing occurs, we all join in this global compact to protect and to preserve these places.

The Advisory Bodies are charged with the responsibility of advising the Committee and States Parties on the protection of these places. Sometimes their advice is uncomfortable and we can attest to that, where in fact in Australia in recent times, both in relation with the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area and the Great Barrier Reef. That advice and the support of it by the World Heritage Committee have driven significant improvement in Australia's management of those World Heritage sites and we continue to welcome that advice.

This discomfort does not absolve us of the responsibility of working within our sovereign system of governments in all their complexities and different forms, and does not absolve us of the responsibility to act consistently with the obligation bound by the World Heritage Convention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any more comments? Would ICOMOS like to respond?”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you very much to all distinguished delegates and Committee members. We took note of your comments and constructive criticism and we will try to do our best to improve the system and our mechanism so that we can be more satisfactory for all stakeholders.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICCROM, you can take the floor.”

ICCROM:

“Just to echo what was said by ICOMOS, that we take the constructive comments and they should be taken into consideration. On behalf of ICCROM, I can only point out that the issues of sustainable development are very much at the core of our strategic direction for the next six years. We will try, obviously, to make sure that we have a dialogue with States

Parties and to make sure that whatever we do is transparent and comes from our discussions together.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN, do you have any comments?”

IUCN:

“Thanks Chair. Just to add on a few specific points that were raised as well. I think I made clear on the general point of the place of nature conservation in relation to sustainable development that it is a mainstream programmatic focus. We know that sometimes the challenge that Australia explained with a couple of specific examples can be quite difficult in terms of reconciling the protection of values with broader sustainable development goals, but the effort is always, as I explained in my intervention, to secure for World Heritage part of the broader contribution to local communities, to economies and to indigenous people and results for people.

On specific points, there were a number of comments made around dialogue. I would like to just comment the point made by ICOMOS and I think Tanzania and Australia. The fact is that it is many years now that we have been in an exploration with the Committee and with the *ad hoc* group at looking at ways to improve the process and opportunities for dialogue and it is now very difficult to find more time in the system to allow for dialogue that is often needed and really quite late in the cycle of Committee processes.

I think that there are opportunities on the Committee agenda under the discussion on Upstream Processes for nominations and item 7 and to look whether there are any further opportunities. Certainly, it is always welcomed, having specific proposals of what can be done, because we can see what the realities are and that might be a way to see if there is anything we have not tried. I think we are getting to a point where there is a need for a more radical approach, the time for dialogue in a situation where we can see very difficult issues that have not been resolved.

One specific point from IUCN, and I think I say this at every Committee: We are very keen to see States Parties come and visit us at IUCN and we would like to invite the States Parties whenever you wish to engage in dialogue. I would like to acknowledge Australia, Spain, China and Japan; twice in the current cycle of procedures we have been able to meet on site. Our offices are in Geneva and we welcome more States Parties if they have the opportunity.

Two specific points that were both raised by Azerbaijan and the Centre might also comment on this: I would like to reassure you that as far as the procedures are concerned and for paragraph 174 of the Operational Guidelines, there should be no information from civil society sources, NGOs, that appear in any state of conservation reports that the State Party was not first asked to comment on. I think the Operational Guidelines asked for verification as far as possible. It is the reality sometimes that we might need a report from States Parties and no responses to requests. There should be nothing in the States Parties report where there has not been disclosure and the opportunities for feedback.

The last was the comment on guidance and to place World Heritage within the framework of sustainable development. One of the goals of the World Heritage Leadership Programme is to completely revise the current separate manuals on Managing Cultural and Natural World Heritage into broader guides on Managing World Heritage for Nature, Culture and Communities. This could be one good opportunity regarding the need that you identified. Thank you for that.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is back to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to very briefly answer the query from the honourable delegate from Angola by the participation of the drafting of the ICOMOS paper on the evaluation of Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflict. I just like to confirm that the paper involved the participation of 23 people from 23 different countries. They reflected all the various regions: 8 per cent Africa, 12 per cent from the Arab States, 20 per cent Asia-Pacific, 56 per cent from Europe and 4 per cent from Latin America and the Caribbean. Of course, as the discussion moves forward even broader participation in this debate would be extremely helpful.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think that now we have to see with the Rapporteur about the amendments. I saw the Secretariat circulating the amendments. I am not sure they are yet on the screen. I give the floor to the Rapporteur to give us an idea.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. Indeed, as has been flagged during the discussion, we received one amendment presented by the delegation from Angola that you can see on the screen. This amendment is supported by Tanzania. I will now proceed to read it out clearly. The new paragraph 3 will be:

‘Takes note with appreciation of the paper on the Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts developed by ICOMOS and encourages ICOMOS to further improve this paper by broadening the participation of stakeholders in this new thematic, including from the African region.’

Madam Chair, if I may, I wish to make a small suggestion of using standardised language. Since paragraph starts 2 starts with *‘takes note with appreciation’*, paragraph 3 would read: *‘Also takes note with appreciation’* and the new paragraph 4 would read *‘Finally takes note of the progress made’* and so on.

Thank you very much Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I can see that Zimbabwe would like to take the floor, followed by Cuba.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. Zimbabwe also supports the draft decision submitted by Angola. I would like to propose a slight edit to the decision. Where it says ‘*in this new thematic*’ to add the word ‘area’, ‘*in this new thematic area*’. I know it is new language at this stage, but it is easier to understand if you add ‘area’.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you, Madam Chair. We see no problems with the Decision as it stands, but we are not sure that it actually reflects the discussion that we just had. Prior to seeing the decision on the screen we had concerns of some member States on the need to strengthen dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States parties to the Convention. Therefore, we were wondering if it could be possible to submit some proposed language for this draft decision and perhaps reflected in the summary of the meeting that a group of member States had expressed concerns surrounding the need to foster heightened dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. Otherwise, this Decision would not be reflecting the discussion that we just had.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Madam chair. Our delegation would like to put a motion and also a substantial issue related to what Angola has mentioned. Our motion would be if it was possible to have these proposed amendments submitted a little earlier so we do not discover them for the first time on the screen. Secondly, we are not entirely comfortable with the wording when we talk about ‘*stakeholders*’. We are not really sure whether this is too broad. It is so vague; we are not quite so comfortable with the use of that word, ‘*stakeholders*’, as is drafted.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to China.”

China:

“Thank you Chairperson. We would simply like to echo what Cuba’s delegation expressed and we add our support to this motion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Cuba, you have the floor, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “We would have no problems submitting some more wording if you think that would be useful. How would you like to proceed?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Yes please, you can do that. I now give the floor to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“I would also like to support the proposal of Cuba to add some paragraphs that would reflect the debates that we have had so far. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor now to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“The State of Kuwait congratulates her Excellency for chairing the World Heritage Committee. As this is the first time we are taking the floor we would also like to thank the World Heritage Centre for the excellent work they are doing and the Advisory Bodies. We would also support the amendment to add wording on more dialogue.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other suggestions? Cuba, could you please read the suggested text?”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you chair. We ‘request the Secretariat to take good note of the discussions on the need to improve the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties’.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please take the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you. In looking at my intervention earlier, expressing the view that while there was always room to improve the quality dialogue, it is reasonably good at the moment. I think I hear we would be happier with a formulation which was more to affirm the value of consolidating the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. Therefore,

this captures the commentary in a positive frame, which I think is very important. I am proposing an alternative which I will read again: *'Affirms the value of strengthening dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties'*."

The Chairperson:

"Norway, please take the floor."

Norway:

"Thank you, Madam Chair. Norway supports the amendment made by Australia; we also have the same notion of the discussion. There are issues that will be discussed later on during our session on 12A or 12B. We support Australia. Can I also ask, because we are a bit unsure, what is asked from ICOMOS, since in decision 5A, there is a decision on the further work on this topic which includes several expert meetings, perhaps. The course of that would take another two years. Is this something that would be part of that process or would that be something extra? I am a bit confused."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Cuba, please take the floor."

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] "Thank you very much Madam chair. Our comment was not requesting anything from ICOMOS but from the Secretariat, to take note of our discussion. The comment we make could be presented in the report in which case we could accept the addition presented by Australia on the values and dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties. We could enter a new item on the agenda of our next meeting to discuss this matter. Then, the proposal of Australia would be acceptable, but it would need to be added that the next session would include an item on the agenda to discuss this issue and we would agree with that proposal in that case."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Ms. Rössler will answer."

Ms. Rössler:

"Just referring to the intervention from Cuba. It is not in the oral report of The Chairperson, it is in the summary record of all your debates as duly reflected in the summary records. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Ok, the floor is now to China, please."

China:

“Thank you, Madam Chairperson. Sorry to ask for the floor again. I thought the reason of much conflict between the Cuban-proposed wording and the Australian and Norwegian-proposed wording and maybe we could combine both. In fact the second one affirms the value and is a sort of general statement. I think the earlier question is that we are also trying to encourage the improvement of dialogue, which means there is room for improvement. It is not only a general view on the strengthening of the dialogue. I think if you would add, in our view not redundant, the entire phrase proposed by Australia and supported by Norway after the Cuban statement.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. Following what has just been said by the representative of China, we are pleased with a new consolidated paragraph which includes value, strengthening dialogue as well as the need to implement that improvement.

We would also like to go back to what was said concerning paragraph 3. We believe that it is perfectly acceptable to mention the nominations related to memories and we would also like to go back to the original wording by Angola and to mention ‘*experts*’ rather than ‘*stakeholders*’. Stakeholders here could refer to many persons or bodies, it could be NGOs; we would prefer something that mentions ‘*experts*’. We could then qualify the experts, such as ‘*well-known experts*’ if you prefer. It would need to be ‘*experts*’ instead of ‘*stakeholders*’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. In the interest of helping draw this debate to a conclusion, on my side we would be very happy with the amendment proposed by Cuba and if it is the words that we suggested and the desire of the Committee to also include the reflections currently at point 5 which was proposed by Cuba, then we will not be objecting to that proposition.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie souhaite apporter sa convergence et son soutien à l’opinion émise par la Chine puisqu’il nous paraît tout à fait possible et loisible de joindre les deux paragraphes. Je crois que le sens du paragraphe proposé par Cuba est autour d’améliorer le dialogue et le sens du paragraphe proposé par l’Australie est un renforcement du dialogue. Le premier parle de qualité le second parle d’intensité et de

quantité. Je crois qu'ils sont tout à fait variables et que donc un seul paragraphe synthétique est tout à fait envisageable. Cela montre combien il est difficile de refléter un débat même sur un plan linguistique ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. Since I am taking the floor for the first time, allow me to congratulate you on your leadership of the Committee. Commenting on the proposals by both Cuba and Australia, I also support the views that they are both talking about the same thing but using different words. So the best approach would be to marry them.

I have a compromise statement here that could probably be a way of having the wording done. It reads: '*Requests the Secretariat to act on the urgent need to improve the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties*'. This is what I submit.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, nous sommes d'accord avec la proposition de l'Espagne de changer les parties prenantes par les “*experts*”, mais nous aimerions que cela soit seulement les “*experts*” au lieu d’ “*experts de renom*” car cela est trop subjectif. “*experts*” nous convient bien ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to read out the text as finalised.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. We have received a number of amendments and I will start from the top. For paragraph 3 we now have Zimbabwe also sponsoring the paragraph and we have two small modifications. One would be to strike out '*renowned*' and '*stakeholders*' and the one by Zimbabwe would be to add the word '*area*' to '*thematic*'. The new paragraph would read as I will now proceed to read out:

3. '*Also takes note with appreciation of the paper on the Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts developed by ICOMOS and encourages ICOMOS to further improve this paper by broadening the participation of experts in this new thematic area, including from the African region;*'

This would be the suggested paragraph 3. May I continue? Thank you Madam Chair.

Then we have received. We have received several amendments. The first one from Cuba which would add a new paragraph 5 and would say: *'Requests the Secretariat to take good note of the discussion on the need to improve the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties'*. For this proposal we have received a counter-proposal by Australia and Norway; as paragraph 5, it would be: *'Affirms the value of strengthening dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties.'* To this Cuba suggested adding at the end: *'and proposes that a point be added to the agenda on this issue at the next session of the World Heritage Committee'*.

Finally, we have received one suggestion from Uganda and paragraph 5 would be in that case: *'Requests the Secretariat on the urgent need to improve the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties'*.

During the debate we also received a proposal from China, supported by Tunisia, to merge the two proposals received by Cuba, Australia and Norway. I am not sure we can try to merge the paragraphs on the screen. I would like to ask from China, who proposed to merge the two paragraphs, whether they would be on board with trying to merge them by starting with Australia and Norway's proposal so that the merged paragraph would start: *'Affirms the value of strengthening the dialogue'* and would come the request of Cuba at the end."

The Chairperson:

"Australia please, you have the floor."

Australia:

"I just wonder it might help to bring the two pieces together, as China suggested and as our colleague from Uganda suggested. In Australia's text where it says *'the value of strengthening'* and we add *'improving dialogue'* in the next paragraph. My apologies *'strengthening and improving dialogue'* early on; would that meet the need of the various contributors to this discussion?"

The Chairperson:

"Is everybody in agreement? Yes. China, please take the floor."

China:

"We just want to say that I think it is a very good addition, *'the improvement'* wording, and somehow takes care of the proposal by Uganda. I think it is a very good solution as to the precise wording. The Australians are much better than I am. I am a non-native speaker."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Cuba, please."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. We have no difficulties with this wording. We believe that it does look good but we would not like to give up the

possibilities of suggesting this item on the agenda of our next committee session. It could be a different paragraph. The paragraph as it now stands we agree with.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you. Perhaps this becomes redundant. What I was suggesting is that I was actually thinking about the original, Australian-suggested text, which is the next one down, and therefore that one side ‘*strengthening and improving the dialogue*’ and therefore that would still retain the proposal from Cuba that we talk about this at the next session of the World Heritage Committee. I have a question about whether it is necessary if that was to be the text to also ask the Secretariat to be taking good note of it, given that this discussion would be reflected in the summary of the meeting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is back to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. The suggestion as it stands now would read as new paragraph 5: ‘*Affirms the value of strengthening and improving dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties and proposes that a point be added to the agenda on this issue at the next session of the World Heritage Committee*’. If I understood correctly.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you agree for the next session? I give the floor now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Chairperson. This is not my first language but we say ‘*affirms the value*’ and then we say this point will be discussed at the next Committee meeting. What do we do in this year, between this year and the next Committee meeting? We are just affirming value or strengthening but we are not doing any action, whereas the original proposal seemed as if the Secretariat would create a platform for facilitating dialogue. The one that we are about to adopt just says to put the agenda for the next meeting, in my understanding of the language; I hope I am wrong.”

The Chairperson:

“Let us be practical. There is no problem in this wording, just a few changes. Let us decide to adopt this wording. I now give the floor to Cuba and then you decide.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. I fully understand the concern expressed by Zimbabwe and I believe it is in line with what I said initially; namely, that this concern will be reflected in the minutes of this meeting. The Secretariat has already indicated taking into account our discussions here. Therefore, we do not have it in the text of the decision and it should be in the report, either The Chairperson’s report or any other report that indicates what was discussed here in this room today on this issue.

This is the reason why we have been flexible on the paragraph as long as our full discussion is reflected. Thank very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Ms. Rössler.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much. I can confirm that we have taken good notes and that we will certainly facilitate the dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat will not wait until the next session. I would just like to be very clear about the point on adding an agenda item. This means to the agenda of the next session or do you want to have it under item 6 and create a new item? We are on item 5B; do you want to create a new item or is it under item 5B that we report back on this dialogue?

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor now to Cuba and then to our Rapporteur to finalise the text please. Thank you.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Madam Chairperson. Our apologies for this confusion, with regard to the workload of the Committee, we would leave this for next year. The Secretariat could provide information in the proper condition for us to have an in-depth discussion at that time.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. Paragraph 5 now reads: *‘Affirms the value of strengthening and improving dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties and proposes that a point be added to the agenda on this issue at the next session of the World Heritage Committee.’*”

Madam Chairperson, we finally request through you just to clarify what has been said by the Director of the World Heritage Centre, if this should be a separate point on the agenda or if this should be included in this report. Just to be exactly sure of how we should word

this.”

The Chairperson:

“Cuba please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “We would prefer a separate item with supporting documents different from the report of the Advisory Bodies that they usually present. We are another body of UNESCO and we are requesting an additional independent item on the agenda.

Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much Madam. In that case, with the agreement of the distinguished delegate of Cuba, I should like to make a suggestion that the second part of the paragraph could read: ‘*and proposes that this issue would be discussed at the next session of the World Heritage Committee*’. I would like to ask the distinguished delegate of Cuba. Would they agree with this terminology or prefer another?”

The Chairperson:

“Cuba please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much for the suggestion, but I am not actually really sure that it is better. I think it is actually clearer when we say that we want the Item added to the agenda. That way there will be an item on the agenda with the associated documents and associated draft decisions. If not it seems rather vague that there will be discussion. When I raise this, I thought that it would be worthwhile having a separate item on the agenda. I leave this in your hands.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. I beg your indulgence for these few moments and I will withdraw my proposal with the original proposal of the distinguished delegate of Cuba. It is just that we are also going to have an item on our agenda that could also actually deal with the agenda of the next session. I wanted to ask the Secretariat for the last proposal as to avoid confusion. I would like to make one slight modification in paragraph 4 as it becomes the final paragraph. I would suggest that it starts with ‘*Further takes note*’ if this is agreeable. Thank you.

Now, I will proceed to read out the entire modified paragraph. Please scroll up. Thank you. The new paragraph 3 will read:

- ‘*Also takes note with appreciation of the paper on the Evaluations of World Heritage Nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts developed by ICOMOS and encourages ICOMOS to further improve this paper by broadening the*

participation of experts in this new thematic area, including from the African region;

Paragraph 4 will start with: *'further takes note of the progress (...).'*

New paragraph 5 will read: *'Affirms the value of strengthening and improving dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties and proposes that a point be added to the agenda on this issue at the next session of the World Heritage Committee.'*

Thank you very much Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Do you agree with the final text? Yes. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 5B adopted.

We will now move to Item 6 of our Agenda, Follow-up to the World Heritage Capacity-building Strategy and Progress report on the World Heritage-related Category 2 Centres. The relevant working Document is Document 6. Considering their close links, these two reports are presented together within the same document.

I would like now to invite Ms. Rössler to briefly present this Document."

Ms. Rössler:

"Thank you, Madam Chair. This is a joint presentation by the World Heritage Centre and ICCROM and the document is in two parts. I think Mr. King will present the first part. Thank you very much. "

ICCROM:

"It is my pleasure to present item 6 on the World Heritage Capacity- building Strategy. As many of you know, the World Heritage Capacity- building Strategy was approved by the World Heritage Committee in 2011. It is aimed at providing an overarching framework to capacity-building based on need at the international, regional and national levels. The strategy was developed with three target audiences in mind: practitioners, institutions and communities and networks.

It aims at strengthening knowledge, skills and behaviours, improving institutional structures and processes and introducing a more dynamic relationship between the heritage and its context.

The strategy aims at multiple capacity-building actors, that is it is not just aimed at the Advisory Bodies to implement the strategy but it is implemented by the Advisory Bodies, by the World Heritage Centre by State Parties and by other capacity-building actors in institutions such as the Category 2 Centres.

In showing this slide, I want to call attention to the contributions of the Swiss government to the development of World Heritage Capacity-building Strategy and thank both the Swiss government and the government of Norway for their support in the implementation of capacity-building activities.

As my Director General already said, during item 5B, we would be pleased to discuss additional support from like-minded States Parties in the future for capacity-building needs. You already had a report by the World Heritage Centre on the significant capacity-building

active support that has been carried out by the Centre in all the region of the world.

At the level of the Advisory Bodies the main programme in place at this moment for the implementation of the capacity-building strategy is the World Heritage Leadership Programme. As already explained, the Leadership Programme is a partnership with IUCN in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and—actually I am going to be embarrassed as I left ICOMOS out of this—also ICOMOS, with the support of the Norwegian Ministry of Climate and the Environment.

The World Heritage Leadership Programme has 5 key modules of implementation. 1) Effective Management, Nature, Culture and Communities; 2) encouraging resilience; 3) dealing with the issue of Impact Assessment; then there are two modules dealing with development of learning sites and the idea of creating Leadership Networks around the world.

Several activities have been implemented over the course of the last year. Two courses in particular took place, one in Norway in the World Heritage Property of Roros which was, of course, on culture, nature and communities and a second one on people-centred approaches, which took place in various parts of Italy.

In addition to that, there were also several meetings that took place as part of the ICOMOS General Assembly in December of 2017. Those two meetings on the combination of the resource manual on cultural and natural heritage and there was a second meeting on the issue of governance.

We thank ICOMOS very much for hosting these meetings as part of the General Assembly that took place in dealing with these items. Once Again I apologise for not having included them in the former slide.

Other activities of the World Heritage Leadership Programme that are ongoing included Scope and Study on the Issue of Climate Change and its effect on heritage and World Heritage in particular. We have also carried out a workshop just this past month on the issue of resilience in Rome and we also took part in the annual conference of the International Association for Impact Assessment in order to create better contact with that institution in order to ensure that Heritage issues can be better implemented or integrated rather into impact assessment methodologies and practices.

Finally, for World Heritage Leadership I would like to call attention to the World Heritage Site Managers' Forum which was held in the week prior to this particular Committee meeting in 2018. This Site Managers' Forum was a partnership with the government of Bahrain and in addition there were contributions from the World Heritage Leadership Programme and also the government of Poland as host of last year's Committee meeting.

In addition to the World Heritage Leadership Programme, of course, there are many capacity-building activities that are going on in many parts of the world and there are some key themes that are coming out of the capacity-building area. In addition to World Heritage Leadership, the topic of linking culture and nature is becoming a more important topic in many areas of the world. This can be seen in two activities that are on the slide. One, a workshop on Nature Culture Linkages at Sacred Sites that took place in September of 2017 at Tsukuba University in Japan and also a course that took place in China on management and monitoring of Agricultural Landscapes which took place in Honghe Hani Rice Terraces in August of 2017.

In the area of Disaster Risk Management there have been a number of courses, one in Kyoto which is an annual course in partnership with ICCROM and ICOMOS and this year also with ICOM the International Council on Museums. It added an interesting aspect. It looked at World Heritage sites and also looked at the issues of objects and museums in

World Heritage sites. There was also a training workshop on Post-disaster Recovery for Living Archaeological World Heritage in Bagan in Myanmar, which is on the Tentative List of Myanmar.

ICCROM also continues its work on conservation training and capacity-building specifically in relation to physical conservation of the World Heritage. We now have three different courses on wood conservation. At the first, in September of 2017, we carried out a course at Kizhi Pogost in Russia, then we conducted a regional course on wood conservation in Nara, Japan, and, of course, every other year we have our traditional wood conservation course in Oslo, Norway, which is actually going on right now, as we speak; it has not concluded quite yet. We also had a stone course this past March and April in Mexico City and at the archaeological site of Chicanná in Mexico.

With regard to presenting opportunities in terms of capacity-building, ICCROM also sees that as one of its key roles within the Convention. On our website, in the classifieds section, there is a good range of the various courses, seminars and workshops that can be found around the world for people to apply for and take part in.

In addition to the activities at the international level there are also activities on capacity-building at the regional level. You have already heard from the World Heritage Centre about a number of activities that have taken place in the Asia and Pacific regions, for example there have been training workshops in Bhutan, India, Pakistan and China to reinforce capacities both for nominations and for sustainable management of the Cultural heritage.

In Latin America, again it has already been reported that there is work with the two Category 2 Centres there. It is worth repeating that a sub-regional meeting took place in Mexico to develop an Action Plan for Mexico and Central America. We think that this is a significant development for that sub-region for World Heritage.

In Europe, following on the issue of impact assessment, there were discussions of carrying out a series of regional and sub-regional programmes specifically for ensuring that Heritage Impact Assessment can take place when there are developments being proposed in and around World Heritage sites which might have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of those properties.

In Africa, it has already been mentioned there has been a great collaboration with the African World Heritage Fund and there have been workshops on Disaster Risk Management and I would really like to call attention to the World Heritage Nomination Support Programme which is carried out by the African World Heritage Fund. It is really a model that I would argue other regions of the world should look at in terms of supporting States Parties in the nomination process and ensuring that there is an ongoing dialogue within the region to look at nominations as they are progressing and to see how that progress is going on and how the States Parties themselves can work with each other and learn from each other and eventually come up with positive nominations.

There is also in this region, this was mentioned by the Ambassador to Zimbabwe, a workshop on World Heritage and Educational Institutions in Africa which took place in Zimbabwe and not too far away from the great World Heritage site in Zimbabwe that you see on the slide.

Finally, in the Arab region there have been multiple capacity-building activities carried out both in Bahrain with the ARC-World Heritage Category 2 Centre and also with ICCROM Regional Centre in Sharjah. I just highlight two of the slides which were the ARC-World Heritage where a series of workshops took place and additional ones are being planned to look at enhancing our heritage tool kit. It is looking at evaluating management at World Heritage properties and I will point out from the Sharjah office of ICCROM an activity that

took place in February of this year, which was an Arab Cultural Heritage Forum.

Your document 6 contains actually a large number of other capacity-building activities which have taken place over the course of the last year. There are too many for me to actually present to you here. I will just simply refer you to document 6 if you would like more information on the large amount of capacity-building activities that have been going on around the world.

Finally, I will actually apologise to the Committee because last year I was able to present to you a series of facts and figures about the number of participants and places around the world where capacity-building activities were taking place. This year, due to a technical issue, I was unable to collect this data. We set up a survey form but actually we were unable to collect and implement the data we needed. What I can do now is to promise you that for next year's presentation we will fix that technical glitch and I will be able to present it next year as sort of a more synthetic factual presentation of capacity-building around the world.

What I can say, however, is that ICCROM, through its tracking fund programme, has also been carrying out a series of research projects to look at training and capacity-building around the world. This particular map, which is on the screen right now, shows all the university programmes in Europe that have conservation as their main target in red and programmes that have conservation as one element in blue.

ICCROM is continuing to try to gather more information on capacity-building around the world, both in World Heritage and in the larger framework of capacity-building. Hopefully next year we will present at the Committee meeting a much larger and comprehensive picture in relation with capacity-building around the world. With that I complete my presentation and would like to pass the floor to Ms Rössler for the Category 2 Centres."

Ms. Rössler:

"Thank you very much. I would like briefly to present a report on the progress report on the Category 2 Centres.

As you know, we have currently nine Category 2 Centres related to World Heritage and agreements have been signed for seven centres: Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-World Heritage) (Bahrain); Regional Heritage Management Training Centre Lucio Costa (Brazil), World Heritage Institute of Training and Research for the Asia and the Pacific Region (WHITR-AP) (China); Centre on World Natural Heritage Management and Training for Asia and the Pacific Region (WNHMT) (India); International Research Centre on the Economics of Culture and World Heritage Studies (Italy); Regional World Heritage Institute in Zacatecas (Mexico) and African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) (South Africa). The agreement for the latter entered into force in June of 2018.

Agreements have not been signed yet for two centres: the International Centre for Rock Art and the World Heritage Convention (Spain) which was approved by the UNESCO General Conference in 2011, and the Regional Centre for Human Evolution, Adaptations and Dispersals in South East Asia (CHEADSEA) (Indonesia) which was approved by the UNESCO General Conference in 2017.

In line with the integrated comprehensive strategy for Category 2 Institutes and Centres, external evaluations have been undertaken for two centres: the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage (ARC-World Heritage) (Bahrain) and the Regional Heritage Management Training Centre Lucio Costa (Brazil).

As you see on the screen, the renewal agreement for ARC-World Heritage was

signed in April of 2018, and the renewal agreement for the Regional Heritage Management Training Centre Lucio Costa (Brazil) with the Minister from Brazil and our Director General was signed on the 13th of June 2018.

The 6th Annual Coordination Meeting of the UNESCO World Heritage-related Category 2 Institutes and Centres took place in Robben Island, South Africa, from the 11th to the 14th of February, 2018. This meeting reflected on interregional cooperation and the implementation of the recommendations made at the previous annual meeting, to reinforce the cooperation of the centres and foster partnerships with universities, UNESCO chairs and other stakeholders, and reflected on the ways to encompass Sustainable Development Goals into the activities.

The UNESCO Culture Sector organised the Second Coordination Meeting with UNESCO Category 2 Institutes and Centres and UNITWIN/UNESCO Chairs related to Culture, on 23-27 November, 2017 (UNESCO Headquarters), with an overarching theme of culture as an enabler of sustainable development. The meeting launched the online Forum of UNESCO Chairs and Category 2 Institutes and Centres, as a tool to support effective communication, information sharing and research.

Two thematic workshops were held in conjunction with this event: Advocacy and Communication for Enhancing Culture's Role in the 2030 Agenda and the New Urban Agenda, UNESCO 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.

I think this is in line with some of the discussions we had here. Azerbaijan for example mentioned this last thematic workshop. We need more tools and we try to do it also with our Category 2 Centres.

Thank you very much to all Centres, all of those who are in the room here and thank you very much Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Ms. Rössler. We are now looking at Draft Decision 42 COM 6. Brazil would like to take the floor."

Brazil:

"Thank you Madam Chairperson. I would like to thank Mr Joseph King for his presentation and also Madam Rössler for the additional information she provided. Capacity-building undoubtedly has a pivotal role to play in the implementation of the overall principles of the 1972 Convention especially with respect to ensuring sustainable development and implementation of conservation and preservation policies.

Having this in mind, I would like to refer to the signature last June already mentioned by Ms. Rössler between the Brazilian Minister of Culture and the UNESCO Director General of the renewal of the agreement for the Regional Heritage Management Training Centre Lucio Costa. On that occasion our Minister of Culture reaffirmed Brazil's commitments to continue promoting international cooperation in its south-south dimension focused on the management and preservation of natural and cultural sites.

During the first phase of the Lucio Costa Centre as a Category 2 Centre it worked closely with the national heritage institutions of many countries in Latin America and also with Portuguese-speaking countries of Africa. In this first phase more than 200 stakeholders and specialists and related workers were trained and we are very happy that we could provide this assistance to all the countries.

Our National Institute of Historic and Artistic Heritage (IPHAN) present at this meeting is organising for next August a meeting with UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies, especially ICCROM and the National Heritage Authorities of the Centre's member countries, in order to draw an action plan for capacity-building for the next millennium. Based on our experience we are positive that the enormous potential of Category 2 Centres will continue to be strengthened, thus contributing to the implementation of the 1972 Convention.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. Norway would like to thank ICCROM and IUCN for their fruitful cooperation under the World Heritage Leadership Programme. In our opinion, capacity-building is decisive in implementing the aim of the Convention. The six-year agreement was signed in 2016 and two years later we have experienced that the Programme is improving the nature and culture conservation practice. Several courses have already been conducted and experts are trained. Switzerland has contributed significantly to the project under the Programme. We will hope that other States Parties will find it interesting to join forces.

We also recognised other activities under the capacity-building strategy worldwide. We note the brief report on the status of the Category 2 Centres related to World Heritage capacity-building. Norway would like to thank the Centre, which has contributed to the capacity- building strategy.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. The delegation of Uganda takes honour to participate for the first time in this distinguished forum of the World Heritage Committee. I am joining other delegations in welcoming the presentation on the World Heritage Capacity-building Strategy and progress report on the work of the Category 2 Centres.

Madam Chair, the Ugandan delegation is happy to report that since the commencement of the World Heritage Leadership Programme in 2016, Uganda has effectively embraced this item, with emphasis on getting on board the young people in secondary schools to galvanise heritage leadership development. Coordinated by the Ugandan National Commission of UNESCO, with funding support from the Paris-based UNESCO Climate Change Project, there is ongoing, vigorous drive across all schools, tertiary institutions and the youth in Uganda to promote leadership clubs in juxtaposition with their country's lifelong running initiative.

Once again the delegation commends the performance on the World Heritage

capacity-building strategy and progress report on the World Heritage related Category 2 Centres.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you very much Chair. The Tanzanian delegation would like to commend the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the other partners for the progress achieved so far towards the implementation of the capacity-building activities in response to the need of heritage practitioners, institutions, partners and their communities at large, both at regional and at national levels.

Tanzania’s delegation is satisfied with the diversity of modules that were addressed. These modules including effective management, promotion of culture and education in Africa, risk management and risk preparedness workshops, resilience, impact assessment, leadership networks. Tanzania’s delegation also calls for the formation of other relevant innovative technical programmes leading to actual conservation and evaluation.

Tanzania’s delegation is satisfied that through its capacity building efforts Africa was among the beneficiaries through a number of workshops of UNESCO Heritage through the Category 2 Centres that took place in South Africa, Zimbabwe and Cameroon, just to mention a few. Tanzania acknowledges this effort and encourages the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to continue these efforts by also involving some universities.

Tanzania would also suggest, and think it is maybe high time, that an action should be initiated to audit and to assess the impact and the outcomes of this capacity-building programme.

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. I would also like to comment on the report on the Capacity-building Strategy. We are of the strong view that capacity-building activities are of crucial importance in assisting the States Parties in the implementation of the 1972 Convention. In this regard, we think that the World Heritage capacity-building strategy, which was approved by the Committee in 2011, is an important reference point and we commend the progress made in this regard.

Based on the experience of my country in the capacity-building activities within the framework of 2003 Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage, we would like to share with you some lessons learnt and some particular elements that would need to be taken into account.

First is the sustainability of the capacity-building. This means that the training of trainees approach should be applied and more of those involved in training would be taken on board. Second, the involvement of all stakeholders from the government, national commissions, from site managers and civil society needs to be addressed by this capacity-building.

A very important point is the focus which we believe should be more on preservation and conservation of sites rather than awareness-raising or something like this. Another very important point is the communication strategy. Capacity-building activities accompanied with the proper communication strategy will also deliver the necessary visibility to this process and will attract in return more funding from donor countries.

We also think that the network of UNESCO Category 2 Centres is a valuable asset and we are happy to acknowledge that cooperation with related World Heritage Category 2 Centres is functioning well.

We also want to bring on board the National Committees of the World Heritage, which could also be additional assets for this Capacity-building Strategy. Again, we want to emphasise the role of World Heritage Centres and Advisory Bodies in this mission, as was mentioned in our previous intervention. We believe that their expertise and guidance are crucial in assisting States Parties. Only through capacity-building can we achieve our mission both in a balanced World Heritage List and preservation and conservation of World Heritage sites.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. As the Kingdom of Bahrain is hosting the Arab Region Centre for World Heritage, which was established by the World Heritage Centre, UNESCO and hosted by the government of Bahrain, I would like to say that it has been quite an interesting and successful experiment so far. We have just had an extension for the second six years of work as Category 2 Centre in the Arab region.

It is important to say that there are strong relationships and partnerships between the Arab regional Centre in Bahrain and with the Advisory Bodies. That brings me to the point of the amendment that was discussed and hopefully approved a few minutes ago. To say that having this relationship and partnership with the Advisory Bodies and with the problems that we are facing in the region, this could be a good example for alleviating some of the problems that we have been discussing, and States Parties in the room have been mentioning and requesting some methods to alleviate the problems.

I think regional centres will be able to help in this regard and maybe help to reduce what is seen by many, especially in our region, as the north-south divide, which has been discussed for generations now. It is very important for alleviating misunderstandings and enhancing the relationship and dialogue that has been proposed and suggested lately between regional States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. I believe that Regional Category 2 Centres will be a good facilitator.

Having said that, I would also like to point out that the Arab Region Centre is proud to say that we have similar concentration and focus on both components of the 1972

Convention for the Protection of heritage, as we have exactly two similar Units within the Arab Region Centre, one for the Preservation and Protection of Natural Heritage in partnership with IUCN and also the Cultural Heritage Centre for the heritage component.

I believe my time has expired. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to add our voice to those thanking the Advisory Bodies for the report on capacity-building as well as the additional information that was provided by the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

In Africa, we have a very active Category 2 Centre, which is the Africa World Heritage Fund which my colleagues talked about. I would like to commend their work and also to commend the Advisory Bodies for the increasing collaboration that we are seeing between them and the Africa World Heritage Fund. We are grateful to the government of South Africa for hosting and supporting the Africa World Heritage Fund as well as to other governments that are providing support to the fund.

I would like to support and repeat what the delegate of Azerbaijan said in terms of capacity-building. It should also create a balance and stress more conservation and protection, particularly in our region, where we have a large number of sites in danger or sites that are in danger of becoming in danger. We would like to make sure that we increase our capacities in conservation and protection as well as in management.

These are some of the areas that I hope will increasingly come into play. We are also very grateful for the way it has been done with learning institutions, with universities in English-speaking and Francophone areas, which, in fact, entrenches our capacity-building from the University level upwards. We recognise that some of our experts are now sort of nearing retirement and need to be renewed and this particular programme is of great importance to the African region.

We thank the Centre as well as the countries that gave the extra budgetary support for this process. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the NGO representative. Please be brief. Thank you.”

NGO - The International Indigenous People’s Forum on World Heritage:

“Thank you, Madam Chair. Indigenous people around the world can be strongly affected negatively or positively by policies and actions undertaken in the name of World Heritage sites. At the same time, indigenous people can and do make substantial contributions to the conservation of World Heritage sites. I forgot to say that I am speaking on behalf of the International Indigenous People’s Forum on World Heritage.

We have noticed World Heritage capacity-building throughout the years does not

make any reference to indigenous people; we therefore strongly recommend that the Committee request the Centre and the Advisory Bodies and recommends to member States to include specific action on capacity-building with the indigenous people in their capacity building programmes and activities.

The International Indigenous People's Forum on World Heritage is in the process of developing a comprehensive strategy for capacity strengthening and we would greatly welcome the joint development of capacity as potential joint resources mobilisation. A concrete proposal in that regard could be the establishment of a voluntary fund for indigenous people to facilitate our effective participation in World Heritage processes.

During sessions of the Committee, as well as other processes such as the identification of nomination, monitoring and management of sites, the World Heritage Convention can in this way make meaningful contributions to the objectives to be achieved as referred to in the United Nations sustainable development goals, the UNESCO Policy on Indigenous People and the World Heritage Policy on Sustainable Development, all of which embrace the United Nations declaration on the rights of indigenous people. This Declaration, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly under your distinguished presidency as well as the United Nations General Assembly resolution of 2014, calls on all United Nations specialised agencies and organisations to contribute to the achievement of the objectives of this declaration.

Finally, Madam Chair, just a reminder that you are all invited to the side events which will occur thirty minutes from now in Room Hawar."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to China."

China:

"Thank you, Madam Chair. China warmly welcomes the outcomes of the progress report of the World Heritage-related Category 2 Centres and also attaches high importance to the follow-up to the World Heritage capacity-building strategy.

According to the previous resolutions adopted by the UNESCO General Conference, two Category 2 Centres related to the World Heritage have been established in China and have always played an active role in enhancing capacity-building in the Asia-Pacific and African regions, which are HIST and CRIHAP. These Centres have always organised various activities related to World Heritage together with States Parties and the World Heritage Centre, notably China hosted two sessions of the Changsha Forum on Youth and Heritage.

China is engaged continuously to make its contribution to the enhancement of the capacity-building of World Heritage. Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to see whether we have any amendments. Thank you."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much Madam Chair. We have received no amendments to this draft

decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 6 adopted. Now, we have an announcement.”

Secretariat:

‘The announcement is for the event this evening. As was just mentioned by the Indigenous People’s Forum on World Heritage, they will have a site event at 6:30 pm. This is held in the Hawar room. A side event called Emerging Restoration Practices in the Gulf, organised by the Kuwait National Council for Culture Arts and Letters, which should have started at 6 pm in the Dilmun room. I suppose it will start just after the session.

One more side event at 6:10 pm in the Manama Room; the World Heritage Sustainable Development Policy and what it means for States Parties. Sustainable development has been mentioned many times by various delegates; I suppose that many of you will be interested in this event.

One more announcement which I have just received. *Il s’agit d’une réunion du groupe Arabe aujourd’hui le 25 juin à 19 h à la Salle Tylos.* Can we go to the next slide, with one final announcement which does not concern an event taking place tonight?

Look at the screens and the Night of Virunga; it is a very, very special side event organised by the World Heritage Centre together with the Bahraini authorities for Antiquities and Culture in consultation with the Institute of the National Parks of the Congo and it is a special evening that is dedicated to the fallen rangers of the Virunga National Park. We will have a benefit concert and a fund-raising event on Wednesday the 27th of June and you are all invited to donate and to get your gold or silver passes. You can find them at the entrance where we have a stand.

We hope that you will come in numbers to support this fundraising event; this is a modest fundraising event that can change lives. We hope you will be there. This is a real promotion that we are making of an event that has a very noble purpose which concerns human life and a commitment to World Heritage. You can always come to us and ask us where to find more information and there is a desk close to the entrance, just after the registration area. We shall provide further information and you have also received an email with which you registered for this Committee.

Thank you very much; we hope many of you come and that together we will be able as individuals who attend this Committee to help a noble cause. Thank you very much and have a nice evening.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We come to the end of our meeting today. We meet tomorrow at 10:00 am and for Bureau members we will meet at 9:30 am at the Bureau. Thank you very much and have a good evening.”

SECOND DAY – Tuesday 26 June 2018

THIRD SESSION

10.00 a.m. – 1.00 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good morning dear colleagues. Before proceeding with our work, I would like to inform you that during the second Bureau meeting that was held this morning, it was proposed that the two draft decisions on Jerusalem and Hebron included in document 7A.Add 2 and Corrigendum be adopted without debate, this morning at the opening of our session.

I would like therefore to proceed with the adoption of Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.21, concerning the state of conservation of the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls and of Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.28 concerning the state of conservation of Hebron/Al Khalil Old Town.

Dear colleagues, these draft decisions were the subject of intense negotiations and have been agreed upon by all the parties concerned. I would like, therefore, to propose to adopt them without debate. Furthermore, I would also like to inform you that the consensus implies that no statement or declaration be made after the adoption of these drafts.

I see no objection. Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.21 and 42 COM 7A.28 are adopted. Thank you.

Dear colleagues, the Bureau was also informed this morning of our progress of work. As you noticed yesterday, we did not have time to examine item 8 concerning the progress report on the preparation of the third cycle of Periodical Reporting. It is proposed therefore to examine this item next week after the completion of item 7 regarding state of conservation. As for item 8 regarding nominations, we will inform you on the due process of the exact date when this item will be examined. Thank you very much for your understanding.

Dear colleagues, I would also like to inform you that during the Bureau meeting this morning, members of the Bureau requested that we open discussion on the state of conservation reports on the Tropical Reinforced Heritage of Sumatra, Indonesia, the Dja wildlife Reserve Cameroon and the Cape Floral Region protected area, South Africa. Thank you very much.

Dear colleagues, to start the day we have a major agenda item to examine, namely Item 7, on the state of conservation of World Heritage report on properties. I would like to inform you as for past years that this item will remain open to possibly take into account the debate held under agenda items 7A and 7B. Draft Decision 42 COM 7 will therefore be adopted once we have completed the examination of items 7A and 7B.

Before I give the floor to Ms. Rössler to introduce this item, I would like to inform you that the conservation community was saddened by the loss of more than 20 rangers and other staff at World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of Congo. Therefore, I would like to propose a tribute to be paid to them and that we all observe one minute of silence in their memory. Please stand for a minute of silence.

Thank you very much. Before we start I would like to acknowledge the tireless effort of the Director General, Ms Audrey Azoulay of UNESCO, for her effort in favour of reaching a consensus between the two concerned parties regarding the issue of Jerusalem and Hebron. Without her effort and that of the two concerned parties and their understanding and flexibility, as I found yesterday, it would not have happened. Thank you very much to the Director General and to the two concerned parties.

The floor is to Ms Rössler.”

Ms Rössler:

“Thank you very much. You see behind me the slide, which is announcing a fundraising event which will take place tomorrow night for the families of Virunga Park. There is also a great band that will play tomorrow.

Madam Chair I believe that the Democratic Republic of Congo would like to take the floor. They put the flag up.”

The Chairperson:

“You have the floor Democratic Republic of Congo.”

République démocratique du Congo :

« Nous vous remercions, madame la présidente, de nous donner la parole. Nous commençons par remercier les autorités de Bahreïn pour avoir organisé cette réunion de haute importance. Nous profitons de cette occasion pour remercier le Comité ici présent qui a exprimé sa compassion à l’égard de la République démocratique du Congo qui a accusé un grand nombre de pertes humaines, presque chaque année, pour tout simplement protéger le bien inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Nous voulons ici réitérer le fait que mon pays va toujours continuer à mener ce qui relève de sa compétence pour assurer la protection des biens du patrimoine. Nous n’allons pas baisser les bras nous vous remercions ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Ms Rössler please.”

Ms Rössler:

“Thank you very much for your intervention. Before we start with item 7, I would also like to tell you that the Internet connection is rather slow; they are working on it or maybe it is the traffic generated by all the emails emanating from this room. Let us start with item 7, which is the general item on the state of conservation.

As you all know, The World Heritage Convention is one of the most successful international instruments for the conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites. Its unique Reactive Monitoring process greatly contributes to the efficient monitoring of threats affecting the properties and to their mitigation. The document 7 in front of you is a key document on global World Heritage conservation issues and contains different parts.

Document 7 provides a detailed snapshot of the factors impacting the Outstanding Universal Value of properties, such as the lack of management plans or their inadequacy, ill-advised housing or ground transport-related development projects, inappropriate management activities, tourism-related activities, illegal activities, extractive industries and, of course, the conflict situations which were just mentioned in various parts of the world.

In part 1, document 7 proposes some explanatory notes on the current evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process you had requested at the 40th session in 2016 and also provides an insight on the efforts we have undertaken to strengthen the dialogue with civil society organisations.

In part II, more comprehensive information is provided on emergency situations in conflict areas. Indeed, in 2018, conflicts affected 20 per cent of all the properties reported to the Committee. This part of document 7 alerts you, the Committee, to the tragic loss of human life, we had just heard about it, resulting from conflict situations and on the devastating damage and continuing threats facing cultural and natural heritage in general. It also provides detailed information on UNESCO's actions to advocate and mobilise the international community for the protection of endangered cultural and natural sites.

I would like to address more specifically some of the other conservation issues presented in part III of this comprehensive document.

The destruction of the past few years have brought the question of Reconstruction sharply into focus. Since the last session of the Committee, several international meetings have taken place or are being planned on broader issues of recovery and reconstruction. I attended myself the Global Conference on Reconstruction of Iraq together with our Director General, attended by more than 70 countries, held in Kuwait in February of 2018. In terms of World Heritage, there was an international conference on Reconstruction, hosted by the Government of Poland in Warsaw in May of 2018, with 200 participants from more than 30 countries, different bodies including the World Bank and our Advisory Bodies providing for specific recommendations with the Warsaw Declaration, which has been uploaded on our webpage and that I really recommend you to read. A special issue of the *World Heritage Review* N° 86 was also published in January, 2018, on World Heritage and Reconstruction with a number of case studies.

This Document also addresses Climate Change, and presents a follow-up to the decision adopted last year, including on initiatives taken by the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and some States Parties towards the updating of the Policy Document on the impact of climate change on World Heritage properties. You heard yesterday Australia already intervening for a sixth 'C' in Climate Change. Thanks to the generous support of the State Party of the Netherlands, we will be able to start contacting experts in this field and advance with the updating of the Policy. Furthermore, in response to the Committee's request, the World Heritage Centre, in consultation with IUCN, has completed the first global assessment on impacts of climate change on World Heritage-listed coral reefs, with the generous support of the State Party of France.

Forty years after the first properties were inscribed on the World Heritage List, there is still a significant number of properties which do not have clearly delineated boundaries. You know that the delineation of boundaries is an essential requirement for the establishment of an effective management plan for the property to fully ensure the protection of its Outstanding Universal Value. Furthermore, it is challenging to accurately determine the potential impacts on Outstanding Universal Value from threats posed from outside of the property without clear boundaries. When something happens and UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies have to react and we do not know where the boundaries are, you put us in a very difficult situation. It is therefore critical that clear and manageable boundaries are proposed at the time of nomination.

For the past few years, the Committee has been stressing the necessity for Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) and Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) to be conducted to evaluate the potential impacts of projects on the Outstanding Universal Value of properties (this was actually one of the discussions of the site managers' meeting last week). You will hear soon from the site managers. These assessments need to be conducted as early as possible in the planning process and submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies before any decision (which would be very difficult to reverse) is taken. Each of those should include an explicit section assessing the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, which is unfortunately often not the case. It is also important to note that HIAs and EIAs have to be proportionate to the scope and scale of projects, with simpler assessments for smaller projects, while very large projects may require Strategic Environmental Assessments (SEA).

This year, a number of large-scale development projects is being considered in the state of conservation reports, because of their impacts on World Heritage properties. Such projects can be located within or outside the property boundaries, and sometimes at great distances or even in other countries, but their impact on the Outstanding Universal Value can be of serious concern. As many such projects are designed to address transport and other issues generated outside the property or extend far beyond it, there is a need for Strategic Environmental Assessment to be used in order to ensure a full appraisal of the wider context.

With over 1.2 billion people crossing international borders each year, tourism is increasingly a major source of growth, employment and income for many countries. However, the increasing demand for tourism infrastructure in response to rising tourist numbers requires consideration of carrying capacity, as well as careful monitoring and management where they may pose potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. This year, 50 state of conservation reports refer to problems associated with visitor management and the construction of tourism infrastructure. There is a crucial need to strengthen policies and frameworks to promote sustainable tourism. In this regard, the World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme is developing a Visitor Management Strategy and research and monitoring framework to improve the States Parties' know-how and share good practices. To this end there will be a side event today at lunchtime.

At its 32nd session in 2008, the World Heritage Committee requested the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to develop a dialogue with the International Olympic Committee (IOC) with a view of putting in place an agreement to ensure that future Olympic Games will not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties. In 2014, IUCN established a dialogue with IOC regarding this matter, and, in 2015, signed its first agreement with the IOC, which has been extended until 2020. I am very pleased to also inform you that in November of 2017, the World Rowing Federation informed the World Heritage Centre that it had made a commitment to respect and preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of sites, and recognised the role that the sport sector can play in supporting the conservation of these special places. It is hoped that this decision will encourage other sports federations to follow this example, and include World Heritage properties within the scope of such commitments.

At its 37th session in 2013, the World Heritage Committee expressed concern about the growing impact of the extractive industries on World Heritage properties and urged all States Parties and leading industry stakeholders to respect the 'No-go' commitment by not permitting extractive activities within World Heritage properties. Through the collective efforts of the Secretariat and IUCN, but also thanks to initiatives taken by the OECD in 2016, the International Petroleum Industry Environmental Conservation Association (IPIECA), UNDP and the International Finance Cooperation, and the WWF, to name but a few, I am very pleased to announce that as of today, thirteen banks and financial institutions have confirmed to the World Heritage Centre that they have some form of policy in place. These policies are diverse but while some restrict finance to extractive projects in World Heritage

sites, others take on a larger commitment not to support any activities, which could threaten World Heritage sites, including activities outside of the property but with potential impact on its Outstanding Universal Value. This is a very encouraging development and personally I am very pleased because I started the dialogue with the extractive industry in 1998; it took a long time.

At its 34th session in 2010, while reviewing general conservation issues, the Committee noted that the availability of earth observation technologies were continuously improving, and that such techniques could provide evidence over time to determine, 'whether some impacts on World Heritage value continue to occur or are being addressed'. Combined with appropriate spatial analytic tools, earth observation facilitates the early detection of natural or anthropogenic (human) threats, such as impacts from natural disasters or climate change, unsustainable developments, deforestation, illegal mining, encroachment, and can enable targeted responses by the responsible authorities. It can also provide valuable support to site managers, especially in areas where access is restricted. The World Heritage Centre and colleagues from the Man and Biosphere (MAB) Programme have established fruitful contacts with ESA, Gemini Space Service & Consulting and HIST, mentioned by China yesterday, a Category 2 Centre, for a European Union-funded project. If approved, this two-year project would assist in developing an application suite, based on eight World Heritage properties and five Biosphere Reserves, and would also include dedicated capacity-building activities.

The illegal trade of wildlife species and their products from within World Heritage properties has been a serious threat for which the Committee has expressed its serious concern on numerous occasions and launched an appeal to all Member States of UNESCO, especially origin, transit and destination countries, to cooperate to combat this threat, including through an improved cooperation between the World Heritage Convention and CITES. The World Heritage Centre has further continued its close cooperation with the CITES Secretariat concerning the state of conservation of several properties, which are heavily affected by the impacts of the illegal wildlife trade, such as the Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico). You have certainly seen the *World Heritage Review* issue on the topic of illicit trafficking which covers both natural and cultural heritage. Finally, it is to be noted that I will meet with the Secretary of the CITES Convention on the occasion of the next meeting of the Biodiversity Liaison Group of the biodiversity-related conventions, to be hosted at UNESCO Headquarters in September of 2018.

Last, but not least, another significant current threat to World Heritage properties is posed by invasive alien species and States Parties are strongly encouraged to develop adequately-resourced strategies to eradicate invasive species in the properties and prevent their (re-)introduction and/or establishment. Such strategies should emphasise prevention, early warning and rapid response.

As you indicated madam Chair, draft Decision 42 COM 7 will only be discussed at the end of the session, to take into account any further reflections which you may have during the state of conservation reports 7A and 7B.

Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Ms. Rössler, I would now like to give the floor to the Advisory Bodies for their additional statement. We start with Mr. Joseph King for ICCROM."

ICCROM:

“Thank you madam Chair. This statement is on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies ICCROM, IUCN and ICOMOS. One of the key issues that emerged from the analysis of state of conservation reports is the accumulated impact of threats to properties resulting in large-scale development projects. Of those threats those related to infrastructure, extractive industries and tourism remain worryingly high. The potential impact of such threats is compounded by weaknesses in the available tools and systems, particularly at the individual property level. If properties have all the necessary tools, then development, whether related to infrastructure, extractive industry, tourism or economic or social imperatives will only be accommodated in a manner that sustains the Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS, ICCROM and IUCN note that any proposed projects with the potential to adversely impact the Outstanding Universal Value should be subject to Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA), Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA), or Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as early as possible and before taking decisions on whether or not to pursue such projects further. A SEA should ensure that a full appraisal of the wider context of the proposed development is undertaken together with a full assessment of appropriate options.

The ICOMOS guidance on heritage impact assessments and IUCN World Heritage advice note on environmental assessment provide guidance on the principles and standards that need to be observed when undertaking impact assessments related to World Heritage properties. There is often no single solution to addressing threats. Instead, a multifaceted approach is needed in this regard.

Strong links between national plans and strategies and decision-making at the local level is imperative. It is also becoming clear that in many cases development pressures arise far beyond the property at the national level and sometimes across international borders, which is a cause for concern.

Another key emerging issue is the impact of climate change on the conservation of World Heritage Properties. The number of properties affected by climate change is increasing, with eleven such properties reported in the state of conservation this year. Owing to the complexity and the indirect impacts of climate change, it is likely that these threats were not fully accounted for in all the properties being reported on.

In regard to cultural properties in areas of conflict we would like to commend the government of Poland for hosting an international conference early this year on recovery and reconstruction. We will take note of the declaration that came out of that meeting. Also, in relation to conflict, we note the continued damage by illegal archaeological excavations, looting and illegal trade.

Poaching and illegal logging of endangered species continues to impact upon the conservation of natural World Heritage properties, driven primarily by illegal trade. It is estimated that no less than 45 per cent of natural properties are affected by the illegal harvesting of wild animals and plants listed under CITES, the Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. IUCN contributes to CITES in assisting States Parties in taking scientifically informed decisions regarding international trade of species and to ensure international trade is not detrimental to wild populations.

IUCN announces a proposal to amend the CITES annexes, which are increasingly taking World Heritage in consideration. Similarly, the contribution provided by IUCN to CITES also helps to inform its advice to the World Heritage Committee.

A related issue is the increased recognition of the right of local people, particularly indigenous people, to participate in decision-making processes for World Heritage properties with which they have traditional ownership of or strong connections with. While there have been significant improvements in engagement with local stakeholders and the convening of

the Indigenous People's Forum there is significant scope to improve and extend recognition of traditional practices skills and knowledge.

Finally, the Advisory Bodies note that according to the statistics in document 7, the issue of management systems remains the biggest conservation issue within a state of conservation report. The lack of clear systems for planning, decision-making and implementation of conservation actions is one of the causes of many of the issues that arise within a state of conservation report. As site managers are one of the key actors within a site management system, the Advisory Bodies considered the launching last year of the Site Managers Forum as a very positive step in improving management systems at World Heritage properties.

The Advisory Bodies would first like to thank the government of Poland for launching the idea last year at the 41st session. With the partnership of the Bahraini Authorities for Culture and Antiquities and again with the National Heritage Board of Poland, we were even able to take the forum further this year, creating a place for exchange of ideas and experience and hopefully creating a lasting network of site managers. You will hear the result of the forum a bit later and we very much hope that these fora will be able to continue on a regular basis in the future.

Thank you very much madam Chair for giving the Advisory Bodies the floor.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Mr King. I would like to know whether you have any comments or questions. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you very much madam Chair for giving me the floor. The Norwegian delegation would like to thank the Secretariat for the comprehensive report which is an instrumental tool for carrying on the work in the Committee. In line with the sustainable development growth, we would like to emphasise the critical role that a healthier place plays in addressing challenges including poverty, climate change and food and water security. The conservation of the World Heritage is essential for all communities who depend on environmental products and services that ecosystems provide.

As Australia pointed out yesterday, the State Parties have themselves nominated their World Heritage properties based on the Outstanding Universal Value. It is the role, responsibility and function of the Committee to give advice related to the conservation and protection of these inscribed properties. Targets under Sustainable Development Goal 11 also highlight the need to strengthen efforts to protect and safeguard the world cultural and natural heritage. The potential impact of large-scale development on the Outstanding Universal Value is alarming. Strategic Environmental Assessments are necessary to assess the potential impact as well as to identify options to protect World Heritage. Integrated heritage value and protection in all planning processes is getting ever more critical. We must respect the right to pursue economic development, but the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value cannot be compromised.

We must identify economic activities which concern and enhance value for people and nature over the long term. It is a common responsibility to work to provide support where social economic development is needed. The World Heritage is of common importance for present and future generations. We encourage all State members to take this into consideration when we are entering agenda items 7 A and 7B.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to the representative of Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I would first like to briefly thank the Secretariat as well as the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for all the work that has been accomplished in order to provide us with additional instruments to support the complex task of conservation and presentation of our sites, whether they are listed as World Heritage or not. This is a complex task, as you have rightly stated. There are many threats and challenges to be taken into consideration on a daily basis for the work of conservation.

Norway rightly stated that this is a work where sustainable development is being sought at all levels of responsibility. I would therefore like to express again our thanks for these guidelines we can all use at those times when we need to assess the impact either for the environment or for the life of communities involved. We must not forget that even though we do have these instruments, we also need to have the capacities for their implementation and we are, of course, getting back to what we were discussing yesterday: the need for capacity building.

Again, our thanks for that advisory work, for that evaluation and for the useful instruments that we all use in our work. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Angola.”

Angola :

« Je vous remercie madame la présidente pour la parole. Nous avons bien pris note du rapport sur l'état de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et félicitons les centres et organisations consultatives pour cela. En analysant particulièrement les éléments relatifs aux biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, les statistiques montrent que les régions d'Afrique et des états arabes représentent 28 et 41 % respectivement. La liste du patrimoine mondial en péril contient des sites qui y sont inscrits depuis plus de dix ans. Il y a même des sites africains qui sont inscrits depuis plus de 20 ans.

Nous avons également pris note de la mise en œuvre des décisions du Comité concernant l'évaluation du processus du suivi réactif. Le Centre a commencé à développer des initiatives sur l'évaluation du processus de ce suivi. Nous encourageons le Centre pour cela et remercions le gouvernement de la Suisse qui a été disponible.

Toutefois, cette situation continue de nous préoccuper. Nous aimerions, à cet égard, avoir certaines précisions de la part des organisations consultatives concernant les points suivants : en considérant toutes les menaces qui pèsent sur les sites, est-ce qu'il est possible que des sites maintiennent leur Valeur universelle exceptionnelle pendant plus de 20 ans ? Si les efforts sont réellement déployés pendant tout ce temps, ne devrait-on pas observer des avancées significatives devant aider la sortie de ces sites de la Liste en péril

pour qu'il réintègre la Liste du patrimoine mondial ? Le fait de maintenir ces sites sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, bénéficie-t-il à l'État partie et à ces populations ? Est-il crédible pour la Convention et pour le Comité que ces sites continuent à être maintenus sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril étant donné que les Orientations ne contiennent aucune disposition spécifique sur ce type de cas ?

Nous aimerions avoir l'avis du conseiller juridique, si cela est possible, ou demander la réalisation d'un audit indépendant pour ces sites inscrits pendant plus de dix ans sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ou de mettre en place un groupe *ad hoc* pour la révision des Orientations concernant les sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril pendant plus de dix ans. Nous avons besoin d'avoir des directives claires concernant cette étude de cas.

Je vous remercie madame la présidente ».

La présidente :

« Merci beaucoup, je donne maintenant la parole au Brésil ».

Brazil:

"Thank you, madam. A very brief intervention just to congratulate the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the representative of the Advisory Bodies for their extraordinary reports. I would also like to say that we fully share the very importance of addressing the challenges posed by climate change and sustainable tourism. I would also like to congratulate the Director for the collaboration with the Olympic Games and also with regard to the need to avoid extractive activities, especially in natural parks.

I would also like to point out that, as important as post-conflict strategies, is the need to have a very strong strategy in the case of natural disaster and I believe that we should also be very alert to this and have some mobilisation strategy in the case they happen.

Thank you so much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Australia."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair for giving me the floor. Australia too would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their informative report on the conservation issues facing World Heritage properties around the globe. These reports highlight a number of key themes, all of which have implications for protecting Outstanding Universal Value of our exceptional properties in the face of a continuously changing environment.

How to manage the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value in this changing environment should be front and centre of all conservation discussions. All threats faced by World Heritage sites are indeed some form of change, whether it would be in the environment, socially or economically. In this respect Australia echoes Norway's expression of the importance of heritage to environmental protection and sustainable development.

All of these threats and issues outlined in the papers have a level of importance to us as State Parties both in technical and policy context. However, allow me to highlight two issues of particular importance. Climate change, as we know, has both direct and indirect impacts on World Heritage properties and there is a need to address how we manage these impacts at the property level through adaptation strategies.

We would like to emphasise the importance of the current process to update the World Heritage Climate Change Policy and to develop an implementation plan. We therefore look forward to providing our input into the process and encourage all States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, the Advisory Bodies and other interested stakeholders to configure and engage with this update.

Through our assessment of the state of conservation report before the Committee this year and from the reports of the Advisory Bodies, it is evident that the illegal wildlife trade remains a major threat for national World Heritage properties and one which stakes affect not only wildlife but communities, rangers and management staff. These alarming statistics that IUCN provided of 45 per cent of national properties implicated in wildlife trade should be a loud signal of alarm. We emphasise the need to address illegal wildlife trade through effective implementation by States Parties signatory to the Convention on International Trade and Endangered species (CITES) and we are pleased to see the World Heritage Centre continue its cooperation with CITES under the framework of the Biodiversity Liaison Group.

Having only two issues raised here, it was already clear the workload for States Parties affected by these issues is significant and dealing with just one of these is no small task. The workload of States Parties and particularly with those sites on the in danger List is unsustainable and the Committee needs to think on how to simplify a very complex process to help achieve positive outcomes for their properties.

Finally, we welcome highlighting the importance of including indigenous people's role and interest in the management of relevant World Heritage sites. Our only experience has illustrated the benefits that flow to the proper protection of the World Heritage by the integration of indigenous land owners in the management of such properties.

Thank you, madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of the Republic of Azerbaijan."

Azerbaijan:

"Thank you, madam Chair. First of all, I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for this very comprehensive report. I would just like to draw your attention to the table which very explicitly explains the threats and factors affecting heritage property sites. We see that almost 75 per cent of the affected properties are related to the management system, which leads us again to reiterate the importance, which we mentioned yesterday in our intervention, of the capacity-building among property and site managers.

I think we should redouble our efforts for capacity-building for the conservation of the sites in order to reduce the percentage of negative management systems affecting the sites.

I would also like to touch upon the monitoring system. We fully understand and are aware of the importance of reporting and missions to the site, but with limited financial and scarce resources we believe that the frequency of these missions and the reporting request

can be reduced, which would save financing and time for the States Parties as well. Of course, it only applies to World Heritage properties in the List not in the in Danger List. We think that this kind of approach of reducing the frequency of the reports and missions will definitely bring results in terms of saving financial resources.

We would also like to touch upon the issue of emergency situations. Of course, we fully share the concerns of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies with the sites that are affected by conflicts and natural disaster. We welcome the positive examples and the decision and the initiative of the Director General on reviving the spirit of Mosul. We fully support this initiative, which aims at reducing destruction. We believe that this practice should also be applicable to other sites in the region, in Syria and in Yemen, provided that security conditions are ensured.

I also join the previous speakers in underlining the importance of climate change and tourism infrastructure which also drastically affects heritage sites.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to the representative of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much. I just want to support and endorse the requests by the representative of Angola for advice on what to do with sites that have been on the in Danger List for more than ten years. Just to amend a little bit what was said, what we need in addition to advice is the option of an audit or an *ad hoc* group to work on them. After we have had an audit, this is when we would know what to do with sites with such problems.

My other contribution was really to understand and thank the Director and the Advisory Bodies for the report and also to realise that the key challenge, as mentioned by Azerbaijan, is related to the issue of management and to say that in the future it would be good to look at what we spend our efforts on under item 6 on capacity-building and how it relates to the challenges that we find in the state of conservation reports.

I hope in future there will be a link between these tools when the Centre reports to show how it affects priorities being given to the problems that have been identified.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to the representative of Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We would like to thank the Secretariat for the information provided, which is very thorough in terms of content. There are more than 50 paragraphs, so it is important to peruse it thoroughly. There is also a lot of sensitivity and various different threats to heritage sites. I wanted to focus on one. I feel that there is a shortfall when it comes to climate change impact information, in particular for Small Island Developing States.

We think that a lot of initiatives are under way and we are getting some support from the World Heritage Centre, but we would like to see greater focus on that issue here in the Committee and in the supporting activities. I was wondering if you noted for example the participation project in Jamaica last year and in terms of monitoring the climate change impact on heritage.

Cuba this year has submitted another inclusive project at the regional level encompassing various countries in the region looking at impact on heritage in the Latin America and Caribbean region. We submitted it and we are hoping it will garner support from the Centre. The idea is to ensure that we can share and exchange information on climate change's impact on heritage. Not only with climate change but also sustainable development of tourism. We think that these are areas which deserve greater visibility and therefore we would like them to be given more scope in this type of report.

We think it is also important to examine the Samoa Plan's implementation progress, which we think is another very sensitive issue.

On the follow-up and implementation mechanism: We would like to see further work done with initiatives to bolster dialogue on these issues with Advisory Bodies. As we know, these are very sensitive issues in the Committee and we think it would be good to have greater transparency and clarity thereupon. That is why we would like to see more of this in the report and reflected in the sensitively-worded language in the draft decisions.

That's all I wanted to contribute. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Tanzania."

Tanzania:

"Thank you, madam Chair. I would like to support Angola, Zimbabwe and other delegates who talked about the issue of sites for a long time on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Indeed, there are sites in countries with no war, no conflict and no insecurity but that still do not have their corrective measures in place and they do not have the desire for conservation for removal. Yet, the site has been on the in Danger List for more than ten years.

We do understand that there are challenges than can affect this, such as financial constraints of the third party concerned. According to the Convention, it is the duty of every member of the Convention to assist and find out which possibilities can help protect these World Heritage sites. Yet, we also see from the Advisory Bodies and probably from the World Heritage Centre that you start with one, two or three problems, but when the missions come to the site they keep on adding other things.

This will definitely put a World Heritage site on the in Danger List forever because I do not know any site without challenges; maybe in other places. The Tanzanian delegation would really seriously advise that once we have some issues that have really put the sites in danger let us dwell on those and let us make sure we have worked on them before we come to the other issues that are definitely there anyway.

Our delegation suggests a way to put up a strategy where we should try to see what has happened with these sites.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Poland.”

Poland:

“Thank you madam, Chair. Considering Poland is taking the floor for the first time, let us congratulate the government of Bahrain for their effort in organising the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee and their great hospitality in Manama. We would also like to congratulate madam Chairperson for her leadership and the Secretariat for the preparation of the report and this meeting.

As the main organiser of the international conference entitled to “The challenges of the World Heritage recovery”, we would like to thank all the participants for their invaluable input and the experts of the working group for their hard work while preparing “The Warsaw recommendation on reconstruction and recovery of cultural heritage”.

This international meeting gathered more than 200 participants from all over the world, including international organisations such as ICOMOS, ICCROM, the World Bank, UNISDR and UNESCO, who for the first time met all together to summarise the debate on recovery and reconstruction of properties damaged in a result of armed conflicts or natural disaster.

Taking into consideration the example of Warsaw; the history of its destruction, spiritual reconstruction and recovery of the city, which was appreciated by the international community through exceptional inscription on the World Heritage List in 1980, we follow our obligation to share this powerful example as a point of departure for further reflection on current challenges.

In *The Warsaw Recommendation* we proposed a set of principles regarding values, conservation doctrines, sustainability, resilience and capacities. Local communities as well as any stakeholders, should follow these principles while keeping in mind the importance of memory, reconciliation, education, awareness-raising and documentation to ensure that the process of recovery of cultural heritage is successful.

We are convinced that the importance of *The Warsaw Recommendation* could not be overestimated in today’s world, we wish that the history of Warsaw’s recovery will inspire the revival of other tragically destroyed cities, especially Aleppo or Mosul, and bring hope to people, to their communities and to the international community.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Bosnia.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci au Secrétariat de nous avoir préparé ce document. Nous aurions voulu dire un mot sur la nécessité de l’éducation aux monuments historiques. Une fois que l’on détruit un monument, on fait aussi en sorte de détruire une mémoire collective. Donc, l’éducation

dans le sens de la protection de la mémoire collective, l'éducation dans le sens d'une continuation, nous semble importante et de faire en sorte que les États parties de l'UNESCO aillent dans le même sens aurait l'avantage d'améliorer notre capacité de protection des monuments et de former peut être un centre qui s'occuperait de cette activité.

Merci bien. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of the NGOs.”

NGO:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I come from the River without Boundaries Coalition, which works to protect Lake Baikal. May I bring to your attention, a resolution of the first World Heritage Watch Forum of Civil Society Organisation to the growing threats on World Heritage from poorly planned and poorly managed water infrastructure?”

The impact of water infrastructure seems to be the most serious and irreversible factor in World Heritage degradation, as it is exacerbating the long-term effects of climate change. One quarter, 24 per cent, of all natural sites the Committee is reviewing now are affected or threatened by dams and water diversions. They constitute one third of the Natural Heritage List in Danger.

Ill-conceived hydropower often marketed as countries' contribution under the Paris Climate agreement is the lead cause of such damage. In the last five years, annual installation of hydropower around the world decreased by half, as the sector became much less relevant to development. Despite this, the reported number of incidents of dams threatening World Heritage sites has significantly increased over the same period. This means that due to poor planning and weakened conservation enforcement, dams are increasingly encroaching upon the last free-flowing rivers, biodiversity hotspots and heritage properties.

We submit the following possible solutions that may help to enhance your already excellent draft decision: timely implementation of the Committee's decisions is the key; we hope to attend improvement in preparation of States Parties and the Advisory Bodies will focus on achieving complete and timely implementation of decisions.

Utilisation of water is the vital part of sustainable development, but nowadays there is simply no necessity for water infrastructure to encroach on natural ecosystems and ecosystem services. We feel there is a need for early use of strategic environmental assessment tools to determine which development options are win-win solutions. Early strategic assessment will have great value for enhancing sustainable development and not just for World Heritage preservation. Therefore, we recommend, pre-emptively subject to strategic assessment, not only large projects but their sources of origin, such as spatial development plans, river basin management plans and economic corridor schemes.

Thank you very much for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Kenya.”

Kenya:

“Madam Chair, since this is the first time Kenya is taking the floor, we wish to congratulate the Kingdom of Bahrain for organising this session of the World Heritage and for their warm welcome.

Kenya will be hosting the first ever Global High-Level Conference on Sustainable Blue Economy. The conference will be held at the Kenyatta International Convention Centre in Nairobi from 26th to 28th November 2018.

The conference aims at providing a global forum for advancing global conversation on the two important pillars of the Blue Economy. These are sustainability, climate change and controlling pollution on one hand; and production, accelerated economic growth, jobs and poverty alleviation on the other. The Blue Economy presents alternatives that can augment the achievement of the UN 2030 agenda for sustainable development.

The conference will therefore discuss how to use the oceans, seas, lakes and rivers which are our common heritage to accelerate sustainable economic growth, building sustainable livelihoods, job creation and poverty alleviation. It will also discuss challenges facing the blue economy sectors such as pollution, waste management, overexploitation and security.

Kenya invites you, the Committee and the States Parties, to participate and share ideas and exchange views, new knowledge, technologies and innovations, strategies and experiences that can catalyse establishment of sustainable partnerships and projects in the cultural, economic, social, environmental, technological, scientific, and governance issues of the Blue Economy.

The proposed outcomes of the conference include co-hosts initiative, pledge, promise on Blue Economy; business deals, technology sharing and partnership agreements; a pledging board on productive and sustainability pillars for individuals, governments, businesses, civil society and conference report and summary.

Already 3 heads of state have confirmed their participation and several countries have pledged monetary assistance, technical and in kind. The pledging season is still on.

Welcome to the High-Level Conference on the Sustainable Blue Economy in Kenya in November.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Ms. Rössler, who will reply to your enquiries.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I would like to thank all the delegation and committee members and observers for their very rich and very constructive debate on this item. Let me briefly react to two points.

First of all, the interventions from Angola, Zimbabwe, Tanzania and etc. on potential audits or evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring process linked to the question of why sites are for such a long time on the in Danger List. We looked into the figures and you have exactly 23 properties on the in Danger List which have been on it for at least ten years. It is less than half of the in Danger List.

Secondly, I may have been a little bit short earlier because I did not want to talk for too long. Actually, this Committee has already decided to have a Reactive Monitoring evaluation which is on-going and which is described on page 6 of the document. It was Decision 40.COM 7, which looked into promoting an understanding of the List of World Heritage in Danger, but specifically to evaluate the effectiveness of Reactive Monitoring, including procedures and case studies.

We put this on the market place to get funding which we got from the generous support of the State Party of Switzerland; the process is actually ongoing. I wanted to tell you that we will report to the 43rd session of the Committee in 2019 on this project which will give you much more detail and based on this you will be able to take a more informed decision in this regard.

The second point I would like to make and here I thank very much Norway, Australia and Cuba especially on climate change-related issues. Definitely it is a threat we have identified as a key threat to World Heritage properties. I would like very much to welcome what Cuba mentioned; the project in Jamaica and potential future projects, because what we are doing at the moment is updating the Climate Change Policy which the Committee adopted and it was also adopted by the general Assembly of the States Parties of 193 countries. I think this Policy will definitely benefit from concrete projects on the ground and you will take informed decisions at the Committee next year. I believe the Advisory Bodies would like to make more statements.

Thank you”

Advisory Bodies:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The Advisory Bodies acknowledge the issues that were raised by the representative of the States Parties of Angola and others. In relation to the question about whether Outstanding Universal Value can be maintained after a long period on the in Danger List: we believe that the answer is an unquestionable yes. It is a question of framework and process for ensuring that the risks and threats to the Outstanding Universal Value are properly addressed. In that regard the provisions of paragraphs 178 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines provide for places to be included in the List of World Heritage in Danger when there are ascertained or potential threats to the Outstanding Universal Value. We believe that is indeed the appropriate framework and emphasise that in danger listing is a call for help and identification of a need for action.

We acknowledge that a number of properties have been on the list for a long time and thanks to the Director we have the specific number of 23 — noting also that the size of the current in Danger List has increased dramatically in the last four years, particularly at the 39th session of the Committee, when there was some group listing of properties in areas that were subject to conflict. However, the reality is that over the period of the Committee operations, the in danger system clearly works and through the identification of the desired state of conservation for removal and the corrective measures, a framework is provided for the issues that give rise to threats to the Outstanding Universal Value to be addressed.

This leaves the question why are places, properties on the in Danger List for a long time? In some cases, it is because there is a lack of action by the States Parties, but that is not the majority. In far more cases the questions relate to a lack of resources, and more recently external factors such as armed conflicts, which simply prevent corrective measures from even being identified, let alone being taken.

The response to these issues is of course centred on capacity-building and it should be noted that with respect to the properties that are in areas of armed conflicts, capacity-building is possible remote and off site, awaiting for an improvement in security situations.

ICOMOS and the Advisory Bodies believe that it is appropriate for the Committee to take a strategic approach, which needs to be centred on resources and capacity-building rather than perhaps too much focus on the reporting and Periodic Reports noting that a review of the periodic process is underway.

Thank you madam Chair; I think that IUCN and ICCROM also wish to comment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, you have the floor, IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. Perhaps just to supplement my colleague’s comments in response. There have been several mentions already about IUCN’s World Heritage outlook and we will have a side event today on this. This is IUCN’s attempt to comprehensively better understand the nature of the threat and more systematically find solutions that are needed to be addressed.

The statistics and outlooks are also alarming. We know that only one third of the sites have a poor conservation outlook; 80 per cent of the threat categories have increased in the period between assessments. Protection and management standards are regrettably slipping.

I think it is very clear that we are pressing hard on these precious places and there is really a need for creative decisions and for wise decisions that are based on integrated planning and long term planning. Hence the conversation around strategic environmental assessments on impacts.

IUCN definitely believes we need to be more creative in finding solutions. IUCN undertakes a lot of work in parallel to our role here with Advisory Bodies. We need to understand contextual issues around connectivity with large landscape approaches and we again have a side event today to elaborate a little bit more.

We fully support the need for creative approaches to address some threats that are in need of tailored responses, such as climate change, which has been mentioned. Again, the idea of different tools and mechanisms that would allow us to more precisely prioritise the need for action in key sites.

Just to remind the Committee, as it called for cost of action plans which should be timetabled in relation to sites on the in Danger List, I think that this particular measure, if it can be operationalised more clearly, would give us the menu of actions that are required and more precision in the resources that would allow us to mobilise resources more effectively.

Again IUCN is a very willing enacting partner in how we might collectively find more creative solutions to address this raft of threats. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, now, if you would like to reply.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. Just a few quick points in the area of climate change. First, we would note that Australia actually made a proposal yesterday to add to the ‘Cs’. I am not sure, as it is an important point, whether it deserves to be lumped with other ‘Cs’ or whether it should be a ‘C’ on its own, as it is something that we have to deal with in a very serious way.

On the topic of climate change, we would like to remind everyone that usually the discussion on climate change revolves around natural heritage properties. The truth of the matter is that potentially there is a very significant impact on cultural properties. It is something that ICCROM and ICOMOS are very concerned with.

I think within World Heritage leadership, again, we try to sort of package the issue of climate change and its effects on both cultural and natural heritage into work on resilience.

The second point goes to some of the comments made by Zimbabwe, and I believe Azerbaijan, on linking capacity-building with the issues related to the threats within the state of conservation report. That is actually something that is within the World Heritage capacity-building strategy that was approved in 2011. This is exactly what we tried to do: look into some of the main threats to World Heritage and try to design a strategy around some of the most important threats.

The culture-nature linkages, for example, did actually come out of that because that was actually seen as important threats. I do believe it is worth the effort as proposed by Zimbabwe to do some monitoring on that and to come back to the Committee and look at how we are doing in relation to try to deal with those threats within our capacity-building effort.

The third point, just very briefly: Brazil talked about the fact that we need to focus not just on climate but also on natural disasters. Indeed, we are trying to do that with the work we do on resilience. I think all of us are doing that. There is a tendency for us to focus more on conflict because it is something that is front and centre in the news and something we are paying attention to. Natural disasters are definitely something we are looking at; we try to build capacities to a variety of actions at the regional and at the international level.

Finally, the last point I wanted to make was on the Polish intervention on the Warsaw Declaration. Again, I wanted to thank the government of Poland for that and for putting forward the Warsaw declaration. ICCROM strongly believes that this document is important because it puts the activity of reconstruction within a larger context of recovery. The aim is not to reconstruct cultural heritage, it is to provide recovery for communities and heritage. Sometimes that involves construction, sometimes it might just be restoration or consolidation or a variety of other activities and should also include community recovery efforts, not just to the physical heritage itself. We do think that the Warsaw Declaration is a very important document and again we thank the government of Poland for hosting that meeting.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think that Zimbabwe has asked for the floor for the second time. I give you the floor, but please, we are just very picky with time so do not take long.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. I will not be long. I just want to appreciate the clarification by the Director on the evaluation of the Reactive Monitoring missions that is taking place but also to really specify that there is a difference. The terms of reference do actually address the issue of sites that have been on the in Danger List for more than ten years. That would be a different subject. An additional component should be put into this current exercise or it is really not exactly addressing the questions or the concerns that we have raised.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. I now give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous avons pris note des réponses qui ont été présentées par les Organisations consultatives présentes. Pour appuyer ce que vient de dire le Zimbabwe, nous avons pris note de ce qu'ils sont en train de faire, mais nous pensons que nous reviendrons sur ces sujets puisqu'ils restent ouverts pour proposer un amendement au projet de décision plus tard. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Ms. Rössler to answer your queries.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I would like to thank the ambassadors of Zimbabwe and Angola for their interventions. Just to clarify, it is in the terms of reference, but we can further strengthen this with a focus on those sites which have been on the in Danger List for more than ten years.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, according to paragraph 190 of the Operational Guidelines, the Committee shall review annually the state of conservation of the properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We have now reached this crucial part of our agenda which is at the heart of the Convention. Before we start with the examination of the individual state of conservation report, I would like to give the floor to Ms Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Committee, to review this item.”

Ms. Rössler:

“I think madam Chair that we now have the site managers coming, if I am not mistaken, to report on the results.”

The Chairperson:

“Actually, let me first give the floor to the representative of Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Very quickly, I have a point to report. The decision was one we were going to take once we concluded with items 7A and 7B because we have some amendments to make.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Just to confirm what Cuba said: Yes, these items remain open; you will look at the overall decision, once we have considered all state of conservation reports under 7A and 7B, so we do not adopt at this moment.

Thank you very much. I think madam Chair that the site managers have arrived.”

The Chairperson:

“As you all know, the second edition of the World Heritage Site Managers Forum started on the 21st of June in Manama. This capacity-building event has gathered over 40 site managers from all over the world. I would like to express my sincere thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain, to the Bahraini Authority for Culture and Antiquities, to the World Heritage Centre, the three Advisory Bodies and the National Heritage Board of Poland for organising such a great, enthusiastic and successful forum.

I also thank the Norwegian Ministry of Culture, Climate and Environment for their assistance through the ICCROM, IUCN World Leadership Programme. Thank you very much to all of you for having made this event possible. I would now like to give the floor to Mr. John Zulu, site manager of a Zambian site, the World Heritage property of Mosi-oa-Tunya/Victoria Falls, to give a view on the forum. You have the floor.”

Site Manager Speaker 1:

“Thank you so much madam Chair. To all distinguished Committee members, Ladies and Gentlemen, we would like to thank you for giving us this opportunity as site managers from around the world to give you a presentation. Firstly, I did not do this by myself so please allow me, madam Chair, to invite the site managers so that you can see and appreciate them. Please, colleagues, come here to the front of the podium.

Madame Chair, this is a statement that has been drafted by site managers regarding the forum that we had and the title of this statement is ‘Recognition and Inclusion’.

The second World Heritage Site Managers’ Forum was held in Manama, Kingdom of Bahrain, from June 21st until the 28th of June, 2018. The participants of the Forum included 44 site managers of their respective World Heritage properties in 33 State Parties, namely: Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Belize, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Cyprus, Germany, Jordan, Italy, Lesotho, Lithuania, Malaysia, Malawi, Mali, Malta, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Slovenia, Sweden, Turkey, the United Republic of Tanzania, the USA, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

The participants of the Forum discussed and exchanged stimulating constructive

debates on their role and responsibilities as well as the challenges they face in the management of World Heritage properties. The Forum also served as a platform to assess their capacity-building needs in the implementation of the World Heritage Convention at local and regional levels.

As an outcome of these discussions and exchanges the participants of the Forum would like to address the following observations and make recommendations to the honourable delegates of this distinguished Committee. I hand over to my colleague.

Site Manager Speaker 2:

“Recognition: we observe that our World Heritage properties differ greatly in size, type, age and scope and our management systems are very diverse. Our role as coordinators of these management systems and the daily challenges and responsibilities we face are very similar. We, as site managers, require interdisciplinary experiences and knowledge and deal with complex and time-sensitive issues to ensure the sustainability of our sites.

The term ‘site managers’ does not fully capture this complexity and incorrectly implies that it is a task undertaken by a single person. We suggest that the World Heritage system could better recognise in a formal way the complexity of site managers’ roles and responsibilities and strengthen their mandates and recognition in national and international compacts. This would better enable us to act for our formal recognition, institutional backing, adequate resources and timely access to information and data, as bridges delivering the values and ideas of the Conventions to the local fabric of society.”

Site Manager Speaker 3:

“We understand that our task to conserve and protect the World Heritage properties goes beyond the physical attributes of the site and includes the entire environment and interaction with communities. Further, we acknowledge that our duties are sometimes carried out during times of conflict and crisis. As such, there is a need to protect site management teams in their daily duties. As guardians, we require your assistance to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of our precious properties that we care for on a daily basis by means of transparent, informed and responsible decision-making, which emphasises the needs of the heritage above short term political and diplomatic interests.”

Site Manager Speaker 4:

“As communicators we play an important role in the empowering of local participation inclusive of various communities and historical narratives. Identification with ownership of World Heritage: in this role we ask you to assist us in creating networks and channels for exchange of our concerns, experiences and knowledge among each other including at the sub-regional, regional and global levels.

Inclusion: we recognise the importance of exchanging our experiences and good practices in the World Heritage management and we highly recommend that the organisation of an annual Site Managers’ Forum in the context of World Heritage Committee sessions is continued and institutionalised to allow for our better inclusion in the World Heritage system.”

Site Manager Speaker 5:

“It is vital to involve site managers in this process at an early stage, to strengthen our

capacity and to recognise needs and opportunities in this context. We therefore encourage States Parties to develop national capacity-building strategies and to support site managers in this annual forum and have capacity-building opportunities. We invite the States Parties to include site managers in their delegations to the World Heritage Committee, to allow us to understand the circumstances of development and adoption of the policies and decisions we are expected to implement.

Our presence and inclusion could be a mechanism to enhance and guarantee credible and transparent decision-making through dialogues. We can offer informed insights which could lead to more effective and more efficient monitoring processes, as well as prevention and resolution of conflicts that might arise.

As site managers we are both recipients and disseminators of the policies and decisions you create. Our understanding of the implementation of these is essential to the wider public awareness and the sustainable transmission of our World Heritage properties to future generations.”

Site Manager Speaker 6:

“Before we end, madam Chairperson, please let us express our thanks and gratitude to the Kingdom of Bahrain for hosting us here. We would also like to appreciate the Norwegian government for supporting this programme and the Centre itself for giving us this opportunity to come and stand before you. We are grateful, we are here as well, and our passion is there to serve our country and our heritage.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Many thanks for a very inspiring feedback from the site managers. I wish you all success. Do you have any comments before we continue our proceedings? No. Thank you very much. The floor is to Ms. Rössler to continue the state of conservation reports.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. We now start with item 7A. You have the list of documents on the screen behind me and you also have the INF.7Rev.2 document. They were some other presentations made by the Bureau for opening of sites so they will be a new REV document issue very shortly.

These reports present detailed reports on the state of conservation of 54 properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In addition to those individual reports there are two general decisions, included in the document. One is on World Heritage in the Syrian Arab Republic and one on the World Heritage properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that less than half, or 25 of the 54, requested state of conservation reports from the States Parties were received by the World Heritage Centre by the statutory deadline of 1st of February, making the timely preparation of these documents very challenging. Five reports were not received at all. We cannot report information from the States Parties to you.

Madam Chair, with your permission, I would like to call upon States Parties to really do their utmost to comply to the statutory deadline and to report according to the format included in annex 13 of the Operational Guidelines in one of the working languages of this

Convention.

In line with our rotation practise, this year we will start reports on cultural properties in the order of the following regions: The Asia- Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa and the Arab States. The presentations are made jointly by the Secretariat and Advisory Bodies.

After the examination of cultural properties, we go to natural properties in the same order. There are no mixed properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Once we reach environmental agenda items and before the floor is given to the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, it is the practice, madam Chair, that the Committee member who has requested its specific state of conservation report to be open for discussion to present the reasons why it felt important to discuss this report in order to keep the debate focused on this issue.

Before concluding, I would also like to recall some of the Committee rules on procedures that may apply to this agenda item to facilitate the conduct of our debates. Rule 22.4: *'The Chairperson shall put Committee members to a State Party once at the end of the Committee's debate on the property'*. Rule 22.6: *'States Parties shall not speak to World Heritage properties in their own territories, except at the explicit invitation of the chairperson within the allowed time for their speech and in response to specific questions posed'*.

Lastly, madam Chair, I would like to remind the distinguished Committee members about the very important decision 35.COM/12E, which the Committee adopted at its session in 2011, requesting States Parties to refrain from providing additional information on state of conservation issues after the deadlines indicated in the Operational Guidelines, as this information cannot be reviewed by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies in due course. Therefore, any such update received will be highlighted by the Secretariat during the presentation.

Thank you very much madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Ms. Rössler for this useful introduction. Are there any questions or clarification requests? I cannot see any. I now invite Mr. Feng Jing, Chief of the Asia-Pacific Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in the Asia and Pacific Region and open for discussion. You have the floor."

Mr. Feng Jing:

"Thank you, madam Chairperson. The first site for review by the Committee is located in Afghanistan, the Cultural Landscape and Archaeological Remains of the Bamiyan Valley. The summary of conservation issues for this property is available in working document 42 COM 7A on pages 3 to 6 of the English version and also in the French version.

In 2017, the State Party has undertaken a number of conservation activities in collaboration with UNESCO and other international partners. These included the preliminary stabilisation of the Western Buddha niche, as part of Phase V of the UNESCO Japanese Funds-in-trust project. Assessing the condition of mural paintings was carried out in the main Buddha cliffs, in the Kakrak and Foladi Valleys.

The Committee may recall that the State Party has on several occasions stated that it would like at least one of the Buddha niches to be partially reconstructed, most likely the eastern one, as it is less damaged. As recommended by the May 2014 ICOMOS technical advisory mission in the framework of the Japan-funded project, an international symposium was organised in Tokyo, Japan, in September of last year. The director of the Centre in her presentation yesterday presented the outcomes of this symposium. The conclusion of the symposium is that discussion on the possible reconstruction of the site requires further study and review is still needed. In that regard the State Party of Afghanistan is establishing a Steering Committee to review the proposals for the project.

Meanwhile, the 14th Bamiyan Technical Working Group meeting took place in December of last year and put forward priorities for activities from 2018 onwards. Additionally, Phase 6 of the UNESCO Japan funds-in-trust project is under consultation between the donor and UNESCO for the period 2019-2021.

The World Heritage Centre would like to thank the governments of Italy and Japan for their generous support in favour of the conservation work at the property and for their support with the implementation of the corrective measures. The Committee may wish to commend the State Party of Afghanistan for the significant progress achieved with the development of a cultural master plan and its incorporation into the Bamiyan Safety Master Plan. This tool aims to control urban development pressure in and around the property and to ensure that any development projects carried out are sustainable.

Furthermore, the Committee may wish to reiterate its full support for the State Party to proceed with the boundary modification and revised national registration in this regard. At the end of 2017, the State Party submitted a proposal for construction of the cobblestone paved road within the property and this project is under review by ICOMOS with some additional information provided by the State Party before the Committee.

The Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM consider that it is essential that independent discussions take place, as soon as possible, between the State Party and the relevant experts in order to establish a new timeframe leading to the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. We therefore suggest that the cultural landscape and archaeological remains of the Bamiyan Valley be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger at this stage.

Madam Chairperson, dear Committee members, the Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.1 can be found on page 5 of both the French and English versions of the working document. With your permission the ICOMOS representative will provide the comment on this property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this information. Do you have any enquiries or comments? ICOMOS please take the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Significant progress has been made with conservation and consultation activities in the Bamiyan Valley in cooperation with UNESCO’s international partners and, importantly, local communities. Preliminary stabilisation of the western Buddha niche and evaluation of the mural paintings in the main Buddha cliffs in the Kakrak Valley have been supported through the Japanese Funds-in trust project for Safeguarding the Bamiyan Valley. Additional funding and ongoing support from the international community

are required to address persistent resource shortages and to continue the conservation works needed to achieve the desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The international symposium held in Tokyo enabled experts to discuss technical and conceptual concerns related to the possible reconstruction of the eastern Buddha statue. ICOMOS and ICCROM concur with the symposium's participants that there should be an ongoing and broad ranging consultative process.

The Cultural Master Plan for the property has both facilitated productive consultation between authorities and local stakeholders and insisted on sound decision-making about actions that might affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. In this regard, it is important that due recognition be given for coherence of the wider valley and that the boundary modification and related national legislation be implemented as soon as possible so that the significant heritage resources in the Bamiyan Valley receive permanent protection.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank very much. Are there any other requests for the floor? Yes. Tanzania, please, take the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you, madam Chair. This delegation would like to commend efforts by UNESCO in collaboration with external partners to support the State Party in their effort to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Observations and recommendations by the Advisory Bodies and the current activities being undertaken are the key springboard for the site to attain the desired state of conservation.

Excellency madam Chairperson, after the destruction made to the properties, any effort to restore the property should take into consideration a holistic and coordinated approach in the case of reconstruction of the statues as well as other monuments. Due to financial challenges that the State Party is facing, we would like to request other States Parties to lend a helping hand to the current effort so that the State Party can improve the state of conservation of this property. Tanzania, therefore, goes along with the Advisory Bodies' recommendation to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. There are no more comments. Dear colleagues, I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.1 concerning this property. Before that I would like to ask the Rapporteur whether she has received any amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. We have not received any amendments to the proposed Draft Decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any more comments? Would ICOMOS like to respond?”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Thank you very much to all distinguished delegates and Committee members. We took notes of your comments and constructive criticism and we will try to do our best to improve the system and our mechanism so that we could be more satisfactory for all stakeholders. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.1 adopted. Thank you very much. Mr. Feng Jing, please take the floor for the next report.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you very much. The next site is called the Historical Centre of Shakhrysbz, in Uzbekistan. Conservation issues identified for the property included detailed information on Periodic Reporting and the Reactive Monitoring process for the property are summarised in document 42 COM 7A, on pages 10 to 15 of the English and French-language versions.

The property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2000 and on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2016, following the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission of March 2016. A further joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS Monitoring Mission, took place in December of 2016 and could not recommend mitigation measures or suggest major boundary modifications that might save the entire property or even part of it. You can see this on the slide.

In 2017, the Committee stated that it would decide at the current session whether the property has deteriorated to such an extent that it has lost the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value defined at the time of inscription and whether it should therefore be deleted from the World Heritage List in accordance with paragraph 192 of the Operational Guidelines.

Regrettably, the destruction that occurred during development works have altered the morphology of the city to such a degree that reclaiming the street patterns would be impossible, as the ground levels have been altered significantly. You can see from the current slides on the left corner.

Reinstating the relationship between the monuments and the city is similarly not an attainable goal. In terms of individual monuments, all have been subjected to extensive restorations that impacted adversely on their authenticity. Only the fragmentary remains of the Ak-Saray Palace may have had the capacity, but you can see from the photos the work carried out and recently, its structures and surroundings and the state of conservation of the remaining tile work would not allow it to satisfy conditions of authenticity and integrity.

As requested by the Committee in last year’s decision, a link to the summary outcome of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting was made available in the working document to facilitate consultation by the distinguished Committee members. It should be noted that during this exercise, carried out in 2011-2012, the State Party made no mention of the large-

scale development project which was already ongoing and rated major visitor accommodation and visitation facilities as positive factors for the property.

The State Party of Uzbekistan submitted its report on the state of conservation of the property by the 1st of December, 2017, as requested by the Committee. The documentation has been carefully reviewed by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Following this review, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies recommend that the Committee express its deep regret for the situation and that since the property has lost the attributes which convey the Outstanding Universal Value defined at the time of inscription and in accordance with the paragraph of the Operational Guidelines, it decides to delete the property from the World Heritage List.

I wish to emphasise that this could be a third case of delisting in the history of the World Heritage Convention and that such proposals are not put forward lightly. But, in the absence of any realistic alternatives emanating from the Reactive Monitoring missions or the State Party and giving that no means of restoring the destroyed Outstanding Universal Value could be envisaged, there is regrettably no other solution left at this time.

In view of this situation and following the official transmission on the 14th of May of the working document, a debriefing was held between the Director of the World Heritage Centre, myself and the representatives of the parliamentary delegation of Uzbekistan to UNESCO on the 23rd of May, 2018. During this consultation with Uzbekistan, worth undertaking, in accordance with Paragraph 196 of the Operational Guidelines, the Director informed Uzbekistan that the current session of the Committee would express its deep regret that the State Party of Uzbekistan was unable to fulfil its obligations to protect and conserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as defined at the time of inscription and that it may decide to delete the site from the World Heritage List.

On the 14th of June the newly appointed Deputy Prime Minister of Uzbekistan, His Excellency Mr. Aziz Abdukhakimov, met with the Director and myself as the recently appointed representative of the Uzbek National Commission for UNESCO. He expressed the desire of his government that they wish to elaborate close cooperation with UNESCO. He further debriefed the Director of the Centre on the government resolution on the protection of historic sites of the Republic of Uzbekistan inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List adopted on the 9th of June, 2018, by the Cabinet of Ministers of Uzbekistan. This document was also attached with a Road Map for improvement of the protection of World Heritage properties in Uzbekistan.

Another meeting was also held between the Assistant Director General for Culture of UNESCO and the Deputy Prime Minister of Uzbekistan on the 18th of June, in Paris, before the Committee session. The Assistant Director General assured him of UNESCO's technical support on the ground for the preservation of cultural heritage in Uzbekistan with the new government.

It should be noted that previous working documents and decisions of the Committee accurately reflect the irreversible damage done to the property. While the commitment of the recently appointed authorities in Uzbekistan to undertake administrative reform is commendable, there is simply no possibility of reworking the damage caused and bringing back the lost Outstanding Universal Value.

Finally, I wish to emphasise that previous Committee decisions on the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz aimed at protecting the precious World Heritage properties of Uzbekistan, which is a shared heritage of human kind. However, issues similar to those encountered in Shakhrisyabz have now been reported at several other cultural heritage sites in Uzbekistan and notably at the Historic Centre of Bukhara, and Itchan Kala and Samarkand, crossroads of cultures. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are extremely, extremely

concerned about the ongoing state of conservation issues at these three properties which are mostly due to proposed large-scale tourism and development projects and wish to urgently reiterate their offer to assist the State Party in preventing man-made disasters such as the one that took place at Shakhriyabz from ever occurring again.

Madam Chairperson the draft decision is on page 14 of both the English and the French language versions. With your permission, ICOMOS will now provide further comments. The representative of the State Party, Uzbekistan, is also present in the room to provide clarification to the Committee.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The analysis provided by the State Party's report confirmed the conclusion of the December 2016 Reactive Monitoring mission: drastic and irreversible damage has been caused to the remains of the town planning of Shakhriyabzand, particularly to the core of its medieval town. While the main monuments remain, the destruction of buildings and the lowering of the ground level in the centre of town have altered the morphology to such an extent that the monuments are now divorced from their urban context and sit in a modern park landscape.

We understand the State Party considers that this project was a mistake. The December mission could not envisage any mitigating measures or suggest a boundary modification that might in their view save the property. None of this has been suggested by the State Party in the state of conservation other than small cosmetic measures.

It is worth recalling that the property was inscribed on the World Heritage List not just for its collection of exceptional monuments, but also for its ancient quarters that *'bear witness to centuries of history and particularly to the period of its apogee, under the empire of Temur, in the 15th century'*. The main centre which connected two Medinas still existed at the time of the inscription as its planning structure. It was not just an ensemble of buildings that was outstanding, but the urban planning reflected in the 15th century layout. As the nomination dossier stated, *'monumental buildings of Temur surrounding by traditional dwelling houses have a special character which is typical only for Shakhriyabz'*.

Moreover, the nomination dossier reported the results of archaeological evidence for settlements dating back to the 8th century AD, in the centre of the town where the ground level was some 2 and 2.5 metres higher than elsewhere. This earlier settlement was gradually enlarged, developing in a similar way to Samarkand and Bukhara. What we had at the time on inscription was a gloriously intact 15th century town, possibly the only one left in Central Asia, that displayed this extraordinary combination of major monuments to a coherent ensemble of traditional houses, all reflecting its apogee in the 15th century. It was said at the time of inscription that there was no analogy in central Asia.

What we have left today are the main monuments, but no centre of the town. What has gone is the build-up of ground for multiple occupation layers over many millennia, upon which were tightly packed vernacular buildings that were particularly dense and chaotic in the area identified as the centre of the early medieval town.

Two out of the seven *mahallas* or town quarters have been impacted and some 2000

residents were relocated outside the town. ICOMOS greatly regrets this fusion of monuments and that Temur's urban form has been totally erased in the centre of town, as can be seen from the slide. We consider that there is no way to reinstate what is gone. What is left does not justify criteria (iii) or (iv) for which the property was inscribed, nor the conditions of authenticity and integrity, and overall it can no longer justify the Outstanding Universal Value. If the property remains on the List, ICOMOS suggest that the credibility of the Convention would be rightly challenged.

We consider that there are clear lessons to learn from what has happened. It is relevant for other properties within Uzbekistan, which likewise were not just inscribed for their monuments. The Outstanding Universal Value of Itchan Kala were seemed to derive from the individual monuments, but also from the incomparable urban composition of the City. For Bukhara the real importance was seen to lie not in its individual buildings, but rather in its overall townscape, demonstrating the high and consistent level of urban planning and architecture that began with the Sheibanid dynasty.

In both these properties, workers have been undertaking very recently to lower ground levels and some of the traditional buildings have been demolished and rebuilt, not so far from the same extent as in Shakhrisyabz. In ICOMOS's view, Shakhrisyabz cannot be saved, but we consider there is an urgent need for capacity-building at other properties to ensure that their extraordinary importance and structures survive and are conserved as part of a dynamic, historic, urban landscape.

In conclusion, ICOMOS considers that the urban centre of Shakhrisyabz has been destroyed to such an extent that it has lost the attributes that defined the Outstanding Universal Value as set at the time of inscription. Regrettably, we consider it should be deleted from the World Heritage List in accordance with Paragraph 192 of the Operational Guidelines.

Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any more comments? Now, I give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan."

Azerbaijan:

"Thank you, madam Chair. At the very outset I would like to make it clear that Azerbaijan shares the concerns of ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre about the illegal activities that took place in Shakhrisyabz Historic Centre. We were part of this Committee when it took the unanimous decision to inscribe this heritage site on the in Danger List and we very well understand and acknowledge those irregular activities that were detrimental to the Outstanding Universal Value.

But we cannot agree with the scope of this destruction, demolition and we cannot agree with the use of the word 'irreversible' and also with the outcome as a solution recommendation by ICOMOS.

First, we think that the destruction that happened in this historical centre of Shakhrisyabz do not encompass the whole historical city which bears the Outstanding Universal Value; it is only 10 per cent. This is information provided by the State Party and I would also like to verify with ICOMOS whether this is true or not and we were asked as States Parties to respond to this. According to our information, only 10 per cent of the buildings were affected, without justifying the irregular activities and demolition. These

buildings were demolished due to some emerging issues such as sanitary conditions, etc. There was no tourism infrastructure built on the place where the destruction occurred (hotels, etc.).

At the same time, I think we should encourage and acknowledge the efforts of the State Party in understanding the emergency of the situation. I think this is acknowledged by ICOMOS itself in its report when it says *'it is noted that the State Party is ready to collaborate with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in order to keep the property on the World Heritage List'* "The State Party has already made some efforts in order to mitigate the impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value, namely the newly-constructed dividing wall between the Old City and the modern centre, as well as the metallic gate, which were removed. There are some other facilities such as a children's centre and new street lighting systems that were also removed, what was called cosmetic change. We do not think they are cosmetic changes and they have been removed. Then, the historic streets between communities in Shakhriyabz were revitalised.

In addition to that, in order to mitigate this negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, the government of Uzbekistan adopted a special resolution on the protection of World Heritage sites in Uzbekistan on the 9th of June, 2018. According to this decision, the government of Uzbekistan established a working group for the effective protection of the cultural and national heritage sites in Uzbekistan. The resolution also contains a Road Map with concrete actions, 26 activities with reasonable deadlines on the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz. In addition, the resolution contains provisions with the respective financial and human resource support, including expertise from international experts, for elaborating new management and conservation plans.

In short, I would just like to point out that the State Party is ready and very committed to work with the Advisory Bodies and with the World Heritage Centre to do everything possible and to prepare a management plan which will mitigate these illegal negative impacts to the Outstanding Universal Value.

In general, I think we are not in favour of hasty decisions and with regard to the delisting of this site from the World Heritage List, simply due to the reason that we are here to encourage rather than discourage States Parties to work for the preservation and protection of sites. At the end of the day, we are here to preserve sites and not get involved in a blaming and shaming exercise.

I thank you very much if I may also to put the question to the State Party first to evaluate the scope of destruction and irregularities and the second is to evoke the activities that the State Party has done so far and what is planned. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Please, each participant keep with your time, which is of three minutes only. If you do not keep within time, we will never end. Three minutes only or I will turn off your microphone. Thank you very much."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much madam Chair. Now, we are very struck by the language and this is something that we have said since the beginning of this session, the language used by the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies, we have seen very strong terms in evaluation that is to lead to a Committee decision and seem to prejudice on a decision that is yet to be taken. I will reiterate this every time I feel that this is appropriate and to the point.

We are here to contribute to the dialogue and this is a remark for both the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies.

My second point is that we have some questions very much along the lines of what was said by the Ambassador of Azerbaijan and we thank him very much for the information provided. Since this is only ten per cent of destruction on the part that has Outstanding Universal Value, the remaining 90 per cent that has not been destroyed contained no Outstanding Universal Value?

My second remark from what I found in the report of the Secretariat, there seems to be a will of the concerned State Party to work to overcome these difficulties with a management plan and there is talk of a legislation to ensure protection of all sites listed as World Heritage. We would like to get further information as it has already been considered that the State Party should cooperate. I would like to reiterate how important it is to pay attention to the language used in the report.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Indonesia expresses deep concerns about the overall impact of the reconstruction projects regarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the Historic Centre of Shakhrysbz. We also take note of the conclusion of the Reactive Monitoring mission undertaken in December of 2016. Therefore, we recommend that the Committee gives ample opportunities to the government of Uzbekistan to implement corrective measures in order to retain the Historic Centre of Shakhrysbz on the World Heritage in Danger List.

We are of the view that the extension requested by the aforementioned State Party is a reasonable one and deserved to be granted, taking into consideration that the property has been listed on the list of World Heritage in Danger for only two years.

Finally, we also urge Uzbekistan to double its efforts to define any possible recovery attributes and to strengthen its collaboration with the Advisory Bodies and other stakeholders thoroughly in order to keep the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“The Tanzanian delegation would like to thank you for giving us the floor to contribute to the discussion on this historic centre. Tanzania’s delegation does acknowledge the wisdom, the great expertise and efforts being put in place by the Committee members to address major issues to attend to our World Heritage properties; this cannot be defended I assume in this case.

Tanzania at this juncture, in this case, sympathises with the Advisory Bodies, the Committee members and other stakeholders in such situation. The facts are crystal clear; the damage is massive. Chairperson, this is a property that was inscribed in 2000 on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (iv). This property was inscribed on the List in Danger in 2016. Two years later, it has lost all the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value.

Chair, one of the last decisions of the Committee directed to the State Party was to define any possible mitigation measures to recover the lost attributes, or to propose a significant boundary measure based on any recoverable attributes. To date the Committee has not been informed by the State Party although the Centre and the Advisory Bodies wanted that to happen. Why was this undertaking not done? Chair, the Tanzanian delegation would want to know from the State Party what the challenges to undertaking were.

Chairperson, the damage to the property seems to be irreversible and it is a loss to the entire world and future generations. Tanzania's delegation understands that the protection of this property is the responsibility of all nations to make sure that heritage properties are protected, preserved and passed on to future generations.

Chairperson, Tanzania's delegation notes the good intentions of the State Party of Uzbekistan to improve standards and at the same time to protect World Heritage in its country. The third party has acknowledged its failure to inform the Centre about the project. It is very unfortunate. It has been observed also that since its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the state of conservation of the property was not determined; neither were the corrective measures identified, even the timeframe for the implementation of the measures was not put in place. This was contrary also to the general guidance we have on Paragraphs 82 and 89.

Chairperson, based on this kind of situation, the Tanzanian delegation is in line with other speakers that this State Party needs to be given time, and during this time, the Tanzanian delegation would suggest that a technical report is submitted to really advise the Committee on the appropriate decision to be taken. Tanzania recommends that the property be retained on the World Heritage List in Danger and thus supports the proposed amendment to the draft decision."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Angola."

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous savons que la Convention a pour finalité de conserver et de préserver au maximum les sites du patrimoine mondial. Nous avons pris note malheureusement qu'il existe des situations qui affectent sérieusement le centre historique à l'étude. Nous avons également pris note qu'il y a une volonté assez approfondie et un engagement du gouvernement d'Ouzbékistan de pouvoir travailler avec les Organisations consultatives et le Centre dans le but d'améliorer au maximum possible la situation négative qui prévaut sur le terrain.

Étant donné que la finalité est de préserver et protéger au maximum les sites du patrimoine mondial et considérant également l'ouverture du dialogue entre les Organisations consultatives, le Centre et les États parties nous pensons qu'il est possible que nous puissions accorder une opportunité à l'État partie.

Déjà, de pouvoir nous apporter des éléments devant justifier qu'il y a encore des attributs sur le terrain pour que le site soit maintenu sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril et de

l'autre côté également permettre à cet État de pouvoir continuer à travailler avec les Organisations consultatives et le Centre pour que, d'ici une année, un rapport nous soit soumis afin nous puissions de nouveau réexaminer ce cas pour prendre une décision sage qui pourrait aider le Comité à maintenir ou non ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam chair. I would like simply to say that China supports the view expressed by Azerbaijan, Cuba, Angola and also Tanzania. We would like to further also point out three points and make comments.

First of all, we are concerned with the loss of 10 per cent of the Outstanding Universal Value, which does not automatically negate the rest of the 90 per cent of the Outstanding Universal Value; it does not sound very logical to us.

Secondly, I think that the purpose at the end, and here I am supporting the distinguished representative of Azerbaijan, is that the Convention is really here to encourage States Parties to take measure, to conserve and protect. It is not a business to simply negate the efforts of any country. I think it is a question of sending the right message, but not only to the State Party involved, as it could resonate in other cases. A little more human message perhaps would be more helpful. Therefore, we hope that giving second or third chances is always more productive than simply to deny.

Thirdly, we are pleased to note the Uzbekistani government has taken very decisive measures to implement the protection of this particular site. We encourage them. We believe this Committee should also encourage them.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je voudrais commencer par là où j'ai terminé mon propos introductif d'hier en disant l'attachement de le Tunisie à la lettre et à l'esprit de la Convention. Mon intervention commence d'abord par exprimer l'extrême inquiétude de mon pays quant à la situation décrite et nous faisons complètement confiance aux experts qui ont attiré notre attention sur une situation grave. J'ai bien retenu le qualificatif d'irréversibilité, cela, en État responsable, doit nous interpeller.

Le professeur de droit international que je suis souligne aussi qu'il n'est pas possible de répondre à une irréversibilité par une autre. Nous sommes sur le point de “délister” un site qui a été porté à la Liste du patrimoine mondial. L'acte de placement est un acte responsable, l'acte de faire sortir doit être un acte tout aussi responsable.

Nous sommes très inquiets de la situation sur le terrain, mais je crois que nous pouvons envisager une suite et nous demandons à donner la parole à l'État partie sur ce qui a été fait, sur la réalité et sur la proportion des dommages. Je crois que l'esprit de la Convention est d'accompagner les situations, de comprendre les situations et de trouver des solutions. Si à l'arrivée, et je crois que nous ne sommes pas à une année près, cela s'avère absolument impossible de le considérer comme site méritant la place qu'il occupe aujourd'hui, auquel cas, l'ensemble des États parties du Comité, à ce moment-là, sera d'accord.

Nous avons une responsabilité morale en tant que membre de ce Comité de se dire qu'est ce que nous aussi nous avons fait pour accompagner une situation complexe vers une meilleure situation. Je crois que c'est notre devoir moral que d'essayer de donner du temps, davantage de temps, accompagné par une très grande sévérité pour que l'on voie qu'elles sont les issues possibles à une situation qui serait pour nous plus conforme non seulement à la lettre de la Convention qu'à son esprit.

Je souhaiterais également rappeler que le qualificatif d'irréversibilité devrait être accompagné jusqu'à mesure et décision du Comité par le prudent subjonctif et notamment d'utiliser "serait" ou "pourrait être perdu". De ce point de vue là, nous soutenons l'idée de donner à l'État partie une année et qu'il revienne l'année prochaine au Comité nous dire qu'est-ce qu'il aura fait pour essayer de faire face à cette situation tout à fait inquiétante ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I now give the floor to Spain."

Spain:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much madam Chair. Spain shares the concerns voiced by all previous speakers. Should we delist a site that was inscribed in 2000, according to what we have been told by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, which has suffered irreversible damage? We have a moral responsibility to protect and also have a moral responsibility with respect to the State and the government, which is to require that they implement the obligations contained in the Convention.

We are therefore particularly concerned and aggrieved that this historical city, that a Spanish ambassador visited in the 15th century, he was sent by Henry III of Castile, no longer has its former identity. These are not isolated instances. It is not just ten per cent of the city, it is a coherent whole that was inscribed as such, and we want to maintain the whole design and layout of the city. I think there will be an opportunity to engage in dialogue and how to protect what remains of the Outstanding Universal Value.

The recommendation made by the Committee and based on what was noted last year evoked the irreversible damage. Is there any Outstanding Universal Value that remain or are there other properties that can be recognised as attributes and we continue to work in order to protect what remains? On the basis of the reports made by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre, they are very conclusive.

I think we should hear from the authorities as to what can be done. When it is said that integrity and authenticity is gone, I think that it is very difficult to say that we can keep 90 per cent of the site or we can keep part of the historical centre. This is a very difficult issue. We are not speaking of a property affected by a war or destroyed by armed conflict. Therefore, we would like to hear from the Member State. We find it difficult again to accept the amendments that have been tabled.

Thank you very much and sorry for taking longer.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the representative of Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The decision to delist a site is a very drastic and sometimes dramatic one, especially when we are discussing a country that has only four cultural sites. We know that some sites have been in the World Heritage List in Danger for many years. As we heard this morning, there are 23 sites that have been on the List for ten years or more. In the case we are discussing now, the site has been on the List for only two years and we are already recommending making a very drastic recommendation about this specific site.

In order for us to make a decision, I think it would be interesting to know what role could have played ICOMOS to prevent this situation from coming to this point. What preventive measures could we have taken in order to rescue or to avoid further damage?

Another question I would like to ask is what percentage of this site is still considered of Universal Value? As far as I understand, I think about 90 per cent of the site is still standing. I wonder if it would be possible to re-dimension the site and requalify it instead of punishing the State Member for the mismanagement of the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam chair. Zimbabwe joins other States that have called for the extension. It is not difficult for us to extend by one year the decision on this site based on the availability of the State Party’s Road Map and its willingness to take corrective measures.

I am sympathetic and I can hear the disappointment of the Advisory Bodies and the Centre in terms of the way they dealt with the States Parties in the past and the constant reworking of Paragraph 172 is evident of that. But the State Party has committed itself and it has taken measures and some of the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies raised have already started to be implemented. It is then surprising that instead of giving the State Party a chance, giving it clear deliverables and targets, we are choosing the easy way out of delisting it from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

I do not think this is the approach to take. The last time we were there was 2016; we are still doubtful that the Outstanding Universal Value is completely lost. I am not convinced from the write-up that the Outstanding Universal Value is completely lost, even from the Reactive Mission, and this is based on your 2016 information. I think that before we delist I know that there are ways and processes to do that. It is important that we feel certain that we have done all we can from the Advisory Bodies from the Centre and us at the Committee to

encourage the State Party to protect this important historic site.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Je vous remercie madame la présidente. Comme c’est la première fois que ma délégation prend la parole, je voulais d’abord remercier la présidente et son équipe ainsi que les autorités de Bahreïn pour leur accueil et l’organisation réussie de la 42^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

Ma délégation partage les préoccupations soulevées par les prédécesseurs concernant la proposition de retrait même de la Liste du patrimoine en péril deux ans seulement après son inscription sur celle-ci. Nous apprécions et comprenons les observations faites par les missions d’évaluation qui montrent la complexité de la conservation de ce site. Nous notons aussi que des mesures ont été prises par le gouvernement ouzbek pour l’accueil de missions d’évaluation, une bonne collaboration et la prise en compte des recommandations des experts de l’UNESCO.

Rappelons-nous, madame la présidente, que ces efforts viennent aussi dans un contexte où la demande des États parties de la nécessité d’effectuer une évaluation du suivi réactif de l’état de conservation de ce site figurant sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril depuis plusieurs années se fait de plus en plus sentir.

Ma délégation propose par conséquent, que l’examen de ce dossier soit reversé dans le cadre général de cette nouvelle dynamique qui s’amorce et qu’il soit donné à l’État partie un délai supplémentaire pour mettre en œuvre des mesures permettant le rétablissement de la Valeur universelle exceptionnelle impactée. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Images in front of us on the screen here in this room are graphic testimony to the gravity of what has occurred in the Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz. Australia supports the draft decision to remove this site from the World Heritage List, but we do so with a heavy heart. Such removal would reflect what is a tragedy for the World Heritage system, the international community, and above all for Uzbekistan and its heritage.

However, we cannot ignore the seriousness of the successive reports we have received detailing the devastating effect of development within the property. This is all the more concerning; the damage done has not been done as a result of conflict, or natural disaster but the deliberate acts of men. Australia is encouraged by the reports of the commitment of the new government to the protection of its own World Heritage, but we noted from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies that the damage is done and irreversible and irreparable.

It is vital that the World Heritage Committee sends a strong message that States Parties cannot destroy the Outstanding Universal Value and, so to speak, get away with it. The question is not just about how much of the Outstanding Universal Value has been destroyed, it is not 90 or 10 per cent, it is actually also a question about the integrity and authenticity of the site as a whole and the loss of that authenticity and integrity is a result of the developments that have occurred.

Australia recognises the difficulties in balancing development in historic urban centre in ensuring that the Outstanding Universal Value is maintained. We also note the impact that unplanned development might have on communities and their connections to place. All developments in World Heritage properties need to be managed following the processes under the Operational Guidelines including Paragraph 72 and in consultation with the World Heritage Centre.

Australia considers that in this case development has been inappropriate and extensive and not guarded by an appropriate management plan and this has resulted in the loss of the Outstanding Universal Value and a strong case has been put forward for the delisting of the site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Uganda appreciates the effort of the Advisory Bodies in monitoring and making assessments and reports. As we all realise, our World Heritage is disappearing at an alarming rate and it is our duty as States Parties to work together to ensure that the remaining heritage is well protected.

Considering that only 10 per cent has been destroyed and 90 per cent remains, Uganda’s view is to have our efforts consolidated as States Parties to ensure that all those sites that have been inscribed are maintained and their management improved. In this regard, it is Uganda’s view that the State Party is given more time instead of delisting its property.

I thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait please.”

Kuwait:

“First of all, the State of Kuwait thanks the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their efforts and we also share their concerns regarding the status of the city. We heard a lot of terminology which is very hard to manage like 'lost identity of the city', 'irreversible' and 'no authenticity of the city' and we do not know how the people came to this conclusion when viewing the PowerPoint and the pictures of their presentation.

We think as a Committee member before we reach the decision, how some of us, Committee members, went to the ground, looked at the site and came up with this kind of decision, because it is not a common decision to remove any city or sites from the List.

I also would like to address those questions of lost identity and irreversibility to the State Party and have them answer whether this is true or not. We are in the business of conservation. I am not going to use the words 10 or 90 per cent, I am going to use the words the majority of the city is intact and a minority has been affected. We are in the business of preserving the majority of the city and working with the State Party, especially when we see major engagement from the new government to move on for the minority of the lost city to be recovered and hopefully to be reversible.

Once again, we appreciate the work of the Advisory Bodies and World Heritage Centre but the State of Kuwait would like to support the amendments made with other countries.

Thank you madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the representative of Bosnia.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. La Bosnie-Herzégovine comme tous les autres membres du Comité voudrait exprimer ses plus vives préoccupations concernant l'état dans lequel se trouve ce site magnifique du patrimoine mondial. La Bosnie-Herzégovine aimerait entendre les réponses de l'État partie aux questions formulées par nos collègues d'Azerbaïdjan et de Cuba et d'autres délégations du Comité afin de former notre jugement.

Avant de prendre la décision, je crois que nous devons penser à notre objectif ; l'objectif de la convention et l'objectif de nos travaux. Nous pensons que notre premier objectif devrait être de préserver et de garder le patrimoine mondial afin de le transmettre aux générations futures. Ici, on se trouve devant un dilemme. Soit de prendre une décision un peu rapide et de décider d'enlever ce site de la Liste du patrimoine mondial, ce qui à notre avis engendrerait la destruction complète de ce site et l'impossibilité d'accomplir notre mission qui est de transmettre notre patrimoine aux générations futures, ou de donner un délai, une autre chance à l'État partie, d'une année comme est inscrit dans l'amendement afin de voir s'il y a la possibilité de faire quelque chose pour ce site magnifique.

Pour la Bosnie-Herzégovine, nous disons donnons encore une chance, une année à l'État partie et dans un on se retrouvera à la prochaine session et on verra s'il y a la possibilité de répondre à ce premier objectif, celui de conserver un site magnifique et de le transmettre aux générations futures.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. As you are aware, we have interpretation until one o'clock, so we do not have time to hear the request for the floor of another three representatives. We conclude now and will resume at 3:00 pm, sharp. Please, stakeholders, manage your representatives. We have an announcement.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. This is an announcement for the side events. Before this, let me remind you that the Budget Group’s first meeting, which is not a side event, but is a very important ancillary body of this Committee, is scheduled for 2:00 pm in the Rifa Room, which is the Bureau meeting room for those who have been already.

Side events: at 1:00 pm you are invited to Visitor Management in World Heritage Properties, which is the Sustainable Tourism Programme of the World Heritage Committee organising this event. It is taking place in the Hawar room. Another event is the Traditional water systems in the Arab World organised by the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage in room Muharraq at 1:10 pm. IUCN World Heritage Outlook Tracking the conservation prospects for the world’s most outstanding natural heritage is organised by IUCN in the Advisory Bodies’ space, Manama Room. At 2:10 pm, World Heritage Wilderness and Large Landscapes in the same room organised by IUCN and Wild Heritage. There is an exhibition taking place in the main lobby again from the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage on Oasis Landscapes.

Once more, let me remind you about the special fundraising event organised by the World Heritage Centre and the Bahraini Authority for Culture and Antiquities in cooperation with the Congolese Institute for National Parks. I would like to mention that we should have a multicultural group of musicians performing a concert at the event and that it will be followed by a reception. Hurry to get your passes as they are disappearing fast. You can get them at the desk next to the registration for this Committee.

Thank you very much. Enjoy your side events and lunch break.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We reconvene at 3:00 pm.”

End of June 26, 2018 morning session

SECOND DAY – Tuesday 26 June 2018
FOURTH SESSION
3 p.m. – 6 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“This afternoon first speaker is Kyrgyzstan. Please, you have the floor.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As this is the first time that Kyrgyzstan takes the floor as a Committee member, I would like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for their warm hospitality.

We also share concerns about the new development projects at the Historic Centre of Shakhrysyabz. At the same time, we join the distinguished delegates of Azerbaijan and many others who expressed the view that the delisting is a premature decision. I visited Shakhrysyabz as an expert a few times. Shakhrysyabz is an outstanding city in Central Asia which overcame disasters, wars and many stages of development. It has a special atmosphere and it cannot lose the Outstanding Universal Value so easily.

I also join our colleagues by requesting more time and effort to identify corrective measures. Also, UNESCO could have maintained more consistent dialogue with the State Party as it has offices based in Tashkent, before the situation turned to this stage. Also, States Parties together with UNESCO and the Advisory Bodies, should use more local and regional expertise such as IICAS, the International Institute for Central Asian Studies based in Samarkand. We also suggest that the floor should be given to the State Party to answer questions.

Thank you.”

The Chair:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. It is indeed a sad day when the Committee is considering the delisting of a World Heritage site. I have to say that we have listened carefully and have taken note of the concerns that have been voiced in this room. Our obligation is to conserve rather than discourage the State Party in implementing this Convention.

That being said, I need to remind the distinguished colleagues that I struggle a little bit with the notion of 90 per cent of Outstanding Universal Value and the same goes with authenticity and integrity. Regrettably, in the case of Shakhrysyabz, drastic and irreversible

damage has been done to the attributes. These convey the Outstanding Universal Value for which the site was included in the World heritage List in 2000.

Beyond doubt, the damage is so extensive that the site can no longer justify its Outstanding Universal Value; consequently and, as Norway stated in its intervention yesterday, and with reference to Paragraph 193.a of the Operational Guidelines, Norway considers that we have no other choice than to support the draft decision.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. To conclude, I give the floor to Uzbekistan to answer all these enquiries and comments. Thank you very much.”

Uzbekistan:

“Madam Chair, dear members of the World Heritage Committee, let me express my deep gratitude for the opportunity to participate in the current session on behalf of the government of Uzbekistan. We also express our thanks to the members of the Committee for their questions regarding the preservation of the Historic Centre of Shakhrisyabz.

First of all, we would like to inform you that the Outstanding Universal Value, the integrity and authenticity of the site are preserved. Unfortunately, images shown on the screens do not reflect the whole picture of the situation. Indeed, all *mahallas*, medieval architectural monuments, are preserved and conserved. Only about 10 per cent of the territory of the property was covered by the development project. There were houses that did not have any facilities such as sanitation and energy supply in poor condition.

Secondly, based on the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, studies on groundwater impact on the medieval architecture of monuments have been conducted and a new drainage system has been installed in order to mitigate negative impacts. Moreover, a GIZ-based inventory of preserved traditional residential houses in the historical centre of Shakhrisyabz constituting the urban fabric has been carried out in cooperation with experts from Germany and the United Kingdom.

Thirdly, in order to demonstrate commitment of the provisions of the Convention, the government of Uzbekistan has recently adopted a special Road Map on the protection of all heritage sites in Uzbekistan. It consists of 26 activities covering several issues of further development, such as national legislation, elaborating new management plans, establishing an ICOMOS National Committee and membership of ICCROM.

It is very important to outline that for the purposes of dialogue and transparency, the UNESCO field office in Tashkent was consulted during preparation of this Road Map.

Ladies and gentlemen, the government of Uzbekistan is open to continued dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies of the Convention. In conclusion, we believe that before the adoption of such a drastic decision on the delisting, not only experts of the Advisory Bodies but also members of the Committee should visit the cultural site.

Therefore, once again taking this opportunity on behalf of the government of Uzbekistan, I have the honour of extending the invitation to visit World Heritage sites in Uzbekistan, including Shakhrisyabz.

We hope that our clarifying statements will receive the favourable consideration of the distinguished members of the Committee and that the Historical Centre of Shakhriyabz will be kept on the World Heritage List.

Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur, to inform us about the proposed amendments on the draft decision.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As it has emerged during the discussion, we have received a set of really complex amendments presented by Azerbaijan and supported by a number of countries that I will read out later. Madam Chair, if you allow me, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the timing submission of this amendment. And I am sure Committee members could benefit from having had the opportunity to take a look at them before hand. We have also received another amendment from Brazil in the form of two new paragraphs.

I will now proceed to read out the draft recommendation with the amendments. I would just like to flag that, as you know, the original proposal was for deletion of this property. All the amendments go in the sense of retaining this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

I will start from the top. Paragraphs 1 and 2 would remain unchanged. Paragraph 3 has some modifications, parts of the end would be deleted and some words changed. It could read:

3. *‘Also recalling that the March 2016 and December 2016 Reactive Monitoring missions to the property confirmed that some part of the Temurid town planning has been lost, that some traditional dwelling houses in the core of the medieval town have been destroyed, and that the some attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value have been damaged.’*

Then Paragraph 4 and paragraph 5 would remain unchanged. The old paragraph 6 is moved and would now become paragraph 10. The old paragraph 7 would be completely deleted. Paragraph 8 would also be deleted. The new paragraph six would be the old paragraph 9, and not amended. The new paragraph 7 would be the former paragraph 11 which was moved up. The new paragraph 8 would be the former paragraph 12 which was also moved up.

Paragraph 9 would be former paragraph 10 which would remain unchanged, but you will notice that there was an editorial mistake in the submission. You will see on the screen that we have struck out the words ‘*State of conservation of the property World Heritage Centre*’ and the number of the decision. I believe it was just an editorial mistake. You will not see that in the French version because we did not think it was necessary to translate an editorial mistake. Paragraph 10 would be former paragraph 6 and would also be slightly amended that now we could read:

10. *‘Also notes that, the work is currently suspended on the ‘State Programme for complex measures for the building and reconstruction of Shakhriyabz City, and the State Party in close consultation with World Heritage Committee will prepare the new Management Plan for protection of the Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz;’*

New paragraph 11 would read:

11. *'Notes with satisfaction the new approach and recent initiatives, including Decree of the Government, of the State Party related with adoption of the Road Map on protection of the Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz;'*

I would like here to propose to strike out the comma after government; I believe that is a mistake. Thank you very much. We scroll further down. New paragraph 12 would now read:

12. *'Decides to retain the Historic Centre of Shakhriyabz (Uzbekistan) in the List of World Heritage in Danger and to continue applying the Reinforced monitoring mechanism until the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee in 2019;'*

As I have mentioned, we received two additional amendments from the delegation of Brazil which would now become the new paragraph 13 and it would read:

13. *'Strongly recommends the State Party to continue close consultations with ICOMOS with a view to submitting a proposal of significant modifications to the boundaries of the property in order to assess the possibility to retain the intrinsic values of the attributes related to the outstanding monuments dated from the period of the Temurid.'*

The New paragraph 14 would read:

14. *'Recommends the State Party to establish an information centre within the axis of the intervention project to raise awareness of the elements that have been lost regarding the original property;'*

The new paragraph 15 in the original version was 14, and it would remain unchanged. These are all the amendments that we have received madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. We have now seen the amendments. Do you have any comments or views or we could move to the adoption. I now give the floor to Norway."

Norway:

"Thank you madam Chair for giving me the floor again. I will try to be brief. I noticed there are, at least in my interpretation, a few issues that I would like to point out. One is the language that has been used in paragraph 3 which is actually *'recalling previous decisions and the language used in Reactive Monitoring mission reports'* which are published and it could be challenging to change the wording of that. I want to make a point on that.

Also I am a little bit confused or maybe I ignored some vital information about the outcomes of the Reinforced Monitoring mechanism as mentioned in paragraph 12. This is confusing me a little bit. I think I would ask for clarification from the Secretariat on these issues.

Thank you."

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Mr Feng Jing.”

Mr Feng Jing:

“Thank you very madam Chairperson. I think regarding the notes taking by the distinguished delegate of Norway paragraph 3 as stated, in my orientation, that the previous working documents and the decision of the Committee precisely reflected the situation of the site. It is the same Committee to make decisions in its previous sessions and it is difficult to change at this stage.

Regarding other issues, on the percentage, in fact in the mission report of March, 2016, there were clear descriptions of the situation and the percentage was around 30 per cent and a figure of 70 hectares, which was reviewed by the Committee in 2016 and 2017. These are facts provided to the Committee. ICOMOS may provide further review on this.

Regarding the Reinforced Monitoring mechanism, this has been introduced in the Convention and it is to the Director General of UNESCO to define the terms of reference for such Reinforced Monitoring missions. Since, as I said, this is the third case in the current history of the Convention to put forward such a mechanism, whether the Reinforced Monitoring mechanism would be appropriate for such a case, this is due for the Committee's decision. I think ICOMOS might comment too.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“ICOMOS would just like to comment on the issue of percentage, as the actual percentage of the area that has been damaged has just been mentioned, and also in relation with the comments made earlier on the percentage of Outstanding Universal Value, which we consider different from the percentage of the area damaged. Outstanding Universal Value is conveyed by attributes and these are not evenly spread around a property. In order to assess an impact, one has to look carefully at the disposition of attributes, their strength and the way they contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value before coming to a conclusion on how the percentage of the property that has been damaged impacts on the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value.

I would just like to make one other point and to stress how much attention was given by the last mission to whether or not the property might be recovered. We had a great deal of discussion on this with all local stakeholders. Three to four days of the mission were spent looking at the property and discussing what has been damaged, what has been lost and what can be recovered. As was said in the Committee last year, the mission could not find a way forward. The decision of the Committee last year suggested that the State Party might like to consider how it could make some recommendations as to whether or not the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value could be recovered. That has still not been put clearly on the table as to what might be done to recover this property.

I would hope that this decision could be clear enough to suggest that at the moment we do not really have a Road Map of a way forward, it is by no means clear whether and how the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value might be recovered. Clearly, if the Committee is to delay a decision by one more year, there would need to be a clear understanding of the measures that need to be taken on clarifying and defining very clearly

whether or not the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value can be recovered and if so, how.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you, Madam. Sorry for taking the floor again. I have to admit that we are quite far from reaching a consensus on this although we do note the sentiment of our distinguished colleagues. I thank you for the clarifications, in particular those provided by ICOMOS, which were very useful. But I do want to propose that we could possibly consider forming a drafting group to work on an alternative decision. If you could guide us on the possible process for establishing that.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you, madam Chair. I think by listening to all the deliberations that have taken place with regard to this item, it is important to express our viewpoint. We understand that the majority of the Committee is in favour of retaining the property on the List In Danger if that is the approach of the Committee. I think in general our policy would be to encourage any consensus that can be reached.

Some of the amendments that are incorporated in the current draft can be quite challenging and I think would require some more time to reflect on. I think we would be in support of the proposal by Norway. Just to give an example and I am not pointing at any of the specific items of the draft decisions: the proposal of the modification of other important elements should be looked at carefully before their adoption by the Committee to avoid any precedent in future cases where a demolition of this sort that can be avoidable would trigger a similar reaction from the Committee.

We propose to look further into those elements in more detail within a drafting group or any other modalities that are deemed appropriate. Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We go along with the idea of the drafting group to revisit this draft decision. Brazil, of course, will regret that the original 15th-century urban planning

has been affected. But although the historic urban fabric of the town is perhaps irreversibly damaged, thus affecting the integrity of the property, we believe that many monuments and buildings that were kept along this major development still maintain to some extent their intrinsic values that justified the inscription under criteria (ii) and (iv).

We believe that, perhaps following what ICOMOS said about the Road Map of what to do, maybe a significant boundary modification could retain these intrinsic values of the attributes related exclusively to the outstanding monuments from the period of the Temurid and perhaps on the serial approach to the monuments only. Also, we propose on the draft decision a paragraph on the establishment of an interpretation centre at the property to allow awareness-raising about the elements that have now been lost and to provide and to communicate the development of this medieval urban planning.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the representative of Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much. I think that the concern over the site which has given rise to its protection is such that it has to be taken up by a working group as proposed by Norway and seconded by Brazil. This is in order to take account of the elements that were brought by ICOMOS as well as to see the possibility of substantial modification of the decision tabled.

The decisions adopted and accepted by the government of Uzbekistan should be analysed and we have to understand the Road Map that we find hard to read, and to see more clearly what steps can be taken in the next year in order to assess the extension of the damage as well as the effect it has on the Outstanding Universal Value. We have to be very careful when adopting this decision and there must be no contradiction with decisions taken in the past by this Committee. We must be consistent and we must take time in order to see to it that the elements of the property that still have values and can be protected are actually protected. Therefore, I think we are to set up a drafting group in order to take a calmer look at the decision, which we think is going to be very important.

Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. I just wanted to say that having heard the discussion since lunchtime, the explanations from the distinguished representative of Uzbekistan and the clarifications from the Centre and ICOMOS, Australia is supportive of the proposition to establish a drafting group. To be clear, the intention of that drafting group would be to bring forward a decision for consideration by the Committee that would allow the twelve-month extension that has been asked for and we would be prepared to support a drafting group on that basis.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this wise advice. I call on one of the member States to lead the drafting group. Maybe Brazil would like to establish a small group of four or five or even three from Committee members, of course. Give us your views during this session. Maybe come back tomorrow to give us what you reach on this matter. Are there any other volunteers? Australia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia, Spain and Zimbabwe.”

Tanzania:

“Tanzania is raising its hand to volunteer.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“It was not my intention to take the floor, just to volunteer.”

The Chairperson:

“The group will be chaired by Brazil with Australia, Azerbaijan, Norway, Cuba, Bosnia, Zimbabwe and China.”

Tanzania:

“May I clarify, it is actually Tanzania.”

The Chairperson:

“Tanzania, yes you are very far. I give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We would like to speak because we think that the group should be open to all members of the Committee who would like to participate in this negotiation process. To limit to three Member States would be too few. We are asking for the floor in order to make this an open process, as is the case with other processes. All members should be able to take part in. There are 14 countries that will sign the resolution; it would be good if they could be members of the group. We will await the decision patiently.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The group is open for anybody who would like to join. We close this issue and tomorrow Brazil will chair and we will have a draft tomorrow. We do not want to further discuss this issue.”

Secretariat:

“We would just like to know where we could meet and if there is any specific room. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“We will communicate with Brazil for the location. Thank you very much. We will move on to the next item. I now invite Mr Feng Jing to read the list of collateral properties inscribed on the List of the World Heritage in Danger located in the Asia Pacific region, for each the reports are prepared for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. The following cultural heritage sites are located in the Asia Pacific region for which the draft decision presented to the Committee will be approved without discussion. They are: Minaret and Archaeological Remains of Jam in Afghanistan and Nan Madol: Ceremonial Centre of Eastern Micronesia, located in the Federal States of Micronesia.

Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections from the Committee? There are none. I declare the decisions adopted.

For cultural properties located in Europe and North America, I now give the floor to the delegation of Hungary to present to the Committee the reason it requested to open the state of conservation of the World Heritage Medieval Monuments in Kosovo.”

Hungary:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The medieval monuments in Kosovo, Serbia, were inscribed on the List in Danger in 2006. The debate on it was adjourned by the World Heritage Committee by its Decision 41 COM 7A.21 in its 41st meeting in Cracow. The Hungarian delegation wishes to open the discussion for this item, the reason being that the present circumstances are not met for the debate on this property and we propose to the Committee to decide to adjourn the debate on this agenda item until the next Committee session.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chairperson. The Spanish delegation seconds the proposal made by Hungary to postpone that discussion to the next session. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. The delegation of Azerbaijan would like to support the proposal made by Hungary to adjourn the discussion on the said item. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. It is then decided. No other cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and located in the Europe and North America region is proposed for discussion this year.

I will therefore invite Ms. Isabelle Anatole Gabriel, Chief of the Europe and North America Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Madame Anatole Gabriel:

« Merci madame la présidente. Bon après-midi à tous. Les biens qui sont inscrits sur la liste du patrimoine en péril pour lesquels les cas sont présentés au Comité pour adoption sans discussion sont : le Centre historique de Vienne en Autriche, décision 42 COM 7A.5 et Liverpool port marchand du Royaume-Uni de Grande-Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord, décision 42 COM 7A.7.

J'aimerais ajouter que s'il n'y a pas de discussion sur ces deux biens cela est en partie dû à ce que disait la distinguée représentante de Cuba tout à l'heure, c'est-à-dire à la discussion avec les États parties bien sûr sans que cela préjuge des résultats. Néanmoins, je pensais qu'il était utile de le souligner et de le porter à l'attention des membres du Comité ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? No. I declare the decision read out adopted. The floor is to the representative of the NGOs.”

NGO:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. My presence here is a testimony to the commitment shown by UNESCO, the World Heritage Committee and you, Chair, to the importance of civil society in the protection and conservation of the designated properties. Also, to the commitment and determination of the citizens of Liverpool who have made

possible my participation with many small donations in a crowd-funding exercise to enable our voice to be heard among you today.

Firstly, I want to thank you for the inspirational support given by the World Heritage Centre in Paris and to our effort in Liverpool to save our site from deletion. I think the report you have received demonstrates the significant changes that have been made and important decisions taken and I hope it will lead to the removal one day from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

I want to ensure you that the people of Liverpool, including our young people, hugely value our inscription as a UNESCO World Heritage site and are committed to making sure that our designation is not lost. We completely support the recommendation in the desired state of conservation report and recognise the substantial steps taken by the State Party, the Liverpool City Council and peer holdings which have contributed to this new moment in our relation with UNESCO.

Considerable gratitude must be expressed to the members of the Liverpool World Heritage Board established as a task force by Mayor Anderson. As an engaged civil society actor, Liverpool this autumn is inviting three similar World Heritage site cities to come to Liverpool and share with us the insights and policy decisions that have enabled them to make the most of the World Heritage status: Strasbourg, Hamburg and Bordeaux.

We are playing our part in protecting and developing our World Heritage site status and we thank you for supporting and encouraging us by your decisions today.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. No cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and located in the Latin America and the Caribbean region are proposed for discussion this year.

I will therefore invite Ms. Petya Totcharova to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Ms. Petya Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. The properties for which decisions are to be adopted without discussion of the report in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean are: the City of Potosi in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works in Chile, Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama, Portobelo-San Lorenzo in Panama, Chan Chan Archaeological Zone, I hope I pronounced it correctly, in Peru, Coro and its Port in Venezuela. These are all the properties in question, madam Chair.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections from the Committee on this state of conservation report? I see none. I declare the decisions read out adopted.

I will now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala, Chief of the Africa Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in the Africa Region and opened for discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala;

“Thank you Chair. If you allow me, I will read my oral intervention in the official language of the State Party, so in French.

Le bien concerné est la ville ancienne de Djenné au Mali. Ce rapport se trouve dans le document 42 COM 7A à la page 40 de la version française et page 39 de la version anglaise. Le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien soumis par l'État partie en janvier 2018 informe sur plusieurs développements encourageants, notamment la finalisation d'un plan de gestion et de conservation 2018-2022 en consultation étroite avec la communauté locale, ainsi que la prise de mesures de restauration de maisons en ruines.

Également, des mesures ont été prises pour le renforcement des dispositifs d'évacuation des eaux usées et contre l'érosion par les eaux de pluie ainsi que la sécurisation des sites archéologiques, la sensibilisation des communautés locales à la lutte contre le pillage et au trafic illicite de biens culturels.

Toutefois, malgré ces avancées, l'État partie reconnaît cependant que certaines menaces continuent à peser sur le bien qui avaient déjà été évoquées dans les rapports antérieurs tels que l'érosion hydrique, les fouilles clandestines ou encore des transformations sur le bâti qui s'exprime par exemple par l'utilisation accrue de matériau moderne, ce qui appelle une accélération de la définition des règles de la conservation et d'entretien pour les bâtiments de la ville historique, y compris des normes urbanistiques pour la reconstruction de maisons en ruines.

Il est à souligner également que la mission de suivi réactif demandée par le Comité n'a pas pu être organisée en raison des conditions sécuritaires précaires. Afin de répondre plus efficacement à ces conditions extrêmement difficiles prévalentes sur le bien, il est donc recommandé que le Comité du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives examinent la possibilité de mettre en place un programme de soutien à distance à court terme, afin de permettre un dialogue sur le renforcement des capacités et l'élaboration de l'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du Comité du patrimoine mondial en péril. Un tel mécanisme est également proposé pour les deux autres biens du patrimoine mondial dont je parlerai un peu plus tard.

Pareillement, compte tenu des besoins importants en matière de sauvegarde du patrimoine culturel suite à la crise au Mali, il est également recommandé, ici comme dans les autres objets de décision, que le Comité renouvelle son appel à la communauté internationale pour contribuer à la mise en œuvre de la deuxième phase du Plan d'action pour la réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel et la sauvegarde des manuscrits anciens du Mali 2017-2020.

De même, ce Plan d'action pour la réhabilitation entre dans le cadre de l'Initiative pour le développement socio-économique et durable du Sahel mis en place par la directrice générale de l'UNESCO, Mme Audrey Azoulay, dont l'objectif est de contribuer au développement socio-économique et durable de la sous-région du Sahel, en tenant compte des priorités de l'éducation de la formation des jeunes et des femmes, de la préservation du patrimoine culturel et de la promotion de la culture de la paix, et la réduction des effets négatifs de l'immigration.

Il est recommandé que le Comité maintienne le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Le projet de décision, madame la présidente, se trouve dans les documents de travail 7A aux pages 42-43 pour la version française et pages 41-42 pour la version anglaise.

Merci madame la présidente et, si vous me permettez, je donnerai la parole aux organisations consultatives ».

La présidente :

« S'il vous plaît ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. ICOMOS commends the State Party for the work it has achieved toward implementing the corrective measures in what are highly adverse circumstances, including few human and financial resources and a comparative isolation of staff, all of which have made the task of promoting conservation extremely difficult.

While certain buildings are being restored and work will soon start on the Mosque Palace, ICOMOS also notes the extreme fragility of the wider context and the difficulties in adequately controlling the incremental change in the Old Town. Djenné was inscribed as an intact town around the great Mosque and its survival depends on the regular maintenance of its mud buildings, which was traditionally undertaken by skilled masons.

This process now seems to have largely halted and there is wide use of new materials and techniques. These have become apparently much more prevalent over the past four years and they are now in danger of having long-term adverse, perhaps irreversible, impacts on the long-term fabric. The State Party for instance notes the complete transformation of some properties.

In response to these extremely challenging conditions, ICOMOS strongly supports the idea of setting up a short-term distance support programme, as suggested in the decision. This could allow dialogue and capacity-building on a wide range of technical aspects as a way of strengthening the resilience of the property as well as drafting the desired state of conservation now that substantial progress has been made with the corrective measures.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I ask the Rapporteur whether she has received any amendments.”

The rapporteur:

“Thank you. We have received no amendments for this draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any more questions or comments? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42.COM.7A adopted.

I will now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala to present the next report opened for discussion.”

M. Edmond Moukala :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ce rapport sur Tombouctou se trouve dans le document 42 COM 7A page 43 pour la version française et page 42 pour la version anglaise.

Dans son rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien soumis en janvier par l'État partie, complémentaire d'un deuxième rapport de mars 2018, l'État partie a mis en avant des progrès importants dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives adoptées dont une dizaine sur douze sont en cours de réalisation. L'élaboration et l'adoption du nouveau Plan de gestion et de conservation 2018-2022 constituent une avancée majeure dans ce contexte, mais sa mise en œuvre nécessiterait une augmentation des moyens budgétaires pour permettre à la mission culturelle de mieux remplir sa fonction centrale compte tenu de ses capacités insuffisantes notamment en matière de moyens logistiques et de ressources humaines.

L'État partie a également évoqué les progrès accomplis dans le cadre de la deuxième phase des programmes de réhabilitation et, notamment, grâce à l'importante contribution de l'Union européenne qui a permis de poursuivre les travaux de réhabilitation et de sécurisation des trois mosquées du monument Al Farouk, des bibliométriques de manuscrits anciens et les musées entre autres. Il est à noter aussi que la communauté locale est particulièrement impliquée et mobilisée ce qui est un gage central pour la réussite des actions menées.

Dans le même temps, la situation sécuritaire continue à être toujours instable et préoccupante, ce qui a de nouveau empêché d'effectuer une mission de suivi réactif demandée par le Comité. Face à cette situation, comme déjà mentionné pour le cas de Djenné, il est proposé d'examiner la possibilité de mettre en place un programme de soutien à distance à court terme afin de permettre un dialogue sur le renforcement des capacités et l'élaboration de l'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Compte tenu de l'importance de poursuivre dans cette voie, il vous est proposé de renouveler un appel à la communauté internationale pour contribuer à la mise en œuvre de la deuxième phase du Plan d'action pour la réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel et la sauvegarde des manuscrits anciens du Mali 2017-2020.

Comme pour la ville ancienne de Djenné ce plan d'action pour la réhabilitation entre dans le cadre de l'Initiative pour le développement socio-économique et durable du Sahel mise en place par la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO, madame Audrey Azoulay, dont l'objectif est de contribuer au développement socio-économique et durable de la sous-région du Sahel, en tenant compte des priorités de l'éducation de la formation des jeunes et des femmes, de la préservation du patrimoine culturel et de la promotion de la culture de la paix, et surtout par le moyen de réduction des effets négatifs de l'immigration.

Le projet de décision pour ce bien se trouve dans le document de travail 7A aux pages 45-46 pour la version française et 44-45 pour la version anglaise.

Merci madame la présidente, je laisse la parole à l'Organisation consultative ».

ICOMOS :

« L'ICOMOS salue les progrès accomplis pour la préservation de Tombouctou. Il reconnaît que l'État partie poursuit la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives dans un contexte très difficile. Ces avancées concernent la conservation des mosquées, l'entretien des mausolées et la gestion du bien. Néanmoins, le cadre urbain traditionnel des trois mosquées est essentiel.

L'ICOMOS note que la présence militaire constitue une menace pour les bâtiments alors que la mission culturelle de Tombouctou manque de techniciens qualifiés dans la conservation d'édifices en terre. La mobilisation des autorités, de la communauté locale, la pérennisation des savoir-faire et le renforcement des ressources de la mission culturelle sont essentiels pour poursuivre et consolider ces avancées et préparer le bien au retour à des conditions normales. L'ICOMOS souligne de nouveau et en particulier le besoin de ressources pour épauler les maçons locaux.

L'ICOMOS s'engage à soutenir l'État partie dans la situation actuelle. Par conséquent, les Organisations consultatives appuient la possibilité de mettre en place un programme de soutien à distance à court terme afin de permettre un dialogue sur le renforcement des capacités et l'élaboration de l'état de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Je vous remercie. Are there any comments or enquiries? Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I have a comment for both sites. First of all, we would like to commend the Malian authorities for all the efforts they have deployed in recovering and restoring these sites, given the very complex situation they are in. Spain, through its cooperation agency, has supported the rehabilitation of Djenné and we have taken due notes on all progress made in following the recommendations of the Committee and of the Advisory Bodies.

We should be sending back a clear message from this meeting to partners in the European Union and other places because great achievements have been made and we would like to see the good work continue along these lines. Therefore, I should like to reiterate my thanks to the stakeholders for all the efforts undertaken.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bosnia.”

Bosnie- Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. On va être très bref. On voudrait juste féliciter l'État partie pour tous les efforts qu'il a mis en œuvre dans un contexte très difficile. Nous pensons que c'est un bon exemple qui montre comment avancer dans la bonne direction ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Our delegation would also like to add its voice to all of those who have congratulated the concerned State Party and also to mention that we do think all of the progress made in Timbuktu sets a good example on how important it is for UNESCO to take actions so quickly.

In light of Resolution 23.7, referring to UNESCO’s strategy of preserving culture and in the framework of the Convention on the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; this is a good example of collaboration with the State Party accompanied by the Secretariat.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“The Republic of Tanzania’s delegation commends the State Party of Mali for its commitment to protecting and conserving this World Heritage property, in particular the historic town of Timbuktu and that of Djenné, in terms of the challenging situations it faces and a shortage of resources.

The delegation of Tanzania congratulates the State Party for successfully preparing the Conservation and Management Plan of 2018-2020 and the creation of the Management System. We congratulate the State Party for the implementation of most corrective measures and encourage the State Party of Mali to continue its determination and to finish the implementation of the remaining corrective measures.

Excellency Chair, the Republic of Tanzania appeals to the international community to continue accompanying the State Party in its effort to protect and preserve these human treasures. The delegation of Tanzania commends the government of Spain and UNESCO for the financial assistance that has produced positive results. They are well-documented in the draft decision.

Finally, Excellence Chair, the United Republic of Tanzania believes that collective efforts and constant discussion between State Parties, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies are key for this achievement. The delegation of Tanzania encourages all parties to continue their dialogue to achieve the objective of removing the Property of the in Danger List as soon as possible.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite the Rapporteur and ask her whether there are any amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We have not received any amendments to the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.15 concerning the property. There is no objection; I therefore declare draft decision 42 COM 7A.15 adopted.

I will now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala to read the list of cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. Please you have the floor.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. If I may, I think we still have item 15 that concerns the Tomb of Askia.”

The Chairperson:

“Yes, please, go ahead.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Can I also go ahead with the 15?”

The Chairperson:

“Yes.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Before I read the list of the sites without discussion, I have one last site, the Tomb of Askia.

Ce rapport se trouve dans le document WHC/1842 COM 7A à la page 46 de la version française et page 45 de la version anglaise. Comme a été le cas pour Djenné et Tombouctou, le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien soumis par l'État partie en janvier 2018 avec un rapport complémentaire en mars 2018 a fait état de progrès important dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives. Dans ce cas-ci, huit des mesures sur dix ont commencé à être mise en œuvre par rapport à seulement trois l'année précédente. On note donc une avancée très prononcée en moins de douze mois.

Ce bien a également bénéficié comme l'ensemble des biens maliens d'une mise à jour de son Plan de gestion et de conservation pour la période 2018-2022 toujours avec une

forte implication de la communauté locale. Parmi les actions positives, on retiendra également les mesures contre l'érosion hydrique, le nettoyage et la construction du mur de clôture permettant de contrer les effets de dégradations de la nécropole de la mosquée et les problèmes de salubrité de l'esplanade. Néanmoins, l'érosion hydrique a entraîné l'effondrement d'une partie du toit de la mosquée des Hommes l'an passé. A aussi été relevé le besoin d'un mécanisme d'évaluation périodique de l'état de conservation du bien, y compris des inspections régulières et l'importance de mobiliser des fonds pour la mise en œuvre de nouveaux plans de gestion et de conservation.

La situation sécuritaire de la zone de Gao n'ayant là encore pas permis d'effectuer de suivi réactif demandé par le Comité, il est suggéré d'étudier la mise en place d'un programme de soutien à distance à court terme afin de permettre un dialogue sur le renforcement des capacités et d'élaboration de l'état de conservation du bien.

Il vous ait également proposé de renouveler un appel à la communauté internationale pour contribuer à la mise en œuvre de la deuxième phase du Plan d'action pour la réhabilitation du patrimoine culturel et la sauvegarde des manuscrits anciens du Mali 2017-2020. Comme pour Djenné et Tombouctou, ce Plan d'action a été pris en compte dans l'Initiative de la directrice générale pour le projet G5 Sahel. Enfin, il est recommandé que le Comité maintienne le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Le projet de décision pour ce bien se trouve dans le document de travail 7A pages 48-49 pour la version française et pages 47-48 pour la version anglaise.

Merci madame la présidente. Permettez de passer la parole à l'Organisation consultative ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS welcomes the progress made on corrective measures relating to management conservation and the involvement of local communities; all of this in a very extremely difficult security context. We also commend the dedication of the staff.

We do note with great concern the further collapse of the roof of the Men Mosque, the third in recent years. Clearly, this degree of collapses is not good for the structure integrity or authenticity of the comparatively small building. A major component of this small property, which consists of the main tomb, two mosques, a necropolis and an open-air assembly ground. The cause appears to be water ingress due to the lack of adequate regular maintenance, which in turn is directly linked to the security situation and migration of people away from the property with the lost of skilled masons. The positive news is that the whole mosque was re-plastered in April this year.

As with Djenné, in response to these extremely challenging conditions, we support the setting up of distance support programmes as a means of allowing dialogue and capacity-building to strengthen resilience, as well as drafting the desired state of conservation, now that essential progress is being made with the corrective measures.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite you to adopt decision 42 COM 7A.15. I would like to know whether there are any objections and amendments from the Rapporteur. I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Just to join the others in congratulating the State Party on the efforts being made. I asked for the floor to ask ICOMOS to tell in this area, where people are using traditional materials to restore World Heritage sites, and in other areas that these traditional materials are becoming very vulnerable to the elements. This is not just in Timbuktu, but I think it is prevalent in many areas from our own experience. I think this would be an area where we would need your guidance and advice on the issue of restoration and the use of traditional materials and traditional methods and to know whether an alternative to that is possible.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Norway, please, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Norway would just like to make a general comment on the World Heritage properties in Mali. Despite the difficult situation on several levels, Mali seemed to have managed to continue dialogue and collaboration with the international, national and local partners. The latter is crucial as local communities’ participation strengthen the sense of ownership and identity related to the property. We find the safeguarding actions particularly important.

We congratulate Mali on the new management and conservation plans and the way to configure its implementation, also in cooperation with the people who live close to the World Heritage property.

Despite progress accomplished, it is urgent that more actions are taken. We therefore particularly support the implementation of the second phase of the programme for the rehabilitation of the cultural heritage and the safeguarding of the ancient manuscripts of Mali as well as the possibility of setting up a short-term distance programme at the World Heritage property.

Finally, we would like to congratulate Mali for having ensured that the tomb of Askia is granted enhanced protection under the Hague Convention and the Second Protocol and encourage the State Party to strive for the same legal protection for other relevant World Heritage properties in its territory.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? I see none. We can now adopt the decision. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.15 adopted.

I now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The list of cultural property on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without adoption is the Tombs of Buganda’s Kings at Kasubi, Uganda.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Does the Committee have any objections on this report and decision? I see none. I declare the decision read out adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegations would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion.

I will now invite Ms. Nada Al-Hassan, Chief of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in the Arab States Region and opened for discussion. You have the floor.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Excellences, Mesdames et Messieurs, en abordant l’état de conservation des biens irakiens inscrits sur la liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, nous aimerions souligner que malgré la libération de toutes les régions d’Irak en 2017, le patrimoine culturel du pays qui a subi d’importants dommages demeure menacé.

Le conflit a été caractérisé par de nombreuses destructions intentionnelles des sites les plus emblématiques de notre civilisation. Sur les diapos vous pouvez voir la destruction d’un fleuron de l’architecture islamique le mausolée de l’Imam Dour du site de Nimroud, ainsi qu’Assour, Nabiyounes, Hatra, Samarra. Les combats qui ont permis la libération ont engendré de grandes souffrances humaines et des centaines de milliers de réfugiées et de déplacés.

Les institutions ont été affaiblies rendant difficiles la préservation et la gestion du patrimoine culturel. Malgré les grands efforts nationaux qui sont déployés, la reconstruction, le relèvement et la stabilisation de l’Irak constituent une entreprise colossale, tant sur le plan humain qu’opérationnel et elle requiert des moyens financiers et techniques aujourd’hui largement insuffisant.

Les fouilles illégales et le trafic illicite des biens culturels irakiens demeurent un problème très répandu, et ce malgré les résolutions du Conseil de sécurité de l’ONU relative au moratoire sur le commerce de biens culturels irakiens depuis 2003.

L’État partie fait signe que la situation sécuritaire actuelle est stable ce qui permet de lancer des travaux de restauration et de reconstruction, mais il souligne la nécessité de missions techniques pour évaluer les dommages subis sur les biens du patrimoine mondial. Il demande que l’UNESCO et la communauté internationale, que vous représentez, les universités et les institutions scientifiques et techniques s’engagent à ses côtés dans le relèvement de l’Irak et que l’UNESCO organise une conférence internationale sur le patrimoine culturel irakien et sur la lutte contre le trafic illicite de ses biens.

Cette conférence constituerait le suivi du Plan d'action que nous avons élaboré avec les autorités irakiennes après la libération des zones du nord. En outre, la directrice générale de l'UNESCO a lancé l'initiative "Faire revivre Mossoul", le relèvement de la ville par la culture et l'éducation. À la conférence internationale pour la reconstruction et la stabilisation de l'Irak qui a eu lieu au Koweït en février dernier. Cette initiative phare est alignée sur le mandat de l'UNESCO visant à promouvoir la paix et la diversité culturelle dans le processus de relèvement après les conflits grâce à une vision inclusive et intégrée du relèvement et de la reconstruction. Elle vous sera présentée lors d'un événement spécial le 30 juin à 19 h pendant le Comité.

À cet égard, notons que l'UNESCO, le Comité du patrimoine mondial et le secteur des sciences humaines, ONU Habitat et l'Organisation internationale du travail ont lancé en avril dernier un programme conjoint sur la reconstruction post conflit dans les États arabes alliant la planification urbaine intégrée, la dimension patrimoniale, culturelle et sociale et la création d'emploi. Ce programme informera le travail de relèvement et de la reconstruction de l'Irak surtout dans les zones urbaines.

Madame la présidente, l'ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole avant d'entamer la discussion sur Hatra en Irak. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Please go ahead."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you, madam Chair. ICOMOS and ICCROM acknowledge that armed conflict has significantly damaged Iraq's cultural heritage with the actions of extremists groups resulting in destruction and preventing important conservation work. It remains imperative that all parties to the conflict refrain from any actions that would cause further damage. Although the State Party advises that the current security situation is stable, the absence of detailed information about the state of conservation for several years remains a serious concern.

An assessment of the extended damage to Iraqi World Heritage properties should be undertaken to inform conservation, restoration and reconstruction work. ICOMOS guidance on post recovery and reconstruction of World Heritage properties might assist in guiding this process. With regard to capacity-building: Iraqi professionals participated in ICCROM courses, including a short course series organised by the ICCROM Sharjah office. Syrian officials were also involved in activities held by ICCROM and ICOMOS on the topic of post-conflict recovery.

It is important to recognise that basic humanitarian needs must be addressed and dignified returns for displaced persons enabled. However, until properly informed conservation programmes can be instigated, any further physical activities should be confined to emergency protection measures which prevent further damage. It is highly desirable that Member States of UNESCO support emergency safeguarding measures including through the UNESCO Heritage Emergency Fund and that the State Party invites a joint World Heritage Centre, the ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission, to address the damage, to liaise with and advise the Iraqi authorities as soon as the security situation allows.

Thank you, madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to know if you have any comments or questions or clarifications. I see none. Did the Rapporteur receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Madame Chairperson. We have not received any amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Therefore I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.19 adopted.”

Ms. Nada Al -Hassan:

« If you allow me Ms Chair, I did not have the opportunity to present the World Heritage site of Hatra. I just presented the general report. Please, allow me to present, although the decision has been adopted. I can still give the members an idea of the site.

Le site d’Hatra en Irak. Le rapport sur l’état de conservation d’Hatra en Irak se trouve dans le document 7 A page 50 en anglais et 53 en français. Vous vous souvenez peut-être d’images sur les réseaux sociaux de personnes en train de casser les sculptures qui étaient sur les façades de ce site romain. Vous voyez ici sur les images avant et après les destructions intentionnelles.

L’État partie souligne le peu de progrès dans la protection du bien et fournit un rapport supplémentaire d’évaluation rapide des dégâts dus à l’occupation militaire du bien et à des destructions en son sein de 2015 à 2017 et à des pillages surtout dans la maison des fouilles.

Les actions préliminaires post-conflit requises dans le cas du site archéologique d’Hatra n’ont pas encore été mises en œuvre et demeurent nécessaires. Il s’agit de l’identification des dégâts et des mesures prioritaires, de la protection du point de vue sécuritaire, de la collecte des fragments archéologiques et sculpturaux et de leurs inventaires ainsi que des mesures de consolidation et de protection d’urgences. Ces actions demeurent nécessaires aujourd’hui et il est urgent de les commencer.

Le projet de décision se trouve à la page 54 du document en anglais, 55 en français. Il réitère le besoin d’une évaluation détaillée des dégâts et d’une mission conjointe avec ICOMOS. Il demande aussi à l’État partie de continuer sa consultation et ce dialogue qu’ils ont toujours eus avec nous afin d’entreprendre des travaux de restauration en bonne et due forme au sein du bien.

Madame la présidente, ICOMOS souhaiterait ajouter quelque chose avec votre permission. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. ICOMOS and ICCROM regret that Hatra has been significantly impacted by years of conflict. Although the current security situation is stable and the September 2017 mission by the Iraqi authority provided a general assessment, there is still no thorough understanding of the extent of damage nor the state of conservation of the property.

Pending the implementation of a comprehensive conservation project, physical actions on site should be confined to emergency protection measures to prevent looting and further damage or minimal intervention for protection and emergency stabilisation, especially where collapses or further damage are imminent. It is highly desirable the State Party invites a joint World Heritage Centre, the ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission, to further assess the damage and to help the Iraqi authority establish short and long-term proposals and goals, including identification of the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Ms. Nada Al -Hassan again regarding the situation at the national level in Libya, followed by a presentation of the property.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan:

“Thank you, madam Chair.

Nous abordons maintenant les sites du patrimoine mondial de la Libye. Depuis 2014, la Libye fait face à des situations de conflit et a des divisions qui menacent son patrimoine culturel. Le Centre du patrimoine mondial s’est mobilisé depuis le début de la crise pour soutenir les professionnels du patrimoine dans leurs efforts pour la sauvegarde des sites et des musées du pays et notamment les cinq biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial dont vous voyez l’image à votre gauche.

Au cours de l’année passée, les professionnels libyens ont fait de grands efforts pour mettre en place des mesures de protection, de restauration et de sensibilisation malgré des conditions difficiles et le manque de moyens. Une stratégie nationale pour la protection du patrimoine mondial et sa mise en œuvre se fait sous la supervision du département des Antiquités. L’État partie a préparé des cartes avec les limites de tous les biens ainsi que leurs zones tampons et il a initié une discussion avec nous et ICOMOS pour la finalisation de ces cartes. Ceci est crucial pour la gestion des biens.

Les travaux de conservation ont été mis en œuvre ainsi que plusieurs activités de renforcement des capacités dans la documentation, les inventaires, la restauration de mosaïque, la protection des collections des musées, etc. Comme vous le voyez sur la photo, ceci se fait avec la société civile et les autorités locales notamment lors d’une réunion des cinq villes membres de l’Union des municipalités du patrimoine mondial, malgré les difficultés de mouvement dans le pays, pour élaborer des mesures de protection commune. Nous saluons leur engagement en ce sens.

Cependant de nombreux défis restent à relever en Libye. Le manque de financement, la complexité pour le gouvernement de recevoir des fonds depuis l’étranger, la fuite des cerveaux libyens, des capacités techniques limitées qui empêchent les Libyens d’effectuer des actions soutenues sur le long terme.

Les professionnels du patrimoine, selon leur propre terme, ont des besoins importants de renforcement de capacité pour faire face aux menaces. Leurs attentes sont à la hauteur de la complexité de la tâche qui leur incombe, mais le soutien international tarde à venir.

L'empiètement urbain et les constructions illégales demeurent une menace grave pour certains sites comme Cyrène. Les fouilles illégales et les pillages des biens culturels syriens continuent à être très préoccupants. La mobilisation de la communauté internationale pour empêcher ce trafic illicite est cruciale.

Dans la ville en terre de Ghadamès, de fortes pluies survenues en décembre 2017 ont occasionné l'effondrement de murs de toits et dans certains cas de maisons entières, tandis que d'autres maisons sont menacées d'effondrements en raison de l'effet domino dans ce tissu urbain dense. Cet été, quand les températures vont augmenter, les matériaux vont sécher et des effondrements sont attendus.

La situation reste préoccupante également dans le site d'art rupestre de Tadrat Acacus qui se trouve sur le chemin de migrations qui se sont accrues ces dernières années en Libye, comme vous le savez. Les conditions de sécurité, les difficultés de gestion délicate et de surveillance adéquate sur des superficies très étendues sont autant de défis qui empêchent de contrôler le vandalisme et le pillage déjà important.

Notons que le site de Leptis Magna, grâce à une documentation très récente par une équipe franco-libyenne, a montré qu'il est dans de bonnes conditions de conservation et, bien entendu, nous nous en réjouissons. Il demeure essentiel que la mission conjointe avec ICOMOS se rende sur tous les sites du patrimoine mondial dès que les conditions le permettront.

Mesdames et messieurs, la situation extrêmement difficile de ce pays diviser et encore instable, faisant face aux défis du relèvement et de la reconstruction de plusieurs de ses villes endommagées nécessite votre soutien pour la protection de son patrimoine riche et divers et dont seule une infime partie est inscrite sur notre Liste du patrimoine mondial. Un soutien matériel, mais aussi moral de votre part en les félicitant pour leur engagement sans faille.

Madame la présidente l'ICOMOS souhaite prendre la parole ».

ICOMOS:

"Thank you, madam chair. ICOMOS and ICCROM note with regret that the security situation in Libya continues to hinder conservation. The Libyan World Heritage properties are impacted by the consequences of inappropriate urban encroachment, flooding, looting, graffiti and inadequate resources, all of which are exacerbated by armed conflict and challenges in accessing in gaining definitive information.

The effort of the State Party and its agencies to delineate the boundary of the properties and buffer zones is acknowledged and will be important for effective future management. Also important is the work to develop a strategy for the protection of the Libyan World Heritage properties building on the measures identified during the 2016 international meeting on the Safeguarding of Libyan Cultural Heritage.

It is truly uplifting to understand the extent of community action that has occurred to protect and extend first aid to Libyan World Heritage properties, despite the extremely challenging circumstances. The actions of local authorities and local community members to protect World Heritage sites are important steps towards long-term conservation and

management. It is also important that long-term conservation is founded on a thorough understanding and informed by experts' advice.

Therefore, it is crucial that the local efforts are supported through increased mobilisation of the international community to provide more financial and technical support for remote training and related capacity-building. Capacity-building for Libyan professionals has already occurred through participation in ICCROM activities including a short course series organised by the ICCROM Sharjah Office. In addition, ICCROM is working on a jointly funded activity with the Prince Claus Fund on the restoration and recovery project which concerns the capacity-building model for World Heritage properties in Libya.

The joint mission previously requested by the Committee should be sent to Libyan World Heritage properties as soon as security measures improve. Thank you, madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is back to Nada."

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

"I will continue with the property of Sabratha.

Je me permets d'ajouter aussi que le Centre régional pour le patrimoine mondial à Manama a également organisé un cours de formation pour les professionnels libyens, il y a deux mois, et je les en remercie.

Le site archéologique de Sabratha : son rapport se trouve dans le document 7Add pages 22 en anglais et en français. Les combats aux abords du site de Sabratha ont cessé et la situation sécuritaire s'est sécurisée dans la ville. Heureusement, car les extrémistes armés menacent les sites et les ont occupés l'an dernier.

Les informations communiquées par l'État partie attestent de son engagement en faveur de la conservation de ce site archéologique. L'étroite concertation actuellement engagée avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et ICOMOS pour élaborer les limites du site et sa zone tampon est vraiment très appréciée par nous. Il est recommandé à l'État partie d'accorder la priorité à la finalisation de ces cartes et aux réglementations urbaines dans la zone tampon afin de gérer et de contenir de manière définitive le problème de l'empiètement urbain.

Les dommages subis par le bien en raison du conflit armé, dont vous voyez certaines images, avec des traces de balles sur les murs, ainsi que les difficultés rencontrées pour améliorer la situation et mettre en œuvre les mesures adéquates pour sa protection sont réellement préoccupantes.

Le bien requiert une stratégie globale de gestion et de protection, de conservation afin de mieux traiter les effets du conflit armé, le vandalisme, l'empiètement urbain, les altérations dues aux conditions climatiques, l'humidité, sel, eau salée (car on est au bord de la mer) et la croissance de la végétation.

Il est donc recommandé au Comité d'appeler la communauté internationale à soutenir les actions de conservation et de protection de Sabratha. Il importe que l'État partie poursuive ses efforts et qu'il tienne le Centre du patrimoine mondial informé sur la situation sur le terrain et poursuive la mise en œuvre des actions entreprises.

Le projet de décision est soumis page 24 dans les deux langues et ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole avec votre permission madame la présidente ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. ICOMOS and ICCROM acknowledge the extraordinary commitment towards the conservation of the archaeological site of Sabratha by the State Party and all the actors, despite prevailing conflict and other challenging circumstances.

The ongoing close consultation that occurs with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies is appreciated and should continue. The State Parties should follow up the work done in preparing a map of the property and of the buffer zone by submitting a boundary clarification and minor boundary modification in line with Paragraph 164 of the Operational Guidelines.

Further Encroachments remain an issue at this property. There are discrepancies in the report on the extent of this issue highlighting the challenges that arise from lack of secure access. The joint mission previously requested by the Committee should be sent as soon as security conditions are met.

Assistance is also needed from the international community to provide further financial and technical support through the UNESCO Heritage Emergency Fund to implement the measures identified during the International meeting on the safeguarding of Libyan Cultural Heritage held in May of 2016.

Thank you, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any comments? I see Tunisia and Kuwait.”

Tunisie :

[Interprétation en français] « Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Puisque je prends la parole pour la première fois après avoir écouté la présentation concernant les sites dans les pays arabes, permettez-moi de saluer le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Il faut dire que la région arabe, et c'est un euphémisme, connaît une situation très difficile. Je voudrais saluer madame Al-Hassan et son équipe pour le travail effectué. Je voudrais également saluer les Organes consultatifs pour le travail également mis en œuvre.

Je voudrais parler des sites archéologiques de Libye. Dans ce sens, il ne faudrait pas oublier de saluer les efforts déployés par l'État partie, par les instances locales en Libye. Il faudrait également prendre à leurs mesures les efforts déployés pour les sites cités par madame Nada Al-Hassan que ce soit Sabratha, Leptis Magna ou d'autres.

Les efforts déployés par les autorités libyennes sont également à saluer dans un contexte très difficile. Il faudrait ainsi les aider afin d'empêcher le trafic illicite des biens culturels libyens, bien évidemment, dans une situation et des conditions très difficiles.

Je n'oublierai pas de dire que nous déployons au niveau de mon pays, la Tunisie, des efforts assez importants afin d'empêcher ce trafic illicite des biens culturels libyens. Il faudrait que nous soyons tous auprès de la Libye pour lui offrir le soutien nécessaire afin qu'elle puisse justement relever ces défis et pour qu'elle puisse renverser la situation et également changer celle-ci de ses sites actuellement sur le site des biens en danger ».

The Chairperson:

“I now give the floor to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you Chair. I will join the delegation from Tunisia and commend the State Party of Libya for their efforts to protect and preserve significant historical and archaeological sites. Many of them are in danger due to armed conflict as well as environmental factors, despite difficult working conditions and hazardous security. We find that such cases are well-deserving of urgent financial and technical support from various bodies.

We thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their effort in supporting the Cultural Heritage sites in Libya. Madame Chair, I would like to hear more from the State Party, and I request your permission to give them the floor to clarify things regarding the sites in question.”

The Chairperson:

“Is there anyone from Libya who would like to comment or anyone who would like to speak on behalf of Libya? I give the floor to the representative of Libya.”

Libya:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Libya is pleased to invite ICCROM, ICOMOS and the World Heritage Centre to Libya in order to visit our archaeological sites. With respect to clarifications, consultation with the State Parties will continue. The State of Libya promises that it will continue the conservation of the site when it comes to setting the boundaries or buffer zone.

We would also like to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for what they said regarding the effort made by the government of Libya. We would also like to have the sites taken off the List of sites in Danger. The efforts that we have made and the initiatives taken have been recognised by the Committee.

We can say that since 2017 the situation has greatly improved. The situation was stabilised thanks to the work of the police and security forces of the government of Libya. We have taken the first steps to guarantee proper watching of our sites, including electronic surveillance. We already have plans and are in steady contact with the UNESCO regional office in Cairo to pursue this joint effort for heritage.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the representative of the NGOs.”

NGO:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving me the opportunity as representative of World Heritage Watch to express our concern on the Libyan World Heritage sites. As UNESCO knows, there is a list of threats to the property which are mainly due to political instability in Libya. Therefore, to conserve these properties and avoid serious consequences, we call on the World Heritage Committee to request the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to urge the State Party to invite a World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission to inspect and evaluate the five Libyan World Heritage sites as a matter for immediate action and consider this an opportunity for the mission to meet with the representatives of civil society and local communities.

Also, we urge UNESCO to work with the State Party to develop a World Heritage Management Plan for the five sites following consultation with national and municipal authorities and the local community. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.23 adopted.

The floor is again to Ms. Nada Al-Hassan to give us a report on the situation at the national level in the Syrian Arab Republic. Thank you.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Madame la présidente, permettez-vous que je réponde aux deux questions qui ont été posées sur les sites libyens, sur la sortie possible de la Liste en péril l'année prochaine ? Je vous remercie.

Je souhaiterais répondre très rapidement d'abord en vous remerciant pour vos félicitations nous ne faisons que notre travail pour lequel vous nous faites confiance. Nous pensons, et je suis sûr que l'ICOMOS est d'accord avec nous, que les sites libyens comme Leptis Magna et Sabratha vont bien. Que la ville de Ghadamès a été très affectée par les inondations et qu'elle ne va pas très bien, malheureusement. Mais qu'il est nécessaire que nous allions en mission tous ensemble pour évaluer et travailler sur les problèmes. Nous allons maintenir avec l'État partie un dialogue constructif cette année, avant le Comité de l'année prochaine, afin de discuter de cette question du danger ou non d'un ou de deux sites actuellement, donc dans l'ensemble en bon état. Je vous remercie madame la présidente.

Je passe maintenant à la Syrie, à la décision générale sur les biens du patrimoine mondial de la République arabe syrienne. La décision générale sur les biens du patrimoine mondial de la République arabe syrienne se trouve dans le document 7A.Add page 53 et 54, elle contient un rapport sur l'ensemble des biens syriens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, mais aussi sur la Liste indicative de la Syrie.

Le conflit armé en Syrie a commencé en 2011 il a et continue d'engendrer une crise humanitaire de grande envergure, des centaines de milliers de morts, plusieurs millions de réfugiés et de déplacés. Il a aussi causé de nombreux dégâts au patrimoine culturel et a été caractérisé par des époques de destructions intentionnelles du patrimoine qui ont marqué vos esprits. Nous pouvons voir ici le théâtre de Palmyre détruit intentionnellement par exemple.

Le site de l'ancienne ville de Bosra se trouve dans une situation assez stable depuis l'an dernier, même s'il a subi des fouilles illégales et une inondation récente dans les cours adjacentes à l'amphithéâtre romain. Les communautés locales y ont mené des travaux de restauration sur certains bâtiments historiques et nous nous préoccupons des méthodes de restauration, nous espérons qu'elles se limitent à la consolidation. Aujourd'hui, Bosra se

trouve cependant dans une zone propice au combat et son sort reste très hautement menacé.

Dans l'ancienne ville de Damas, plusieurs petits incendies ont été reportés, ils ont endommagé des bâtiments historiques et des boutiques situés au sein du bien et dans des faubourgs historiques formant la zone tampon. Ces incendies sont préoccupants, car il démontre que les mesures de réduction des risques peinent à être mise en place. Il en résulte des restaurations rapides effectuées avec des matériaux disponibles mais inadéquats. Quant au bâtiment du XIX^e siècle appelé la banque ottomane qui avait été affecté par un incendie en 2016 et brûlé, le projet révisé soumis par l'État partie est conforme à nos attentes et celles des Organes consultatifs.

Dans le site du patrimoine mondial du Crac des chevaliers et Qal'at Salah El-Din, un site sériel, on note que les travaux de restauration sur lesquels nous étions d'accord l'an dernier, ont, par contre, peut être été réalisé d'une manière un peu hâtive, car nous avons vu des restaurations définitives qui ne bénéficient pas des méthodes les plus compatibles avec les exigences qualitatives d'un site du patrimoine mondial.

À Qal'at Salah El-Din, site à l'abri du conflit tout le long, la direction générale des Antiquités et des Musées nous a soumis un projet préliminaire qui prévoit la mise en œuvre d'équipements touristiques et d'un téléphérique au sein du bien, ce qui représenterait une menace pour sa Valeur universelle exceptionnelle et nous l'avons bien signifié à l'État partie avec l'aide technique de l'ICOMOS.

Concernant Palmyre, la direction des Antiquités et des Musées qui gère ce site a évalué les dégâts supplémentaires causés par des destructions intentionnelles une deuxième fois sur le site et qui ont causé la destruction du tétrapyle et d'une partie de la scène du théâtre que nous voyons ici. Un projet pour la protection de Palmyre serait envisagé avec une fondation basée en Russie. Il est important de protéger Palmyre et d'entamer sa restauration. Il est nécessaire que tout projet envisagé à Palmyre soit transmis au Centre du patrimoine mondial pour évaluation par les Organes consultatifs, et ce avant le début des travaux.

Concernant les douze sites inscrits sur la Liste indicative de la Syrie, l'État partie indique que le gouvernement a pris le contrôle des sites de Mari et de Dura Europos et il confirme que les dommages rapportés les années précédentes étaient bien réels. À savoir des fouilles illicites et des dommages au Palais royal de Mari du troisième millénaire Av-J.C. Dans la ville de Maaloula, sur la Liste indicative, la municipalité et le PNUD ont complété la réhabilitation des infrastructures de la ville.

Depuis la 41^e session du Comité l'an dernier, l'UNESCO continue de sensibiliser la communauté internationale à la destruction du patrimoine en Syrie. Dans le cadre du projet Sauvegarde d'urgence du patrimoine culturel syrien que finance l'Union européenne et qui arrive à sa fin avec le cofinancement des Flandres et de l'Autriche et grâce au Fonds d'urgence de l'UNESCO, dont nous remercions tous les contributeurs, nous avons organisé plusieurs ateliers de formation, poursuivi la documentation et l'évaluation des dommages et soutenu la mise en œuvre des travaux de consolidation d'urgence notamment dans la citadelle d'Alep.

Mesdames et messieurs, la situation en Syrie demeure très difficile rendant une mission de suivi réactif sur place impossible pour le moment et limitant considérablement nos capacités de soutien technique et d'intervention. Le conflit armé continue dans plusieurs zones de la série pouvant mener à des destructions et dommages ultérieurs.

Dans ce contexte nous saluons le travail soutenu des professionnels du patrimoine en Syrie et des communautés locales qui ont maintenu leurs efforts pour protéger leurs patrimoines et en assurer l'étroite surveillance autant que faire se peut. Les ressources

financières et humaines sont énormes face à l'ampleur de la tâche pour le relèvement des villes historiques et la restauration du patrimoine selon les normes internationales scientifiques et techniques.

Le projet de décision est soumis page 56 en anglais et 57 en français et prie instamment toutes les parties liées à la situation en Syrie, au conflit, de s'abstenir de toutes actions susceptibles de causer de nouveaux dégâts au patrimoine mondial et de s'acquitter de leurs obligations conformément au droit international. Il invite en outre la communauté internationale à apporter son soutien accru à la sauvegarde du patrimoine syrien et à mettre fin au fléau du trafic illicite en conformité avec les résolutions du Conseil de sécurité de l'ONU les Conventions de l'UNESCO de 1954 et de 1970.

Madame la présidente, ICOMOS souhaite prendre la parole s'il vous plaît. »

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Armed conflict in Syria since 2011 has constantly escalated, leading to significant degradation of humanitarian conditions and ongoing damaged to the six inscribed properties and those on the Syrian Tentative list. The Syrian properties have increasingly been threatened by ascertained and potential dangers, in particular the ancient city of Aleppo, which has been extensively damaged. There is now a re-looming risk of further irreversible damage and impact during the forthcoming recovery phase. Because access is limited, the full extend of damage to the World Heritage properties cannot be thoroughly assessed. In particular, the ancient villages of northern Syria and the ancient city of Bosra remain in combat zones.

Emergency first aid work has occurred, for example at the Chapel of Crac des Chevaliers and Qal'at Salah El-Din. The ancient city of Damascus has been subject to fire damage and in Palmyra. It is important that work be limited to urgent interventions pending improvement of the city's security situation and essential detailed studies and project scoping.

At the same time, illegal excavations across archaeological sites continue to be a major source for the illicit trafficking of cultural objects that causes extensive and irreversible damage to those sites. ICOMOS and ICCROM have supported and will continue to support the State Party to safeguard cultural heritage. A range of projects have been undertaken within the framework of the emergency safeguarding of the Syrian cultural heritage project co-financed by Flanders and Austria and the capacity-building technical and media support for the protection of Syrian cultural heritage workshops in Beirut and Berlin, implemented in collaboration with German agencies.

Capacity-building for Syrian professionals has also occurred through participation in ICCROM activities, such as, for example, a short course series organised by the ICCROM Sharjah Office and the International course on stone conservation. UNESCO also provides stone conservation training in Aleppo. Syrian officials have been involved in activities held both by ICOMOS and ICCROM on the topic of conflict recovery.

It is regrettable that the joint World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS' Reactive Monitoring mission in March 2017 could not take place in view of security concerns. All parties to the conflict should refrain from any action which further jeopardize what is already a severely impacted cultural heritage. International and national heritage professionals should continue to work for the safeguarding of Syria's cultural heritage and to provide further support through funding projects and contributing to UNESCO Heritage Emergency Funds.

Thank you, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any comments? I see none. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We have received no amendments to the decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.36 adopted. Ms. Nada Al-Hassan you have the floor again to present the next property, which is the situation at the national level in the Syrian Republic.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Je vais donc maintenant aborder l'état de conservation dans l'ancienne ville d'Alep qui se trouve dans le document 7A.Add page 37 en anglais et en français. Alep, ville dévastée souvent comparait à juste titre à Varsovie ou Berlin après la Deuxième Guerre mondiale, a subi jusqu'en décembre 2016 des dégâts et une destruction d'une vaste étendue qui ont lourdement affecté sa population et son patrimoine culturel.

Je vous rappelle qu'en janvier 2017, l'UNESCO avait effectué une visite à Alep et y avait installé deux responsables de liaison dans les domaines de la culture et de l'éducation. Le document devant vous énumère les mesures prises et les défis rencontrés par les autorités nationales depuis la 41^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

Aujourd'hui, les rues sont encore largement encombrées de débris, les structures endommagées s'effondrent faute de moyens pour les consolidations d'urgence. Les habitants de retour à Alep ont commencé la restauration et la reconstruction de leurs maisons et boutiques, mais leur sécurité est mise en cause par la situation précaire de nombreux bâtiments ayant subi les effets de destructions souterraines ou, pourrait-on dire, d'explosions souterraines de grande envergure.

De plus les matériaux traditionnels sont rares et les autorités locales ne peuvent assurer la qualité et le suivi nécessaire pour les travaux en cours. Avec le soutien de l'UNESCO, la Syrie a effectué une évaluation précise des dommages sur 170 bâtiments historiques et elle supervise le tri et la sauvegarde des décombres.

Actuellement, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et UNITAR, notre agence sœur avec son programme sur les images satellites, UNOSAT, sont en train de finaliser ensemble l'évaluation des dégâts à Alep à partir d'images satellites étudiées et interprétées grâce à un travail minutieux d'historiens de l'architecture.

L'UNESCO, en collaboration avec la fondation Aga Khan pour la culture, a mené un atelier de formation professionnelle à la maçonnerie et taille de pierre afin d'allier technique de restauration et création d'emploi. La vie reprend petit à petit à Alep. Soulignons que malgré les recommandations opérationnelles et la feuille de route qui avaient été formulées avec l'aide de l'UNESCO et les Organes consultatifs à Beyrouth en mars 2017, il ressort pour le moment que les actions entreprises à Alep sont éparses et ne suivent pas de stratégie planifiée et qu'un plan de travail concerté matérialisant une vision pour la ville, un projet intégrer pour son relèvement et sa reconstruction font défaut. Tout comme un

mécanisme de coordination participatif et efficace entre les parties impliquées dans le redressement de la ville.

De plus, les projets de restauration en cours, comme dans la grande mosquée d'Alep, sont entrepris sans concertation avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organes consultatifs ce qui nous préoccupe beaucoup. Le 7 juin, les autorités syriennes ont soumis au centre du patrimoine mondial un document complémentaire intitulé Plan d'intervention sur la ville d'Alep. Le document énumère les étapes qu'elles comptent mener à Alep d'ici la fin de l'année 2018 : l'évaluation des plans directeurs existants, une base de données, évaluation des dommages, gestion des décombres, des risques, etc. ainsi que l'amendement de la réglementation en vigueur.

C'est un développement positif, mais c'est une information très récente. Ce rapport mentionne également l'implication des communautés locales que nous ne mentionnerons jamais assez, l'indisponibilité des matériaux de construction et les besoins en formation, ainsi que la nécessité de créer une structure financière dédiée à la reconstruction de la ville.

Mesdames et messieurs, le rôle de premier plan que joua la ville d'Alep dans la vie en Syrie depuis des siècles tant comme centre urbain de vie sociale et culturelle et spirituelle et comme carrefour économique et d'échange devra être pris en compte pour renforcer la paix et permettre la résilience des populations qui ont survécu à la guerre.

Face à l'urgence de la situation et afin d'éviter des détériorations supplémentaires du tissu urbain, il est crucial que les autorités commencent à travailler sur les consolidations d'urgences pour assurer la sécurité des habitants et qu'elles entreprennent une planification, intégrée et structurée pour la ville avec toutes les parties prenantes. La mise en œuvre de la feuille de route que nous avons élaborée avec les professionnels syriens en mars 2017 devra être assurée aussi bien dans ses volets relatifs à la planification stratégique qu'au volet concernant les aspects opérationnels.

D'autres réunions de planification et de soutien technique pourront avoir lieu en dehors de la Syrie puisque les conditions ne nous permettent pas de nous y rendre aujourd'hui.

Le projet de décision vous est soumis page 39 en anglais et 40 en français et l'ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole avec votre permission madame la présidente.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. ICOMOS you have the floor."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you, madam Chair. ICOMOS notes that some shop and home owners are now returning to their properties, which is a positive sign. We also know that the prevailing, extremely challenging circumstances mean there is very limited control of building practices and, moreover, building permits are readily available. All this must be set against the background that some 33 per cent of the buildings are already destroyed or mostly destroyed, and 34 per cent heavily damaged. This means there is only 25 per cent that are in quite good condition, while at the same time more buildings have collapsed on a regular basis from the lack of emergency consolidation.

The work undertaken on new buildings and also on restoration and conservation, as you just heard, is being done on an *ad hoc* basis, without any overall agreed planning context because of the vacuum caused by the conflict. It would clearly be highly beneficial if an overall strategy or strategic recovery approach could be drawn up before improved circumstances allowed major restoration and building programmes at a pace that might be difficult to control.

ICOMOS is ready and willing to join with the World Heritage Centre in collaborating with the State Party on the development of such a recovery strategy on a distance basis if that is the best way of communicating in the current circumstances.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I see none. Rapporteur, did you receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair we have received no amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare draft decision 42 COM 7A.30 adopted. Once again the floor is to Nada Al-Hassan for the third site in Syria.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je vais donc vous présenter l'état de conservation des villages antiques du nord de la Syrie. Ce rapport est page 46 en anglais et 47 en français dans le document 7A.Add.

Le conflit armé s'est intensifié ces derniers mois dans la région de la Syrie dans laquelle sont situés ces villages antiques, villages byzantins, post-Romain du IV^e siècle. L'accès à ces sites demeure impossible. Depuis la 41^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial, ces villages ont subi des dommages et des destructions liés au conflit armé. Des épisodes de destructions intentionnelles, de fouilles illégales, de constructions illégales transformant les ruines antiques en refuges pour les déplacés et autres exactions. Certains villages ont été utilisés à des fins militaires et ajoutons à cela que les habitants souvent démantèlent des structures antiques et pillent les pierres anciennes pour les réemployer dans de nouvelles constructions.

Cependant, soulignons que les communautés locales coopèrent avec la direction des Antiquités et des Musées pour protéger et surveiller ce bien en série et donnent souvent l'alerte.

Le projet de décision est page 47 en anglais et 48 en français. Il relate notre vive préoccupation face à l'intensification du conflit dans la région où est situé ce bien en série et l'aggravation de son état de conservation ainsi que le manque d'information détaillée sur les dommages subis.

Madame la présidente, l'ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole s'il vous plaît ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. ICOMOS and ICCROM regret the conflict in Syria continues to cause significant damage to its inscribed World Heritage properties. The ancient villages of northern Syria are less prominently reported than other Syrian properties in inactive combat zones. The components of the property are subject to unauthorised excavation and the reuse of archaeological material for illegal construction. Lack of access obstructs understanding of the damage, although the reported efforts of local communities to monitor and protect the property despite tragic humanitarian circumstances should be acknowledged.

All parties to the conflict should be urged to refrain from any actions that could cause any damage to the property, particularly any usage for military purposes. As with the other Syrian properties on the list of World Heritage in Danger a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM’s Reactive Monitoring mission to this property would be highly desirable as soon as the security situation improves.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the last property in Syria? I see none. Rapporteur are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We have received no amendments to the decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.33 adopted as agreed. Once again, Ms. Nada Al-Hassan, you have the floor to present the next property, which is the situation at the national level in Yemen.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous abordons l'état de conservation des biens du Yémen. Mesdames et messieurs le conflit au Yémen a éclaté en 2015, mais ces effets sur le peuple yéménite sont déjà très importants. Le patrimoine nombreux et précieux du Yémen subit des dégâts irréversibles à cause du conflit et reste sous la menace constante d'être détruit par le conflit armé et le déclin socio-économique. Dans ce qui est actuellement l'une des crises humanitaires des plus aiguës.

Vous voyez sur l'écran des villages et les dégâts subis par les sites du patrimoine mondial comme Shibam au Yémen et ceux de la Liste indicative comme Marib et Saada. Malgré ces difficultés, les professionnels du patrimoine du Yémen accomplissent des efforts louables pour la sensibilisation des populations locales comme à Zabid site du patrimoine mondial avec la documentation des dégâts, comme à Sana'a site du patrimoine mondial, la capitale, et l'amélioration de la gouvernance comme dans l'archipel de Socotra. Toutefois, la pression du conflit, les défis de la gouvernance, le manque de moyens financiers et la

situation sécuritaire toujours instable du pays sont autant de freins à la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel du Yémen.

Dans ce contexte, le Comité est invité à appeler les parties du conflit à respecter leurs engagements internationaux en évitant de cibler et militariser le patrimoine. L'appui de la communauté internationale est aussi requis ici pour préparer le relèvement du Yémen et sa reconstruction ainsi que la préservation de son patrimoine culturel et naturel et la prévention du trafic illicite en provenance du Yémen.

Notons le commencement imminent d'un projet de l'UNESCO financé par l'Union européenne pour la conservation du patrimoine et la création d'emplois en particulier chez les jeunes les femmes et les groupes vulnérables.

Madame la présidente ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole sur cette partie introductive ».

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Armed conflict and political and socioeconomic disturbances combined with a lack of organised national support and resources continue to obstruct effective heritage management and physical conservation at the Yemeni World Heritage properties as well as taking a huge humanitarian toll.

The historic town of Zabid has continued to be affected by the escalation of conflict. The earthen architecture of the old walled city of Shibam remains highly vulnerable, with flood damage needing substantial physical conservation action. The Old City of Sana'a has endured further impact from conflict and increasing social and economic decline.

The General Authority for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen and local actors have been involved in damage assessment, documentation, first aid interventions and communication. However, it has not been possible to progress to finalisation of the draft National Strategy for the Preservation of Historic Sites and Monuments, nor, the Emergency Action Plan for Safeguarding of Yemen's Cultural Heritage adopted at the UNESCO experts' meeting in July of 2015.

In the short term, the security situation severely limits options for substantive capacity-building; the preparatory training offers opportunities to prepare for longer-term sustainable solutions. In this regard, programmes such as the training of Yemeni experts arranged through the UNESCO Regional Office in Doha, in coordination with the Oxford University school of Archaeology, delivered in Jordan in August of 2017 and the international training course on Disaster Risk Management of cultural heritage organised in cooperation with UNESCO, ICOMOS, ICORP and ICOMOS, can help build capacity.

Resources such as the ICOMOS provisional guidelines on post-trauma recovery and reconstruction of World Heritage properties offer useful guidance. Additional training and access to expert advice would be needed. ICOMOS and ICCROM stand ready to assist; support from the international community remains essential for capacity-building to conduct adequate preventative conservation measures. Joint Reactive Monitoring missions undertaken in response to the open invitation from the State Party would be highly desirable as soon as the security situation improves.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments on the issue of Yemen? We will now talk about the Old City of Sana’a and the floor is back to Ms. Nada Al-Hassan.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien de la vieille ville de Sana'a se trouve dans le document 7A.Add page 60 en anglais et 62 en français.

Le conflit armé et socio-économique mentionné préalablement menace gravement la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de Sana'a, ville capitale. La situation dégradée au sein du bien pour les habitants avant tout et pour l'intégrité de la ville est très préoccupante. Les nouvelles constructions non réglementées et les restaurations ou reconstructions inadéquates mènent progressivement à la perte de l'authenticité du bien et menacent par conséquent la valeur universelle exceptionnelle qu'il possède.

Bien que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS aient apporté leur soutien à des plans de reconstruction pour Sana'a pour ce quartier détruit sur cette photo, à travers des préconisations techniques pour la restauration et la reconstruction, les besoins de solution rapide pour des abris, dans une situation de conflit, et le manque de gouvernance ne permettent pas l'utilisation des techniques et matériaux de construction adéquats aujourd'hui. En outre, dans certains cas, la faible gouvernance laisse libre cours à des reconstructions abusives comme illustrées.

Compte tenu des conditions de sécurité et de la difficulté d'organiser une mission conjointe de suivi réactif, le projet de l'UNESCO pour la conservation du patrimoine et la création d'emploi chez les jeunes financé par l'Union européenne devrait, nous l'espérons, permettre de faire des progrès en matière de protection, de restauration, de formation et de conjuguer conservation d'une part et progrès économique durable de l'autre.

Le projet de décision vous est soumis à la page 59 en anglais et 64 en français. L'ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole, madame la présidente. »

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The Old City of Sana’a continues to suffer from the impact of continuing armed conflict and political and social economic disturbances, the effect of which are exacerbated by minimal organisational support and lack of resources. The situation within the property for both residents and historic buildings remains dire.

The General Authority for the Preservation of Historic Cities in Yemen has undertaken an important inventory of work, but much-needed emergency interventions have not been possible. The World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM have supported reconstruction plans to sustain shelters for inhabitants and provide the technical guidelines that reconcile the provisions of basic shelters and services with a need to restoring and reconstructing damaged buildings based on surveys and documentation using traditional construction techniques and materials.

While the imperative of providing shelters and accommodation for those who have lost their homes is acknowledged, unregulated new constructions and inadequate restorations threaten incremental impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Joint Reactive Monitoring missions undertaken in response to the open invitation of the State Party are highly desirable as soon as the security situation allows.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or clarifications? I see none. Rapporteur, are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have not received any amendments to the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.38 adopted as agreed.

I now invite Ms. Nada Al-Hassan to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Arab States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ces biens dans les états arabes sont : Abou Mena en Égypte, Assour (Qal'at Sherqat) en Irak, la ville archéologique de Samarra en Irak, le site archéologique de Cyrène en Libye, le site archéologique de Leptis Magna en Libye, l'ancienne ville de Ghadamès en Libye, les sites rupestres de Tadrart Acacus en Libye, le lieu de naissance de Jésus : l'église de la nativité et la route de pèlerinage, Bethléem en Palestine, Palestine terre des oliviers et des vignes paysage culturel du sud de Jérusalem – Battir (Palestine), ancienne ville de Bosra, République arabe de Syrie, ancienne ville de Damas, République arabe de Syrie, Le Crac des chevaliers et Qal'at Salah El-Din, République arabe de Syrie, Le Site de Palmyre, République arabe de Syrie, la ville historique de Zabid au Yémen et l'ancienne ville de Shibam et son mur d'enceinte au Yémen.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections from the Committee on this list of state of conservation? I see none. I declare the decision read out adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any Observer delegations would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without discussion. Have you got any comments? There does not seem to be any.

For our first site in the Asia-Pacific; I would like to give the floor to the delegation of China to indicate to us the reasons why it wished to open the report on the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) for discussion. You have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Before we start examining the items on the current list related to the state of conservation report of the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, China would like to suggest inviting the delegation of Indonesia to provide more information on item 7A.40, the Tropical Rainforest of Sumatra in Indonesia, based on two main reasons.

First, the concerned State Party only received the full report drafted by IUCN when this Advisory Body accomplished its Reactive Monitoring mission to the site in April of 2018. There is a need to update on follow-up efforts that the party is about to take after the mission.

Second, prior to follow-up on the much-appreciated recommendations, the State Party also feels obliged to make a statement and an oral response to the report, as well as to the draft decision. We are of the opinion that the best forum to do this is in this current session. Therefore, China would greatly appreciate it if the Committee would allow the State Party, Indonesia, to take the floor and make a brief statement in response to the IUCN report.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections before I give the floor to Brazil?”

Brazil:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We would just like to second the proposal made by China so that we can hear the delegate for the clarification presented by Indonesia. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson, for giving me the floor and allowing me to update you and the members of the Committee on the progress of Indonesia’s efforts to restore the condition of the Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra. At the onset, I would like to convey Indonesia’s appreciation to IUCN on the positive outcome of the Reactive Monitoring mission organised in April of 2018.

First, for the past eight years we have rehabilitated and restored more than 7,000 ha of areas in the tropical rainforest heritage of Sumatra. We have committed ourselves to continue with this rehabilitation.

Second, to prevent forest loss and forest encroachment, for some years we have developed and strengthened community participations and restorations of the sites with new paradigms and new methods such as placing the local community as subjects in the conservation effort, promoting local culture and employing scientifically-based decision support systems.

We also improved site management through target-oriented performance. For example, our designated target is to restore 8,888 hectares of degraded areas in Gunung Leuser and develop community-based tourism in Bukit Barisan National Park.

Third, the government of Indonesia is committed not to grant permits with regard to exploration of energy within the property.

Fourthly, both local and central government have worked together to prioritise the prevention of further deforestation and forest degradation in the Park of the entire Leuser ecosystem.

Fifth, with respect to two road upgrade projects in the property, Indonesia remains committed not to allow any negative impact to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Our national law has regulated the institutions of Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure that the sustainable development goals are indicated in the plan.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Mr. Guy Debonnet, Chief of the Nature, Sustainable Tourism and Outreach Unit of the World Heritage Centre, and IUCN to respond to this comment. You have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, madam Chair. IUCN would also like to thank the State Party for the gracious hosting of the mission, which was indeed very successful, and we have taken note of the additional comments just provided and are pleased to note the various commitments that Indonesia has taken as a State Party for the protection of the World Heritage property.

I did not pick up on any specific concerns with the draft decision which is before the Committee. I would therefore just like to say that IUCN is also committed to continuing to support the State Party in addressing the concerns raised in terms of the conservation of this serial World Heritage site in Sumatra.

Thank you, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.40 concerning this property. There are no comments, I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.40 adopted.

I invite Mr. Guy Debonnet to present the next report. You have the floor, please.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The next site is East Renell in the Solomon Islands. The 7A.Add report can be found in your working document, on page 17 of the English and 18 of the French version. Regrettably, the State Party did not submit any report on the state of conservation of this property as requested by the Committee at its 41st session. In the absence of the report, the current situation at the property can unfortunately not be evaluated.

On the 3rd of May, 2018, the World Heritage Centre received a letter from an indigenous group noting that in its recent council meeting, the group decided to withdraw all its customary land from the property in East Renell. This raises serious concerns on the practical modalities of customary ownership management and decision-making.

The property remains one of the few to be inscribed on the World Heritage List with a traditional customary governance system and ensuring that the rights of customary land owners and land users are fully respected is therefore crucial for securing the long-term conservation of the property's Outstanding Universal Value.

On May 16th the Centre asked the State Party to request further information on this issue. On June 19th, just before the Committee, a meeting was organised with the Ambassador of the Solomon Islands in Paris. The Ambassador noted the limited possibility of the government to address this issue, as traditional land owners have the legal right to decide on the use of their traditional land. He also noted that the State Party is welcoming any help or support from UNESCO or IUCN to address this issue.

It is therefore recommended that the Committee request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to this property. Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.41 is available in the document on page 19 in the English and French versions.

IUCN has some comments on this property.”

The Chairperson:

“Please, go ahead.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Whilst some progress has been achieved by the State Party in the recent years in addressing a number of threats facing the property, overall the progress has been slow, facing challenges with regard to the engagement of all relevant actors and stakeholders.

In view of the serious concerns raised by the letter sent to the World Heritage Centre by the Tuhunui tribe of East Renell, IUCN considers that the joint World Heritage Centre's IUCN mission is urgently required in order to facilitate a dialogue between different stakeholders with a view to addressing the concerns expressed by the customary land owners and at the same time identifying a way forward for achieving the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in danger.

The mission would also provide an update on the current state of conservation of the property, which is of the utmost importance given the absence of a report from the State Party and given the lack of updated information on the issues that justified the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, namely invasive species and logging on West Renell.

IUCN also notes that the Committee has called upon the international community to support the State Party in finding solutions for supporting the development of sustainable livelihoods for the local community and to help address some of the most present threats, such as invasive species.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Australia notes the situation in East Renell with serious concern. We would like to point out that the inscription of this property was a milestone for this Convention. It was the first natural site with a traditional governance system.

The property is extremely remote. However, this remoteness did not prevent the property from being subjected to external problems beyond the customary owners’ control since the inscription. In particular, the rise in the level of the Lake Tegano, due to rising sea levels, and the increased salinity. Both of these factors have reduced the area available to grow food with consequential threats to the livelihood of customary owners. The invasion of rats from West Renell has also had a negative impact on the biodiversity values of the property.

Unfortunately, despite some international assistance, the customary land managers have been unable the support they need to manage the property in a manner that is sustainable for their community or the property. They have not had the capacity to finalise a management plan. As pointed out in the draft decision, there are opposing views within the indigenous community about the desirability of the property remaining on the List.

Australia supports the draft decision, thus the priority of the proposed Reactive Monitoring mission must be to attempt to understand the wishes and needs of the customary land owners of East Renell given the crucial importance of respecting their rights for the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I see none. Rapporteur, are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We have not received any amendments to the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.41 adopted.

Now item 7A: the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger and located in the Europe and North America region, the Everglades National Park (United States of America), is not proposed for discussion. Are there any objections? If there is no objection, I declare Decision 42 COM 7A.42 adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any observer delegations would like to express themselves about the property for which we have adopted the decision without discussion. No comment. Thank you very much.

We move on to natural properties in Latin America and the Caribbean. I invite Mr. Guy Debonnet to present the reports on the state of conservation of the natural properties located in the Latin America and the Caribbean Region and opened for discussion.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The next property is the Barrier Reef System in Belize. The report can be found in working document 7A.Add on page 67 in the English version and 70 in that French. The state of conservation report was received on the 29th of March and additional information received on the 15th of April and the 15th of May. Just before the Committee started on the 26th of June, the State Party sent an update of the report which was uploaded on the website, which confirmed the adoption of the mangrove regulations.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the important progress made by the government of Belize towards the implementation of the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

A legal moratorium on oil exploration and petroleum operations in the entire maritime zone of Belize was enacted in December of 2017. The revised legislation for the protection of the mangroves was adopted by the Cabinet on the 15th of May. It includes stricter controls for priority mangroves and permits for mangrove alteration throughout the property. The legislation entered into force on the 23rd of June.

A scientific assessment has confirmed that the current mangrove coverage of the property is at 95 per cent in comparison to the date of the inscription of this property on the list in 1996. Virtually no clearing has occurred since the inscription of the site on the List in Danger in 2009. The Environmental Impact Assessment Checklists has been amended to include consideration of potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Furthermore, a visionary, integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan was adopted in 2016 and is operational today. The voluntary moratorium on sales and leases of public land within the property continues to be upheld. An agreement has been reached between the Ministry of Natural Resources and that of Fisheries, Forestry and the Environment for the completion of a land tenure study and the subsequent declaration of all remaining public lands as strict reserves throughout the property. The completion of this task is scheduled for later this year.

Overall, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN welcome the important progress which has been made by the State Party in implementing the corrective measures. They concluded that the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger has been achieved. It is therefore recommended that the Committee removes the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.43 is available in your working document 7A on page 64 in English and page 65 in French.

Madam Chair, IUCN has also some reactions on this property.”

The Chairperson:

“Please, go ahead.”

IUCN:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Over the last years, the State Party has made significant progress towards achieving the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property

from the List of World Heritage in Danger. This effort culminated in a number of significant achievements finalised at the last Committee session.

This includes significant regulatory actions. Firstly, the enactment in December of 2017 of the Petroleum Operations Act which established a moratorium on all the activities on the entire maritime zone of Belize and secondly the adoption of the revised Forests (protection of mangrove) Regulations. The latter, together with the revision of the Environmental Impact Assessment Checklists and the regulations represent significant progress towards establishing a framework for protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and particularly its sensitive mangrove areas from potentially harmful development.

With these achievements, IUCN considers that the indicators of the desired state of conservation have been met. However, IUCN notes that the completion of the land tenure verification within the property, a declaration of remaining public land as reserves is not fully resolved. The State Party nevertheless expressed its strong commitment to completing this process in 2018 and presented the methodology and procedure agreed by the relevant ministries.

Taking this into account, IUCN's overall assessment is that the desired state of conservation has been achieved and we therefore recommend that the Committee removes the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, ongoing efforts will be required in the future to ensure sufficient resources are available for the implementation of the strengthened legal protection framework in order to prevent the re-emergence of the threats that led the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I remind you that we have only 15 minutes because we will not have the interpreters after 6:00 pm. There is a long list of speakers and I do not know how we can manage in 15 minutes. Please take the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Saint Kitts and Nevis acknowledges the questions and concerns regarding the Belize Barrier Reef and its removal from the List of sites in Danger. However, it is noteworthy to state that Belize has met all the targets of the desired state of conservation including the passage of legislation as was just indicated on the protection of mangrove regulations. This was passed on 15th of June, 2018 and came into effect on the 23rd of June, 2018.

The new mangrove regulations place greater emphasise on the management and conservation of mangroves in critical areas of the mainland and in the case at hand for special protection for those within the World Heritage property. The new regulations safeguard the intrinsic ecological values and functions of mangroves in Belize through a strengthened framework for permit management, monitoring, fines and penalties geared towards deterring illegal mangrove alteration.

We compliment the commitment and the Herculean effort of Belize in addressing the issues impacting the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. Belize has protected 21 per cent of its territorial waters, instituted a legislated total ban on offshore oil drilling and has approved a comprehensive Coastal Zone Management Plan, addressing all development and sectorial activities within its territorial waters. Therefore, Saint Kitts and Nevis support the removal of the Belize Barrier Reef System from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Hungary welcomes and fully supports the removal of the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System from the World Heritage List in Danger. We congratulate the State Party for achieving the desired state of conservation for removal through the proper application of legal tools and procedures, including the Environmental Impact Assessment as well as protective measures integrated into the Coastal Zone Management Plan and the regulations of the mangrove forest. The Property was inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger in 2009.

Hungary recommends that this almost ten-year process be used as an example and good practice for States Parties having World Heritage sites on the List in Danger. The narrative surrounding World Heritage List in Danger seems to be overly negative. This example shows that the inclusion of a property on it can lead to increased awareness and mobilisation towards safeguarding and conservation.

Again, we commend Belize for its strong and active engagement towards the implementation of the World Heritage Convention as well as the implementation of the Committee’s decisions.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you, madam Chair. First, we find it very interesting to comment on this experience. The conservation of this site has been a priority for the Committee. Considering that we are speaking about this site in the Caribbean in danger List we are very satisfied to be able to propose the removal of this site from the In danger List and to recognise the efforts made by the State Party to protect marine sites and their significance, not only for the region but also for the World Heritage.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Australia also commends Belize for the actions taken by the government and civil society to reach the desired state of conservation for the removal of

this property, the second-largest barrier reef system in the world, from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Globally, coral reefs are under great challenge from climate change and it is increasingly important that other anthropogenic threats are addressed, as has been done in the case of this property.

Australia fully supports the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Tanzania notes with satisfaction the major effort undertaken by the State Party to improve the state of conservation of the Belize Barrier Reef System. We commend the State Party for an excellent demonstration of the implementation of the desired state of conservation for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

It is clear to us that this effort has led to an improved management of the property to an extent that it cannot remain on the in Danger List. We therefore congratulate the State Party of Belize for this well-earned effort and we encourage the State Party to maintain and further improve the momentum of conservation activities.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Brazil wishes to commend the government of Belize for its outstanding effort for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the second-largest World Heritage Barrier Reef and the largest barrier reef in the northern hemisphere.

Brazil would also like to commend the government of Belize for its model role in cooperation with NGOs and civil society such as the Belize Society for the management or the information system of protected areas which is an innovative model that should be looked at by other, less-developed countries.

Brazil heartily supports the removal of the property from the List of property in Danger. Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We congratulate Belize; it is an achievement, an example for inspiration for other States Parties. We commend Belize in their efforts to protect one of

the world's largest Coral Reef that has importance far beyond its borders. We support the removal from the List in Danger.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Bosnia.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Comme les autres collègues, nous voudrions aussi féliciter l'État partie. C'est un très bel exemple qu'en travaillant bien et en synergie avec la société civile on peut obtenir de très bons résultats en matière de protection. Nous aussi, comme les autres collègues, soutenons la proposition de retrait de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Madam Chair. We also second the draft decision and seek to adopt it as it stands.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia”.

Tunisie :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Je suis très heureux au nom de la Tunisie de féliciter l'État partie de tous les efforts consentis. Cela nous rassure par rapport à l'ensemble des discussions que nous avons eu depuis hier et ce matin, que le système que nous protégeons et portons est un système vertueux qui peut produire des résultats probants.

Merci, non seulement pour la qualité qui a mené à ce résultat, mais également cela nous rassure que nos démarches ne restent pas veines, donc c'est tout à fait avec beaucoup de joie que la Tunisie soutient la décision et le projet de décision de retrait de ce site de la Liste en danger. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. Just shortly to congratulate the State Party of Belize for all its effort and the progress made in achieving the desired state of conservation. We would also like to congratulate them for their great cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and taking on board their recommendations to this regard. We strongly support the removal of the site from the List in Danger and in this regard strongly support the proposed draft decision.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. Indonesia would like to join the other delegations in congratulating Belize for its outstanding efforts. It certainly motivates Indonesia to equally show the same commitment to follow the success of Belize in the coming years.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.43 adopted. Congratulations to the State Party of Belize for this achievement.

Now, I give the floor to the Deputy Prime Minister of Belize. Please Sir.”

Belize:

“Thank you, madam Chair. I am really grateful for all the support and I want to begin by thanking all of those who spoke on our behalf just now. I must confess from the start madam Chair that it is almost an unkind thing to do, to just allow us, and especially me, a politician, three minutes to speak, to celebrate a milestone achievement. There is so much to say in such short time.

Notwithstanding madam Chair, it is with great pleasure that I speak before for you, as our delegation represents our beautiful Belize at this 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee, marking this occasion that concludes the journey to remove Belize’s Barrier Reef System from the UNESCO World Heritage List of sites in Danger. I bring you warm greetings from our Prime Minister, the Honourable Dean Barrow, and my Cabinet colleagues, one of whom is present here with me, the honourable Dr Omar Figueroa, but also on behalf of the wider government and people of Belize.

In Belize we have long realised that one of our best assets is natural resources. It is the cornerstone of our national economy and forms the rock upon which our culture and identity as a people is centred. Inscription of the Belize Barrie Reef System as a World Heritage site in 1996 is a crown on top of treasures, valuable to us and significant to the world.

The prestigious designation confirmed the state of the site and pronounced the level of excellent stewardship by the people of Belize. In 2009, the listing of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger marked a shift in the economic activities and the use of the

resources which led to the questioning of the compliance with the desired state. Addressing the challenge took us some time, but we are pleased to say that we have met and surpassed the requirements and can lead the way in several regards.

For example, we have gone beyond the key target of the desired state of conservation; we currently meet the achieved target of 21 per cent of our territorial waters under protection and 36 per cent of all terrestrial areas are under protection.

We have instituted and legislated a total ban on offshore oil exploration and have passed and implemented a comprehensive coastal zone management plan. We celebrate the fact that Belize's overall mangrove cover in the site has been maintained at 96 per cent over the last 36 years.

We furthered strengthen our position by now ensuring the further protection and management of mangroves, nationally revised mangrove regulation, and we are finalising the work to create mangrove reserves for the remaining mangrove stands within national land in the site and have a draft revised Environmental Impact Assessment framework and legislation to ensure that development nationally is well-regulated and takes into consideration the importance of our natural assets.

I am also privileged to say that we have committed to pass modernised and robust fisheries bills to support Belize's leadership in sustainable small-scale fisheries. Our government also recognised the need to address the global issues of plastic and Styrofoam and has passed legislation to have a complete ban on the use of Styrofoam and the single use plastic by April of 2019.

Madam Chair, as small and vulnerable and developing a country as we are, we have gone beyond most global targets set. I would like to take this opportunity to also highlight the threats, challenges you feel that Belize currently faces in its effort to maintain the value of our natural resources. While we have made great strides to address those that are local, Belize's natural resources, both terrestrial and marine, are constantly being pillaged by incursions from our neighbouring countries. We call on the support of the international community and partners to assist us when possible in our effort.

Allow me to conclude madam Chair, by stating how pleased I am to be a part of a government which gets it, which recognised the role it needed to play, even when the challenges were down and the protection necessary when this site competed with national economic plans. A government which understood for it to work, we all had to be singing from the same song sheet and working to align policies from various ministries. A government, madam Chair, which entered into fruitful dialogue with the stakeholders to move ahead with correctional action to benefit the site and the country's long-term economic stability.

We fully recognise, madam Chair, that success has come as a result of the integrated and collaborative action of all the key stakeholders. Each stakeholder entity played its specific role well in order to get us to this point today.

Finally, madam Chair, we celebrate the fact that some on the List in Danger are enabled to make a difference as those countries that are in that position should act upon. The wider majority of these countries can one day too be lifted off it.

I thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to Guatemala."

Guatemala

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you, madam Chair. The Government of Guatemala would like this intervention to be recorded in the minutes of the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee.

Bearing in mind the ultimate objective of the Convention for the Protection of the World Heritage, whatever improvement in the implementation of corrective measures in a property on the Danger List is positive news for this Committee.

The Government of Guatemala certainly highlights the Outstanding Universal Value of the set of ecosystems comprising the coral barrier reef system; and yet, it deems necessary to inform the distinguished members of this Committee that Guatemala has a territorial, insular and maritime dispute with Belize concerning the sovereignty over and access to those spaces.

Guatemala considers that no effort should be spared to preserve the diverse forms of life hosted in this jewel of nature and in that sense, we commend the conservationist spirit that inspires the protection of this valuable and unique natural treasure.

The dispute goes back to the 18th century and was consolidated by the violation of the Aycinena-Wyke Treaty of 30 April 1859, between Guatemala and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

Throughout the time elapsed since its origin, Guatemala has maintained its claim and pointed out the illegality of the occupation of this territory. Throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, multiple attempts were made through direct or third-parties negotiations, to find a solution to the dispute, although none of them succeeded.

The United Kingdom unilaterally granted independence to Belize in 1981, without having solved the pending claim raised by Guatemala. Many efforts have been made to try to reach a solution. In 1991, the Government of Guatemala recognised the Government of Belize and established diplomatic relations, without renouncing its territorial claims in this area.

On 32 July 1992, Guatemala and Belize issued a Joint Declaration in which both States recognised that their boundaries and marine territories are not clearly defined. In 1994, Guatemala presented to the General Secretariat of the United Nations a statement on the official position of the country.

Further attempts were made in 2000, 2003, 2005 and finally, on 8 December 2008, the governments of Guatemala and Belize signed a Special Agreement submitting the territorial, insular and maritime claim of Guatemala before the International Court of Justice.

In the case of Guatemala, a public consultation took place on 15 April 2018 resulting in 95.88% favorable votes. For its part, the Government of Belize has reported that it will hold its corresponding public consultation on 10 April 2019.

In this context, the existence of the dispute is evident, as well as the efforts made by the governments of both states to find a solution to their differences, including the insular and maritime component.

As the spirit that inspires the World Heritage Convention is the protection and preservation of World Heritage sites and not political debate concerning sovereignty, and given that Guatemala and Belize openly and explicitly recognize the existence of the territorial, insular and maritime dispute between both countries, we considered in the past that it was unnecessary to express ourselves on the site

Thank you very much, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The last business for today is the announcement and we reconvene at 10:00 am and the Bureau at 9:30 am.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. A few announcements: the drafting group that was established this afternoon will meet from 6:10 pm to 7:00 pm in the Bureau meeting room which is the Rifa Room. Tomorrow the Bureau is from 9:30 am in the same room.

We have a number of events tonight. At 6:30 pm we have an event organised by Switzerland, the Davos Declaration, I cannot see it on the screen, that will take place in the main lobby. An event organised by WWF and United Nations Principles of Sustainable Insurance organised in Muharraq Room: Momentum from multinationals, why major businesses are acting to respect the value of World Heritage sites. Then World Heritage, Culture and Achieving the Ambitions of the Paris Agreement, a climate change meeting organised by ICOMOS in the Manama Room in the Advisory Bodies’ space.

Finally, an event outside of the venue of this session. The shared Heritage 20th-century building environment in the Gulf organised by Kuwait. This event will take place outside, so transport will be provided from this venue, departing at 7:00 pm in front of the building.

I also remind you about the very worthy cause being promoted tomorrow, A night for Virunga, which is to support Park Rangers. We have a lot of interest in this cause and what it is about. The fallen Rangers Funds support the widows of the rangers who lost their lives doing their job. Not only does it provide a financial safety net, but through initiatives such as the recent establishment of a sewing training centre it seeks to empower these women and give them the means to warrant sustainable livelihoods. Again, make a donation and get your pass for the event tomorrow night. Transport will be provided from the venue.

Thank you and have a nice evening.”

THIRD DAY – Wednesday 27 June 2018

FIFTH SESSION

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We have two points of order today. That first we discussed this morning at the Bureau; the time limit was raised to four minutes for Committee members.

The second thing is that some of the delegations were holding meetings in this room and doing this showing their backs. As we are one of the United Nations families and according to tradition, no one can turn their back to the podium. This is something I will not allow; nobody shows us their back during the session. If anyone does that, I will stop the session and they will have to leave and do it outside.

Before we start our agenda we have a young girl from Belize, she is 12 and will talk about yesterday’s decision.”

Young Belizean girl:

“Thank you, madam Chair. I am a 12 year Belizean. I am here before you now not only as the future but part of a proud nation entrusted with safeguarding Belize’s Barrier Reef System. The people of my country have shown great passion in defending our livelihoods against threats to our World Heritage site. I thank the government of Belize for listening to us and taking the necessary steps towards stopping our site’s removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

I dream of a Belize where we redefine our culture through education to include a deeper connection to nature and its value; a brave Belize, inspiring change all over the World. We may be a small nation, but me being here today proves that it is the size of our courage and commitments that matters.

I would like to respectfully encourage representatives of each country present to think of my generation in decision-making regarding our World Heritage sites. Our Barrier Reef and our planet depend on it.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I have noticed that there are still people that stand with their back to us during this session. I will be obliged to send them out of the meeting if there is anybody seating like that. Really, this is not in the custom of our United Nations organisation. If you need me to speak in any other languages, I can also tell it in any other languages. Please, do not show us your back when you seat. Thank you very much.

I invite now Mr. Guy Debonnet to present the report on the state of conservation of natural properties located in the Africa region and opened for discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr Guy Debonnet:

“First, we have to have the report that was not open for discussion on the Latin America Region. There was one report that was not open for discussion, which is the Rio Platano Biosphere Reserve in Honduras.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We adopt the decision. Adopted. Please, Mr Debonnet.”

Mr Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you. The first site is the Manovo-Gounda St Floris National Park in the Central African Republic. The report can be found in your working document 7A.Add on page 71 of the English version and page 74 of the French version.

The situation of this property which has been on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 1997 remains critical. A census done in 2017 again confirmed the continuing erosion of the wildlife populations. Elephants, which were estimated at around 5000 at the time of inscription, have now completely disappeared. All other populations of large mammals show further decline compared to the previous inventories in 2005 and 2010. During the census, numerous illegal activities were also documented, including the presence of illegal poacher camps and artisan mining sites. Nevertheless, the census also confirmed that the habitat of the Park is still largely intact. It is therefore considered that if illegal activities could be curbed, remaining wildlife populations could probably still rebound, although some species would have to be brought back through translocation.

While the security situation remains problematic, it has improved slightly over the last year, allowing some conservation activities through the European Union-funded Eco-Fauna project to restart in the region. The State Party in its report also notes that the management agreement between the government and the conservation NGO Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) is currently being negotiated, giving the management responsibility of the site to WCS for an extended period of time.

If the security situation remains stable, this could be a unique window of opportunity to prevent the loss of the Outstanding Universal Value and to start an ambitious rehabilitation programme for the property. It is therefore a priority that the Reactive Monitoring mission is organised as soon as possible.

The draft decision also raises concerns about the planned rehabilitation of a road crossing the property to be funded by the World Bank and the French Development Agency (AFD). Opening of this road would improve accessibility to the site and could further aggravate the threat. In addition to formal exchanges with the State Party, which are mentioned in the report, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have been in contact with the World Bank and AFD who have agreed to involve the Centre and IUCN in the preparation of the terms of reference of the Environmental Impact Assessment and who have also ensured us that the Environmental Impact Assessment will investigate other possible alignments of the road.

Giving the critical situation of this property, it is recommended that the Committee maintains the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and continues to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.45 can be found in your working document on page 73 in the English and on page 76 in the French version and IUCN also has some comments on this report.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN please.”

UICN :

« Merci madame la présidente. L'état de conservation du parc national de Manovo-Gounda St Floris demeure une forte préoccupation pour l'UICN. En effet, les populations de grands mammifères du bien continuent de diminuer de manière drastique mettant en cause la valeur universelle exceptionnelle déjà fortement dégradée. Les activités illégales persistent encore sur le bien et risquent de s'aggraver si le tracé actuel du projet de réhabilitation de la route numéro 8 à travers le parc est réalisé.

Madame la présidente, même si la situation du bien reste inquiétante il y a un espoir d'améliorer progressivement sa gestion à travers la mise en place d'un partenariat entre WSC et l'État partie. Le fait que l'inventaire 2017 ait conclu que les habitants du bien restent largement intacts est encourageant. Il est donc important que la mission réactive du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN se rende urgemment sur le bien comme demandé par le Comité depuis plusieurs années afin de déterminer s'il est encore possible de restaurer sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Je vous remercie madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to know whether there are any comments or enquiries. I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.45 concerning this property; but before doing so I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments on the Draft Decision?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair. I wish good morning to all my colleagues. We did not receive any amendments to this Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson

“I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.45 adopted. Mr. Debonnet, you have the floor to continue his report with the next property. Thank you.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you very madam Chairperson. The next property is Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve, a transboundary site between Cote d'Ivoire and Guinea. The report can be found in your working document 7A.Add in page 74 in English and 77 in French.

The State Party of Cote d'Ivoire notes in its report that it has been able to obtain project funding to support the management activities inside the property for the next five

years. Unfortunately, the report of the State Party of Guinea includes little information on the current situation of the property and seems to refer mostly to outdated information.

The World Heritage Centre and IUCN were also contacted by a mining Company, Société de Fer de Guinée, which holds the mining concession situated in the mining enclave of the property. The Company informed us that with the rising price of iron ore, the mining project could be revised soon and that the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project in 2019 cannot be finalised.

Given the geographical situation of this project, located in an enclave surrounded by the property, it will be of utmost importance for the Environmental Impact Assessment to carefully review the potential impact of this property on the Outstanding Universal Value. In addition, it is important to note that at least one of the mining concessions is located just outside the property, hence the importance of reviewing the cumulative impacts of these different projects through a Strategic Environmental Assessment.

It is therefore timely that the Draft Decision proposes that the World Heritage Centre, IUCN's joint Reactive Monitoring mission is organised to this property which will allow review of the current state of the mining project. It is also recommended that the committee maintains the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.46 can be found in the working document 7A.Add on page 77 of the English and 80 of the French version and IUCN has also further comments on this property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN please.”

IUCN :

« Merci madame la présidente. Les avancées réalisées par l'État partie de la Côte d'Ivoire dans la gestion du bien sont accueillies favorablement. Il est par ailleurs d'une importance cruciale que les deux États parties développent une gestion transfrontalière harmonisant le suivi écologique et mettent en place des opérations conjointes de surveillance.

Cette démarche transfrontalière serait facilitée par la mise en œuvre conjointe d'un projet sur la préservation de l'intégrité du bien. Madame la présidente, l'IUCN et le Centre du patrimoine mondial ont reçu des informations concernant un projet d'aménagement de route en vue de faciliter le transport entre les deux États parties. Ce projet comprendrait le bitumage de la route de Lola, en Guinée, à Danané, en Côte d'Ivoire, qui passe par le mont Nimba. Aucune information sur ce projet n'a été fournie par les États parties.

Toutefois, le résumé de l'étude d'impact environnementale et sociale datant d'août 2014 est disponible sur le site Internet de la Banque africaine de développement. Celui-ci reconnaît simplement que ce projet aurait des impacts négatifs indirects sans pour autant reconnaître qu'il s'agit d'un bien du patrimoine mondial. Par conséquent, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien déjà menacée risquerait de subir davantage de pressions du braconnage et de la coupe illégale de bois, si ce projet de bitumage de la route Lola-Danané était réalisé.

Il est donc recommandé que le Comité demande aux États parties de soumettre au Centre du patrimoine mondial une étude d'impact environnemental et social complète évaluant clairement les impacts potentiels du dit projet sur la valeur universelle

exceptionnelle du bien conformément à la note de conseil de l'UICN sur le patrimoine mondial et l'évaluation environnementale.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci beaucoup. Are there any comments or questions or queries about this item? I see none. Therefore, I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.46 adopted.

The floor is back to Mr. Debonnet to present the next property. Thank you.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“We now start the discussion of properties in the Democratic Republic of Congo, starting with the Garamba National Park. The report can be found in the working document 7A on page 68 of the English version and 69 of the French version.

Management and surveillance of this property have continued to improve. Patrols are now covering the entire property as well as 40 per cent of the adjacent hunting area. Despite this, the number of elephants killed by poachers remains high, with 50 documented cases of elephant poaching in 2017. The elephant population is now at an all time low and the April 2017 census estimated the current population at 1191 animals, down from 100,00 before the conflict in the Democratic Republic of Congo started in 1994.

Instability in the neighbouring countries linked to the conflict in South Sudan and the Central African Republic continues to be a permanent threat to the security of the property. The influx of refugees into the region is also putting additional pressure on the property. Two refugee camps have been established just 15 kilometres away and should accommodate up to 20,000 people.

However, we just got information from the Management authority, ICCN, that following a letter sent on this issue by UNESCO to UNHCR and following a recent visit of the High Commissioner for refugees to the region, discussions are now ongoing about relocating this camp to an alternative location 35 kilometres away from the property.

In view of the continuing threats posed by the insecurity in the region and poaching, it is recommended that the Committee maintains this property on the List of World Heritage in danger and continues to apply the Reactive Monitoring mission. Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.47 can be found in the working document 7A on page 70 of the English and 71 of the French version. IUCN has also further comments on this site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments?”

UICN :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme noté par mon collègue du Centre du patrimoine mondial, la situation de l'éléphant reste extrêmement préoccupante, il en est de même pour la girafe du Kordofan dont les 49 individus recensés dans le bien constituent

l'unique population en République démocratique du Congo. Il est encourageant qu'aucun cas de braconnage de girafes n'ait été documenté en 2017.

Les efforts consentis par l'État partie pour la conservation de ces espèces, y compris la pause de collier télémétrique, sont précieux pour indiquer la tendance de la baisse de ces populations et pour éviter que ces espèces suivent le sort du rhinocéros blanc du nord pour qui le bien était le dernier refuge, mais qui est désormais malheureusement éteint à l'état sauvage.

Madame la présidente, du fait des pressions importantes auxquelles fait face le bien, il est recommandé que le Comité réitère sa demande à l'État partie de soumettre sa version finalisée de l'état de conservation souhaité en vue de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions, clarifications? There are none. Does the Rapporteur have any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you, madam Chair. We did not receive any amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“If that is the case, I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.47 adopted. Mr. Debonnet, the floor is back to you to present the next report. Please.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The next site is the Salonga National Park, also in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and the document can be found in the working document 7A.Add on page 78 of the English and 81 of the French version.

The improvement of the security situation in the region of the property has made it possible to strengthen surveillance activities in this vast property of 360,000 km². The area covered by surveillance reached has now 56 per cent. A management plan has been developed and approved. There is now significant investment improving the management of the property, with important financial assistance provided by Germany, the European Union and the USA. If these efforts can be sustained, it should be possible to fully recover, over time, the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The preliminary results of the biological inventories of the northern block of the property are also encouraging. The Bonobo population in this block was estimated at 8746 animals, but unfortunately only 767 elephants were found. It is clear that the elephant population has been greatly reduced following years of heavy poaching. Two important challenges remain: securing the biological corridor in order to maintain the connectivity between the two forest blocks of the property and finding a sustainable solution for the communities living inside the property.

Unfortunately, the property also remains threatened by oil exploration, with the attribution by the President of the Republic on the 1st of February 2018, of three new petroleum exploration concessions which are overlapping with the property. The World

Heritage Centre was also informed in May of a proposal made by the Minister of *Hydrocarbures* to the government for the degazettement of one or several zones of this property, or also of Virunga National Park, to allow for petroleum exploration to be carried out. However, at this stage no decision has been taken by the government.

The UNESCO Director General addressed a letter on the 7th of June, 2018, to the President of the DRC to express her concerns regarding the attribution of exploration, concessions overlapping with the property and to recall the position of the Committee on the incompatibility of oil exploration or exploitation activities and the World Heritage status.

In view of this situation, it is recommended that the Committee maintains the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and continues supply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism and it is also recommended to request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to this property.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.50 can be found on page 80 in English and page 83 in the French version. IUCN has also a comment on this property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN :

« Merci madame la présidente. L’UICN note sa vive préoccupation quant à l’octroi de trois concessions d’exploration pétrolières chevauchant le bien. D’autres blocs pourraient également être attribués si bien que la totalité du bien serait couverte par les concessions pétrolières. Il faut noter que toutes activités d’exploration ou d’exploitation pétrolière dans le bien et sa périphérie pourraient compromettre les progrès accomplis par l’État partie pour sécuriser le bien et pourraient avoir des impacts négatifs irréversibles sur sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Il convient de rappeler la position du Comité que l’exploration et l’exploitation pétrolière sont incompatibles avec le statut de patrimoine mondial. Il est donc recommandé que le Comité prie instamment l’État partie d’annuler les permis déjà attribués et de ne pas en attribuer de nouveaux dans le bien et sa périphérie.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions? Rapporteur did you receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We did not receive any amendments for this site.”

The Chairperson:

“Therefore, I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.50 adopted. Mr. Debonnet, the floor is back to you to present the next report. Please.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you madam Chair. The next property is the Virunga National Park, also in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). The report can be found in document 7A.Add in page 82 in English and 85 in French.

A joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission also visited this property in April. The property continues to face serious security problems with several rebel groups in and around the property. This year has been extremely difficult for the Park’s rangers, as already mentioned in previous speeches. Several rebel groups have attacked different sectors of the property. Since the last session, 12 guards have been killed during these attacks. Also, in the most recent incident, in early May, two tourists were kidnapped. As a result, the Park authorities have been forced to suspend all tourism activities for the rest of this year. I also would like to recall that tonight there will be a charity event for the widows of the fallen guards from the Park. I hope many of you will join us at this event.

In spite of this, guards are deployed in all sectors of the Park with the exception of the extreme northern part, which is totally occupied by militias. Aerial surveillance is happening on a daily basis and is covering the entire property. Poaching remains a major concern with the elephant population now estimated at about 200-300. The hippos which had started to recover again have diminished to 1850 animals. However, the good news is that the recent mountain gorilla survey showed that the census across the whole Virunga National Park and massif covering DRC, Rwanda and Uganda estimated a total of 1004 gorillas, an increase compared to the last census. 300 of these gorillas live inside Virunga National Park.

As mentioned in the case of Salonga National Park, this property also remains under the threat of oil exploration. We have already mentioned the proposal made by the Minister of *Hydrocarbures* to degazette part of Virunga to allow for oil exploration. As mentioned, so far there has been no decision by the government on this issue. I also want to mention that on June 7th the State Party of Uganda submitted a copy of a Strategic Environmental Assessment carried out in 2013 for oil and gas activities in the Albertine rift in the Ugandan part of the Virunga area. However, IUCN has not yet been able to review this newly-submitted information.

Given the continued insecurity and the threats to the property, the Reactive Monitoring mission recommends that the property remains on the List in Danger and that the Committee continues to apply the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism. The mission also updated the Corrective Measures and the timetable in consultation with the State Party and these are included in the draft decision in front of you.

Draft Decision 7A.51 can be found in your working document on page 84 in English and 87 in French. IUCN also has further comment on this site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN :

« Merci madame la présidente. Malgré les efforts de l’État partie d’améliorer la surveillance du bien et les progrès accomplis, les menaces auxquelles fait face le bien restent graves. L’empiètement des terres agricoles bien que stable reste une préoccupation majeure. Avec l’impossibilité de fournir plus de données précises sur les terres envahies

pour des activités agricoles, il est clair que l'ampleur de l'empiètement porte atteinte à l'intégrité du bien.

Il est à espérer que l'effort de l'État partie pour la démarcation des limites et la relocalisation en dehors du parc des activités agricoles tout en proposant des moyens de subsistance alternatifs grâce aux activités de l'Alliance Virunga porte ses fruits.

Je vous remercie madame la présidente. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions? Brazil, please?”

Brazil:

“Thank you Chair. As you know, Brazil has held the position of the commanding Chief of the United Nations forces in Eastern Congo for quite sometime now. Therefore, we are only too aware of the stringent difficulties face by the Congolese government and Park Rangers for the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value in Virunga National Park.

Therefore, Brazil wishes to commend the Congolese authorities and also the Park officials for their outstanding efforts in order to safeguard the Park and its attributes. Brazil also wishes to extend its mourning for the death of Park rangers who are committed to helping the Congolese government in order for this not to happen ever again.

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. My delegation notes paragraph 7 of the draft decision: *‘Congratulates the State Party for the sustainable development activities established in the framework of the Alliance Virunga to improve the life of local communities and encourages it to continue this innovative model combining nature conservation and sustainable development’.*

Madam Chair, Tanzania recalls that in May of 2016, a rather vibrant presentation was given by Alliance Virunga during the African Regional Workshop on Heritage and Sustainable Development that took place in Arusha, Tanzania, which culminated in a Declaration. During that presentation, it became clear that this robust finance initiative was not only, as it was said, to foster conservation in Virunga but also to improve the living standard of local communities living in its vicinities. This included, among other things, providing them with the much needed electrical energy, which was expected to lessen their dependence on natural fuel.

In this context and with regard to the recent Reactive Monitoring mission that we are told was carried out in April 2018, my delegation is curious and would like to request the Advisory Bodies to explain in some depth the progress reached so far by Alliance Virunga in improving the lives of local communities.

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would like to commend the Advisory Bodies for this report and the State Party for the effort being made. Tanzania has taken the words out of my mouth. I would like to find out how the local communities are benefiting and how this programme involves the local community as core stakeholders within the forest.

At the moment, there are still problems with our local communities regarding logging and poaching, but it is not clear what programmes are in place to support local communities and for local communities to benefit. I would like clarification whether the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat have now subcontracted support to Alliance Virunga.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the representative of the NGOs.”

NGO - Goodall Institute Global:

“Chair, on behalf of the Goodall Institute Global I would like to congratulate you for your nomination as Chair and the Kingdom of Bahrain for holding this session. As an international wildlife organisation we want to express our support for the actions undertaken under the World Heritage Convention for the decisions and initiatives adopted by the Committee for the conservation of Virunga Park, another Congolese site, as well as to congratulate the Congolese authorities, especially ICCN.

Virunga remains at the heart of the World Heritage Convention and is among the 16 World Heritage sites over 21 we have researched to protect great apes. From all the Parks in Africa, Virunga is the only Park in the world to host three species of Great Apes: mountain gorillas, eastern lowland (Grauer’s) gorillas and chimpanzees, our closest living relative. Chimpanzees and humans share more than 98 per cent of their DNA and in biological terms, chimpanzees are more closely related to humans than they are to gorillas. They were 2 million at the beginning of the 18th century and today they number close to 350,000.

We invite the World Heritage communities to join us in the celebration of the first ever World Chimpanzee Day, the next 14th of July, in honour of the day Dr Jane Goodall first set foot in what is now Gombe National Park in Tanzania, in 1960. This is an initiative of a number of organisations, mainly primate sanctuaries in North America, in Africa and the Jane Goodall Institute Global.

Please take the time to reflect on the fate of our closest relatives and consider adoption or the reinforcement of measures. You can visit the site www.worldchimpanzeeday.org. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We had another NGO speaker but apparently, the speaker does not want to take the floor, so I give it to IUCN to reply.”

IUCN :

« Merci madame la présidente. L’UICN remercie d’abord l’ensemble des membres du Comité qui sont intervenus pour me poser des questions très pertinentes. Madame la présidente, je rappelle que la situation que vit le parc national de Virunga est extrêmement difficile et date de très longtemps. Le processus qui est en cours de mise en œuvre par l’Alliance Virunga allie la conservation du parc et également développe des initiatives au profit des communautés locales qui portent essentiellement sur la fourniture d’électricité, mais également le développement d’un système d’agriculture durable familiale. C’est un processus qui n’a pas encore atteint sa vitesse de croisière.

Le processus en cours a déjà montré des résultats intéressants, encouragé également par les communautés. Je pense que, à ce stade, l’État partie qui est ici présent pourrait également donner plus de détail sur les avancées notées par le programme de l’Alliance Virunga. Je vous remercie madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I just wanted to make a short intervention. Firstly, to express our condolences to the families of those rangers who have been killed in the line of duty serving our collective interest in the conservation of a World Heritage property.

Secondly, I wanted to just underline the reality that we will never ever get on top of these terrible problems, poaching and illegal trade in wildlife, until such time as the global community deals effectively with the source of the problem. That is the demand for those products that are being traded illegally. In that regard I want to urge all States Parties to do their utmost under the Convention on international trade of endangered species and in their own jurisdiction to stamp out wherever we can illegal trade in wildlife.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. I would like to join what Australia said before and highlight the need and necessity to have a stronger cooperation with the other Conventions, Washington, CITES, as this is crucial to at least starting to stop these serious problems.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor is to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We are just echoing what IUCN has just proposed to have a word from the State Party of Congo on the situation of Alliance Virunga. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. The floor is to the Democratic Republic of Congo.”

République démocratique du Congo :

« Merci madame la présidente. La République démocratique du Congo tient à vous remercier ainsi que tous les membres du Comité et toute la communauté internationale pour son appui afin de pouvoir remettre ce parc dans son état.

Aujourd’hui, il est vrai que nous avons un grand programme pour réconcilier conservation et développement et nous sommes dotés d’une troisième centrale hydroélectrique qui apporte de l’énergie, l’électricité, dans tous les centres sociaux, hôpitaux et autres gratuitement et qui soutient des microprogrammes de développement pour les communautés.

Nous pensons que ce programme va se développer davantage avant de soulager la misère de cette population qui avoisine le parc national de Virunga. Nous sommes conscients que les efforts fournis vont apporter d’ici là une réponse adéquate avec l’agriculture durable pour aider ces populations à soulager leur misère, mais principalement à adhérer à la vision de la conservation. Tel est notre objectif : impliquer cette population dans la conservation et les amener à pouvoir nous soutenir dans ce travail en s’appropriant ce parc de Virunga comme leur patrimoine.

Nous croyons qu’avec tout cela nous pourrions apporter dans un temps court une solution à la vie de cette population et même à la sécurité du parc.

Je vous remercie beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Did the Rapporteur receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have not received any amendments for this decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.51 adopted. Mr. Debonnet the floor is back to you for the next report. Thank you.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“The next report is on the general situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo. As you know, this country has five World Heritage sites, all inscribed on the List of World Heritage in danger. A few years ago the Committee decided to have a report on the general situation. The report can be found on your working document 7A.Add on page 86 in the English version and 89 in that French.

As mentioned in the individual reports on the site, insecurity caused by the presence of armed groups and various militias continues to threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of many of the properties located especially in the Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). As mentioned before, the ranger staff has paid an extremely heavy toll this year, with, in total, 22 guards in the Okapi Wildlife reserve and in the Virunga National Park killed and many others seriously injured. Also, in the Kahuzi Biega National Park, a team of 27 ICCN employees were kidnapped last March for more than a month by a group of militiamen.

The State Party report notes that no petroleum activities are envisaged in the DRC World Heritage sites. However, as also mentioned before, the recent approval by the president of petroleum blocks in the Salonga National Park and the recent proposal by the Minister of *Hydrocarbures* to review the status of Salonga and Virunga to allow for oil exploration clearly demonstrate that the sites are still potentially threatened by oil exploration activities.

It is therefore recommended that the Committee reiterates its position on the incompatibility of all oil and gas exploration and exploitation within World Heritage sites and calls for any proposal for the modification of the boundary of the sites must be based on strengthening its Outstanding Universal Value and not be proposed for the aim of just facilitating extracting activities.

The Draft Decision 7A.52 can be found in the working document 7A on page 87 in English and 91 in the French version. IUCN has no further comments on this report.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any queries or interventions? Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway

“Thank you Chair. Firstly, Norway would like to express its deepest condolences to the families of the guards killed. We strongly condemn the targeting of staff working to protect the national heritage of the DRC. Oil exploration in World Heritage properties is of the utmost concern. We strongly support paragraph 7 in the Draft Decision stating that:

‘Any proposal for modification to the boundaries of a World Heritage property must be based on strengthening its Outstanding Universal Value and should not be proposed with the aim of facilitating extractive activities’.

We would also like to stress the long-term benefits from sustainable use of natural resources not only for biodiversity in generating well-being and economic benefits for local people. Recognising the many challenges the DRC is facing, we encourage States Parties

and the donor community to support the State Party in their efforts to protect these areas of outstanding biodiversity, which are of global importance. Norway supports the draft decision.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Zimbabwe also supports the Draft Decision. However, on paragraph 9 there is a request that the State Party will present updated reports on the four properties by the 1st of February 2019; I think this is trying to put a lot of pressure on the State Party. The State Party may need more time given the complexity of the issues here.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Ms. Rössler.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. I just consulted with the Rapporteur. The idea was to get reports back for the 1st of February to be able to report at the next session. Does it mean you do not want a report at the next session? Could you please clarify?”

Thank you.”

Zimbabwe:

“Yes Madame Chair. I think the State Party should report at the 44th session of the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Maybe, if you agree, the report will not be submitted next year, but for the 44th session; that means in two years. Do you agree with this? Does anyone support this suggestion? Tanzania please you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We second that position.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to clarify further. This is the general decision because the Committee examines every year all the sites on the in Danger List. So you will review all Democratic Republic of Congo sites, but what you do not want to have is a general decision

on the Democratic Republic of Congo and the challenges in general in this situation. Just to be very clear, so that the Rapporteur knows how to change the last paragraph.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I now give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda

“Thank you madam Chair. Madame Chair, Uganda looks at the issues that are actually affected by the protected areas in the Democratic Republic of Congo. We have to consider the fact that there are so many sites that the Democratic Republic of Congo needs to look at to produce a comprehensive report. I think it would be reasonable for us to give them a bit more time, so that they can look at all the sites and get a comprehensive report for all the sites and submit. I think that the time requested is reasonable enough and Uganda supports.

I submit.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to one of the NGOs’ representatives.”

ONG :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je représente des autochtones de basse altitude du parc national de Kahuzi-Biega et je parle au nom du Forum international des peuples autochtones sur le patrimoine mondial. Il est bien connu que les autochtones ont eu une contribution historique dans les métiers de la biodiversité issue du patrimoine mondial.

Nous reconnaissons en tant que citoyens du pays les grands défis et les menaces que rencontrent les gardes du parc en particulier les territoires où ont eu lieu les enlèvements au Kahuzi-Biega et les récentes tueries dans le parc du Virunga. Nous félicitons l'attention du Comité sur ces menaces et encourageons les initiatives de compassion annoncées en marge de cette 42^e session du Comité. Je ferai aussi partie de cette initiative ce soir.

En ce qui concerne le Kahuzi-Biega, les autochtones n'ont pas accès aux ressources naturelles traditionnelles ce qui affecte l'agriculture, l'identité et les moyens de subsistance. Les activités traditionnelles, la chasse, la cueillette, la médecine traditionnelle pour beaucoup sont qualifiées d'illégales et ils risquent des sanctions violentes par les gardes forestiers. Il y a eu des cas de meurtres des autochtones en août 2017. Cela est encore le cas malgré le travail important au niveau national avec les autorités pour établir une résolution positive et une résolution positive entre les Bambuti et les Mbuti et les autorités du parc alliées avec les gardes forestiers pour les autochtones de haute et de basse altitude du parc de Kahuzi-Biega.

Nous référant aussi à l'acceptation de la République démocratique du Congo d'une recommandation garantissant les droits des peuples autochtones dans les aires protégées lors de l'examen périodique du Conseil des droits de l'homme en avril 2014, nous sommes très préoccupés de constater que le rapport des décisions du Comité sur le bien n'a pas pris

en compte la situation particulière des autochtones de haute et de basse altitude du parc de Kahuzi-Biega.

Nous recommandons ainsi la relance de ce processus de collaboration dans le cadre du processus de Wakatany et d'assurer que les autochtones participent à la gouvernance et à la gestion du patrimoine mondial en République démocratique du Congo et aussi encourageons spécifiquement l'implication des peuples autochtones dans la proposition, l'inscription, la gestion ainsi que la rédaction des biens du patrimoine situés sur leur territoire.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the Rapporteur to give us the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As we heard during the debate, we have one proposed amendment from Zimbabwe, seconded by Tanzania, for paragraph 9 of the decision. The new paragraph would read:

9. ‘Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2019, a detailed report on the implementation of the Kinshasa Declaration, the security situation in the properties, and the status of the oil exploration and exploitation concessions that encroach on World Heritage properties, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020.’

Now it is on the screen. Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any objections? I see none. We will go ahead and adopt the Decision. I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.57 adopted as amended.

Mr. Debonnet you have the floor to present the next property. Thank you”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“The next property is the Aïr and Ténéré natural Reserve in Niger. The report can be found in the working document 7A on page 78 in the English version and page 79 in the French version.

The State Party is reporting on its continuing efforts to implement the corrective measures. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that development of surveillance and management plans remain urgent. Therefore, we recommend the Committee to submit a revised International Assistance Request in order to receive assistance to complete these tasks.

The presence of uranium, oil and gold exploration and exploitation permits in the vicinity of the property remain of significant concern. The State Party should be requested to submit maps which clearly show the location of these permits in relation to the property. The State Party should further ensure that all exploration and exploitation activities are subject to

prior Environmental Impact Assessment in line with IUCN World Heritage Centre advisory note on Environmental Assessment, to ensure that these activities do not have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

It is also recommended that the Committee encourage the State Party to seek advice from the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to prepare the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the list of World Heritage in Danger, and that it retains the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.54 can be found in the working document on page 80 in the English and 82 in the French version. IUCN also has comments on this report.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN please.”

IUCN :

« Merci madame la présidente. L’UICN apprécie les efforts de l’État partie pour continuer d’améliorer la surveillance et le suivi du bien et pour restaurer les zones dégradées notamment celles infestées par l’espèce envahissante *Prosopis juliflora*. Toutefois l’État partie n’a fourni aucune donnée issue des programmes de suivi des espèces clés du bien, ni sur l’étendue de l’invasion du *Prosopis juliflora* et son impact sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Ces données sont nécessaires pour informer les décisions de gestion du bien, mais également pour élaborer l’État de conservation souhaité en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Il est extrêmement préoccupant que le soutien accordé au programme d’élevage en captivité de l’autruche à cou rouge ne soit toujours pas suffisant pour assurer sa réussite. Vu l’importance cruciale des programmes d’élevages en captivité de cette espèce au Niger, il est recommandé au Comité de demander à l’État partie de solliciter des conseils d’experts pour l’amélioration de ses programmes.

Il est également recommandé que le Comité demande à l’État partie d’œuvrer en étroite collaboration avec les États parties dans l’aire de répartition de l’autruche à cou rouge pour l’élaboration et la mise en œuvre d’un plan d’action régional pour la conservation de cette espèce. L’UICN encourage l’État partie à solliciter des conseils des experts du groupe spécialiste de la commission de sauvegarde des espèces de l’UICN afin d’améliorer l’efficacité du programme et d’élaborer la stratégie de réintroduction de l’espèce au sein du bien.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments, queries or questions? I do not see any. Did the Rapporteur receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We did not receive any amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.54 adopted. Mr Debonnet you have the floor for the next property please.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you madam Chair. The next property is the Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal. The report can be found in your working document 7A on page 81 in English and 83 in French.

The State Party reports on its continuing effort to implement the corrective measures, in particular in the field of law enforcement and monitoring. The results of the ongoing monitoring activities are reported to indicate that viable and increasing populations of key wildlife species such as lions, wild dogs, chimpanzees and Derby elands are confirmed. However, the Centre and IUCN know that more time is required to confirm these tendencies as well as the reported downward trend in poaching.

The potential impact of the Mako gold prospecting project remains a serious concern with regard to the potential impact of the project on the chimpanzees within the concession. The State Party notes that currently no funds are available to implement the Sambangalou Dam project. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN reiterate the need to keep the Centre informed of the developments of this project, which could potentially impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Despite the progress accomplished, the Centre and IUCN consider that more time and effort are required to ensure that the reported positive tendencies are maintained for at least three consecutive years, as stipulated in the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. Consequently, it is recommended that the Committee maintains for the moment the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.54 can be found on page 84 of the English version of the working document and 82 in the French version. IUCN has some further comments madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please IUCN.”

IUCN :

« Merci madame la présidente. L’UICN accueille favorablement les efforts consentis par l’État partie pour la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives. Toutefois, les impacts potentiels du projet aurifère à Mako restent une préoccupation. Bien que les efforts de l’État partie et de la société (Pétowal Mining Company, PMC) soient bien notés, aucune donnée issue de ce suivi n’a été fournie, hormis celles concernant la quantité d’eau dans le fleuve Gambi.

Il est recommandé que le Comité demande à l’État partie de soumettre au Centre du patrimoine mondial un rapport de suivi, y compris une analyse des données sur la qualité et la quantité des eaux souterraines et de surface en amont et en aval du projet. Il est

recommandé que le Comité demande à l'État partie de fournir des données spécifiques et détaillées sur le suivi des chimpanzés afin de permettre une évaluation de l'impact réel du projet sur cette espèce ainsi qu'une évaluation de l'efficacité des zones de conservation créées en dehors du bien dans l'optique d'atténuer ses impacts.

Prenant note qu'aucun financement n'est encore disponible pour la construction du barrage de Sambangalou, l'UICN considère que ce projet demeure une menace potentielle pour le bien qui doit faire l'objet d'une étude d'impact environnemental et social détaillée, y compris l'évaluation des impacts sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien conformément à la note de conseil de l'UICN sur le patrimoine mondial et l'évaluation environnementale.

Pour finir, madame la présidente, l'UICN regrette qu'aucune information n'ait été fournie concernant la fermeture de la carrière de basalte à Mansadala prévue pour 2018 comme l'avait confirmé l'État partie lors de la 41^e session du Comité. Il est donc recommandé de demander à l'État partie de confirmer dans les plus brefs délais si la fermeture de la carrière s'est effectuée comme prévu, rappelant que cette date a déjà été repoussée à plusieurs reprises.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments or interventions, questions? The Rapporteur does not have any amendments, I have just been told. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.55 adopted.

Mr. Debonnet you have the floor to present the next report."

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

"The next report is on the Selous Game Reserve in the United Republic of Tanzania. The report can be found in the working document 7A.Add on page 91 of the English version and 95 of that French.

The Selous Game Reserve was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 2014, as a result of a steep increase in poaching which led to the dissemination of the elephant population and doubts about the continuous survival of black rhinos within the property. Since 2014, the State Party has worked closely with its partner to address the poaching issue through an emergency action plan. The aerial census planned for 2018 by the national authorities should help to confirm the state of the elephant population, which now appears to be stable. Following an intensive search a small number of black rhinos also appear to be still present in the property. These positive developments are overshadowed by plans by the government to develop the Stiegler's Gorge Dam.

In this regard, in July of 2017, the State Party submitted to the World Heritage Centre a position paper stating its intention to proceed with the construction of the Stiegler's Gorge hydropower project within the property. On the 8th of August and 11th of September, 2017, the World Heritage Centre sent letters to the State Party reiterating the Committee's request to fully assess the potential risk and to consider potential options. On the 26th of January, 2018, the UNESCO Director General also sent a letter to the president of the Republic of Tanzania to express her concern about this project.

It is to be recalled that by Decision 40.COM 7, the World Heritage Committee established the position that the construction of dams with large reservoirs within the

boundaries of World Heritage properties is incompatible with World Heritage status. In the case of the Stiegler's Gorge Dam, the reservoir will cover close to 1500 km² inside the property, almost twice the size of the Kingdom of Bahrain.

It needs to be pointed out that while this Committee session is considering potential cases of dams on World Heritage sites, in all these cases we talk about dams constructed outside the property, but with potential upstream or downstream impacts on the property. The proposal to build a large dam such as the Stiegler's Gorge Dam inside the property is therefore a very new development for the Convention.

On the 3rd of April 2018, the World Heritage Centre participated in the stakeholders' consultation as part of the Socio-Environmental Impact Assessment concerning the dam project. It was recalled that the World Heritage Committee has taken numerous past decisions which expressed concerns of irreversible damage of the construction of the dam on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. Following the call, the World Heritage Centre also conveyed its input by a letter dated the 6th of April, 2018. Today, the complete Environmental Impact Assessment has still not been submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

The World Heritage Centre notes the short time-frame available to conduct the ongoing Impact Assessment and it also notes the requirements for a Strategic Environmental Assessment for all hydropower development under Tanzanian legislation.

It is therefore recommended that the Committee reiterates its request to the State Party to fully assess the cumulative impact of the Stiegler's Gorge project on the property and its wider landscape through a Strategic Environmental Assessment undertaken to the highest international standard and to consider alternative options to meet its power generation needs.

On the 25th of April, 2018, the Tanzanian Forest Service Agency published a tender for the deforestation of 143,000 hectares located within the World Heritage property: more specifically, within the area earmarked for the construction of the dam. The map on the screen shows the area where this deforestation will take place and it includes some of the most pristine forest areas in the property.

The World Heritage Centre was also informed that the signs of the remaining black rhinos were actually found in the area which is proposed to be deforested. If authorised, the complete deforestation of such a large area would lead to irreversible damage to the property's Outstanding Universal Value and the loss of its integrity.

In response to this new development, the UNESCO Assistant Director for Culture sent a letter to the Minister of Natural Resources and Tourism of Tanzania on the 31st of May, 2018.

Madam Chair also received a petition signed by more than 100,000 people requesting Tanzania not to proceed with the logging. It is therefore recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre and IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to review the state of the Stiegler's Gorge hydropower project.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.56 can be found in the working document on page 94 in English and 98 in French. IUCN has also further comments on this report."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Please go ahead."

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. The State Party’s decision to develop the Hydropower project inside the property and its associated activities is a cause for great concern. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre therefore recommend that the Committee adds this issue for the justification of the continued inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN and the World Heritage Centre also recommend that the Committee urges the State Party not to proceed with the planned logging and all the activities related to the hydropower project until a comprehensive Strategic Environmental Assessment has been completed and reviewed by IUCN and the World Heritage Centre.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to know if you have any comments. I give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Norway understands that Tanzania wishes to achieve its energy objectives. As Committee members, it is overall our mission to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value is conserved and protected. Plans for the construction of a dam within the borders of a World Heritage property have to be seen as a potential threat according to the criteria for in Danger listing. In addition to our understanding, a tender to start logging in the World Heritage property has been announced.

In order to ensure the full assessment of the impact project, a Strategic Environmental Assessment is needed, in order for the Committee to make an informed decision. Norway considers the draft decision as accurate with regard to the current situation and we hope that it will truly demonstrate that the international community cares about the loss and that there is a will to assist Tanzania in finding solutions that will not have detrimental impacts on one of Africa’s most important protected areas, an area with Outstanding Universal Value. Norway supports the draft decision.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Angola, please.”

Angola:

“Madam Chairperson, Angola concurs with the analysis made and the recommendations suggested by the Advisory Bodies on the state of conservation on Selous Game Reserve. We urge the State Party of Tanzania to address the key issue related to the improved conservation of this property within the limits of resources available.

Angola appreciates that anti-poaching interventions undertaken so far by the State Party of Tanzania have begun to bear fruit. All this indicates that poaching, the primary reason for its placement on the in Danger List, has been arrested, as testified by an upswing of elephant population growth and a healthier population structure.

We encourage the State Party of Germany and other interested funding partners to continue the commitment and collaboration in strengthening the conservation of Selous.

Madam Chairperson, the consideration of provisions of adequate energy is crucial for the fast-growing economy of Tanzania and Africa as a whole. This is particularly necessary as to keeping pace with the dire need to address poverty, which remains a priority for Tanzania and Africa at large. Why did the Gorge project stimulate significant debate? We heard that an Environmental Social Assessment has been finalised and readied for review by the World Heritage Centre. In any case, we underscore the need to minimise the possible negative impacts to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

At the time an explicit decision has been made to continue with this project, we strongly suggested that the State Party of Tanzania engage in a close dialogue and consultation with the World Heritage Centre so as to study the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies in the most practical and feasible way.

Thank you very much Madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia supports the draft decision to retain this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger given the imperative of preserving the attributes for which the property was inscribed. We note the Advisory Bodies’ advice that the development of the Stiegler’s Gorge hydropower station and the associated planned deforestation would damage its attributes in a manner which would be incompatible with World Heritage status.

Australia respects the aspiration of Tanzania to achieve its vision to develop into a modern electrified and industrialised country and notes the consequential increase in energy demand that would occur over the coming decades. Australia urges Tanzania to implement the Draft Decision, particularly the Strategic Environmental Assessment, and to explore options to meet its increasing energy needs through sustainable alternatives that would not irretrievably damage the attributes for which Selous was placed on the World Heritage List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to request permission from you to allow the State Party to make a statement.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will be as brief as soon as possible. Hungary fully agrees with the position of Australia and Norway and we support adoption of the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is back to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We do not want to prolong the debate but we do want to add our voice to the previous speakers, particularly Australia, in our support for the draft decision as submitted to the Committee. We want to commend the State Party in its effort for ensuring the continued protection of the site and we also encourage them to look for all possible alternatives to ensure the sustainable energy supply in this protected area.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the State Party of Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Tanzania agrees with the submission of the distinguished delegate of Angola. At this juncture, we propose for a continuous engagement in a constructive dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies by way of striking the best way forward on this important issue. We confirm that the Environmental Impact Assessment for the project is out; it should be on its way to the World Heritage Centre, but also we welcome the Strategic Environmental Assessment process that should be implemented very soon.

We wish to bring the attention of the World Heritage Committee to the fact that during the previous decision on this issue of Selous, Tanzania was encouraged to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment, which we have undertaken. During the decision that we are discussing now, madam Chair, the stress has been on the Strategic Environmental Assessment, this is why we worked very hard to make the Environmental Impact Assessment and now we are doing the Strategic Environmental Assessment, although the latter should in practice precede the Environmental Impact Assessment.

We wish to comfort the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies that we are ready to engage and we have already started this engagement to see the best way on how to handle this rather sensitive issue.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of NGOs.”

NGO:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. Africa has only a few truly wilderness areas left where you can experience wildlife in its true self. Selous World Heritage site is one of them. But it is not just about wildlife at Selous; it provides values for people and communities. WWF-commissioned research suggests that 1.2 million people could benefit from being sustainably developed.

Currently the reserve generates 6 million US dollars annually and is one of the prime tourism attractions in southern Tanzania, despite being under-developed for tourism. In addition there are 200,000 livelihoods downstream of Selous that depend on maintaining the flow of the Rufiji River.

We welcome the government’s anti-poaching efforts and progress made this far. We acknowledge the start of the SECAD project and the World Bank loan to improve the management of the Selous. These efforts seem to be working as data seems to suggest a fallen poaching rate and an increase in elephant calves. This will all help to expand the tourist sector and increase revenue.

However, these efforts could be undermined by the development of Stiegler’s Gorge for hydroelectricity. We welcome the announcement of the State Party to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment as required under Tanzanian law to assess the impact and other sectors’ strategies and opportunities for alternative power generation schemes. We understand that there is a range of alternatives that could provide the Park without destroying the tourist potential or the Outstanding Universal Value that makes Selous such a unique and magnificent landscape for the planet. In this case, with wise planning, it seems that Tanzania can have its cake and eat it.

The world is losing its wilderness areas but in Selous there is the potential to host a vast population of elephants and become a primary global tourist destination if wise choices are made about its future. This would benefit Tanzania and its people for generations to come.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Did the Rapporteur receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Madam Chair. No, we did not receive any amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7A.56 adopted.

I now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala, Chief of the Africa Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Since Mr. Edmond is not here, I will quickly do that. There are three sites that are not for discussion in the Africa region: Kahuzi-Biega National Park in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Decision 42 COM 7A.48; Okapi Wildlife Reserve also in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Decision 42 COM 7A.44 and the Rainforests of the Atsinanana in Madagascar, Decision 42 COM 7A.53.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Is there any objection from the Committee on this matter? I see none. I consider the decisions read out adopted. I would like to ask whether any observers or delegations would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decision without the discussion. I cannot see any.

We will first discuss the report concerning cultural properties, followed by the mixed properties and natural properties, the same regional order as for item 7 will be used: Asia and the Pacific, Europe and North America, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Africa and Arab States.

I now invite Mr. Feng Jing, Chair of the Asia- Pacific Unit for the World Heritage Centre to present report on the state of conservation of the Cultural properties located in the Asia- Pacific region and opened for discussion.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The first site to be reviewed from the Asia-Pacific region is the cultural property of the historical ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa. The summarised conservation issues for the property which comprise of the Potala Palace, the Jokhang temple and Norbulingka can be found in working document 42 COM 7A.Add on pages 7 until 9 in the English version and pages 6-9 in the French-language version.

In accordance with Committee Decision 40 COM 7B.31, the State Party of China submitted a state of conservation report on this property in December of 2017 and responded to some of the requests made by the Committee. Following a fire at the Jokhang temple on the 17th of February, 2018, the World Heritage Centre requested information from the State Party which was provided on the 15th of March, 2018. According to the State Party, the monitoring and control will be improved at the property, lessons drawn from this incident and fire safety screenings are currently taking place at the property and other cultural heritage sites in Tibet.

With regard to the clear definition of buffer zones of the property’s detailed maps should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as a matter of priority, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines and communicated prior to the decision from the Committee. The State Party advised that regulation for the buffer zone be contended within the conservation plans for the component part of the property. The three conservation plans for the component parts of the property should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies as soon as possible. Guidelines need to be devised for the protection of historical buildings within the buffer zones and ensure that the preservation of traditional urban structures and layout including historical buildings is a focus of the urban master plan for Lhasa, 2009-2020.

As recommended by the 2015 Reactive Monitoring mission, the urban master plan should also promote the spatial linkages and the visual corridors between the components past the historical context and the wider sightings that gave Lhasa city its unique character. With regard to the February 2018 fire, the preliminary report contained in the additional information is acknowledged but is not the work carried out in the immediate aftermath of the fire, as more detailed assessments are carried out and plans for restoration are developed. More detailed report including images, drawings and other graphic illustrations of the damage, paying particular attention to the golden ceiling, should be submitted to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies.

In this regard it is recommended that the Committee requests the State Party of China to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to assess the damage caused by the fire and the proposed restoration works to be carried out as well as to examine the other aspects of the state of conservation of the property.

After the publication of the state of conservation report the World Heritage Centre received third party information expressing concerns on the state of conservation of the property. The State Party was requested to provide clarification on this matter and a reply was received on the 22nd of June from China's State Administration of Cultural Heritage. In brief, the State Party is willing to invite a joint Reactive Monitoring mission, as mentioned earlier. This supplementary information provided by the State Party has been shared with the Advisory Bodies for review.

Madam Chairperson, dear Committee members, the Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.2 can be found on page 9 of the English version of the working document and page 8 of that French. With your permission madam Chairperson, ICOMOS will provide further comments on this property. Let me also point out that the representative of the State Party is present to provide additional information."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Please, go ahead."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you madam Chair. The State Party and its agencies have implemented important initiatives to improve the experience of both pilgrims and tourists at the property and documented and valorised traditional knowledge systems through a range of studies and monitoring and maintenance systems.

The involvement of more Tibetan craftsmen, artisans and experts in the conservation work as recommended by the 2015 Monitoring mission is strongly supported. The special relationship between the components of the property and holistic management of the attributes which contribute to its Outstanding Universal Value requires definitive identification of buffer zones. It is of great importance that development maps are prepared soon and the conservation plans for the three component parts of the property include appropriate regulations for these buffer zones.

ICOMOS and ICCROM stand ready to review the maps and conservation plan once these are submitted to the World Heritage Centre. A proposed television tower has potential to affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and this impact is to be carefully assessed in accordance with the 2011 ICOMOS guidelines on Heritage Impact Assessment for cultural World Heritage properties and review by the Advisory Bodies before any work on this project commences.

The fire which occurred in February of 2018 has caused some damage. While the effort of the administration of Cultural Heritage and the People's government's autonomous region are acknowledged, it would be appropriate for the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to assess the fire damage and the proposed restoration work to be undertaken, as well as examining other aspects of the state of conservation of the property.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions? I give the floor to the representative of Tanzania."

Tanzania:

"Thank you madam Chair. Tanzania wishes to congratulate the State Party of China for the notable progress made in maintaining the state of conservation of the property in particular on valorising and utilising the traditional knowledge systems and training young craftsmen on management of the property. Tanzania also commends the State Party for the establishment of the conservation plan to prevent soil erosion and improve bedrock conditions on the site.

Furthermore, Tanzania commends the State Party for their policies and administrative measures that have been put in place to monitor the development project that contribute to the promotion of the Outstanding Universal Value for the property and therefore improve visitor experience.

Madam Chairperson, while we remain sympathetic with the State Party for the devastating fire on the site in February of 2018, we commend the timely rehabilitation work carried out in the immediate aftermath of the incident. This delegation, in this regard, therefore encourages the State Party to invite a joint Reactive Monitoring mission to assess the damage caused by the fire and the proposed restoration work to be undertaken therefore.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Cuba."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much madam Chair. In this case we really want to acknowledge, in this very disagreeable state of affairs with the fire that took place, all the actions undertaken by the State Party to mitigate that. We do think this needs to be kept in mind when the Reactive Monitoring mission takes place and when it comes to the overall respect for heritage.

I think there has been long-term awareness raising about the situation of the site and this is why we wanted to leave a clear mark on the records as to the recognition of everything

the State Party has done and also we would like to commend the Secretariat and the State Party for their input.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to ask China whether they have any comments. Please, take the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China appreciates the concerns and the work of the Committee and of the World Heritage Centre and of the Advisory Bodies on the Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa. We will continue to take actions to implement the resolution to strengthen the protection and management of the property.

With regard to the fire at the temple monastery on the 16th of February, 2018, China has submitted to the World Heritage Centre a report with detailed explanation on the basic situation, including assessment of damage to the components and structures and post-fire repair works with relevant joints and postholes. As mentioned in the report, the fire happened to the ventilation timber on the second floor of the back hall of the main hall of the monastery.

Due to the proper measures carried out by the local government, the fire was blocked and controlled and put out rapidly. The building of the main hall remained safe and stable. The Outstanding Universal Value, the authenticity and integrity of the monastery were not damaged or affected. Of course, as required in the decision, further information and materials will be provided to the World Heritage Centre in the future; meanwhile, China is also willing to invite the Reactive Monitoring mission organised by the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM, which could learn more about the local fire incident and follow-up conservation efforts and offer comments and recommendations.

By the way, the local government has taken the lessons of the fire and organised a safety inspection of all cultural heritage sites throughout the Tibetan region in order to eliminate any potential risks to safety.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Rapporteur, are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have received no amendments to the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.2 adopted. I now invite Mr. Feng Jing to present the next report. You have the floor, please.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The next site for review by the Committee is the Kathmandu Valley in Nepal. Review of the conservation issues identified for the property are summarised in working document 42 COM 7B on page 21 of both language versions.

These properties are threatened by the impact of severe earthquakes of April and May of 2015. Other important threats include the lack of a coordinated management mechanism and some of the work carried out as part of the post-earthquake recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction processes.

In view of the extensive damage to all seven monument zones by the 2015 earthquake, there is both a certain and potential danger to the property as defined in Paragraphs 177 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines. Therefore, since the 39th session of the Committee in Bonn, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have been recommending the Committee to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This position was confirmed by the joint World Heritage Centre ICOMOS and ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission of October, 2015 and March, 2017. Both concluded that an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be the best way forward for the protection and recovery of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. However, following intense debates at each session, the property has not been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger so far.

A report on the current state of conservation of the property was submitted by the State Party on the 31st of January, 2018. After careful review, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider that despite the positive measures taken by the State Party, the recovery process is not currently at an adequate scale to deal with the major challenges that have arisen following the earthquake. Worryingly, there is also a lack of evidence to support the work undertaken so far, which often does not respect the distinctive traditional structures, materials and local practices. All of these are impacting adversely on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Therefore, in accordance with Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines, it is clear that the property is currently facing considerable ascertained threats confirmed by both the monitoring mission and by field visits of the UNESCO office in Kathmandu.

Despite laudable efforts there is no doubt that the scale and the scope of the disasters require to go well beyond the capacities and the resources of the Department of Archaeology of Nepal. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies consider therefore that inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger will ensure that immediate measures can be taken to focus on recovery projects that sustain the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, particularly the distinctive building structures and their materials, in order to avoid problematic reconstruction and conservation activities that threaten the authenticity and integrity of the property.

Regarding the advisory mission encouraged by the Committee in 2017, the State Party had proposed to invite the joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM advisory mission in May, September and late October of this year. Finally, a debriefing meeting was held with the delegation of Nepal to UNESCO ahead of the session on the 24th of May, 2018 to explain the process and prepare the working document to the Committee.

Madam Chairperson, Committee members, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.12 can be found in working document 42 COM 7B on page 24 of both language versions. With your permission, madam Chairperson, ICOMOS will now provide further comments on the property. The State Party representative is also present in the room.

Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. ICOMOS acknowledges the State Party’s strong commitment to recover this property following the earthquake and the work that has so far been undertaken, such as the state of conservation report. We also note that the detailed recommendations of the two Reactive Monitoring missions of 2015 and 2017 have not yet been fully addressed. We are concerned by the overall slow pace of recovery and the lack of action in some areas and the damaging restoration that has been undertaken in some of the monuments which does not respect local building, materials or practices.

The difficulties being faced in dealing with the scope and scale of the impacts of the earthquake appear to reflect the lack of work planning and coordination as well as the lack of capacity to undertake projects in a fully systematic way, including documentation research and analysis to underpin decisions.

We consider the work is still lacking a coordinated overall recovery plan along with subordinate plans for individual monument zones that together could provide the context and guidance for how projects should be undertaken by international agencies and other donors. Such plans could also clearly set out how recovery might balance the needs of the fabric of the property with the socio-economic needs of communities so the support of donors could benefit both.

Meanwhile, the uncontrolled work that has been undertaken is impacting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as is the deterioration from lack of attention. This is leading to a significant loss of traditional fabric. In ICOMOS’s view, the property is in danger through the results in loss of attributes and the potential for further irreversible loss which would impact highly adversely on its integrity and authenticity.

We appreciate the issue of in Danger listing has been considered by the Committee several times after the earthquake and was not supported, as assurances were given by the State Party that recovery work was being undertaken that would reverse damage and decay. In ICOMOS’s view, we are now in a position just over three years after the earthquake where we have not reached a stable position with the immediate actions having been taken and the long-term recovery plan under way.

ICOMOS considers that the property clearly satisfies the conditions of in Danger listing and its inclusion on the list should not be seen as a criticism of the heroic efforts of the State Party but rather as a means of gathering the necessary support to help the State Party with the enormity of the task that it is facing. It would be ideal if the Kathmandu Valley could add to the current momentum to overcome the negative perception of in Danger listing and demonstrate the benefits that it might bring.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments questions or enquiries? China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Regarding Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.12 on the Kathmandu Valley, the State Party, Nepal, has been carrying out conservation,

reconstruction, restoration and rehabilitation works on the monuments damaged and destroyed by the 2015 earthquake. We understand that substantive work has been carried out during the past three years in a well-coordinated manner among related agencies including the local government and communities. More than 17 monuments have been reconstructed within the protected monument zone. Some projects have received a bilateral assistance.

The joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission visited Nepal twice, in October, 2015 and March, 2017. An invitation for the third one was extended and due to complications with scheduling has not been carried out at this stage. This shows Nepal's commitment to fulfilling its obligations, as decided by the Committee. Nepal is ready to receive the Advisory Bodies' mission soon, before the end of the year, which will allow this mission and the World Heritage Centre to prepare a report and review the progress.

The Committee may kindly also take notes that the international community and other States Parties, including Japan and China, are also directly engaged in reconstruction work. The government of Nepal has developed a guideline and put the necessary measures in place to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property, while carrying out conservation and reconstruction work including quality material. Progress has so far remained satisfactory and the government has expressed its commitment to ensuring the quality of all works.

Subsequently, the Committee may take the appropriate decision after considering the report of the Advisory Bodies' mission during the 43rd Session of the Committee next year. In view of the above, the State Party, Nepal, should be allowed to continue the implementation of its reconstruction and conservation plan on the World Heritage property. China would therefore like to propose an amendment to the draft decision in consideration by the Committee today. Amendments are particularly related to paragraphs 11 and 12 of the draft decision contained in the document WHC/18/42 COM 7B.

Since the delegation of Nepal, led by the Secretary of the Ministry Culture and Tourism and Civil Aviation is in the room, we propose that they should be given an opportunity to speak before the Committee today to report on the current state of conservation reconstruction, restoration and rehabilitation works.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Actually, we agree with the representative of China and would like to thank and commend the strong commitment of the State Party of Nepal and the work that it has undertaken so far for the recovery of the damaged components and their attempts to safeguard the property in view of the devastating effects of the disaster they have just experienced.

We also recognise that the pace of the recovery work emphasises the need for the improvement in the management of the needed works and for capacity building of the involved professionals and technical practitioners. Thus, we urge the international community to provide the needed support to the State Party.

However, we would also like to point out that the international community should also appreciate that under such severe circumstances and conditions and the consequences of either a natural disaster like this one or post-conflict results, the devastation that the State Party usually experiences is far more serious in humanitarian consequences than the actual physical safeguarding of the heritage alone. We have to remember that this is a living place, that there are people affected; whether the pace is not quick enough or whether there are unplanned or unjustified interventions from the local community should be appreciated and considered, as temporary measures for them to continue living, because they cannot just sit around and wait for the international community to come and tell them how to implement the sometimes complex and difficult rules and regulations related to conservation.

Therefore, I think that there is a lot of responsibility on the international community to support and understand the difficult situation. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Tanzania would like to intervene based on pillars. The first pillar is the disaster that affected the property, the second pillar is out of the analysis of the Advisory Bodies, where we note that there is a lot of work undertaken at very slow pace, the quality of the work is very poor, there is a continuing, serious intervention of property architecture and town planning incoherence that erodes the integrity and authenticity. There is a lack of adequate control and coordination and there is a lack of capacity to undertake the necessary documentation research and analysis that should underpin all current work. That is, on the one hand.

On the other hand, the Advisory Bodies are saying, considering the potential and the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the recovery process needs to be more effective and that the scale and the scope of the disaster and the response required go well beyond the capacity and resources of the State Party. The Advisory Body is making a conclusion saying: considering the above, it considers now inscribing the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger so as to ensure immediate measures can be taken to focus on the recovery and projects sustaining the attributes of the properties in order to avoid restoration and reconstruction that is problematic and damaging to the authenticity.

If this equation is right, it means that work done through the in Danger List is neither locally engineered nor locally designed. In Danger listing then is the magical solution that when applied to properties gets results very quickly. Thirdly, the in Danger listing is the perfect solution to challenges faced by World Heritage properties.

Tanzania thinks that this is not the right solution. It is not answering any questions because we see that sites on the World Heritage in Danger List have been there for many years, so it is not a good solution. We see States Parties that fear being put on the List in Danger, which also confirms that to be on the in Danger List is not a good solution. If that is the case, Tanzania asks why we do not go with Paragraphs 183 to 189, where discussions are at a wider angle whereby dialogue is a very important tool. In the Operational Guidelines, and I would ask here legal advice, why are we not using that process? Because that process is inclusive; it allows for dialogue, it tries to identify the corrective measures that need to be taken, it allows states to come up with the desired state of conservation for removal before we even put the site on the in Danger List. What we are doing? We are putting the Committee into a situation that is not admitted and attainable.

Thank you chair, I submit.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Uganda has learnt that the State Party has made progress on the reconstruction and rehabilitation work since the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee. Conservation and rehabilitation work on 16 monuments have been completed to date and 13 more will be completed by mid-July, 2018. The State Party has shown its commitment to reinstating all the cultural properties of Kathmandu by undertaking necessary measures for ensuring quality work on the heritage property.

While appreciating the effort made by the State Party in the conservation and rehabilitation of the property, the progress made so far should be considered as satisfactory in the view of the damage caused by natural disaster which is not man made. It should also be taken into account that the State Party has a local government in place after a long gap, a stable government which would make things steadier.

We therefore request the Committee to allow the State Party to continue to work on the reconstruction process. We do recommend that the World Heritage Centre sends an Advisory Bodies mission before the end of 2018 to review the progress. Uganda supports the draft amendments proposed by China.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Cuba?”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. First and foremost, I would like to thank you for the information and the clarification that has been given by some of the delegations beforehand. That allowed it to be clearer and more direct. I also thank the State Party for the efforts it made within a regional framework which has been developed in order to help overcome this situation. In countries that have suffered from natural disaster like hurricanes and earthquakes, like Cuba, we understand how complex it can be and how long it can take to recover. It can take a year or longer.

Nepal suffered from two earthquakes. We are actually looking at one and its damage but there were actually two earthquakes that affected Nepal. Following such disasters, we have to focus on issues like health and safety, human factors, and that is difficult for developing countries. Then, we focus on the 15 historical sites that have been destroyed, for example. All of this leads to what has been done in terms of UNESCO’s Action Plan to help countries when they are dealing with disaster situations.

Before the property is to be put on the in Danger List, when the State tells they are making progress and we can see that: we start looking at properties on the in Danger List, they can remain on the List for ten years. Being on the in Danger List is no guarantee that these countries will be able to overcome their issues. We know that many years ago,

UNESCO launched a campaign, the Action Plan for Heritage, for example Resolution 46 of the United Nations, to try to help these countries overcome these issues.

Indeed, we understand that there are systematic issues that countries that really do want to protect their heritage face. Here we are not speaking how this affects the World Heritage Committee or World Heritage Centre; we are speaking about how the State Party is affected directly and wants to preserve its heritage. We need to have projects where we all come together to help these countries, for example by setting up special funds.

It is fairly simple to come here and say, a country is not able to deal with a situation for which they do not have the capacity; they have not shown that they are able to overcome the situation. I will ask a specific question to the Secretariat. Have we exhausted all measures that are set out and have been admitted after all our different Committees in order to deal with all these issues? Have we exhausted all our options?

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Brazil understands that the inscription of a site on the World Heritage List in Danger may serve the purpose to calling the international attention to the need of mobilising resources and extending cooperation, including capacity-building, to the country’s concerns. The case we analysed yesterday and Iraq among others provided us good examples in this sense. The case here was to analyse the danger caused to World Heritage sites by manmade damage in situations of conflict and we are glad to recognise that there is a great mobilisation regarding the protection of heritage in the context of armed conflicts. The initiative launched by the Director General of UNESCO aimed at Reviving the Spirit of Mosul is a good example of the organisation’s sensibility when it comes to sites in conflict areas.

In the case we are now analysing, we are aware that the damage at the Kathmandu Valley was caused by natural disaster and not any deliberate manmade action. It is our understanding that the country mostly needs financial and technical assistance and capacity-building. The Brazilian delegation is not very sure that inscribing this site on the List in Danger will be a way to assure more resources. We are examining a country with very limited resources and for which tourism to the Kathmandu Valley represents a very important source of revenue and job creation for its population. We should ask ourselves whether the inscription proposed would have the effect of further reducing the tourists that flow to the country, additionally affecting its economy.

Brazil believes that rather than being listed as a World Heritage site in Danger, Kathmandu Valley needs a comprehensive strategy of international cooperation within the framework of the 1972 Convention to cope with the damage involuntarily caused to one of its most important tourist attractions. I would like to recall my intervention on the opening of this session to the need for having a permanent strategy to help countries in case of natural disaster.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. After studying the draft decision regarding the Kathmandu Valley property and the state of conservation report provided to the World Heritage Centre, we can honestly say that the State Party has done a lot of work for the preservation of all seven sites that are part of one World Heritage property.

The pictures in the state of conservation report demonstrate the undertaken preservation works at those sites. Some of them have already been completed and other ones are being worked on and rehabilitated. The government master plan was prepared and submitted to the World Heritage Centre at the 2015 mission. We wanted to evaluate this master plan but unfortunately could not find an online version.

The government of Nepal covers all expenses for the restoration of the sites; at the same time States Parties and relevant state institutions invited all levels of governmental or otherwise organisations and the international community to support Nepal in this post-earthquake rehabilitation process. One could say that most of the items of the draft decision were implemented or are being implemented. Unfortunately, the Advisory Bodies’ mission to the property could not be realised this year.

In conclusion, our suggestion is to postpone the decision to inscribe the site on the World Heritage in danger and return to this issue after the Advisory Bodies’ mission and the evaluation of all undertaken works and the recovery master plan and its implementation. For more detailed understanding of the current situation of the World Heritage property concerned, we would like to have more information about factors affecting the property, such as housing, ground, underground and air transport infrastructure in future mission reports.

Thank your for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. The situation between 2015, when the earthquake happened, and now is very different. The 39th session of the Committee did not put this property on the World Heritage in Danger List and that is when we should have done that. The situation has improved greatly and right now, fellow members of the Committee, we are too late. There have been great improvements in terms of the work of the State Party. We also commend the governments that have been offering international assistance to the State Party.

We also would like to ask the Centre to address the issue of capacity and that the Centre works; I think Brazil talked about the comprehensive strategy for boosting capacity of the State Party in this way. I think it is important that we reward and join the effort of the State Party strategy rather than saying that what they are doing is not acceptable, as long as we are not involved.

We would ask for good will and dialogue between the Centre, the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. We hope that this could be achieved by the Advisory Bodies’ Reactive Monitoring mission that will be sent this year. I think it is important that a mission goes this

year and we put this matter to rest by coming up with a clear programme and plan of working together to restore this magnificent site.

I think it is unfortunate when we have the impression that help will only come when one is listed on the in Danger List. We have evidence sometimes, but in other cases it does not come. We therefore support the draft decision proposed by China for not putting this property on the in Danger List and we really emphasis to colleagues that we missed the boat in the 39th session.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We would also like to acknowledge the endeavours undertaken by the State Party to protect this magnificent site after the disaster and after having heard the report in which we have been notified of the numerous threats hanging over the property. We consider the needs are very great indeed and the State Party is indeed working with the Committee and, as we have heard from the Ambassador of Zimbabwe, we need to work along the lines of boosting the local capacity and heightened the cooperation and dialogue between the Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the State Party.

I believe that we have in our Operational Guidelines a procedure for dialogue; it is true that missions have been conducted already and that there will be another mission after this Committee session ends and maybe that will enable us to better analyse the situation and to see whether we continue along or we change tack. Hopefully, that dialogue within the framework of the guidelines of the Convention will offer us some guidance and enable us to ensure that we are giving our best possible support to the State Party.

On the other hand, maybe we will see that it is clearly not necessary to put it on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The only thing that we can add is to request that the State Party has a chance to have its say. We would be very interested in hearing from the State Party as to why they would not accept for example or whether they would like to have a scientific and technical mission and there is no way that this is designed to humiliate anybody. The idea is to see with them for any further capacity development and initiatives required. This is why we would like to hear from the State Party and listen to some explanations from the Nepalese authorities to see the work currently under way and to see how they are experiencing the current situation with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Dans le cadre de notre intervention sur la vallée de Katmandou, nous soulignons que nous sommes devant un cas interpellant parce qu’il pose une triangulation pour le moins critique entre le patrimoine et sa protection, les défis et nécessités de son développement économique et également les catastrophes naturelles avec leur lot d’irrésistibilité et d’impunité.

La Tunisie souhaite d'abord souligner les efforts dans les conditions qui sont les siennes des États parties pour essayer de ramener le site vers les valeurs qui l'ont permis d'être inscrit sur le site du patrimoine mondial. Je souhaite également, au nom de la Tunisie, que cela incombe nous seulement à l'État partie, à l'UNESCO, au Comité et à l'ensemble de son système qu'il soit consultatif ou décisionnel, mais également à la communauté internationale dans sa globalité. C'est une question qui nous interpelle tous, celle de ramener le site à sa valeur ou la valeur en laquelle il a été constaté et inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Il y a évidemment un élément positif qui se profile, c'est celui d'envisager une visite, sur le terrain durant l'année prochaine. Il me paraît sage d'attendre les conclusions de cette visite pour en déduire une quelconque décision d'inscription ou de maintien. C'est pour cela que la Tunisie, qui est un des pays qui ont introduit le projet d'amendement, souhaite que le Comité l'adopte en état et que par là même il sera extrêmement fort utile et éclairant d'écouter l'État partie sur cette question.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. According to what has been raised by several member States, Cuba and Brazil, Hungary finds it important to give special attention and support to countries that have suffered from natural disaster. Hungary acknowledges the work of the State Party of Nepal and truly believes that the work of conservation is carried out in a satisfactory manner, therefore Hungary supports adopting the decision proposed by China.

Taking into consideration the serious damage caused by the disaster, Hungary also finds it necessary that the State Party welcomes an Advisory Bodies' mission later this year. This would enable us to discuss further this case at the 43rd Session of the Committee. Hungary proposed these dates to be included in Paragraph 12 of the decision in order to further support the State Party in its effort.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia, with all the members of the Committee, also applauds the effort of the State Party to recover from the damage. We recognise that the task is enormous and that damage is not only on the heritage property but right across the Valley.

We also note that the social and economic recovery of the people of Nepal is inextricably linked to the success of the efforts to recover cultural properties and the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage site. We urge the State Party to take note and to implement the recommendations of the draft decision. We also recognise that the

State Party cannot conclude the task required without the assistance of the international community.

We consider that the damage from the earthquake and subsequent damage on the architectural and historical landscape means that the ascertained threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are significant and require further action and that the property meets the conditions for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. However, given the State Party will invite an Advisory Bodies' mission before the end of the year and provide a progress report to the Committee in 2019, Australia supports the amendment to the draft decision.

Australia will seek that the World Heritage Committee considers in the absence of substantial progress in relation to the recommendations in the decision, the possible inscription of Kathmandu on the World Heritage List in Danger in 2019. We have submitted an amendment to this effect.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Echoing other members of the Committee, Indonesia is of the view that the property should not be put in the World Heritage List in Danger at this point. The fact that damage was caused by natural disaster should serve as the justification that it will take the State Party a considerable amount of time to retain the Outstanding Universal Value of the site in its original state.

Considering that the purpose of the Committee is to help find solutions and assistance to the affected State Party, we would like to echo the suggestions made by the delegation of Brazil for us to work together in assisting Nepal in helping conserve its World Heritage sites. We are sure that the government of Nepal is readying a comprehensive plan to restore this site and with The Chairperson's permission, as suggested at the beginning of the discussion by China, we deem it appropriate to invite the representative of Nepal to give an explanation of the current state of conservation and future restoration at this forum.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the State Party of Nepal to answer all these questions. Thank you.”

Nepal:

“The government of Nepal has been working for the preservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation of all the damaged cultural heritage sites devastated by the earthquake of 2015. Nepal submitted to all the members of the Committee the outline of the reconstruction, preservation and rehabilitation works that are ongoing. Nepal welcomed the joint Reactive Monitoring missions since the devastating earthquake. They have been very useful to streamline and order our work. In the meantime, we would like to bring to your kind attention

that the State Party invited a joint Advisory Bodies' mission in April. However it did not take place. We welcome the next mission between mid-September until mid-October of 2018. We are waiting for the response from the World Heritage Centre.

Nevertheless, I would like to mention some of our major achievements in the past three years. The government of Nepal has adopted successive plans for the Kathmandu Valley. It has also instituted a cultural heritage management system which has already begun to work regarding all heritage in the Valley, managing the results of all ongoing preservation construction and rehabilitation activities, including a focus on historical records. In the meantime, the department of archaeology has already completed the conservation, rehabilitation and reconstruction of 17 monuments within the property. Thirteen monuments are in line of completion within mid-July. Twenty monuments are ongoing restoration activities within a year.

The department is now fully equipped, with more than 100 engineers, architects and other subordinate staff. The department has been attending a series of required technical training sessions with various stakeholders. These training activities are done in close coordination with UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, ICCROM and the UNESCO office in Kathmandu.

In Nepal, our government governs by the procurement act. Nevertheless, following the comments of the joint Reactive Monitoring mission, the department of archaeology, government of Nepal, has worked to develop a tender system that would allow only those contractors who meet eligible criteria of maintaining Outstanding Universal Value to the sites listed so that the contractors respect them in achieving the required task.

Nepal has just held fully democratic local and federal level elections. Accordingly, we now have a stable government at all levels with local participation which will further expedite the process of conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation of the cultural heritage. The government of Nepal has a mechanism at the ministerial level and the Ministry of Tourism and Culture and Civil Aviation to coordinate with all stakeholders. We highly appreciate the understanding and cooperation of the Committee members regarding our commitment and work and also the government of Nepal highly appreciates the continuous support of the World Heritage Committee and looks further for its continuity.

In view of the achievements made so far and our efforts and commitments to the case, the government of Nepal humbly requests this honourable Committee to allow the State Party to move forward with conservation, reconstruction and rehabilitation activities with the support of UNESCO and the international community and other partners without placing the Valley of Kathmandu site on the in Danger List.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to read out the amendments and will leave it for you. We only have ten minutes and I propose that as it was discussed we will debate after 1:00 pm.””

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As you heard in the discussion, we received several amendments for this item. We have received amendments from Brazil, China, Guatemala, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe and the distinguished delegate of Tunisia, if I understood correctly, would also like to be added to the list of sponsors. We also

received an amendment from Australia, and a slight amendment to the amendment proposed by the group of countries from Hungary.

As you know, the original decision is to include this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The proposal is not to include this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. All the paragraphs should be read in that sense.

I will now proceed to read out the amendments. Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged and also paragraph 2. Paragraph 3 has a slight amendment.

- 3. *'Acknowledges the strong commitment of the State Party and the work that it has undertaken for the recovery of the property, particularly its capacity-building efforts, as well as the efforts of international agencies and the six-year plan for the recovery of the monuments damaged by the earthquake;'*

Paragraph 4 is also slightly amended by replacing some parts at the end. It reads now:

- *'4. Also acknowledges the scale and scope of the disaster (as described in the reports of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM Reactive Monitoring missions to the property of October 2015 and March 2017), the laudable work undertaken and the continuing, serious deterioration of the property's architectural and town-planning coherence resulting from the immediate impacts of the earthquakes;'*

Then for paragraph 5 we have two different proposals. The proposals of the group of countries of Brazil, China, Cuba and so on would be an alternative redrafting of paragraph 5 which would read:

- *'5. Recognizes that the pace of recovery and the damaging restoration work on some monuments appears to reflect the current need for improvement in management capacity across the property, to undertake the necessary documentation, research and analyses that should underpin all recovery work;'*

We have received an amendment from the delegation of Australia who is proposing to retain some parts of the original paragraph 5 so that it would read:

- *'5. Expresses concern that the continuing, serious deterioration of the property's architectural and town-planning coherence, which results not only from the immediate impacts of the earthquakes, but worryingly also from some of the work undertaken during the subsequent recovery process, is eroding the property's integrity and authenticity;'*

For paragraph 6 we have two different proposals. Australia is proposing to keep the original paragraph, but Brazil, China, Cuba and the rest of the countries wish to reword it so that it would read:

- *'6. Requests that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions be carry out fully followed and implemented in a best way by the State Party;'*

Just to make sure on this point, the delegation of Australia is suggesting that we keep the original which would read:

- *'6. Regrets that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions have not been systematically and fully followed and implemented by the State Party;'*

For paragraph 7, we have a deletion proposal. The former paragraph 8 would become paragraph 7. It has a slight amendment and it should read:

- 7. *'Encourages the State Party to initiate, with technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, to assist the State Party with developing structures to coordinate and guide the recovery of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value (OUV);'*

Former paragraph 9 would become former paragraph 8 and would read with amendments at the end:

- 8. *'Also considers that the potential and ascertained threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are so considerable that the recovery process needs to be made more effective, and that the scale and scope of the disaster and the response required goes well beyond the capacity and resources of the Department of Archaeology of Nepal (DoA), and also considers that much greater input, collaboration and coordination of support from the international community could likely help to achieve this shift;'*

The former paragraph 10 is proposed for deletion. As well the former paragraph 11 which would put this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Subsequently, former paragraph 12 that talked about the desired state of conservation is also proposed for deletion. So, we have a new paragraph 9 that would read:

- 9. *'Requests the State Party to fully commit to use appropriate methods and materials in recovery works;'*

And we have a new proposed paragraph 10:

- 10. *'Reiterates its request that the State Party integrate the RMP within an overall socio-economic revitalization programme for urban communities, encourage residents and local business to engage in the recovery process and ensure that it delivers wide-ranging social and economic benefits;'*

Madame Chair, if I may make a suggestion on this paragraph. Since this is the first time that we see this RMP abbreviation in this decision, I suggest that we write out Recovery Master Plan and then we put the abbreviation into brackets. Thank you very much.

Going on, the former paragraph 13 would now become paragraph 11 and here again we have a counter-proposal from Australia. The proposal for the amended paragraph would read:

- 11. *'Calls upon the international community to support the State Party's urgent recovery work through financial, technical or expert assistance;'*

Australia is suggesting keeping the original which would include the word as following:

- 11. *'including support for local communities in terms of their housing and social needs;'*

Then we have a proposal for a new paragraph 12 with a slight amendment by Hungary at the end so that it would read:

- 12. *'Further requests the State Party to invite a Joint World Heritage Center/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory Mission to ascertain the progress accomplish by the state party in implementation and assist of six-year RMP and to give guidance on reviewing it and recommends that this mission takes place by the end of 2018.'*

Madame Chair, if I may have a slight suggestion on this paragraph instead of 'requesting' I would ask to propose 'suggest' or 'strongly suggest', because a mission cannot be requested by the State Party, it has to be invited by the State Parties.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you madam Chair. This is a rather complex draft decision given the number of amendments. I think perhaps we should decide on which methodology we want to use as it is rather difficult to get the whole picture. I was wondering whether it would be possible to go paragraph by paragraph. There is a lot to digest. It is almost one o'clock and it would be difficult to get negotiations rounded off before the lunch break."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I agree. I think it is not easy and it will take time. Would you like to do it in the plenary or would you like to have a Working Group make the changes and come back to us. What would you prefer? Spain, please you have the floor."

Spain:

[English interpretation] "Thank you Chair. Indeed, it is rather complex. However, as we are trying to compare the two texts, I actually find it quite useful to read the whole text. I believe that during the lunch break we can look at these texts and afterwards we can come back paragraph by paragraph and see overlaps between the texts, as right now the wording may not achieve what we want."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. According to your proposal, we will distribute the text with the amendments and you can review them at lunch time and when we are back, we can study them one paragraph after the other in the plenary. Thank you very much. We will see you at 3:00 pm. We will circulate the text now. Thank you very much."

The Secretariat:

"A few announcements for today's side events during lunch time. You have the Historical Urban Landscape approach in rethinking urban management organised by the World Heritage Centre in room Hawar. You have Sites of Memory organised by ICOMOS in room Manama in the Advisory Bodies' space. At 2:10 pm you have the contribution of ICCROM and the Sharjah regional office in the conservation of regional cultural heritage, again in Manama Room.

On this slide, our special fund-raising event, taking place tonight. You are all kindly invited to make your donation and get your pass for this very special event just outside the room and next to the registration space. Thank you very much and on the next slide you can

see the group that is going to perform; there will be a free shuttle and a reception after the event.”

End of the June 27, 2018 morning session

THIRD DAY – Wednesday 27 June 2018

SIXTH SESSION

3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon. We are starting with an announcement.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to announce that on your desk was put the beautiful issue of *World Heritage Review* magazine on Bahrain. As we are in Bahrain, you can visit their World Heritage sites and I just wanted to recommend the magazine to you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please be seated. Dear colleagues, before resuming our discussion on the state of conservation of Kathmandu, I would like to propose the following. As you know, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.10 has been proposed on *Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution: Iron and Steel, Shipbuilding and Coal Mining (Japan)*. This draft decision can be found in Document 7B.Add.2. This draft decision was the subject of intense negotiations and has been agreed upon by all parties concerned.

I would like therefore to propose it to be adopted without debate. I see no objection. Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.10 is adopted. Thank you.

Dear colleagues, allow me to underline the spirit of dialogue and mutual respect which has prevailed in achieving a consensus, keeping in mind the Committee’s debates. In that context I would like on behalf of the members of the Committee, first, to congratulate both parties for their concrete efforts in achieving this consensus; second, allow me to encourage the continuing dialogue between the concerned parties in this endeavor, and thirdly, to request the full implementation of the decisions. Thank you for your understanding and cooperation in this matter.

I now give the floor to the States Parties for a short statement. I would like to invite the delegation of the Republic of Korea.”

Republic of Korea:

“Thank you madam Chair. I note with appreciation that Decision 42 COM 7B.10 on Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution was adopted by consensus. I would like to express my sincere thanks to H.E. Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, Chair of the Committee, Secretariat of UNESCO, and the Member States of the Committee for their sincere cooperation and support on the matter.

As clearly referenced in the decision, I hope that bilateral dialogue between the Republic of Korea and Japan will be continued to fully implement the decision we have adopted and that the government of Japan will take into account best international practices

for interpretation strategies when continuing its work on the interpretation of the full history of the property.

The World Heritage Convention emphasises that the safeguarding of World Heritage property is a common task for all of us, regardless of our diverse origin or nationality and that it requires cooperation from all people around the world. This is why I would very much appreciate that the members of the Committee would continue to take special attention in this matter and the follow-up measures for its full implementation.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Delegation of Japan.”

Japan:

“Thank you. As this is the first time that I take the floor, let me, at the onset, commend you, madam Chair for your dedication and able leadership.

I would also like to thank the government of Bahrain for its excellent preparation of this conference and for the warm hospitality kindly extended to us.

Madam Chair, on behalf of the government of Japan, I wholeheartedly welcome the adoption by consensus of the decision 42 COM 7B.10 on the state of conservation of the “Sites of Japan’s Meiji Industrial Revolution”. I do thank all the Member States of the Committee for the adoption.

As made clear in the state of conservation report, Japan has sincerely implemented the recommendations included in the Decision 39 COM 8B.14 adopted at the 39th Session of the Committee.

Today’s decision provides us with a new platform for our conservation efforts. Japan renews its determination to fulfilling all the recommendations described in the decision, including interpretation strategies, opening of the information centre, and continuation of dialogue, while sincerely maintaining the commitments Japan has made in its statement as referred to in Decision 39 COM 8B.14.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now we will continue discussion regarding the Kathmandu Valley and will continue with our Rapporteur who will read out the proposed text paragraph per paragraph as proposed. Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good afternoon to all colleagues. I guess you have had time to review the decision as all copies were distributed to you. As I already proceeded to the presentation of the paragraphs, I would just like to read out the last paragraph.

I believe we were at paragraph 13. As you will see there is a proposal from Australia on paragraph 13 which would replace the original and would read:

- 13. *'requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2019, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019 with a view to considering in the case of confirmation of the ascertained or potential danger to Outstanding Universal Value of the property its possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.'*

These are all the amendments we have received so far, madam Chair. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson

"Thank you. Are there any objections or comments? For the first three paragraphs, there are no comments so they are adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"For Paragraph 4 we have an amendment that you can see on the screen."

The Chairperson:

"Paragraph 4, do you have any comments? Paragraph 4 adopted. Australia, please."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. We are happy with the changes from Brazil and of other countries because the text we want to highlight is really represented in the amended paragraph 4 so we are happy with the change."

The Chairperson:

"Let us move to paragraph 5. It is adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"For Paragraph 6 we have two options. Australia is proposing to keep the original while a group of countries is proposing a slightly revised version. The question will be if we retain the original paragraph or we instead decide to go with the amended version."

The Chairperson:

"Bahrain you have the floor."

Bahrain:

“We agree with the second option from Brazil, Cuba and China. ‘*Requests that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions be systematically carried out, fully followed and implemented in the best way by the State Party.*’”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madame Chair. We agree with the change, but we do not think ‘*in the best way*’ in the text is appropriate because the State Party would think about its best way. So we are not sure we want this.”

The Rapporteur:

“In the case the Committee wishes to consider the revised paragraph. I would like to make a suggestion to change the wording a bit keeping to the spirit of the proposed amendment so that it might be a bit easier to read. My proposal would be:

‘Requests that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions are implemented systematically and fully observed by the State Party;’

I put this suggestion to the members who have proposed the amended paragraph to see if they can agree with it.”

The Chairperson:

“Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. Maybe it could be an issue with the interpretation, but we believe that the spirit of this amendment should mention ‘*in the best possible way*’ as was proposed originally. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “I simply need clarification because we have sections of text crossed out and others added. Could the Rapporteur please repeat or read out what the final version would be, because we prefer the Rapporteur’s version and not necessarily Cuba’s version. Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. What I proposed was: *‘Requests that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions are implemented systematically and fully observed by the State Party;’* then we have received by Cuba the following if I understood correctly to add: *‘in the best possible way’*. We will try to reflect this on the screen as well.”

The Chairperson:

“Cuba, you have the floor, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “The problem is that this is a new version and that we in fact prefer the initial text. We do not want to change our amendment. For the rest of what we see in the text we prefer the initial text, but if the feeling in the room is that **if** we change to Rapporteur’s text we can do that.”

The Chairperson:

“Excuse me, are there any objections on the Rapporteur’s version? Brazil, please, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Chairperson. I think we could accommodate what Cuba is suggesting by including Cuba’s suggestion above. It would read: *‘Requests that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions are implemented systematically and fully in the best way possible observed by the State Party’*. Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Yes, we could accept that proposal. I believe that we are getting bogged down by the words, but I believe we can live with that proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “As we have two different concepts, we have *‘systematically and fully observed’* and *‘in the best way possible’*. I have no problems with the flexibility given the circumstance, but in that case it is not going to be *‘systematically and fully observed’* but if there is a consensus on what is on the screen now, and that would lead the State Party to

respect the recommendations from 2015 and 2017 and that is clear to everyone, we are not opposed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Yes, the problem is how this has been edited. What we are saying the idea of fully being there and Spain also supports the idea of being the best way. We believe that what the Rapporteur said could actually complicate things. So, the ‘*being implemented systematically in the best way*’, I wonder if ‘*fully*’ could be a contradiction to ‘*in the best possible way*’; what terms need to be taken out basically.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much.”

The Rapporteur:

“I just want to make a clarification. The reason I proposed this wording is because the distinguished delegate from Australia did not feel that the ‘*in the best way*’ should stay in. So, actually, my proposal was to put forward a text that does not have these words in it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We are happy with the formulation that is ‘*in the best possible way*’. We were simply making the point that we have confidence that the State Party will, of course, seek to implement the recommendation in the best possible way and we did not need to say that to them, but if the Committee would like to use ‘*in the best possible way*’ we are certainly not going to stand in the way.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I will withdraw my proposal and we can stick with the original amendment as submitted. I read it out now: ‘*Requests that the recommendations of the October 2015 and March 2017 missions be systematically carried out fully followed and implemented in the best way by the State Party;*’ thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Is this paragraph OK now for you? Yes. Thank you very much. It is adopted. Now, the next, paragraph 6.”

The Rapporteur:

“Now we have paragraph 7 which would be slightly amended as you can see on the screen. I apologise, we have former paragraph 7 that is proposed for complete deletion by a group of countries.”

The Chairperson:

“The original paragraph 7 is deleted. Are you OK with this? Spain, please you have the floor.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Can I ask you something? The modifications to the following paragraph where we talk about the ‘*international coordination mechanism*’, this is a case where there is a real need for a series of challenges to be met, so why deleting ‘*international scientific coordination mechanism*’, why was it struck out? Is it because it is just the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS that should be involved? I do not really understand this and I would like to know why you proposed deletion for this possible international cooperation?”

The Chairperson:

“I need one of the countries who proposed to delete article 7 to explain the reason for deletion of the original article 7: China, Brazil, Cuba, Tanzania, Zimbabwe and Uganda. Would a country give us the reason behind the deletion? China, please you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you, madam Chair. I am not sure I can be very helpful in this direction because we consulted the State Party concerned and it is their view. I think we are in full respect of their views not to include and make the proposed deletion. I think the main spirit of this document should be in line with encouragement. I think they deserve it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for giving us the answer.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “What we wanted to do is to harmonise the text with previous paragraphs’ versions. Therefore, we also agree with the explanation provided by the ambassador from China. That is based on the State’s sound ability to deal with the situation whereas cooperation can be there and be welcomed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “I do not want to break this consensus which apparently is based on the reason introduced by the State Party, but this would not be coherent with paragraph 3 which recognises the work accomplished by the member States and in particular in capacity-building and the work provided by international agencies. I think they have to work with all necessary and appropriate international agencies for the cooperation mechanism in order to protect the site and to avoid future problems. Not only challenges caused by the earthquake damage, but others as well.

Therefore, I think that having the support of the international scientific community is always very positive. However, if the other country wants to delete this ‘*international scientific mechanism*’ we will not oppose it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If they agree they accept to delete it. Australia has a comment.”

Australia:

“We have no intention in interrupting the consensus that we support. It is just by removing ‘*an International Scientific Steering Coordination Mechanism*’ we render the sentence meaningless because there is a verb ‘to initiate’ and there is nothing being initiated.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. I think our colleague from Australia is correct. Maybe the reason for deleting this ‘*International Scientific Steering Coordination Mechanism*’ was very much in line, I believe, with the inscription of the site in the List in Danger. The other reason, as far as I understand, for deleting it is that it might take some time until we constitute this ‘*International Scientific Steering Coordination Mechanism*’ which I understand still does not exist, although it is written in capital letters as if it was already established.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I then presume that you all agree to delete? Now, do we agree that paragraph 7 is to be deleted? Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. I just wanted to ask the Secretariat if you could give us a recommendation on whether this paragraph should be left in the text or not.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you to the distinguished delegate of Norway. The original intention was to make sure of overall coordination on the mechanisms tools for all the ongoing operational projects to be carried out at the site by different countries, including international agencies. In the text we say, ‘*initiated by the State Party*’ it should be said with ‘*a proposed International Scientific Steering Coordination Mechanism*’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank very much. I now give the floor to China.”

China:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Can I make a suggestion? I agree with the colleague of Australia at the moment, ‘*the State Party to initiate*’ with no object does not mean anything. Can I change ‘*encourage the State Party to invite*’ then delete ‘*with*’ ‘*to invite technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to assist the State Party with developing structures (...)*’. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you agree? Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“We agree with the proposal from our distinguished colleague from China.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. You agree, are there any objections? Brazil, please you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Excuse me madam Chair, but the way it is written, it does not make that much sense. We do not know who has to be encouraged the way it is drafted. ‘*Encourage the State Party to assist the State Party,*’ maybe, ‘*we encourage technical support from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to assist the State Party.*’”

The Chairperson:

“Do you agree with this? Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “I am not an Anglophone, but I think that what we are doing here is meaningful. We do have to encourage the State Party to receive from the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies technical support in order to develop coordination structures and to ensure the recovery of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value. I am not sure how that could be worded in English; perhaps English-speaking countries could help us. I think it should be reworded along those lines, in order to ensure that the paragraph is logical.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. In the interest of helping us to reach a conclusion on this paragraph, I would say that the language proposed by our distinguished Chinese colleague in fact captures very neatly the spirit of the discussion. It encourages the State Party to invite technical support from the World Heritage Centre, we could make it active and say: ‘*We encourage the State Party to invite the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies to provide technical support*’ if you prefer. I think the sentence is pretty clear in English.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “I would like to thank our Australian colleague because that was the concern that I had. In general, when you draft this type of paragraph you do not invite a State to invite. You invite the Centre. Sometimes, we are afraid of asking things from the Centre or the Advisory Bodies; here this is what we do, we invite the Centre to provide the State Party with assistance and we all agree to the need for that. I think this will also be along the lines of what the Spanish Ambassador was asking for.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please, could you repeat, as they would like to type your proposal?”

Australia:

“It could read perhaps ‘*Encourages the State Party to invite the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to provide technical support to assist the State Party with developing structures to coordinate and guide the recovery of the property and its Outstanding Universal Value.*’

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you agree with this suggested text, or do you have any comments or objections? Cuba is OK. Everybody agrees. Let us adopt it. We adopt the proposed text in front of you on the screen. Adopted now.

Let us move on to paragraph 8.”

The Rapporteur:

“We have a new paragraph 8 which was previously 9 and has been slightly amended by a group of countries. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“The new paragraph 8, is it acceptable for you, no objection from the floor? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, just a slight change that might tidy up. Reading out it would be *‘and also considers that much greater input, collaboration and coordination of support is needed from the international community’*.”

The Chairperson:

“Fine. Are there any objections? Please, Australia.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, I am sorry; we were thinking that we could delete *‘could likely help to achieve this shift’* so to finish after *‘international community’* and left it there it would be better.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I will read out the amended part of this paragraph as proposed by Australia: *‘and also considers that much greater input, collaboration and coordination of support from the international community’*.”

The Chairperson:

“Are you happy with that? Are there any comments? They do not seem to be any, so let us adopt paragraph 8 as amended.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have former paragraph 10 which is proposed for complete deletion.”

The Chairperson:

“Next paragraph, is there any objection to the deletion? I see none. Adopted. Next paragraph please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. We have former paragraph 11 which would have inscribed this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger proposed for deletion.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any reactions to this deletion? There are none, so adopted. Next paragraph, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Former paragraph 12 is also proposed for deletion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Cuba, please, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. I was waiting on the decision on this Committee for this paragraph. If we do not approve the site to be put on the in Danger List, I believe we need to take a fresh look at the end of paragraph 7 as it mentions recovering the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. We will need to write ‘*conserving*’ not ‘*recovering*’. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much. Although the distinguished delegate of Cuba is right as there would be inconstancy, but when it comes to procedure, the paragraph has been approved. Let me ask the Rapporteur that before the paragraph is approved it should be read out in total, because that way we can proof it and form bases and avoid this sort of problem that happens quite often in this Committee and others as well, because we end up with inconsistencies between the paragraphs that we approve.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, but it is in front of you and either read or not, we assume that you read the paragraph. We cannot approve something and come back and think about it again. We need to be very consistent. Please, Bosnia, you have the floor.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous pensons que la remarque de notre collègue cubain est tout à fait appropriée et qu'ici il s'agit de questions de principe et d'un précédent qui pourrait être dangereux quelque soit d'autres décisions si l'on garde paragraphe 7 dans son état ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is back to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I can understand and in fact we have raised this point and we cannot go on dealing with a paragraph that has to do with the removal from the List. We have our legal advisors here, as the decision as a whole has not been approved, until the entire decision has been approved it is possible. As we are reviewing the decision per paragraph, it is possible to come back to a paragraph because at the end we are going through the whole text and approve it as whole and until such a time they can be changes, especially when a paragraph has a bearing on the entire decision.

We do not want to oppose the consensus, we do not want to cause problems, but we do have the right until the entire decision is approved to come back to wording of the decision that could have bearing on the decision as a whole.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I am sorry. If we approve a paragraph, we are not coming back to it. It is not a matter of legal advisor, it is a matter of meeting management. We cannot approve something and come back and remove it. Approval means that we agree. We can do this, it is according to the rules, to my power and Article 14. We will not waste our time and that of all the members. You want something, we approve it and then you come and say we made a mistake and we want to come back again. We cannot do that, and will follow and continue. I will not permit and accept that we are wasting our time and that of the Committee.

Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. After the comments of the distinguished delegates of Bosnia-Herzegovina, I would like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that the group of countries that amended paragraph 7 is also the group of countries that proposed that this site will not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In that sense it was my assumption that all paragraphs preceding the deletion of paragraph 11 would go towards the direction of what we adopt and that the property is not moved to the List of World Heritage

in Danger. I cannot comment on the legal aspect of whether we can go back on paragraph 7 or not.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I have a point of order. Our spirit was not to cause people to waste time, but to make a positive contribution to the debate. I am personally not very comfortable, but when a State makes a point of order it has to be given the floor and when a State asks a question to the legal advisor, the legal advisor must respond.

Let me repeat, it is not our intention to waste time, we are all making contributions to a situation. To accuse a State Party of wasting time is not what we have been trying to do. That is why we would like to ask the legal advisor a question. We also said that we do not want to go against the consensus in the room. It is our right until the final decision has been taken, to go back to that. We raised a point of order, this was denied, we asked for an opinion of the legal advisor and that was not given.”

The Chairperson:

“This is not the first time and I am not sorry: I will not accept this kind of behaviour. You are not teaching us. The law is in front of us and we know each article exactly. From the beginning, you asked about number 7; everybody discussed it and we gave you the full right. Now you asked to come back to number 7. We will not come back to it. If you have any problem, then I am sorry, I have the right to rule this session. Do not waste our time please. You may continue.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I believe we were on paragraph 12. Former paragraph 12 was also proposed for deletion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any comments?”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I am sorry, we are not referring to the paragraph that has been taken out we are talking about the paragraph which we are focusing on now, the new paragraph 7, which beforehand was paragraph 8; maybe there is a problem of communication there.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any other comments?”

The Rapporteur:

“I am going to repeat it, as there seem to be a bit of confusion. We have just adopted former paragraph 11’s deletion, which would have put the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We adopted the deletion of that paragraph. Now, we are talking about the former paragraph 12, which would have talked about drafting the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger, so subsequently, since there was already a proposal to delete paragraph 11, it is logical that now we proceed to accommodate the amendments of the group of countries and also delete former paragraph 12. This is where we stand in my view.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections on the deletion of paragraph 12? No objections, then it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Now, we arrive at new paragraph 9, and it reads out: *‘Requests the State Party to fully commit to use appropriate methods and materials in recovery works’.*”

The Chairperson:

“No comments, it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“We proceed to new paragraph 10. *‘Reiterates its request that the State Party integrate the Recovery Master Plan within an overall socio-economic revitalization program for urban communities, encourage residents and local business to engage in the recovery process and ensure that it delivers wide-ranging social and economic benefits.’* Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I see none, adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“We have new paragraph 11, former paragraph 13, where we have a suggestion from a group of countries to delete the latter part of the paragraph and a counter proposal from Australia to keep the original. This is how it would read:

- 11. *‘Calls upon the international community to support the State Party’s urgent recovery work through financial, technical or expert assistance.’*

Australia's proposal is to continue by ending '*including support for local communities in terms of their housing and social needs*'. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Australia, please, take the floor."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. If the consensus in the room is to take the last line out, we think it is important, and we would like to know why it was deleted in the amendment proposed by the other countries."

The Chairperson:

"Bahrain please."

Bahrain:

"Thank you madam Chair. We agree with Australia; it is absolutely important and relevant to keep the support of the local communities. We agree with Australia."

The Chairperson:

"Norway, please."

Norway:

"Thank you madam Chairperson. We also agree with Australia to keep the sentence. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Zimbabwe, please."

Zimbabwe:

"Thank you madam Chair. We also agree to keep the local communities in. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"The floor is now to Kuwait."

Kuwait:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. We also support Australia's recommendation."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Tanzania also is in line with Australia.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme je prends la parole pour la première fois à cette session, je vous salue et je remercie le Royaume de Bahreïn d'accueillir cette session et la Tunisie s'associe aux autres pays qui approuvent la proposition de l'Australie. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? No, thank you very much. We will adopt the text of this paragraph.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to clarify. The consensus is to keep the original paragraph as it was without deleting the last part. You have it on the screen now.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We adopt this paragraph.”

The Rapporteur:

“We proceed to the new paragraph 12, which would read: *‘suggests the State Party to invite a Joint World Heritage Center/ICOMOS/ICCROM Advisory Mission to ascertain the progress accomplish by the state party to assist in the implementation of the six-year RMP and to give guidance on reviewing it.*’

We have a proposal from Hungary to add: *‘and recommend that this mission takes place by the end of 2018’*. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or comments? There seem to be none. It is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“We have the final paragraph where we have a proposal from Australia, which I will now read out:

‘requests furthermore the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2019, a report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd Session in 2019 with a view to considering in the case of confirmation of the ascertained or potential danger to Outstanding Universal Value of the property its possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.’

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We support the suggestion made by Australia. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. I think that this last sentence regarding the possible inscription on the list of World Heritage in Danger somehow entails or presumes this possibility of getting onto the World Heritage in Danger List. The whole spirit of our document seems to encourage further works; this last bit sounds like a warning. I thought we would have no problem supporting Australia’s view of requesting the State Party involved producing reports and committing to all the requests that have been made. Not necessarily having the last bit of warning, China thinks it looks like a warning. This is a point I wanted to make.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Spain please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Spain believes it is adequate to go with Australia’s proposal because we kind of not see it as a threat or warning, but a simple fact that there is a possibility that would be examined. As it says in the paragraph, we are considering the possibility of this inscription on the in Danger List and we are sure that Nepal is going to respect the recommendations of this Committee. We also see, in the case of Nepal not fully committing to these recommendations, that we will consider a possible inscription. I believe it is important to keep this sentence that Australia would like to add in this draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We are also a little bit concerned about this final condition that has been attached because it is almost conditioning the way we are going to look or review the situation to us leaning more towards inscribing on the in Danger List. I do want to go with Spain and maybe find more positive language and try to find a consensus like was done by Australia in a previous session; change maybe the time scale and give the State Party longer. In the case of confirmation of potential threats to the property, maybe we could go for that if this is the consensus, but we would not prefer it.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. I just want to express that we are in agreement with the suggestion from the State Party of China and also trying to find a better language that does not include warnings or include such a strong condition and maybe find a way which is more positive. So, I also agree with Cuba. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. We believe that we are negotiating and putting these recommendations in good faith and I would like to propose that to show our good faith the State Party will act upon recommendations; let us leave the sentence at 2019, so without any further conditions. I would like to support the proposal by China and Bahrain.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you Chair. Azerbaijan is of the view that we should not prejudge the outcome of this report and to put some conditions on the State Party in the case of the potential of threats to the Outstanding Universal Value that the property could be possibly inscribed to the List of World Heritage in Danger.

We believe that the language should be rather encouraging without any preconditions as we consider it. We always also say that there should be no prejudgment before the report comes out. We support the proposal of China and others to keep the original text.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would have a proposal of rewriting the paragraph in a more positive way as I agree with some observations made by the distinguished ambassador of China. My proposition would be to say the same thing but in a positive way in my point of view. The sentence would read after ‘*with a view to assuring the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site*’.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. Tanzania also supports China, Bahrain, Zimbabwe and the others to delete the last sentence which gives a certain tone to the State Party. We have time to see what can be done to the property, considering the State Party has a lot of challenges and in one year, definitely, time is small. I think we should do it objectively, see what can be done and let us see what happens.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you Chairperson. We also think that we support the suggestion from China. We think that the time scale is very limited to get a site back, especially when there are a lot of organisations, international bodies and local communities involved. The time frame is really short to judge the site and to put it on the in danger List, so we support the Chinese suggestion.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Right now, it seems that we have some member States and some members of the Committee who would prefer to retain the original paragraph 13 without the amendment of the view of considering the in Danger listing of the property. We also have a proposal from Brazil to replace this last sentence with a different one in which it says: *“with a view to ensuring the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site”*.”

Thank you, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Hearing and trying to respond to the commentaries and the desire to cast the word in a more positive tone; I am wondering whether that might be achieved by separating this paragraph into two components. The first would be for *“the Committee to note that in circumstances where there is ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of a property, the Committee may inscribe that property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”* and then the second part would be the existing 13.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Could you please give us the exact wording?”

Australia:

“Certainly: Immediately above existing 13, it would say: *“notes that in circumstances where there is ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of a property, the Committee may consider inscription of that that property on the List of World Heritage in Danger”* that would be it. And then if the Committee was happy with that approach then we would very happily withdraw the text below.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am looking at the new paragraph 13 and it sounds like we are repeating the Operational Guidelines in this property. This would be a standard paragraph in every property if this was the case, because we are repeating here what are in the Operational Guidelines. Should we just appeal to this particular property or you make a new rule that every property carries that new paragraph?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. I agree with Zimbabwe.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, l'Angola aimerait garder les choses simples. Si nous anticipons les choses ici, éventuellement il y a aura un problème sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle donc on parle du futur. Les choses peuvent changer positivement, donc là il faut faire deux paragraphes un dans le sens positif un dans le négatif et cela ne marchera pas.

On garde les choses simples, attendons le rapport du 1^{er} février 2019 pour que l'on décide ou non que le bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Gardons les choses simples. Attendons 2019 pour prendre une décision : il va sur la Liste ou il n'y va pas. Nous appuyons donc la proposition de la Chine et des autres pays.

Merci. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am sorry to ask for the floor again, but I thought the Brazilian addition with a different wording might go along well with the amended text if it captures the essence of the Australian colleagues, but at the same time it is still very encouraging. If we could not accept this or other version, perhaps the additional phrase proposed by Brazil could be a good solution. Simply added at the end of the sentence and paragraph we still maintain the current number 14, because we still consider Australia's new proposal without prejudging the result of whatever work is going to happen.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much and sorry to take the floor again. My difficulty with the proposal that has just been made by our Australian colleague is that we are mentioning circumstances where there is a certain or potential danger. I would like to recall what caused the destruction of this site was an earthquake. This is a circumstance that was not the country’s responsibility. We are now talking about the effort the country is making to recover. There might be circumstances beyond the willingness of the country like another earthquake; God help us that it does not happen. I would like to stick with the proposal endorsed by China.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Australia understands well the point that Brazil has just made about circumstances which are beyond control of the State Party due to the horrible earthquake and all its devastating circumstances. We also understand that some of the potential risks to the Outstanding Universal Value the property are coming respectively from some of the activities in the rebuilding. We understand well.

Our attempt is to reinstate the guidelines, as they exist now, and also make the observation that the formulation of the text that we originally suggested is a very common formulation, it has been used by this Committee over time. It has concerns about the ascertained or potential danger to a site’s Outstanding Universal Value and that we go through a procedure where we do seek to understand the truth of that threat. If that threat is demonstrated and is not mitigated then there is potential for in danger listing.

We have simply tried here to find a way to accommodate, but in the interest of the consensus we would be satisfied with the amendment to our text, as was proposed by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, Hungary and Cuba are you in accordance with the consensus?”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. I just want to thank Australia for joining the consensus. We believe that it is important again not to put any kind of prejudgment and conditions to this text. We would appreciate keeping the original text, but we can go along with the proposal of Brazil as it is already also supported by China.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, nous sommes un peu gênés par cette dernière phrase ; qu'est-ce qui va garantir le maintien de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle ? C'est une question ».

Ms Rössler:

“Thank you very much. This is with this Committee and you can get a report back next year. You will analyse the situation based on the report, the assessment of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chair. I will read out the new paragraph 13: *‘Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2019, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019; with a view to assuring the maintenance of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site.’*

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We agree with the proposal and the new amendment from Brazil, but we should say that we are speaking about maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value whereas the one before talked about recovering the Outstanding Universal Value. There is the Outstanding Universal Value and I think that we have to be consistent. I agree with maintenance, which implies that there is an Outstanding Universal Value that needs to be maintained. Therefore, the recovery as referred before is not right.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The Spanish delegate took the words right out of my mouth. I think that we have had a communication problem that we referred to

sometimes ago. But, of course, we will agree with the consensus and will try to facilitate your task. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now understand that there is a consensus. We adopt the text as agreed. Adopted. Thank you very much.

I now invite Mr. Jing to present the next report regarding the property proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Thank you.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you madam chairperson. Good afternoon to all Committee members. The report on the state of conservation of the Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore can be found in Document 42 COM 7B.Add2 on pages 6 to 11 of the English and pages 7 to 11 of the French version.

The property is mainly threatened by the construction of the Orange Metro Line. A large transportation project that passes on elevated viaduct immediately next to the Shalamar Gardens site. It has been brought to the attention of the Centre by the State Party at a very late stage.

The Committee has reviewed this case every year since the World Heritage Centre first received State Party information about the project in October of 2015 and has noted with increasing worry the scale and impact of the Orange Line Metro Project on the property and its Outstanding Universal Value. In 2016, the Committee requested that a Reactive Monitoring mission be dispatched at the State Party’s earliest convenience to examine the project and discuss with the relevant government authorities to also review the management and protection arrangements for the property.

Last year, the Committee expressed its deep regret that the State Party had not invited the Reactive Monitoring mission as requested and that no exhaustive Impact Assessment had been undertaken for this project, notably the requested Visual Impact Assessment in order to determine the project impact and any possible mitigation measures.

Since the Supreme Court of Pakistan was expected to deliver an imminent final verdict on the approval of the project and despite the fact that construction had already progressed significantly, the Committee asked that the mission be dispatched as soon as possible after the verdict was delivered. In December of 2017, the Supreme Court of Pakistan decided to approve the project and the joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission finally took place in April of 2018.

The context of two years’ delay made this mission quite challenging and complex. The mission found that the project had in fact been planned as early as 2007 and that, until the World Heritage Centre’s requests for information in October 2015, the State Party failed to inform the World Heritage Committee of the project, despite the provisions of Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines.

The State Party did not inform the 2012 Reactive Monitoring mission to the property of this project, although at that time the property had then been on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 2000. Nor was the project mentioned in section 2 of the second cycle of Periodic Reporting, which took place in 2011-2012 in the region of Asia and the Pacific.

Furthermore, the project was carried out without an adequate Heritage Impact Assessment and the study produced by the State Party in April of 2016, nine years after the inception of the project, was not in line with the internationally recommended standard for such studies, notably the 2011 ICOMOS Guidelines and hence failed to address the full range of the impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

This study makes no mention of the noise and the pollution impacts on the property and it failed to take into account the full range of impacts or elements of the component sites. The Heritage Environmental Impact Assessment concluded that the metro line will only have a temporary impact; well, during its operational phase the high visual, noise and vibration impacts recognised on the entrance and the front façade of the site will be permanent and cumulated, but indirect.

Lahore is a city with 12 million residents and there is obviously a need for improved public transport, however, the Impact Assessment failed to take into account views from inside and outside the Gardens. The viaduct passes so close to the southern wall of the Gardens that no measure can eliminate the negative effect on the main perspectives to and from the property.

Where the curved shape of the viaduct slightly reduces its visual impact, the height of the train as it passes will be above 3 metres higher than the top part of the constructed viaduct visible on the screen. You can see the person standing near the viaduct.

Today, what dominates this site is not the façade of the Shalamar Gardens but the Orange Line Metro viaduct which has altered the authenticity and integrity of the exterior appearance of the Shalamar Gardens. And where the existing Impact Assessment Study identified some mitigation actions, the road and the location should have been determined in such a way that they avoided any impact on the features of the Shalamar Gardens.

The 2018 mission found that several proposals to that effect had been made, but were eventually rejected. The visual impact of the next construction on the main perspectives to and from the perspective can clearly be seen in the pictures taken during the mission and shown on the screens. In addition, once the Orange Line Metro is in operation, its noise will add significantly to the already substantial noise and the pollution impacts of the Grand Trunk Road which passes underneath the viaduct in front of the property.

Despite being a masterpiece of Mughal construction, the Gardens have been less and less an oasis of tranquillity, as was their intended purpose, and this increasingly diminishes their ability to convey the full Outstanding Universal Value of this component site. As highlighted in the conclusions of the 2018 mission, there is no doubt that the Orange Line Metro has a negative impact on the attributives of the Outstanding Universal Value related to the artistic and aesthetic accomplishment highlighted at the time of the inscription. It is especially regrettable that such impact could have been avoided if the alternative routes presented to the 2018 Reactive Monitoring mission had been pursued in due time and in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

In accordance with the conclusions of the 2018 mission, it is suggested that the Committee places the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This will allow the State Party to show its goodwill by immediately proceeding with the implementation of all mitigation measures and recommendations put forward by the mission in an effort to mitigate the considerable impact of the project on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, notably its integrity and authenticity.

The Reactive Monitoring mission put forward an exhaustive series of recommended measures to help mitigate impacts and ensure that the property benefits from adequate protection, notably within the buffer zone. ICOMOS will provide more details in this regard. For these mitigating measures to be successful, it is of crucial importance that the State

Party submits detailed project studies to the World Heritage Centre for review by the Advisory Bodies and their implementation only start after positive feedback has been received.

Finally, in response to the report of the 2018 Reactive Monitoring mission, the World Heritage Centre received comments from the State Party of Pakistan on the 15th of June, 2018. Today, a meeting was held between the assistant Director General of Culture and the Director of the World Heritage Centre with the Pakistani delegation in order to discuss the case ahead of the present session and in response to comments made by the State Party.

The Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.12 can be found on page 9 of both language versions and is also displayed on the screen. With your permission madam Chairperson, ICOMOS will provide further comments on this property.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. ICOMOS greatly regrets the highly negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property resulting from the construction of the Orange Line Metro directly in front of the site of the Gardens. It is important to recall that the Shalamar Gardens, along with the Lahore Fort, were inscribed on the List of World Heritage on criterion (i) as an outstanding example of Mughal art.

The Shalamar Gardens, constructed in 1641 by Shah Jahan, were seen to bear witness to the apogee of the Mughal artistic expression. An important aspect of the Gardens was this enclosing wall, which would separate it from the outside world and allow the inside to be an oasis of peace and tranquillity. The metro line not only impacts on the view of the Gardens from outside the gate, but also inside from its lower and upper terraces. The noise will add to that of the Grand Trunk Road and increase pollution.

The current development does not respect the essence of this masterpiece as an earthly utopia within which people had the opportunity to move in perfect harmony with the elements of nature. The metro project has negated that original vision.

In its state of conservation report, the State Party explains that they considered that there was no impact on the Outstanding Universal Value; that is why no notification was made under Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines. ICOMOS considers that for all major infrastructure projects such as the Orange Line Metro, details should be provided so that an assessment could be submitted to the Committee that is otherwise unaware of such projects and can decide on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. Had the notification been made in 2007 when planning was started, we would have had 8 years of dialogue to discuss the details of the project with the State Party and to find a way for the Metro line so that it did not impact the Outstanding Universal Value.

There was a further missed opportunity for dialogue with a two-year delay in inviting the mission, which was only done after the project had been given formal approval. By the time the mission was carried out, the mission was only able to see the almost-completed project and there was no opportunity to intervene when there was still time to influence the outcome.

The mission and this presentation to the Committee are both in a way too late. The construction work has had irreversible impacts on the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value that were identified at the time of inscription. Full mitigation is not possible. For those reasons ICOMOS supports the decision to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List in Danger.

In order to mitigate some of the highly negative impact, and only some of the Metro, as recommended by the Reactive Monitoring mission, the draft decision requests the State Party to take a new approach to the conservation and preservation of the setting. Details are available on the screen.

Measures include installing soundproof glass around the metro line, diverting the ground terminal corridor away from the property and lowering its level, and creating a green belt around the property, especially around its south entrance. Some of these measures can be realised in the short term. We are quite aware that others will need a longer time for implementation. These measures must be carefully designed and submitted for review in order to understand just how successful they might be at mitigating the impact. They should be integrated into a set of corrective measures.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any comments or enquiries? The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, we would like to thank the Secretariat for this comprehensive overview of the present case pertaining to Shalamar Gardens. We appreciate the engagement of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in preservation of the twin listings, which are a marvel of Mughal architecture. We have studied this case carefully and are pleased to know, as per the decision taken in Cracow last year, that Pakistan has shared the Visual Impact Assessment along with the state of conservation report within the stipulated time frames, along with having invited the Reactive Monitoring mission in December of 2017.

We consider the present case as being one of maintaining the balance between the conservation of heritage and sustainable development. This is something that we have advocated for several years and have debated thoroughly in previous discussions. It is our firm belief that human well-being should not be compromised and rather these two issues of preservation of heritage and sustainable development should co-exist harmoniously.

However, while the development of the city needs to happen, we believe that the development mandate must be carried out with social-cultural, environmental and cultural sensitivity. Pakistan has shown consideration in all these aspects in planning and executing the metro project, including exhaustive technical studies and assessments which informed the project in the planning and implementation phases.

Furthermore, given that the Supreme Court of Pakistan has provided the detailed judgement allowing the project to go ahead, it further strengthens the mission and mandate of our Committee. The 31 directives that are detailed in the judgment are largely linked with the preservation and conservation of this property and are legally binding on the State Party.

The State Party has given repeated assurances that all 31 directives by the Supreme Court are practicable and reasonable mitigation measures proposed by the Reactive Monitoring mission along with all other mitigation measures suggested in various studies will be implemented.

When we have a State Party that is already applying relevant mitigation measures and is already constructively engaged with the World Heritage Centre, we see no justification

in taking the extreme step of inscribing this property in the in Danger List. There is a clear commitment by and readiness of the State Party to continue dialogue with the Advisory Bodies with a view to putting in place all these practical mitigation measures.

Moreover, we do not understand why the Committee keeps receiving the same reservation from the Advisory Bodies, as had been repeatedly discussed, debated and struck out in the past two sessions. We believe that instead of remaining stuck in the same loop echoing the past two years' decisions, it would be much more advisable to stick to the previous decisions of the Committee and to move to substantive issues at hand.

Therefore, we do not support the in Danger listing of Shalamar gardens as mitigation measures that are being put in place by Pakistan aimed at preserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, especially because in the light of various measures undertaken by the State Party there are no immitigable consequences on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Thereby, there is no justification of listing this site on the in Danger List.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The Brazilian delegation understands that the case that we are now analysing offers us another example of the challenge of conciliating urban development and the preservation of World Heritage sites, in developing countries specifically. In the case we are analysing, we are also dealing with a country with very heavy demographic pressure.

We understand that sustainable development solutions are urgently required to avoid further damage to the site and we encourage the State Party to take into consideration the recommendations made by ICOMOS, especially the measures that can be undertaken in order to safeguard the integrity and authenticity of the site.

We consider that prioritising the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of this site requires an approach that goes beyond strict aesthetical features and that it is important to elaborate conceptual terms to foster synergies for the transmission of the values attributed to the protected site.

The Brazilian delegation understands that the State Party concerned could be given more time so that the recommendations made by the monitoring mission to the site could be implemented, taking into account the technical and social reality on the ground. Therefore, we are of the opinion that it would be premature to inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. We are ready to present specific amendments if needed during the examination of the corresponding draft decision.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to China.”

China:

“Thank you, madam Chairperson. We would like to appreciate the good work done by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and we share their vision of conservation of heritage as framed in the 1972 Convention. We would also like to thank the Secretariat for their report and the brief résumé of the case before us.

Having carefully perused all the relevant documents, we fully support Azerbaijan that the government of Pakistan has taken into account all aspects of conservation of heritage and the preservation of understanding the Outstanding Universal Value has been at the core of the planning and the implementation phase of the metro project.

This is aptly demonstrated by the numerous studies undertaken by Pakistan before the implementation of the project. It may be useful to understand who undertook the studies and what their main findings were. In the same way, it is our understanding that these studies have indicated that there is no immitigable impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including its integrity and authenticity.

We would like to request the State Party to brief the Committee to understand the matter further. We are content to note the visual impact study has been shared in a timely fashion with the World Heritage Centre along with the state of conservation report. As such a report provides a sound basis for making an informed decision, we would like to request the Secretariat to share these along with the previously undertaken Heritage Impact Assessment with Committee members.

Pakistan Supreme Court’s decision to allow the project to go ahead and the long deliberation spread over a year and the independent verification of various studies undertaken by the State Party is also a welcome development. Furthermore, having gone through the proceedings of the case over the last two years, we believe that there is a need to build on the earlier decisions of the World Heritage Centre taken during the last two sessions.

Many issues here have been repeatedly discussed in past sessions and we need to move beyond these stalled debates to discuss the case on its present merits. Lastly, again echoing the view expressed by Azerbaijan, we believe that given the commitment of the State Party to implement all practicable mitigation measures there is no justification for taking this extreme measure of placing this property on the in Danger List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Cet exemple nous rappelle que hélas, c’est un cas d’occasions manquées de dialogue fructueux entre des États parties et les Organisations consultatives qui auraient permis d’éviter d’en arriver à cette extrémité c’est-à-dire de proposer l’inscription d’un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril.

La Tunisie rappelle que l’inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine en péril n’est pas une sanction, mais dans beaucoup de cas, elle permet de participer à améliorer la conservation d’un bien et la pérennisation de sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

L'état partie depuis les décisions du Comité fournit des efforts pour atténuer les impacts et les effets négatifs des travaux qui ont été réalisés. Sur ce point j'aimerais avoir plus de précisions de la part de l'État partie sur les efforts qu'il est en train de fournir et l'avis de l'ICOMOS. Est-ce que concrètement et réellement, ces efforts effectués ou à effectuer vont contribuer à atténuer les attaques négatives sur le bien ?

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, thank you for giving my delegation the opportunity to express views on the draft decision pertaining to the Orange Metro project and its possible impacts on Shalamar Gardens. As the co-sponsor of the amendments proposed jointly with Azerbaijan, China, Indonesia and Cuba, we believe that the World Heritage Committee should build on its earlier decisions taken during the 40th and 41st sessions.

We need to acknowledge the efforts of Pakistan and its readiness to undertake practical measures to mitigate minor adverse impacts. Madam Chairperson, it is important to give an opportunity to Pakistan to explain its position and respond to issues being raised in the debate. We therefore request the State Party to be given that opportunity.

Chair lady, whereas the World Heritage Committee is mandated to oversee the protection of this heritage site, it should not be oblivious of the requirements of the State Party to undertake projects aimed at uplifting the quality of life of its people. The Orange Metro project which has been envisaged as meeting the transport requirements of Lahore City, home to 12 million residents and the second-largest city of Pakistan, is one such project. Pakistan has conducted a number of assessment studies prior to the execution of the project which indicated no significant or immitigable impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

We have been informed that the State Party is committed to implementing all practical recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring mission. In our view, therefore, we should not punish the State Party that has implemented some of these recommendations which have social and technical constraints, such as shifting a 250-year-old road and constructing a new motorway in an area inhabited by people for the past ages.

Hence, madam Chairperson, similar to the previous case of Uzbekistan, we do not recommend in Danger listing in this matter.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ma délégation joint sa voix à celle de l'Ouganda pour reconnaître que, depuis la 41^e session du Comité, l'État partie du Pakistan a fourni des efforts pour respecter les décisions du Comité en fournissant une étude d'impact visuel, un rapport sur l'état de conservation et en montrant sa disponibilité à accueillir une mission de suivi d'évaluation réactive.

Si en 2016 l'État partie n'avait pas fourni des informations sur la gestion du bien, en 2017 et 2018, par contre, il a pris des précautions, y compris l'achèvement de dix études techniques qui ont été entreprises avant le projet de construction de la mise en œuvre de la voie, objet de contestation.

En outre les observations faites aux points 3, 4 5 et 6 du projet de décision ont déjà été discutées et prises en compte lors des deux précédentes sessions du Comité en 2016 et 2017 et des mesures nécessaires ont été prises en compte par l'État partie. Dans ce cas, aucune étude n'a montré de dommages irréversibles depuis lors.

Notons que le Pakistan a montré son engagement continu en faveur de la conservation du patrimoine notamment dans la collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Il s'est engagé en outre à tenir compte des mesures d'atténuation proposées par la mission de suivi réactif ainsi que le jugement détaillé de la Cour suprême du Pakistan qui annonce 31 mesures d'atténuation complètes que l'État partie est légalement tenu de respecter.

Madame la présidente, dans le cas présent, il s'agit de rechercher l'équilibre entre la conservation du patrimoine et le développement durable. Le Pakistan est un pays en développement et c'est l'un de ses premiers projets de transport en commun de cette envergure. Nous pensons que lorsqu'il sera opérationnel le métro réduira la lourde charge sur la route qui passe devant le bien et augmentera donc son attractivité touristique. La valeur universelle exceptionnelle ne saurait de ce fait diminuer avec les mesures de précaution et de conservation qui seront prises.

En ce qui concerne la pollution visuelle relevée par les évaluations, les études d'experts ont indiqué qu'il est facile de l'atténuer en plantant des arbres le long de la voie du métro pour harmoniser les jardins. Le Pakistan s'engage à planter des arbres le long de cette voie pour y remédier.

Pour toutes ces raisons, la recommandation de placer le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine en danger nous paraît une étape extrême. C'est pourquoi ma délégation a pris la position de l'Azerbaïdjan, de la Chine, du Brésil concernant sa non-inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine en danger.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair. The Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of Pakistan for its efforts to protect and conserve the Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore despite intensive urban development pressure. Tanzania also commends the World Heritage Centre

and the Advisory Bodies for the draft decision which clearly indicates the complexity of dealing with the management of urban heritage in a developing environment.

Madam Chair, the delegation of Tanzania has carefully examined the opinions and facts of both the State Party of Pakistan and the Advisory Bodies, which contradict sharply. For example, with regard to the visual impact of the metro line project which needs to be resolved before implication in the decision.

Madam Chair, the Delegation of Tanzania recommends that, prior to an in Danger listing, the State Party, in consultation with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, identifies the corrective measures and developed desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger as per Paragraphs 183 and 189 of the Operational Guidelines.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Madam Chair, this case emphasises the delicate balance of preservation that includes a certain atmosphere on this site and the need to control urban pressure and the developmental needs of infrastructure projects that, on the one hand, will positively contribute to a better traffic situation, but, on the other hand, are too close and cause negative impacts on the cultural heritage at stake.

Norway shares the concerns expressed by the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS that the project for the Orange Line Metro never became subject to information according to the mechanism detailed in the Operational Guidelines. We encourage the State Party to undertake actions to implement the mitigating actions as specified in the draft decision.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. It is quite obvious to Australia as outlined in the opening presentation that much of the damage to the Outstanding Universal Value of the Shalamar Gardens has been done and it is regrettable, but the State Party during that period was not actively engaged with the World Heritage Committee or fully cognizant of its responsibility, especially regarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Very conscious of the need for Pakistan to meet the need of its people, as it further develops, we encourage the State Party to continue to find ways to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is impacted as little as possible. We do hear what colleagues have said about the more recent willingness and effort of Pakistan to address the concerns that have been expressed by the World Heritage Committee in relation to impacts on this property.

In that regard we would certainly welcome hearing the State Party's response to some of these issues and including, if it is able to, indication as to whether any of the mitigation measures that have been proposed in the Draft Decision are mitigation measures that it is willing to contemplate.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their detailed briefing on the case. We would like to align our views with those expressed by our distinguished colleagues from Azerbaijan and China. We are happy to note that all three decisions of the 41st Session of the World Heritage Committee have been complied with, including the timely submission of the state of conservation report and Visual Impact Study. We are particularly content to know that the Reactive Monitoring mission visited Lahore in April of 2018.

We commend Pakistan for engaging with the World Heritage Committee process despite the extreme scarcity of reaction time available to them. Hence, we are satisfied that Pakistan is doing its utmost to preserve the integrity and authenticity of the property. At the time of its inscription in 1981, it had been included under criterion (iii); that is exceptional testimony of Mughal civilisation at its peak as an artificial landscape of marvellous, sprawling gardens enclosed within walls of red sandstone.

We believe that in their present state, in view of the mitigation measures that are being undertaken by the State Party and given the willingness of the State Party to remain engaged with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS process, with the common goals of preservation and conservation, we join other colleagues with their support not to put the property on the in Danger List at this moment.

Echoing what our colleague from China suggested, we think that now is a good time to invite the State Party to present their case, particularly the efforts that have been undertaken in the past two years and their future plans to implement their mitigation measures.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. In recent years, we have seen how this site has been the victim of an undesirable visual impact. If we look at the information provided to us by the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat, we see that a series of measures have been proposed that could be very useful for the State Party. This was also the result of the Reactive Monitoring mission in 2018 and I was right to hope that the State

Party is in a position to implement and act upon these recommendations. Indeed, if this is done, I believe that there is no reason why we need to put this property on the World Heritage in Danger List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are also very concerned about the integrity of the site and the recommendations and the concerns of the Advisory Bodies and the experts for the site. Meanwhile, we also understand that a lot of countries, especially those with large populations, need to develop and one of the major challenges, as we see in national conferences and meetings, is public transportation. Sometimes those might cause visual obstruction but they solve issues of transportation existing in many cities.

We notice some recommendations adopted that could ease such technical and visual issues. The State of Kuwait also strongly recommends that the State Party engaged in that expertise come up with solutions to ease and solve this issue, but we strongly understand that the site should be on the in Danger List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Kyrgyzstan.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will be very brief. Just to say that, we support the amendments proposed by Azerbaijan, China and other States Party and also supported by other distinguished colleagues, as these amendments focus more on mitigation measures to ensure preservation, protection and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value. We should also note that the report of the Reactive Monitoring mission was submitted in June and the report made certain recommendations and we understand there should be time allowed for and that Pakistan will implement all possible actions suggested by this report.

The report has also directed the government to implement 31 measures to ensure that no negative impact is caused to the property and therefore it would be too early to decide to put the property on the in danger List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I would like to express my concerns as expressed by other delegations, as we would all like to see this site inscribed on the World Heritage List preserved. There is also a desire to combine the existence of this site with the development of this city and the needs of its inhabitants.

Perhaps what worries us most when listening to some of the delegations is that we are forgetting one vital element in this whole affair; that is, dialogue with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. We are actually forgetting our Operational Guidelines that date back to 1972. We are also forgetting that there were a series of recommendations linked to previous monitoring missions and their need to be respected. I believe beyond measures that we take at international level with the aim of preserving heritage, we also have to take into account everything that goes with the 1972 Convention that allows us to better protect sites.

Now, we have to see what kind of additional measures can be taken to try and mitigate the impact of this infrastructure and how we can engage in more dialogue and the State Party can work with the World Heritage Centre in order to really mitigate the impacts to a minimum so we can continue to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of this property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. L'Angola est conscient des risques potentiels qui pèsent sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce bien. Comme nous ne cessons de le dire, quand un État membre fait les efforts d'inscrire un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, il s'efforce de le garder sur la Liste pour la dignité du peuple de son pays et, quand on fait face à des situations aussi dramatiques comme celles-là, nous devons toutefois essayer de trouver des compromis qui pourraient aider l'État partie à continuer à faire des efforts pour pouvoir maintenir la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

Par contre, nous avons également pris note qu'il y a une série de recommandations proposées par les Organisations consultatives qui certainement pourrait demander beaucoup plus d'effort de la part de l'État partie et nous avons également pris note qu'il y a eu des consultations entre l'État partie, le Centre et les Organisations consultatives.

Il semble donc qu'il serait bon de savoir comment l'État partie se positionne par rapport à toutes ces consultations et les recommandations qu'ils ont reçues. Nous voudrions vous demander de pouvoir accorder la parole à l'État partie pour nous apporter des éclaircissements qui pourront aider le Comité à prendre la meilleure décision sur ce cas.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to reflect on the discussion we had. We would also like to encourage continuing the dialogue between the Secretariat, ICOMOS and the State Party. It seems that the Committee members are in favour of not listing the property in the in Danger List. I think it is important for us as well to take a look at the judgement and directions made by the Supreme Court and to ensure these recommendations are actually addressing the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and not just the area in general. I think this is a very critical element and we are hoping that the Committee can take that into consideration when we refer back to the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much Madam. Zimbabwe supports the proposition by Azerbaijan not to inscribe the property of the Fort and Shalamar Gardens in Lahore on the World Heritage List in Danger. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the State Party to answer the questions and comments. The floor is to Pakistan.”

Pakistan:

“Thank you madam Chair for the opportunity to address this august gathering. Before I respond specifically to some of the issues that have been raised I would like to, by way of background, link you to the last two years’ of discussions that have been held and the considerations of various aspects of this project before the World Heritage Committee votes in Istanbul and Cracow.

Before I say anything, let me reiterate Pakistan’s unwavering commitment to the protection, conservation and preservation of our heritage. This august body recalled that the World Heritage Committee, in its 41st session in Cracow, required three important follow-up actions by Pakistan.

1) Accordingly, the state of conservation report of the Shalamar Gardens was to be submitted before the 1st of February of 2018, as required, and it was submitted accordingly before the deadline.

2) The Visual Impact Assessment Study was furnished to the World Heritage Centre in November of 2017; that is, before the 1st of December deadline, as asked by the World Heritage Committee in Cracow.

3) The Reactive Monitoring mission was invited on the 14th of December, 2017, that is immediately after the judgement of the Supreme Court of Pakistan announced directions as did the World Heritage Committee and this action was also completed accordingly.

Madam Chair, the honourable Supreme Court rendered its judgement on this case on the 8th of December, giving 31 specific directions for the protection, preservation and

conservation of the property. We are legally bound to comply with all of these directions. I would just explain to the delegations of this Body that all of these directions pertain to and are for ensuring the preservation, conservation and protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. All of the recommendations are to that effect, which we will implement.

We also assure the Committee that all mitigation measures by all of the studies will also be implemented. Despite our invitation on the 14th of December, 2017, the Reactive Monitoring mission was able to carry out the visit in April of 2018. The report was received by us on the 14th of June, giving us very limited time to examine the details. In this limited time we hurriedly reviewed the report and implemented some of the factual errors to the World Heritage Centre on the 15th of June, 2018.

We wish to point out here that the international consultancy took one year to complete the Visual Impact Assessment study as required by the World Heritage Committee. The study concluded, and I quote: *'that the authenticity, visual integrity and the Outstanding Universal Value of the property are not significantly impacted by the metro project. Corrective measures are applied like installation of vegetation screens'*. I would underscore the importance of this because there are minimal visual impacts created on the property from inside and to some extent on the outside. This is the considered recommendation of the visual impact study which was conducted by an international consultant over a one-year period.

We are surprised to find that a short-term Reactive Monitoring mission of six days makes a statement to the fact that the project has irreversible impacts on the attributes of its Outstanding Universal Value. Madam Chair, in any case, we will carry out a detailed examination of the report and stand committed to implementing all that is doable.

In terms of protective and mitigation measures, Pakistan is legally bound to implement the Supreme Court's decisions. For all mitigation and protective measures in all of the studies of the project, like Heritage Impact Assessment, Visual or Environmental Impact Assessment, vibration analyses, noise, etc. we are fully committed to implementing the recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring mission within the elements of practical reality and feasibility.

Some of the issues that have been highlighted pertaining to noise pollution and vibrations are all taken care of in our studies and these are also mandated by the Supreme Court. I will illustrate one example in terms of noise. The Supreme Court has directed that the speed of the train in front of this property will be reduced to a point where the noise levels do not rise to a level where it can cause any kind of danger to the property. The vibration analyses by the international standard have concluded a safe range during construction as well; it never measured vibrations above the allowed limit and in the operational phase it is far less than 50 per cent of that same limit.

Madam Chair, we would like to assure this Committee that for this property, which has been inscribed on the World Heritage List, we have extreme sensitivity to it and one of the illustrations of that is the picture before you, which shows the sharp curve created to take the viaduct of the train away from the property. This involved special designing, etc. some extra costs which were not an issue for the governments of Punjab and Pakistan to ensure the property was not affected in any adverse manner. At this time, the way it was executed, there is no negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property which cannot be mitigated.

Once again, I will assure you that once we go back from here, we will have a detailed examination of other recommendations from the Reactive Monitoring mission and we ensure this august body that unless something is absolutely impossible to undertake, again, we will share our constraints with the Centre and with the Advisory Bodies and we will try our best to implement their recommendations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the NGO representative.”

NGO - Lahore Conservation Society

“Honourable Chair, respected colleagues, we deeply appreciate and fully endorse the Reactive Monitoring mission and World Heritage Committee draft decision that unequivocally states irreversible damage to the Outstanding Universal Value, which states that the State Party reporting does not in any way reflect the reality on site.

In fact the viaduct is directly above the hydraulic tank, which is an integral part of the property. The Supreme Court was illegally used by the State Party as a delaying tactic. The credibility of the State Party in implementing anything is in doubt. We deeply regret and condemn the continued wilful resistance to invite the Reactive Monitoring mission and the deliberate misrepresentation of technical and legal facts by the State Party over the last two years.

The State Party has suggested mitigation measures which are superficial and irrelevant. No mitigation measures have been made. The transport requirement of this metro, which is costing US\$ 2.8 billions, serves less than 1.5 per cent of the population. The original plan was for an underground.

The State Party points 17 and 18 do not mention the next concrete kitchen structure for a restaurant built within the Lahore Fort; it is illegal and should be removed. We deeply regret that both these cases display a serious transgression and a pattern of non-adherence to the Convention. All mitigation measures proposed by the Reactive Monitoring mission must be implemented; in fact all ground-level traffic should be taken underground.

Today, we are left with no choice but to raise a critical question: Where is the integrity and authenticity we talk about? This is a modern precedent on how the process was derailed and must never happen again. Today, we come here to speak truth to power. We request all Committee members to take this into cognition; we have seen the amendment and we are shocked. It is important not to take political decisions that clearly undermine the technical evaluation and the critical value of the Reactive Monitoring mission of the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies. The process needs to reclaim its credibility. It is imperative to create a formal mechanism to include civil society in the process for objective and transparent evaluation.

Today, the people of Pakistan stand tall in dignity and pride for UNESCO, for the World Heritage Centre, for the Committee, the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. May we all work together...”

The Chairperson:

“You are already one minute over your time. Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As has been already acknowledged during the discussion, we have received an amendment on this draft decision from Azerbaijan, China, Cuba, Indonesia and Cuba. We also received an amendment from Spain for an additional paragraph. As you know, in the original decision this property was posed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In the amendment proposed by the group of countries it is proposed that this property is not inscribed in the in Danger List.

First of all, a small technical correction in paragraph 2: the usual way of referring to previous sessions is that we put the venue of the Committee and the year so we could just amend that part into ‘Cracow 2017’. Thank you very much.

I will run through the proposal. Spain proposes adding a new paragraph: ‘*acknowledges the decision of the Supreme Court*’. Then we have the proposal of the group of countries for paragraphs 4 and 7 to be deleted and we have a proposal for a redrafted paragraph 5:

- 5 ‘*to acknowledge implementation of mitigation measures and to request close monitoring and implementation of measures directed in the order of the Supreme Court*’.

Then we have the proposal to delete paragraphs 9 to 12. Then we have a slightly more defined paragraph 13 and the proposal for all paragraph 14 to be deleted. And then a slightly amended paragraph 15 and, if I may, for just one moment, scroll back to new paragraph 5. I have a small suggestion as it is the first time we see the abbreviation ‘*Orange Line Metro train project (OLMTP)*’.

Thank you very much madam Chair, these are the amendments that we have received.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway commends the State Party for taking steps to replace heavy vehicle traffic with efficient public transport. We think that every big city wherever in the world should do so in accordance with the goals for sustainable development.

Norway is comfortable with postponing the decision of putting the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger and to revisit this case in one year. However, we feel that corrective measures should be in place as listed in paragraph 14 in the draft decision and, furthermore, we agree with Spain in that we need to remember past decisions made by this Committee.

Consequently, we would prefer the text in the draft decision with the exception of paragraphs 11 and 12 that should be deleted or rephrased accordingly and we accept the deletion of paragraphs 5 and 6 as stated in the amendment made by Azerbaijan and other countries.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway took the words out of my mouth, so thank you Norway. We are generally comfortable with the draft decision as amended, but would also like to see the corrective measures identified retained in the decision that the Committee takes, as we heard the distinguished representative from Pakistan outline that they are committed to implementing, as best as they possibly can, all of the recommendations of the Reactive Monitoring mission. Therefore we think it is appropriate those corrective measures, as identified in the draft decision, should be retained.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I think it is important, as Australia said, to recall directive 82, that when we build infrastructure we have to communicate it. Therefore, we think that paragraph 4 should be included as well as the other paragraphs the Norwegian delegation referred to.

We think that it is necessary to refer to the mitigation of the effect of construction initiatives in reference to this sentence of the decisions of the Court because there are other measures that were considered by the Supreme Court to mitigate the impact and the more the measures, the better the protection of the property will be. We have no problem with removing the inscription from the in Danger List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Brazil. Actually, please, Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much. To facilitate your task and work I would suggest we go paragraph by paragraph so that we can respond to certain concerns raised by several committee members. I think it would be easier for us to guide the work.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We would like to support the comment made by Spain in paragraph 4 because it conciliates both of our positions here, which are the non-

inscription of the site on the List of in Danger and to recognise the efforts of the State Party in order to implement the recommendations made by the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Could you now go paragraph by paragraph?”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 remain unchanged. Then we have a proposal for a new paragraph 4 by Spain, supported by Brazil, which I will now read out...”

The Chairperson:

“We will adopt paragraph by paragraph and when we adopt one paragraph it means we will not go back and discuss it, it will be final.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. I restart and apologise. Paragraph 1 has been adopted. Paragraph 2 remains unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 2 unchanged adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Then Paragraph 3 unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 3 unchanged adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Then we have a new paragraph 4 proposed by Spain and supported by Brazil:

- Takes further note of the decision of the Honourable Supreme Court of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan that has given 31 directions with regard to protection, preservation and conservation of the property’.”

The Chairperson:

“Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Azerbaijan fully supports this proposal and we think that it would be very good to take note of the decision of the Supreme Court that Pakistan is legally bound to.”

The Chairperson:

“China, please.”

China:

“Thank you Chair. China also supports this sentence.”

The Chairperson:

“Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie soutient aussi cette proposition. »

The Chairperson:

“Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Chair, Cuba also supports this proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda also supports this paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Indonesia, please.”

Indonesia:

“Madam Chair, Indonesia also supports paragraph 4.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? No, so we adopt paragraph 4.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. We have former paragraph 4 which is proposed for complete deletion. Thank you”.

The Chairperson:

“Any comments? Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. As I said, Spain would like the reference kept on the importance of complying with the Operational Guidelines as well as respect for decisions that can have an impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you. We agree with Spain. We think the paragraph should be kept.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Azerbaijan”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you. The reason for amendments to delete this paragraph are very obvious. This matter has been extensively discussed and debated during the last sessions of the World Heritage Committee in Istanbul and Cracow. It is obvious that reporting under Paragraph 172 is obligatory when restorations or new constructions may affect the Outstanding Universal Value.

In this case, there were multiple studies, starting with the Environmental Impact Assessment, Heritage Impact Assessment and Visual Impact Assessment, and detailed vibration analysis both during the construction and operational phases. All these assessments, as detailed by the international consultancy, have not indicated any adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, so the critical attributes of the property’s Outstanding Universal Value, including the plans of the garden and its terraces, the water tank design and decorative features remain.

None of these Outstanding Universal Value attributes will be directly or indirectly impacted by this Orange Metro Line. So, consequently, reporting of this Orange Line to the

World Heritage Centre under Paragraph 172 was not required, as discussed in the previous session. That was the reason why we proposed deletion of this paragraph. We remain in the position to delete this paragraph.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please.”

Australia:

“We have a different view on this one from my distinguished colleague from Azerbaijan. I think with all the information presented by the reports to this Committee, it is quite reasonable to conclude that there have been impacts on the property and therefore we would align with the preference of Spain and Norway for this paragraph to be retained.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am in support of the Ambassador of Azerbaijan for the reason that he gave for deletion. Just in case we could not reach an agreement on this particular paragraph with our colleagues from Spain, Norway and Australia, perhaps we should draft something new, indicating perhaps from a more positive tone that it is requested for any future development, or implementation of mitigation measures should be in compliance with the requirements under the Guidelines.

Perhaps something in that line, then it is with reference to future rather than reference to what has happened already. It does not really help if we only dwell on the past; rather, we should be forward-looking.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you. I do not think that we are dwelling on the past. I think it is a fact that such information had not been received by the World Heritage Committee. I really do not see any means of reinterpreting that other than stating a fact that information has not been received and it does not have any repercussions for the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “I think we have a different interpretation of Paragraph 172, which asks for information to be provided that may affect the property. So, when one is devising a project there is a need for a dialogue in order to forestall any possible damage. We should have a reference for the future. This goes without saying.

If we start to say in the Committee that the Centre does not have to be informed because the State Party does not think there would be an effect then why should we have Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines? If we do not want a reference to that Paragraph 172, I do not see what harm there is in referring to texts that are mandatory and binding on other States Parties.

If you do not want that reference to the damage that has been caused because you consider that the damage has not been proven, fine. What is clear is that the Centre was not given previous information, which is what Paragraph 172 stipulates. Therefore, it is very important to have a dialogue and to avoid a situation such as this one and which results in us having to discuss whether or not we are going to inscribe a property in the World Heritage List in Danger. That is the sort of thing you want to avoid. The point is to reconcile sustainable development with protection of inscribed properties.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you Chairperson. We also agree with Spain, Norway and Australia regarding stating the facts and also saying that it would help the point of view stated by China for future activities. This is stating a fact to mitigate and we agree with that point of view.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. Cuba is willing to go along with the consensus as to the best way of wording this resolution. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that what this paragraph is saying was the meaning of three years ago, when the situation was brought up to the Committee for the first time. We have been coping with this for the past few years and we think having it in the draft decision now would be superfluous.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“We always refer to consistency in this Committee to decisions taken in previous sessions. As I already mention in my explanation of the deletion of this amendment, I said that this issue was heavily discussed in previous Committee decisions and there was a Committee decision to remove this reference for the text of the Committee decision.

For the sake of consistency we propose to delete this, as all studies have been done and there was no any indication that this metro line project impacted negatively with the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. If the Committee would like to go along with the consistency then it would be good. If there are any other positions, we are really puzzled.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any other comment? China please.”

China:

“Sorry to ask for the floor again madam Chair. I was also thinking just in case we could not reach a compromise perhaps indicating something like ‘*reiterate the importance of the Paragraph 172 of the Operational Guidelines*’, something along these lines might also be a way out.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“We would like to ask the Centre to give us some advice on how to understand Paragraph 172 that we are now discussing.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. You have Paragraph 172 in your Operational Guidelines. The idea is that the Committee can take informed decisions on the basis of early information to avoid situations we are facing today in a number of cases. In this case, early information did not come to the Committee; this was confirmed in the report you heard today.

Unfortunately, I have to say that this paragraph is maybe one of the most underutilised by States Parties of the Convention, as we get most information from other bodies and civil society in terms of Paragraph 172. We would like to see in the future of this Convention that the early information is used to the best possible extent, as was mentioned by many members of this Committee to have an early dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to prevent such situations in the future. We have all the expertise available to make the best available decision.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We now have two different opinions. Would you like to go for a vote or establish a group from all the concerned countries and do we give you some time or you want to vote today? Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Madam Chair, I do not think that the matter requires further discussion as there are other items in the draft decision that would require further discussion. As I mentioned earlier, it is just a regret we are not recommending or requesting anything. If we read the decisions of other Committees and do not regret what happened maybe some members of this Committee will have some concerns of having regret. It is not the matter of consistency it is just a matter of reflecting on things that have happened in the past and as I said it has no repercussions for the State Party whatsoever. I think it is one of the items in the draft decision and there are other items that I think will require time to deliberate and discuss.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you agree that you need more time to discuss? Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, je pense que nous sommes devant une situation où il faut mettre en place un groupe de rédaction. Pourquoi ? Tout simplement parce que le projet de décision a été rédigé dans une perspective négative d’inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Là, nous revenons sur une situation positive donc cela demande que le projet soit revu dans cette perspective-là.

On ne peut pas le faire à l’écran c’est pratiquement ingérable. Il faudra que l’Azerbaïdjan qui a proposé des amendements à ce projet de décision et certains pays que je vois l’Espagne, la Norvège, l’Australie par exemple se mettent ensemble et proposent quelque chose d’assez cohérent en reprenant les recommandations des Organisations consultatives que l’État partie devrait mettre en place pour pouvoir soumettre un rapport dans un an. Je pense qu’il faut mettre en place un groupe de rédaction c’est notre position.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, when we listen to the different voices, we seem to be castigating Pakistan in this room. For sure Pakistan did not abide at this Committee through the World Heritage Centre then, madam Chair, why don’t we allow space to state whether they did so or not? In this regard, then we could either retain or delete after the submission.

I submit Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, Australia is open to the suggestion that this could be resolved through a drafting group. I do make the observation that there is no lack of coherence in what has been proposed by Spain and Norway and supported by Australia. We are simply asking that some elements of the original draft decision be retained and we indicate where they are and if we go through those things paragraph by paragraph we will get productively through them, but I am happy with the recommendation of a working group if this is what the Committee would like to do.

In relation to this paragraph we are discussing right at the moment, having heard the intervention from Azerbaijan, this subject having been discussed previously, I had a look at the decision from the 40th session of the Committee in Istanbul and *‘the Committee expressed concerns about the decision of the monorail and also reminded the State Party of its obligation to report to the Centre any developments that may have the potential to impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property under Paragraph 172.’*

It would be good to know, as I have not been able to ascertain, whether the project was underway already at that time and if it was underway and the State Party had been reminded of its reporting obligations then I think it would be reasonable to assume that paragraph 4 in those circumstances is not necessary to retain, but I would want to know from the Centre exactly what the status was of the development of the railway at the time when the Committee considered this matter at Istanbul.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Norway please. Actually, Brazil”

Brazil:

“Thank you, Chair. Based on our technical evaluation, we think that trying to find a positive and constructive solution does not mean that we will forget what happened and does not prevent us from regretting past measures that could have been conducted in a better way. In that sense, we support the proposal made by Spain, Norway and Australia in order to state that we regret what happened.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Would you like to constitute a drafting group? We give you the text tonight and come back to us tomorrow or the day after. I think that this is a reasonable solution. It gives you time to ponder and tomorrow you tell us when you are ready. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

Madam Chair, we fully respect your aspiration to move forward and understand that we are stuck with this draft decision. We are in favour of consensual decision-making and finding a compromise with opposing opinions. We are ready to discuss this in a small drafting group and to come up, maybe tomorrow in the afternoon, with accepted language.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think this is reasonable. Norway, please, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Could the World Heritage Centre join us in the working group please?”

The Chairperson:

“Ok, thank you. You have to be flexible in order to reach a positive solution. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Regarding the proposal of Norway to invite the representative of the World Heritage Centre we do not object, of course, it would be good to listen to them and their position. At the same time, we would like to invite a representative of the State Party concerned to be part of this and to again provide information during this process.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “The same comment as was made by Azerbaijan. I believe the State Party would give us some additional information regarding the measures taken. If we are going to draft, this should be done between members of the Committee and those who wish to take part in it and also with the presence of the Advisory Bodies and the Centre, so that we can get the needed information from these two bodies and take into account the information from the State Party”

The Chairperson:

“According to the rules, a drafting Committee must be from Committee members; the others can attend as observers without giving their opinion. You just have to be practical. At the end we need to reach an acceptable resolution for all of you. Tomorrow, this will be distributed, today the draft and you can have a think about it, discuss it among yourselves

and I will be happy to take time tomorrow afternoon or the day after to come up with it is as you like.

We have one question. Who will be chairing the group, Azerbaijan or Uganda? Angola, sorry I cannot see so far.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente. D’abord nous appuyons la proposition de l’Espagne que ce groupe de rédaction soit constitué uniquement par les membres du Comité. On n’a pas besoin des observateurs, les membres du Comité doivent rédiger ce projet de décision.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Please, Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “We do not see any problems with doing that and trying to reach a consensus, so that we can come up with a proposal which will allow us to draft a decision which is positive but also consistent. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Is Spain going to chair the drafting group? Yes. Everyone agrees. Spain will chair the group and tomorrow if you have any development or if you need anything, I will be available morning or afternoon. Thank you very much. We are closing today and will see you tomorrow at 10:00 am. Before that we have an announcement.”

The Secretariat:

“For tonight’s side events, there are only two. One starts at 6:10 pm this is an event organised by the Advisory Bodies by IUCN and called Climate Change and World Heritage dealing with the most sinister threat to World Heritage.

Of course, this is the last time we have to announce our special fund raising event, A Night at Virunga, which is at 8:00 pm tonight. Transport will be ensured and leaves from the venue at 7:30 pm and buses will take you back to your hotel. There are still few tickets available. If you wish to join, it is now the time to go and get them.

Thank you and enjoy your evening.”

FOURTH DAY – Thursday 28 June 2018

SEVENTH SESSION

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good morning everybody. Please take your seat. Before proceeding with our agenda, I would like to indicate that there was a typing mistake in the Draft Decision adopted yesterday concerning the state of conservation of the site of Japan, Meiji Industrial Revolution. In this regard allow me to confirm that the correct number of the decision adopted is 42 COM 7B.10. The Director has an announcement to make.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good morning to all of you. At the Bureau meeting there was a discussion presented by the delegation of Azerbaijan to advance the state of conservation report of Pirin in Bulgaria earlier, because the delegation will be leaving. As Bulgaria is not yet here and as proposed by Azerbaijan, we will do it at the beginning of the afternoon session.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Let us continue our agenda item and I invite Mr. Feng Jing to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Asia-Pacific region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. A very good morning to you all, distinguished Committee members. The following properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Asia- Pacific region for which the draft decision will be adopted without discussion are:

The Ancient Building Complex in the Wudang Mountains (China) Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.1; next is the Temple and Cemetery of Confucius and the Kong Family Mansion in Qufu in China, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.3; followed by Zuojiang Huashan Rock Art Cultural Landscape (China) Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.4; Silk Roads: the Routes Network of Chang’an–Tian-shan Corridor in China, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.5; next is the Archaeological Site of Nalanda Mahavihara (Nalanda University) at Nalanda, in the State of Bihar, India, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.6; Hill Forts of Rajasthan in India, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.7; Sangiran Early Man Site in Indonesia, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.8; then we have The Persian Qanat in the Islamic Republic of Iran, 42 COM 7B.9; next site Pyu Ancient Cities (Myanmar), Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.11; Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha in Nepal Draft, Decision 42 COM 7B.13; Rice Terraces of the Philippine Cordilleras in the Philippines; Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.15; Golden temple of Dambulla in Sri Lanka; Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.16 and finally the last site, the Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications in Sri Lanka, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.17

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or comments? Sri Lanka, please, you have the floor.”

Sri Lanka:

“Thank you madam Chair and sorry for the delay. Since Sri Lanka has been given the floor for the first time, I would like to congratulate your appointment, Excellency, as Chairperson of this 42nd Session and I would also like to thank the Bahraini government for their excellent hospitality.

At this point, I would like to mention the current situation relevant to Decisions 42 COM 7B.16 and 42 COM 7B.17 related to the World Heritage sites of Galle and the Temple of Dambulla. Since the beginning of June, 2018, that is the beginning of this month and the appointment of the new Minister of Cultural Affairs, the State Party has now resolved all misunderstandings with the Temple authority and now commenced all actions in order to conserve wall paintings and other significant attributes to the property. There is a site management of the property also in place and working in collaboration with all concerned.

Since the draft decisions state that the time frame given is the 1st of February, 2019, we feel that it is a little bit close and that we are having a problem of attending to this time frame. As it states that the State Party if it cannot fulfil the obligation there is potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value and that it will be submitted in the next session to be placed as possible heritage site in Danger, I would like to extend this time frame until the 1st of December, 2019, to discuss this particular issue in the 44th session,

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Would anyone else like to take the floor? I see no one. We will proceed to the next item, which is Europe and North America cultural properties. To start with the examination of the cultural properties located in Europe and North America Region, I would like to now give the floor to the delegation of Spain to present to the Committee the reason why it requested to open the state of conservation report on Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites. Thank you. Spain you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Spain has proposed some amendments to the draft decision that was circulated, starting with the idea of working more on the measures which are linked to the tunnel which is being developed to try to mitigate the impact on the property. As you know, Stonehenge is one of the most emblematic examples of World Heritage site since it was inscribed on the List over 30 years ago. This Committee has shown its concerns regarding some of the negative impacts of the motorway on the surrounding area.

Indeed, five years ago, a new visitor centre, along other infrastructure and other projects led to better access to Stonehenge. There is a motorway that links London to

Stonehenge and this has increased noise and air pollution, leading the Committee to agree that the current situation is unacceptable. Finding a solution is a very complex task. There have been three missions of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS to try to find the best possible solution, as well as to try and to audit the different impact reports regarding this property.

The most recent report published shows us that the ongoing dialogue is very constructive. However, we believe that there is more to be done. The project is going to explore alternatives regarding this tunnel. The United Kingdom is looking into different options. Other alternative routes according to surveys showed that it could lead to unacceptable environmental damage or would not resolve the traffic issue in this particular region, when it comes to alleviating pressure on the current motorway.

Some of the measures are to try mitigating the effect on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site by designing a route in the best way possible and indeed the issue is that the motorway would run directly through parts of the property.

The amendments that we are presenting encourage the State Party to continue working towards the best possible solution. There are very modest amendments. If necessary, we will be able to give you more information regarding these modifications, which are only slight. The goal is always to try and reduce the impact the traffic would have on this region, especially on this site that is, of course, under threat from such pollution.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. I would like to invite Ms. Isabelle Anatole-Gabriel, Chief of the Europe and North America Unit at the World Heritage Centre, and the Advisory Bodies to respond to this comment. You have the floor.”

Ms. Isabelle Anatole-Gabriel:

“Thank you madam Chairperson and a very good morning to you. With your permission madam Chairperson, ICOMOS would like to comment. Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Even among the constellation of the World Heritage List, Stonehenge is a shining star, an iconic and globally recognised World Heritage property. But it is more than a ring of stones, it is in fact a large megalithic landscape, replete with ancient barrows and routes. The issue before the Committee over recent years and subject to the Advisory Bodies’ mission relates particularly to the entire Stonehenge landscape.

ICOMOS acknowledges that the State Party has been through serious studies and has been steadily working on the complex issues and difficult challenges that have arisen in providing a solution to the impact of the A303 Motorway. And it is true that in recent years the scheme has improved, but it is not yet optimal. Optimal is the appropriate level for this property.

ICOMOS acknowledges, as requested by the World Heritage Committee, having carefully examined the southern F10 bypass and concluded that this is not possible. The much recent mission report nevertheless correctly identified that in terms of the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property a bypass would be best. However, if the tunnel

is to proceed, then the current design is not in a suitable form to be built as it still involves intrusive sections of a dual carriageway within the property on either side of the tunnel as shown on the screens.

The mission report provides detailed and helpful guidance. The mission report acknowledges that, with respect to the eastern portal, if it is to be located close to the boundary of the property, this is not the optimal solution. Well away, at much greater cost, would provide a better outcome for the Outstanding Universal Value. However, with respect to the western portal, there is a large section of the cut dual carriageway still proposed and in the conclusion of the mission report and in the view of ICOMOS, this is not appropriate and further design and requirements are required.

ICOMOS considers that this process has been productive, but that it needs to continue through that further design process in a continuing spirit of collaboration, as has marked the mission to date, to avoid impact on the integrity of the property which is, of course, one of the key pillars of its Outstanding Universal Value.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any other comments to make, or questions, enquiries? Burkina Faso first, then Brazil.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Comme l'a souligné l'Organisation consultative, il se trouve qu'il n'y a aucun problème de communication, de dialogue qui n'est pas du tout interrompu et que l'État partie se montre par ailleurs disposé à poursuivre. Ma délégation apprécie cette observation de l'Organisation consultative, et tout comme le Comité l'avait fait dans le dossier, nous félicitons l'État partie pour les nombreuses études préalables et le dialogue sincère instauré avec le Comité.

Madame la présidente, la délégation fait également siens les amendements de l'Espagne dont la proposition majeure est la suppression du point 6 du projet de décision. Ma délégation souhaite également que l'on puisse donner la parole à l'État partie afin qu'il puisse donner plus d'informations concernant ce point à propos des entrées et sorties du tunnel.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I would like, first of all, to join the support on the proposal made by Spain, as we understand the amendments proposed are very minor changes to the text. I think they are also in the spirit of encouraging the State Party to continue dialogue with ICOMOS to find the most appropriate solution, which is in the interest of both the State Party and ICOMOS and to the benefit of safeguarding the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe supports the draft decision amendments that have been proposed by Spain. We commend the State Party for the thorough work that they have done. We would like to encourage that dialogue with ICOMOS continues in order to find the best alternatives for this highway, which is perhaps indispensable, but it has to be constructed with advice and support from the Advisory Bodies. We also agree that maybe, madam Chair, you could give the State Party a chance to explain and give other details.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia also supports the drafted amendments to the decision that has been proposed by Spain and we wish to encourage the State Party to continue work to avoid the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. I think the distinguished delegate from Spain went through, in some detail, on the extent of the effort that has been made by the State Party to address this issue, as was also emphasised by ICOMOS. Lastly, I must say that the proposed point 6 of the draft decision as amended should be removed. It is not something that Australia would support.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Norway first; the NGOs will have the floor after.”

Norway:

“Norway also supports the amendments made by Spain and we also have some suggested additions to the amendment that we will come back to when we look at the proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Finally, the NGOs please.”

NGO - Stonehenge Alliance:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am conveying to you a message by the Stonehenge Alliance, which is also a member of the World Heritage Watch network. Stonehenge Alliance

is a group of five independent NGOs. We are working together for civil society worldwide to raise awareness of the severe threats to the Stonehenge landscape from the A303 road-widening scheme.

Our supportive organisations have many thousands of members and have petitioned to safeguard the World Heritage site, with 38,000 signatures from over 100 countries. Although unable to attend as an observer today, we are grateful to the Committee for the opportunity to address the World Heritage Committee. We understand the proposed amendments to the draft decision by Spain have been circulated. These changes would significantly weaken the wording of the original draft decision, so that it would no longer correspond with the advice given by the 2018 advisory mission to Stonehenge, nor with the World Heritage report to your Committee, specialist advice we strongly support.

The amendments ask for changes in the design rather than the tunnel's length, but it is the tunnel length that is crucial in protecting the World Heritage site and its Outstanding Universal Value, since both western and eastern dual carriageways cutting through the tunnel would seriously damage the Stonehenge landscape. Last year the Committee urged the UK government to seek options that would not damage the site's Outstanding Universal Value. That advice was endorsed by the recent Advisory Bodies' mission and was also in the original wording of the draft decision.

We command and urge you not to accept the proposed amendments by Spain in their present form. We believe the State Party should be advised not to proceed with the current length of the tunnel and to explore other options that would not damage the property and its Outstanding Universal Value.

Thank you very much Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the United Kingdom.”

United Kingdom:

“Thank you madam Chair. As this is the first time I am taking the floor, I would like to say that the government of the UK would like to express our warmest appreciation to the Kingdom of Bahrain for its generous hospitality and for organising this meeting in such an efficient manner.

In the UK we love all our World Heritage sites equally, but we are aware that the property of Stonehenge Avebury and Associated sites holds a special place in our global heritage and the perception of our country around the world. It was, of course, among the first cohorts of UK sites inscribed by this Committee after we ratified the World Heritage Convention.

Since 1986 we have been proud to promote the World Heritage site of Stonehenge as one of the most iconic monuments of the World. We are highly conscious that we are only the temporary stewards of a site which has stood for 5000 years and we know we carry a solemn responsibility to pass it on to future generations in the best possible condition, with its Outstanding Universal Value not just protected but enhanced.

Tourists from every nation represented in this room come to Stonehenge every year. In tandem with protecting the Outstanding Universal Value and the archaeology of the property, strengthening sustainable tourism is a particular priority for our government. Improving public access and appreciation of the World Heritage site as a whole is a key

driver for the major project of reuniting the property which is currently divided by an ugly, dangerous and environmentally unfriendly road constantly blighted by traffic jams which create pollution.

The issue of traffic congestion around Stonehenge has been the subject of discussion at the World Heritage Committee since its inscription and the existing situation undermines the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. We will enhance the overall Outstanding Universal Value through the construction of bored tunnel which will pass beneath and so protect archaeological deposits, taking road traffic away from the traffic of Stonehenge and basically unify the site for the benefit of visitors and the local community. We have pursued a thorough local public consultation in this project, investigated many options and listened carefully to local, national and international stakeholders including archaeologists, the academic and scientific community, the local community and civil society.

The UK is particularly grateful of the advice and expertise of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, who have been generous with their time through three advisory missions, and have greatly helped to share our plans of reuniting the property. We will continue that dialogue and be steered by their advice, as that of the Committee, as set out in the draft decision.

We believe by focusing on the design of the tunnel rather than its length, the decision better reflects the importance of minimising the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value. We understand why some commentators focus on the length of the tunnel, but to do so in isolation ignores the topography of the site. The natural slopes and the landscape offer us the scope to minimise the visibility and auditory impact of the tunnel and, crucially, avoid damaging the archaeology, which is in line with the Heritage Impact Assessment.

We welcome the impact of the Committee members and thank the State Party of Spain for suggesting the proposed amendments, which we believe strengthen the draft decision and provide a valuable steer to us, as the State Party, particularly at the western end of the proposed tunnel.

In response to the distinguished delegate of Burkina Faso, I would say that, although we believe that we have reached the optimal conclusion at the eastern end, we think that we are not there with the western end, so we take the advice of the Committee on that issue away and we will consider that further. I can assure you that we will seek to implement the decision in a manner which secures the outcome that the Committee desires.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, you have the floor to give us an idea of the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair and I wish a good morning to all our colleagues. As said, we have received a set of minor amendments from Spain. We heard in the discussion the support of Brazil, Burkina Faso and Zimbabwe to these minor amendments that have been circulated and that you have on the screen in front of you.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Hungary agrees with the proposal of Spain and supports it fully. We have only a minor alteration and addition to the text. It is in point number 5 in the last sentence. If I may read the text:

‘if the current length of tunnel solution is pursued, the damage inflicted by the western dual carriageway cuttings would impact adversely on the integrity and the OUV (Outstanding Universal Value)’. What we propose is that at the beginning of the paragraph we say: ‘if the current length of tunnel solution is pursued, the damage inflicted by the dual carriageway cuttings especially approaching the western portal location would impact adversely on the integrity and the OUV (Outstanding Universal Value)’. With this slight addition, we propose the amendment for adoption.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would like to have an addition before paragraph 7 begins. That is in the end of paragraph 6 that says: *‘and to avoid impact due to noise, lighting and visibility’*. In addition we also want a sentence *‘furthermore, urges the State Party to minimise the length of the culvert part of the tunnel, in order to reduce the impact on the cultural landscape’*.”

The Chairperson:

“Can you repeat it please, so that the Rapporteur can write it?”

Norway:

“*‘and to avoid impacts due to noise, lighting and visibility’*. And: *‘furthermore, urges the State Party to minimise the length of the culvert part of the tunnel in order to reduce the impact on the cultural landscape’*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Can we go for adoption of the text paragraph by paragraph or do you want us to read it all? Paragraph by paragraph. Please.”

Australia:

“Simply a language thing, but in the addition from Norway it has been changed. Norway was saying ‘*the length of the culvert*’ and the text currently said ‘*covered*’. It is being corrected. Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“I will now read paragraph by paragraph. The first paragraph would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we adopt it? Yes. Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 2 would also remain unchanged. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“It is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 3 would also remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“It is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 4 would also remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“It is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5 with the original proposal by Spain and then we have a proposal from Hungary to delete the proposal of Spain and instead replace it with a different wording. I will now read out the paragraph as amended:

‘Also notes the findings and recommendations of the 2018 Advisory mission, particularly that, although the current ‘Proposed Scheme’ shows improvement compared with previous plans and would also improve the situation in the centre of the property, the rigorous investigation, evaluation, iterative design and assessment process has revealed that, if the current length of tunnel solution is pursued, the damage inflicted by the western

dual carriageway cutting, especially approaching the western portal, would impact adversely on the integrity and the OUV (Outstanding Universal Value) of the property, and therefore the proposed A303 upgrade project should not proceed with the current design of the tunnel'."

The Chairperson:

"I think ICOMOS would like to comment. Please."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you madam Chair. I think it might assist the Committee for ICOMOS to highlight that paragraph 5 is actually a paraphrase of the summary of the mission report findings and therefore I just highlight that the amendments proposed by both Spain and Hungary change the paragraph, so that it is not consistent with the mission report's findings.

To help the Committee, I also observed that if either form of paragraphs with or without the amendment of Norway is approved, all of the matters that the delegates from Spain and Hungary are trying to introduce would be covered through the clear request that the longer tunnel option be pursued, and the minimisation of the cuttings. I would suggest with respect to all the delegates that it would be best to leave the paragraph as originally drafted, as it correctly summarises what was actually in the mission report.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to Spain."

Spain:

[English interpretation] "I would like to thank the representative of ICOMOS for these clarifications. The idea of using the word *design* is to allow for additional elements other than just the length. I believe that our proposal is only slightly different from the recommendations made by the mission because design does include or may also include the length, but it could also include additional elements that could contribute to mitigating the impact of the tunnel.

As to the additions suggested by Hungary: I would, of course, prefer Hungary to explain the reason behind this proposal, but I believe that we are not really moving away from the findings of the 2018 mission and yet it does allow some flexibility in improving the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value, thanks to the continued dialogue with the British authorities and the World Heritage Centre.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia."

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. Sorry to intervene, but having heard the observations from ICOMOS, I do think that the observation is a correct one. The paragraph 5 as originally constructed is a direct quote from the mission report and we, as a Committee, cannot change what the mission has said to us. It is the advice of the mission captured in the document.

The ICOMOS representative also made the observation that in paragraph 6, as currently drafted, it does have some very clear guidelines to the State Party about the Committee’s expectations as to how it would approach the task of redesigning the carriageway so that it minimises the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, and within that, there is plenty of scope to look at tunnel length and other design options, so as to remove the impact on the cultural landscape. I would therefore like to suggest that we do not change the text of paragraph 5.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Bosnia.”

Bosnia:

“Madam Chair. We would like to suggest simplifying the text because using the word ‘design’ would be enough and there is no problem with what is mentioned in paragraph 6 because the decision goes into so many details. To discuss now about the western exit, entrance, etc., design should show this and the recommendation of the ICOMOS mission, so just to say ‘design’ and not to go into detail in the decision.

Thank you.’

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Australia again.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I really need to say that it is not the prerogative of the Committee to change the statement of the advice that has been given to the Committee by the mission report. I also hear Hungary’s concern to ensure that the Committee’s particular worry about the western portal is captured by the Committee. Therefore, I am going to suggest that we insert a new 6. It would be: ‘*Notes with concern the impacts of the current design on the western end of the portal;*’ and if that was acceptable to the Committee or something in similar form, then paragraph 5 could be left unedited.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We agree with Australia’s suggestion of paragraph 5 not being changed, as it comes from the report and kept as is, and their other suggestion for paragraph 6 that would even the concerns of other countries like Spain regarding the current design. We also have in number 7 the design mentioned again, so that

design concerns are covered in numbers 6 and 7. We think that the report should state the original wording from ICOMOS.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank very much. I now give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We have understood the deep analysis that has been carried out on this particular site and I believe that in 5 we have two different items. First, we have the conclusions of the report and naturally, we should follow what the report has stated, but at the same time we are discussing a draft decision of this Committee which, of course, would make additional modifications provided by Spain in that or other paragraphs. In order to provide the flexibility proposed by Spain, particularly with the word ‘design’ we would agree with that.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor goes to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you Chair. We support the suggestion made by Australia and Kuwait that we leave paragraph 5 as it was and insert the new paragraph 6 and paragraph 7 explains what the Committee wants the State Party to do.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. You have two paragraphs that are following the same idea to reflect the recommendation of the mission and express a concern. We have no problem with the additional paragraph 6 suggested by Australia. Our initial intention, as I stated, was to provide a slight modification that I believe improves the drafting of paragraph 5. The idea is to broaden the possibilities included other than strictly the length. I do not believe that there is any incompatibility.

I would prefer to maintain just one paragraph, but if we can achieve the consensus by splitting it into two paragraphs, as long as we are perfectly clear that along the measures requested or that we are going to request from the State Party to ensure protection of this property that we are not simply concentrating on the simple issue of the length without considering other possible measures, then we would agree with that.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. According to the amendment of the proposed paragraph 6, I just need to revisit it and make it clearer, because we are not concerned about an impact on a portal but concerned about an impact on the site. Can I please reword it from where it says the ‘*impact of the current design of the dual carriageway on the property especially in the approach on the property*’ would be sufficient? Or maybe ‘*especially at the western end*’. I think that is sufficient.

Lastly, I would like to say, again, that it is not our prerogative to change what the mission said, if we were quoting Plato, we would not be using license to reinterpret what Plato said, we would simply quote Plato.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections to keeping 5 under the original text? There are no objections to keeping paragraph 5 as was originally drafted in the Draft Decision. Can we adopt it as the original version? Thank you. As adopted. Now the new paragraph 6.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have a new proposed paragraph 6 by Australia and supported by Kuwait and Norway and it would read: ‘*Notes with concern the impacts of the current design of the dual carriageway on the property, especially at the western end of the portal;*’

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I just do not think we need ‘*of the portal*’ at the end. We are talking about the western end we could say ‘*the western end of the cultural landscape*’ but I think ‘*just the western end*’ is clear.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we adopt it as is in front of you on the screen? No objection, it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“The new paragraph 7 that was former paragraph 6, as there are a few proposed amendments, and I will now read it out:

7. *‘Urges the State Party to continue to explore further design refinement, with a view to avoiding impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, including longer tunnel options that do not require an open dual carriageway cutting within the property and to avoid impact due to noise, lighting and visibility; furthermore urges the State Party to minimize the length of the culvert part of the tunnel in order to reduce the impact on the cultural landscape;’*

If I can make a suggestion to put the second part of what Norway suggested, the part that begins with *‘furthermore urges the State Party’*; it was supposed to be together but maybe we would have 7a and this would be 7b.”

The Chairperson:

“Fine. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“I am sorry, I forgot the last part of the sentence *‘reduce the impact on the cultural landscape and the archaeology’*; that is what we wanted to say. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Do you have any objections or do you agree with the paragraph? Fine, then, as adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. The new paragraph 8 also has a slight amendment by Spain. It reads:

8. *‘Requests the State Party to address the findings and implement the recommendations of the March 2018 Advisory mission and encourages the State Party to continue to facilitate progress towards an optimal solution for the widening of the A303 with a view to avoiding adverse impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.’*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I see none. It is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. The new paragraph 9 which was former paragraph 8 would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 8 will remain unchanged. Do you have any comments or objections? There are none, it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Finally, new paragraph 9 which is former paragraph 8 will also remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 8 remains unchanged. Are there any comments or objections? I see none, so it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Finally, new paragraph 10 that was former paragraph 9 will also remain unchanged. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Paragraph 9 remains unchanged. Do you have any comments or objections? I see none, it is adopted. We can now adopt the whole decision. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.32 adopted.

I will now invite Ms. Anatole-Gabriel to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Madame Anatole-Gabriel :

« Merci madame la présidente. Les biens qui sont proposés pour adoption sans discussion sont la liste suivante :

l'œuvre architecturale de Le Corbusier, contribution exceptionnelle au mouvement moderne (Argentine, Belgique, France, Allemagne, Inde, Japon, Suisse) ; cimetière de tombe médiévale Stecci (Bosnie-Herzégovine, Croatie, Monténégro, Serbie) ; la vieille ville de Dubrovnik (Croatie) ; Centre historique de Prague (République tchèque) ; Coteaux maisons et caves de Champagne (France), Climats des coteaux de Bourgogne (France) ; Monuments historiques de Mtskheta (Géorgie) ; Isthme de Courlande (Lituanie, Fédération de Russie) ; Contrée naturelle et culture historique de Kotor (Monténégro) ; Auschwitz Birkenau – camp allemand de concentration et d'extermination (1940-1945) (Pologne) ; Kizhi Pogost (Fédération de Russie) ; ensemble historique culturel de l'ensemble des îles Solovetsky (Fédération de Russie) ; Site archéologique d'Ani, Turquie et enfin zone historique d'Istanbul (Turquie).

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections from the Committee on the state of conservation report? If there are no objections or comments, we can adopt. There are none. I declare the decisions read out as adopted.

I now give the floor to the NGOs. Please.”

NGO - Ecodefense:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good morning dear colleagues. My name is Alexandra Koroleva. I work for the Ecodefense NGO in Russia. I must say a few additional words about the inscribed property.

I ask the World Heritage Committee to amend the draft decision regarding Curonian Spit. First, illegal construction sites have persisted on the property in 2015 and 2018, and no effective plans of dismantlement of any illegal buildings or to stop further constructions have been implemented. Second, in 2017, a storm led to the Curonian Spit isthmus and left a layer of sand of a metre and a half and damage happened all along the spit end and no effective restoration efforts have occurred since.

Third, inefficient capacity of waste water facilities in the three nearby settlements has led to the electrification of the Curonian lagoon. Fourth, the extremely high urban pressure impacting the ecosystem fields: for example, during the summer, about 2000 unregistered visitor cars are seen, when there are only 600 car parking spaces available.

Fifth, projects are implemented on the Spit without any consideration of its status. For example, the technical coastal protective project, with constructions in 2017 without any prior Environmental Impact Assessment. Sixth, the steps taken by the administration of the Natural Park and the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Russian Federation are ineffective and do not address the problems of protecting the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Armenia.”

Armenia:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving me the floor. Referring to Decision 40.COM.8B.28 and Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.30 on the state of conservation reports submitted by the State Party for the archaeological site of Ani.

The delegation of Armenia stresses its concerns with regard to the actions undertaken by the State Party for the implementation of the 2016 Decision 40 COM 8B. 28. It concerns point 4b and 4e. Nationals of my and many other countries, after travelling to the site, have told us of their being worried that the main information board on the property has not been reviewed in order to provide a better definition of the property. As facts on the ground speak for themselves, we would like to highlight the following five points to this regard:

- 1) We acknowledge the work carried out by the State Party.
- 2) We take good note of the analysis and conclusions by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on conservation activities and thank them for the work done.
- 3) We fully support the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies’ specific remarks: *‘the completion of the landscape would improve the site’s presentation while the State Party has revised information boards to provide a more comprehensive overview including information about the Armenian cultural history of Ani in the post-1918 period.*

Details of the changes made have not been provided but this should be continued in future site presentation activities’.

4) We further call on the State Party to turn to the Committee’s entire 2016 decision to provide the mentioned details of changes to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies referring to the period before 1918 as well and report to the Committee by 2019.

5) Meanwhile, we reiterate Armenia’s commitment and interest as voiced out by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Armenia for the participation of foreign experts in the excavation and restoration of archaeological sites on the territory of the State Party in such places as Ani, the medieval Armenian capital.

Madam Chair, I ask this statement to be included in the record of the Committee Session. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any requests for the floor? I see none. We move on to our next item. There are no cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Latin America and the Caribbean region proposed for discussion this year.

I will therefore invite Mr. Mauro Rosi, Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Mauro Rosi:

“Thank you madam Chair. The list of cultural properties located in Latin America and the Caribbean region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion, reads as follows:

Qhapaq Ñan, Andean Road System (Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru); Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia); Pampulha Modern Ensemble (Brazil); Pre-Columbian Chiefdom Settlements with Stone Spheres of the Diquís (Costa Rica); Colonial City of Santo Domingo (Dominican Republic); City of Quito (Ecuador); National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti); Historic Centre of Puebla (Mexico); Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) and finally Historic Inner City of Paramaribo (Suriname).

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections on the state of conservation report? I see none. Thank you very much. I declare the decision read out as adopted. Are there any comments or questions? I see none. Thank you very much.

We move on to the next item related to Africa. I start with the examination of the cultural properties located in the Africa Region. I would like to now give the floor to the delegation of Hungary to present to the Committee the reason why it requested to open the state of conservation report on the Lower Valley of the Omo in Ethiopia.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The Hungarian delegation understands information has been submitted with regard to the Lower Valley of the Omo in Ethiopia, particularly the approved Heritage Impact Assessment report on the property at the Committee’s 40th session. In the actual report of ICOMOS, it is once again recommended to include the Lower Valley of the Omo World Heritage site in the Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Lake Turkana National Parks in Kenya.

We have different views on this issue, since the Lower Valley of the Omo is not a transboundary property. Indeed, you are talking about two distinct sites located on the territory of different States Parties with different Outstanding Universal Values inscribed on the World Heritage List, based on different criteria.

As these are both sites for discussion during this session, we believe it to be more appropriate to address the issues pertaining to Lake Turkana National Parks under that item, as did the Committee during last year’s session. We also believe that this decision should clearly focus on the Lower Valley of the Omo World Heritage Site; that is why we propose not to include Paragraph 7 in the decision.

The Hungarian delegation was also aware of the recent submissions made by the State Party, including a map that shows the property and the development project and also the distance between the two activities which the Committee appreciated during its 40th session.

Hungary asked Ethiopia be given an opportunity to provide additional information to clarify what additional steps were being made to ensure compliance with the recommendations. Africa is one of the global priorities of UNESCO and thus the Committee should further encourage and support African countries with regard to conservation efforts. To achieve balance between development and conservation is a very difficult task for all States Parties and we wish to commend the efforts of Ethiopia in this regard.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Ethiopia, please.”

Ethiopia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. I would also like to thank Hungary. As I am taking the floor for the first time, I would like to congratulate you on your election as Chairperson; I also thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its hospitality and the warm welcome accorded to my delegation since the arrival in this beautiful city of Manama. We also express appreciation to you, madam Chairperson, for the effective manner in which you are leading this Committee.

Let me first remind the Committee that the Committee decided to separate issues related to Omo Valley with the issues related to Turkana National Parks. The current draft decision mixes up both by requesting a joint Strategic Environmental Assessment to be undertaken jointly by Ethiopia and Kenya to cover the Lower Valley of the Omo. This paragraph should be deleted as requested on the Lower Omo Valley Environmental Impact Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment.

Regarding the development project, it is 12 to 32 kilometres away from the project site. Moreover, the project size has been reduced by half from the initial plan. The initial plan

was the reason for the Committee to put it on the agenda. This information was provided to the Centre in 2016. In addition, the development project is at a very early stage of development; only one ninth of the project is completed.

Ethiopia submitted a Heritage Impact Assessment on the Lower Valley of the Omo in 2017; the Environmental Impact Assessment of the development project is underway. The Decision should be for Ethiopia to update the Heritage Impact Assessment by incorporating the outcomes of the ongoing Environmental Impact Assessment. Along with previous decisions of the Committee, this issue should be revised and the studies of the two sites should be carried out separately.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We understand the argument proposed by the State Party. We do considerate it necessary to see the linkages and the spill-over effect between the two properties. We also understand the fact that we are dealing with two separate sites that are both for discussion in this meeting. In that sense we support the proposal by Hungary to separate the two processes.

That being said, we would also encourage the State Party to continue the constructive work, as started with the boundaries, to have a close dialogue with the local communities and we also strongly encourage the State Party to ensure fulfilment of the other follow-up items as specified in the decision, including the provision of the required information.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Tunisia, please?”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme suite à la réponse de l’État partie, je souhaite exprimer nos encouragements pour qu’il continue les efforts déjà entrepris, mais qui devraient s’intensifier. Sur cette base nous soutenons la proposition faite par la Hongrie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe supports the Draft Decision proposed by Hungary and especially stresses the need to separate the two properties.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. My delegation would also like to join the previous speakers in supporting the draft decision proposed by Hungary while recognising that these two properties are not linked to each other and the reference to the Lake Turkana should be deleted from the decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. Tanzania commends the State Party of Ethiopia for its commitment to protect and conserve the Lower Valley of the Omo. Tanzania also commends the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their draft decision. Tanzania takes note of the concerns raised in the decision but also acknowledges that the State Party has already submitted clarification on the issue related to the site of the Kuraz Sugar Development project and the scope of the development around the project.

Madam Chair, the delegation of Tanzania encourages the State Party to continue the preparation of the Environmental Impact Assessment suggested by the Advisory Bodies. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Kuwait also supports the draft submitted by Hungary: since the two sites are in different locations, we support their suggestions.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. As the present draft decision is very similar to that of the contiguous site of Iguacu in Brazil and Argentina, Brazil supports Hungary's position in

regard to the fact that the site is not a transboundary site between Ethiopia and Kenya, but a separate site. If there is any difference between the site, Brazil is of the opinion that this difference must be resolved through bilateral negotiation.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci Beaucoup madame la présidente. La Bosnie Herzégovine se félicite des efforts de l'État partie nous invitons celui-ci à continuer dans cette direction et soutenons aussi la proposition hongroise ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. China would like to join Zimbabwe and Azerbaijan in support of Hungary’s proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda also supports the draft decision, especially with the separation of the sites, but encourages the two States Parties to promote more dialogue in order to assure the promotion of heritage in the Omo Valley and Turkana. We submit.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the NGO, please. You have two minutes, maximum.”

NGO:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. On behalf of the Indigenous People’s Forum on World Heritage we want to draw your attention to the hardships of many local communities in the Lower valley of the Omo River in Ethiopia, who are impacted both by large reservoir construction upstream and a massive sugar plantation near the site.

The indigenous people in the adjacent part of the same Omo Turkana basin in Kenya are impacted by the same developments. Therefore, we believe that conducting a Strategic

Environmental and Social Impact Assessment is a fundamental precondition and also a requirement in accordance with United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People which requires such assessment and the free, prior and informed consents for such large investment that would have an impact on indigenous people.

The World Heritage sustainable development policy, as well as the UNESCO policy on indigenous people, gives them a rights-based approach and this is clearly one of them. It is also a condition for the preservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of both sites as well as the livelihoods of the communities populating the area, which are facing multiple, interrelated development impacts.

We therefore ask you to reinforce your draft decision on prescribing the basin-wide Strategic Environmental Assessment for the Omo-Turkana basin. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme nous insistons sur le dialogue entre non seulement les Organisations consultatives et les États parties, mais également entre les États parties, nous pensons qu’il s’agit bien là d’un cas tout à fait important. Nous parlons de deux pays frères qui sont dans la même sous région orientale de l’Afrique.

Nous encourageons les deux États parties à continuer le dialogue pour sauvegarder ces biens et également aider les populations à pouvoir en bénéficier. Sur cette note, nous appuyons la proposition faite par la Hongrie. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chairperson. Our delegation would also like to add its voice to the comments made by previous speakers. We would like to emphasise the importance of dialogue. We have underlined this on several occasions when we are taking the floor and particularly when it comes to transboundary properties or also whenever another property in another State is involved. Therefore, we can go along with the proposed amendments submitted by Hungary.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments or questions? I now give the floor to our Rapporteur, but before, the floor is to the Secretariat.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We thank all the States Parties for their questions and point of concerns that have been raised. We have had quite a lengthy discussion also

with the State Party of Ethiopia. While we understand the concerns raised and the comments made by Hungary, we would like to highlight certain points, if we could have the map on the screen.

You can see that the map provided by the State Party clearly demonstrates the hydrological link between the region of the Lower Omo Valley and Lake Turkana in the part of the southern area of Ethiopia. Lake Turkana is a transboundary geographically; we are not talking about the World Heritage, just on location – it is in two countries. One part, ten per cent, is in Ethiopian territory and the rest is within Kenyan territory. Therefore, if there is an Environmental Impact Assessment that needs to be conducted within the Lower Omo Valley, the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies have a scientific and technical responsibility to ensure that the study is carried out in full and is effective. You will understand that it is for a matter of scientific and technical responsibility that we have indicated both countries.

Of course, we will leave it to the decision of the Committee, but this is in response to the analysis, the ground and hydrological links that you can clearly see, because the Omo River that flows into the Omo Valley flows into Lake Turkana. ICOMOS will provide further clarification.

Thank you.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. ICOMOS would like to add that so far the discussion has focused on a Strategic Environmental Assessment, but we need further work on the assessments undertaken in this project. We are still not yet in a position to say clearly what the total scope and extent of the impacts of the Kuraz Sugar plantation have on the property and this remains a cause for concern.

First, we do not have any adequate information on the supportive development, such as access roads, canals, settlements, etc. which will increase the clearly defined area. Secondly, impact assessment is still needed on the work that has already been undertaken and planned. Also, the current Heritage Impact Assessment which we have reviewed needs to be augmented and should also be integrated in the Environmental Impact Assessment.

Thirdly, the Environmental Impact Assessment does not adequately address the full impact of the project and its setting, including its wider setting. One of the difficulties in undertaking these assessments is that we do not have adequately-defined boundaries on this property, as the European Union funded project has yet to be completed. As you are probably aware, approved boundaries are essential for robust Impact Assessment.

Therefore, we remain concerned that after four years of discussion by this Committee, with this being the fifth, the necessary parameters have not yet been provided or defined to allow the Committee to be provided with a full understanding of the Kuraz project on the property and its wider settings.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now turn to our Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As it has emerged we have received draft amendments from Hungary, which you can see on the screen and during the discussion, we have had support for these amendments from Tunisia, Bosnia, Kuwait, China, Uganda, Azerbaijan, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Brazil, Uganda, Angola and Cuba.

These draft amendments, as has been explained, suggest the deletion of paragraph 8 and also suggest a set of smaller modifications in other paragraphs, mainly removing the references left to the other World Heritage property that was mentioned.

Thank you very much”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions or clarifications? I see none. We adopt the draft decision paragraph by paragraph or in total? Would you prefer to adopt the full draft decision? Yes. Therefore I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.44 adopted.

We turn again to Africa with Lamu Old Town property. The floor is now to Mr. Edmond Moukala to present the report.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you Madame Chair. The report on Lamu Old Town, Kenya can be found in Document 42 COM 7B.Add on page 39 in both English and French.

Pending clearance from the joint Reactive Monitoring mission requested by the Committee, a joint UNESCO, ICOMOS and ICCROM advisory mission was dispatched to Nairobi in January of 2018 to meet with Kenyan authorities and the local stakeholders. In the state of conservation report submitted in February of 2018, the State Party indicated that a number of documents were under preparation and that they will be finalised following the Advisory Bodies’ mission; this includes the Memorandum of Understanding between the Lamu Port–South Sudan–Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Authority and the National Museums of Kenya, the Master plan for the Lamu Metropolis, the revised Management Plan and the revised LAPSSET SCA with the Heritage Impact Assessment and specific chapters on the potential impact on Outstanding Universal Value and related mitigation measures.

The State Party welcomed the recommendation of the Advisory mission to fully integrate the recommendations of the Impact Assessment in the report. Also, the State Party acknowledged the potential threats from the LAPPSET project to the conservation of cultural and other heritage and reiterated the pledge of the LAPPSET Authority not to implement any projects within the Lamu Archipelago.

In light of the mission’s conclusion that the large scale LAPSSET would have a profound negative impact on the setting of the property, the State Party should also develop and implement adequate planning and mitigation measures and a sufficiently strong monitoring system.

Moreover, to protect Lamu’s immediate and wider settings, the mission proposed that the State Party consider a buffer zone and accompanying development control and building regulations, as requested by the Committee in past decisions. The mission recommends that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre a proposal for minor boundary modifications. Lastly, it is recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to invite a Reactive Monitoring mission as soon as the security situation allows.

The draft decision for this property can be found in working document 7B.Add on pages 41 and 42 for the English and French version. I turn now to my colleague of ICOMOS for additional comments.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, go ahead.”

ICOMOS:

““Thank you madam Chair. ICOMOS welcomes the commitment of the LAPSSET corridor authority not to carry out work directly in the Lamu archipelago, but it remains concerned about the potential of indirect impacts from pollution from the coal plant, for supplementary developments and on the overall urban landscape of the property and its cultural structures.

The Lamu property must be strengthened to resist adverse change for better protection of the immediate and wider settings of the property through the enlarged buffer zone, as requested by the Committee on several occasions, and through strengthened development control measures. The Outstanding Universal Value of the property acknowledges that Lamu has maintained its distinctive social and cultural integrity. Mechanisms also need to be defined to ensure that integrity avoids cultural disintegration or complete gentrification or becoming overwhelmed by tourism measures.

This is a massive project that could have massive impacts unless there is a much clearer assessment of precisely how it will impact on the property and its social structures and what mitigation measures might be needed to deflect or minimise those impacts.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I now give the floor to Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We deeply appreciate the fact that the State Party acknowledges the potential threat from the LAPSSET project and we thank Kenya for its strong effort to respond to the Committee decision. Norway has further concerns for the environmental impact of the project and also for the fact that it is impacting Lamu town itself, which is not directly related to the LAPSSET project.

We also take note with concern that other significant Swahili cultural heritage sites are facing serious challenges. We have to say it is a fine line between fully justifying needs for development and conservation of very fragile controlled heritage accentuated in Lamu by very strong associative values contributing significantly to the World Heritage value of this very special place. We are concerned by the obvious negative impact on the setting of the property and the strong push of secondary development not part of the LAPSSET project

which undoubtedly will be directed towards the State Party and intensify the tension between conservation and development.

We are painfully aware of the challenges of integrating World Heritage management and conservation in relevant planning and decision-making processes for modern development from our own World Heritage properties in Norway. We strongly encourage the State Party to continue its effort in safeguarding Lamu following international best practices, putting in place the necessary mechanism for planning and development controls according to Paragraphs 98 and 104 of the Operational Guidelines and provides the requested information to the World Heritage Centre.

We therefore support the draft decision and we can accept the amendment as presented by the delegate of Kenya.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The distinct urban historical and fabric reminiscent of this town is out of a very unique demographic, commercial and cultural social Swahili traditions for centuries. These are the traditions of which the entire African region is proud. My delegation argues the State Party of Kenya to therefore fulfil the key features of the draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. Tanzania commends the State Party for undertaking direct actions so as to mitigate the threats to the Lamu World Heritage property due to the implementation of the LAPSSET. Its is a big project which main components include Lamu Port, a major highway, a railway, a crude oil pipeline, an international airport, sub-cities away from Lamu old town and an oil refinery.

The State Party has undertaken plans and is planning to undertake a full Strategic Environmental Assessment for all the components of the project and also the Heritage Impact Assessment on one of the components was completed. Chair, the Tanzanian delegation also commends the Advisory Bodies for their thorough and exhaustive analyses of the project with the objective of ensuring that no threats are left out or unidentified, including the review of the Strategic Environmental Assessment that was submitted to the World Heritage Centre.

The Tanzanian delegation supports the proposed draft decision with the amendment modification that was submitted to the Secretariat.

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe supports the proposed draft decision with the amendment from Tanzania. We note the efforts of the State Party to respond to the decisions by the Committee and that it started being carried out. We also understand that the LAPSSET authority, in the process of preparing other studies, is to come up with a revised Master Plan and that we urge the State Party to continue in this effort.

We also agree with the observations by ICOMOS that the State Party should carry out additional studies to ascertain the effect of pollution from the coal power plant which is planned in the vicinity of the property on the fragile coral stones and the buildings of the old town and other impacts and attributes that may affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any more comments? I see none. Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have received one amendment from Tanzania, which you can now see on the screen. It should be a paragraph 6 if we scroll down. It removes the reference to another World Heritage site. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? I see none. We will adopt the whole decision. Before that Kenya would like the floor.”

Kenya:

“Thank you madam Chair. I wish to draw your attention to several issues that have been raised regarding LAPSSET and to make the following comments. This is a grand project which is being implemented in phases. Some components may not be implemented within the next ten years. The Strategic Environmental Assessment that was carried out on LAPSSET covered the broad area of heritage and potential areas affected along the LAPSSET route. Other studies are currently planned to be undertaken on specific projects. For example, the ESIA for the crude oil pipeline, which is a component of LAPSSET project, has begun. Environmental ESIA are currently going on in various parts of the country through which the LAPSSET corridor traverses, which includes Lamu County.

Kenya commits to submitting the crude oil pipeline ESIA report once it is ready, including the requested draft Lamu Master Plan and Lamu Port-city transport infrastructure

master plan. This indicates Kenya's resolution and commitment to protecting heritage and associate people's livelihoods through sustainable development and planning. Regarding the proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the LAPSSET Corridor and National Museums of Kenya, I wish to State that this is a work in progress and the engagement has commenced with the identification and appointment of officers who collaborate in joint Committees.

Madam President, regarding the proposed decision on the submission on minor boundary modifications, it is Kenya's opinion that this needs to be subjected to further discussion with the Advisory Bodies during the proposed Reactive Monitoring mission. At this juncture, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the two previous advisory missions were conducted in Nairobi in and not in Lamu. It is important that this matter is settled on site to allow for actual and factual verification of issues on the ground to enable the State Party of Kenya to meet the decision.

Finally, I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre, ICCROM and ICOMOS for their support in previous missions to Kenya and welcome the Reactive Monitoring mission.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is to the representative of the NGOs."

NGO:

"Thank you Madam Chair. I am here to support the outcome of the State Party concerning Lamu Old Town but I would also like to add more information concerning this project coming to Lamu. The emerging projects earmarked for construction are very sensitive to the natural resources areas which are in proximity to human settlements near a World Heritage site.

In the recently concluded Strategic Environmental Assessment reports by experts, the ecological factors outside the project areas were never covered and never adequately audited. According to the Strategic Environmental Assessment report the high demand of water by the mega-project will stretch the amount of water that we have for our livelihoods in the whole World Heritage site.

We are therefore urging the State Party, together with all leading agencies, to undertake vulnerability analysis and prepare a response plan to avoid water crisis in Lamu Old Town.

Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. ICOMOS has the floor."

ICOMOS

"Thank you Chair. ICOMOS would like to offer a comment on paragraph 6 of the draft decision. It currently reads:

'Requests the State Party to revise the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the entire LAPSSET project to include a chapter on the impacts and proposed mitigation measures for cultural and natural heritage,'

ICOMOS supports the idea of appending the Heritage Impact Assessment to the draft SEA; we consider the sentence should still read *'and revise the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment'* in order for the sentence to make some sense."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments from the Committee or do we adopt it as it is?"

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. If it may help, I can read out again paragraph 6, although we did not have any objections to it from the Committee members. Paragraph 6 reads:

'Requests the State Party to revise the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of the entire LAPSSET project to include a chapter on the impacts and proposed mitigation measures for cultural and natural heritage, and specifically the impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value of Lamu Old Town'.

Thank you Madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections from the Committee? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.45 adopted.

Our next item is the Island of Mozambique and I invite Mr. Edmond Moukala to present the next report on this matter."

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

"Thank you madam chair. Regarding the property at hand, the information can be found in document 42 COM 7B. Add page 42 for the English and 43 for the French.

In March 2018 the State Party invited a joint UNESCO, ICOMOS and ICCROM Reactive Monitoring mission to examine the concerns expressed by the Committee in 2016 and assess the state of conservation of the overall building of the property. The mission evaluated the progress made on the revision of the Conservation and Management Plan; while the report is not yet completed, we noted the progress made in regard to the Conservation and Management Plan. We also noted the conclusive engagement of stakeholders and the community in the elaboration of the Plan.

The Mission recommended that provision for Heritage Impact Assessment and conservation guidelines to steer restoration and renovation projects should also be included in the Plan. The mission also noted the building structures of the stone and lime town have been identified and graded for their safeguarding. However, inappropriate restoration and lack of maintenance remains a problem within the property and its buffer zone.

The draft decision for this property can be found in working document 7B.Add on page 44 in English and 45 in the French version. Thank you Chair. I turn to my colleague from ICOMOS for additional comments.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, go ahead.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. ICOMOS and ICCROM welcome the regulation, classification and management of Mozambique Island World Heritage landscape and inventory of built heritage. The State Party is encouraged to extend this inventory beyond the stone and lime town to the *macuti* town structure which are under threat owing to limitations on the supply of materials and inappropriate new constructions.

The State Party has made progress in addressing the challenges of the property, including revision of the Management and Conservation Plan, introducing more inclusive stakeholders and community engagement. The application of the recommendations on the historic urban landscape which will assist in addressing issues such as the fast pace of transformation processes in the property and resolve social inequality is especially welcome. There are still, however, outstanding methods such as integration of procedures for Disaster Risk Management for cultural World Heritage and it is now vital that the plans be completely finalised and implemented comprehensively.

The delineation of the buffer zone to include maritime archaeological heritage is also an urgent priority to enable submission of the minor boundary modification. The conservation office of the Island of Mozambique requires further capacity-building and it would be particularly beneficial for the international community to contribute financial and technical support to facilitate the appointment of suitably qualified staff and enable dissemination in external training programmes. The Advisory Bodies stands ready to support this process.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Any comments or clarification? Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam chair. I think that the representative from ICOMOS has said what I wanted to request. Because of the immense work that is required on this property, it is important to mobilise the necessary technical and financial support, so we are relieved that ICOMOS is aware of this and is ready to help the State Party on this particular matter.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? The Rapporteur, did you receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Yes, we received a small amendment from Zimbabwe in the last paragraph of the decision. My apologies, as I was ahead of myself. We did not receive any amendments for this draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.47 adopted. We now move to another Africa item, the Sukur Cultural Landscape in Nigeria. I give the floor to Mr. Edmond Moukala to present the report on this.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you madam chair. The report regarding Sukur Landscape can be found in document 42 COM 7B.Add2 page 14 for the English and 15 for the French version.

On the 29th of November, 2017, the State Party of Nigeria submitted to the World Heritage Centre a report on the state of conservation of the Sukur Cultural Landscape, which gave an account of development observed on the property since attacks of insurgents in December of 2014. The return of relative safety and the resilience of the Sukur community have largely benefited the conservation of the property.

Despite the temporal dislocation of the local population for about one year and the destruction of traditional lives, this allowed for some repair work to be carried out by the community of the Hidi Palace of paved walkways and a number of homestays. In that context, it is also noted positively that a new Conservation Management Plan for 2017-2021 has been elaborated.

Despite the persisting security concerns, the local community as well as the Nigerian authorities are supporting the development of a cultural tourism project and various initiatives that also engage the local community. In its last decision, the Committee asked for a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission which, however, could not be undertaken until very recently, as secure access to the property is still limited. This mission was finally sent to Abuja on 22-25 of May, 2018. The report of the mission will be made available very soon and a draft decision proposed to you aims to request the State Party to report, in December of 2019, on the implementation of the recommendations of the mission for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020.

The draft decision of the property can be found in working document 42 COM 7B.Add2, pages 16 and 17 of the English version and page 17 of the French version. I give the floor to my colleague from ICOMOS for additional comments if she may. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, go ahead.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. This is a particularly fragile, remote property, high in the mountains, set on the remains of the Hidi Palace, which was damaged in a raid by insurgents. With elaborate stone walls and terraces, the houses have distinctive traditional

forms and structures. Even though the situation is now more stable, the property is facing pressure, not only as the residents return, but also others from the plains who have taken refuge in the comparative safety of this mountain settlement.

The refugees are constructing houses using modern materials and using scarce resources. This is causing tension with local residents. Meanwhile, work on the reconstruction of the Hidi Palace still needs to be undertaken. They have clearly been changes to the property since the 2014 attacks. The concern is how these might be impacting on the authenticity. We welcome the intention to undertake a cultural mapping programme and consider it should be extended to include traditional structures and traditional practices.

We have the funds to support this urgent work and it is to be identified as soon as possible in order for recovery and strengthening the resilience of traditional practices.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or enquiries? NGO, please. Excuse me, a Member State from the Committee asked for the floor before. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe commends the State Party for the efforts it is making in the restoration of the Hidi Palace as well as the other traditional homestays that were destroyed by insurgents. We urge the State Party to continue to monitor the influx of refugees into the cultural landscape as was said by the representative of ICOMOS.

I am pleased that the representative of ICOMOS has encouraged greater technical and financial assistance. A request for international assistance was made by the State Party and granted in March of 2017; by the time of reporting in November of 2017, the funds had not yet been transferred to the State Party. It is also reported that there were extra budgetary funds under the Hungary Funds-in-trust for rehabilitation and conservation activities in 2016, but these have not yet reached the State Party. Could we have clarification from the World Heritage Centre on these two items?

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Nigeria, please.”

Nigeria:

“On behalf of the State Party of Nigeria, I congratulate madam Chair for her election to this prestigious responsible position as Chair of this Committee. I also wish, madam Chair, to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for extending us this invitation and for hosting the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee. I wish to thank and appreciate members of the World Heritage Committee and the Advisory Bodies and technical experts and the Centre for their interest and continuous support for the heritage properties of Nigeria.

I wish to appreciate the international community and particularly UNESCO through the World Heritage Centre for their concern and support during the period of insurgency in northeastern Nigeria, where is located our first Heritage site and our first cultural landscape in Africa, Sukur.

Madam Chair, at the height of the Boko Haram insurgency in 2014, the pristine hilltop settlement was invaded and temporarily dislodged, while the homestays and some community facilities were destroyed and scattered. Today, however, normalcy has fully come back to the region and especially around Sukur. The people were quick to return and restore their livelihoods. This is thanks to the efforts of the Nigerian security forces, through a joint military operation with the neighbouring countries of Niger, Cameroon and Chad.

In January of 2016, a detailed report on the effect of the insurgency and the state of conservation and the security situation was sent to the World Heritage Centre. Details of the extent of the destruction of the site and the restoration requirements were also sent with a request for international assistance to support the restoration effort.

Lately, in May of 2018, a Reactive Mission visited Nigeria and assessed the report of the state of conservation of the site conducted by consultants together with the State Party. While Sukur's communities have already come back to their abode and displayed uncommon resilience in restoring their disrupted livelihoods; they still await the international assistance approved by UNESCO since October, 2017 and another grant from the Hungarian Funds-in-trust for rehabilitation and conservation activities since 2016.

Once again thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Hungary. Please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Sukur landscape and some other World Heritage sites in the region of central Africa are in a very dangerous situation. We are interested in this question on this site, especially because two years ago Hungary provided financial support for the restoration, enhancing the situation after the insurgency to repair damage caused by natural disaster as well.

Hungary supports the draft decision and hope that the State Party, also using the financial support of Hungary, can enhance and improve the situation on this site. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to the representative of the NGOs.”

NGO:

“Thank you madam Chair. I start by commending the Chairperson and the World Heritage Committee for their tasks undertaken for the preservation of natural and cultural heritage of the World. I wish to commend the host country for the wonderful facilities put at our disposal.

It is important also to thank World Heritage Watch, under the leadership of Stephan Dömpke, for facilitating my participation in this session. The attack on Sukur in 2014 was indeed unfortunate. For now the government of Nigeria has been able to restore security in the area. Occasional attacks from Boko Haram in the neighbouring areas to this site still occur.

I appreciate the efforts of the World Heritage Committee for the measures taken so far to mitigate the challenges caused by this attack. I also wish to state that we do hope that the assistance from Hungary will come as soon as possible. The core of my plea is that 48 months after the attack on Sukur's Cultural landscape, the people are yet to really feel the effort and the benefit of the World Heritage site from their own perspective. It must not continue like this in the face of the realisation of the fact that cultural well-being occupies an important place in the total well-being of people.

It is in this light that World Heritage Watch calls on the World Heritage Committee to ensure that whoever has to act does so in a timely way. The people of Sukur strongly believe that their World Heritage status entitles them to a prompt response to their distress call. I call on development agencies to come to the aid of Sukur's people.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Would you like to take the floor to answer? The Secretariat, please, take the floor."

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

"Thank you Chairperson. Regarding the question raised by the State Party of Zimbabwe on the international assistance request submitted. I just want to indicate that there was a bank transfer carried out immediately following the approval of The Chairperson for the international assistance for Sukur. Two months later, I had a meeting with the person who informed us in February that they never really received the required amount. We launched an investigation looking into the bank transfer from Paris via New York to Nigeria to trace what really happened in that matter.

We have received all the communications between the banks in New York, Nigeria and Paris. It has been submitted to our Bureau of Financial Management, actually this week in Paris. We are very optimistic that this matter will be resolved soon. Definitely, the transfer will be made; we are also in constant contact with the permanent delegation of Nigeria and we keep the possibility of transferring through another channel via the Abuja office, which will include the Hungarian Funds.

The reason we have held processes is that we wanted to have clarity on what happened and why the fund was not able to reach Nigeria. Immediate action will be taken as the matter is now with the Bureau of Financial Management.

Thank you Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Did the Rapporteur receive any amendments?"

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Chairperson. We did not receive any amendments.”

The Chairperson:

“If there are no objections we can adopt the decision. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.48 adopted.

Our next item is the stone town of Zanzibar in the United Republic of Tanzania. I give the floor to Mr. Edmond Moukala to present the next report. Thank you.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you Chairperson. The report of the stone town of Zanzibar, United Republic of Tanzania, can be found in document 42 COM 7B, on page 100 in the English and 101 in the French version.

The State Party invited a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS’ advisory mission to visit the property in October of 2017 to examine several ongoing and future projects and in particular the Darajani Corridor Business Centre, Chawl building, Beit-el-Ajaib (House of Wonders), the Majestic Cinema, the Bwawani Hotel complex, and the Palace Museum.

The project involving a restoration and transformation into a museum of the House of Wonders is being financed by the Sultan of Oman, while the government of Japan has agreed to fund a restoration of the Majestic Cinema, for which we express our gratitude and thanks. The Advisory mission reported that despite the establishment of a development control unit and progress made on certain projects like tall buildings, the management system is still insufficient.

In addition, the overall state of conservation of the property, building stock and the lack of effective control of development proposals are also matters of concern. In response to the report of the advisory mission the State Party reported in February, 2018 that between 1999 and 2017, 39 buildings out of a total of 2000 in town had collapsed and were demolished. It also reported that the Development Control Unit was operational and that the Conservation Management Plan currently under development will be implemented by 2019. The Advisory mission concluded that the condition of the property could, as in 2015, warrant consideration for inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, under Paragraphs 178 and 179 of the Operational Guidelines.

The draft decision for this property can be found in working document 7B, on pages 102-103 for the English version and 103-105 in the French version.

If I may Chairperson, my colleague from ICOMOS will provide additional comment.”

ICOMOS

“Thank you Chairperson. ICOMOS and ICCROM are extremely concerned by the state of conservation of the Stone Town of Zanzibar as reflected in the vulnerable conditions of buildings, several problematic developments and previous recommendations that have not been implemented. Also, the framework for management of the property should be strengthened through the newly-established Development Control Unit. This system is not yet fully functioning and the Heritage Board is not operational. There have been ongoing issues arising from the multiple actors involved in the management and conservation of the stone town ever since the property was inscribed.

The 2017 mission has disturbingly identified that there are multiple examples of non-compliance with previous mission recommendations and Committee decisions and current projects and initiatives should not proceed as planned.

The minimum mitigation measures for the Mambo Msiige project, identified by the 2016 mission, have not all been implemented. The Palace Museum is in danger of partial collapse unless urgent measures are taken. The Bwawani project involving land reclamation and high-rise building should be halted in view of the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Darajani business project should also be halted, then a new project developed in line with the principal local area plans and green belt proposals. Consultations should occur with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies before any decisions on projects for the Malindi Container Terminal Tippu Tip House in view of their impacts. The final plans that are now completed for the Mizingani Sea Wall project, repeatedly requested by the Committee have not been submitted for review.

Factors identified as adversely affecting the property since 2014 have not been satisfactorily addressed. High-level intervention is required to remedy strategic and systemic weaknesses. The diverse and complex issues facing the property can be resolved through a coordinated and cohesive process. This situation is urgent and needs to be acted upon immediately.

ICOMOS and ICCROM therefore strongly support the immediate establishment of a high-level cross-cutting task team which would have the authority to act and address the potential and ascertained danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of this property.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Chairperson. The Delegation of the Republic of Zimbabwe commends the State Party of the United Republic of Tanzania for its commitment to protecting and preserving the Stone Town of Zanzibar amid the current ongoing social economic transformation associated with rapid urban development pressure.

The delegation of Zimbabwe commends the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for a well-documented and balanced draft decision concerning the Stone Town of Zanzibar.

Madam Chair, the delegation of Zimbabwe carefully examined the recommendation to formulate a task team that could critically examine the challenges and issues included in the draft decision 42 COM 7B.51, including the previous three decisions that were taken during the 39th, 40th and 41st sessions in 2015, 2016 and 2017 respectively.

Madam Chair, if one looks carefully, the issues raised necessitate the intensive multi-stakeholder dialogue, we therefore strongly believe that for the State Party to fully address this complex issue it will need a realistic deadline, longer than the one in the draft decision. We therefore suggest that the State Party will be given an implementation of two years instead of the one. As such, the State Party should be requested to submit its state of

conservation report by the 1st of February, 2020, to be examined by the Committee in its 44th session in 2020.

Madam Chair, Zimbabwe has proposed a minor amendment of the draft decision in this regard. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to remind you that we are late in our schedule. Therefore, I would like to ask for your cooperation on respecting the time, please. The floor is now to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda associates itself with the statement made by Zimbabwe and commends the State Party for the efforts they are making and would also like to support the suggested amendment by Zimbabwe to give the State Party more time to report for examination after the 44th session. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Brazil would like to commend the State Party of Tanzania for following recommendations with regard the restoration of Beit-el-Ajaib and commends as well the donor countries that are associated with donations for these endeavours. We should also like to commend the categorisation of more than 300 buildings owned by the Zanzibar Housing Cooperation in order to provide prioritisation to the conservation of these buildings.

Yet, we share the concern that the management system and that the Heritage Board are not yet fully operational, despite it being 17 years since the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. We believe that we echo the concerns of Zimbabwe and Uganda: that more time should be given to the State Party. We think that perhaps a two-year time lapse would be more appropriate to address all the recommendations we are requesting to the State Party at this stage.

I would like to ask a question to ICOMOS: Since we have already examined another property of Swahili tradition and we have requested for Kenya to invite a monitoring mission for Lamu and we are now requesting a monitoring mission to Zanzibar, could there be a common strategy to learn, although the threats are different, but to draw lessons from one property and another in terms of conservation? Could the same mission attend both properties? Perhaps, we could benefit from synergies from these different properties.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia also commends the State Party for having undertaken restorations and having followed the recommendations of ICOMOS in regard to the rehabilitation of the House of Wonders. We certainly recognise the scale and complexity of managing and conserving historic urban landscapes such as this particular example of traditional architecture. However, like a number of other Committee members, we are also very concerned to read that none of the factors affecting the property identified in the state of conservation report since 2014 have been successfully addressed and in particular development at the site is continuing without the required notification to the World Heritage Centre and the potential impacts of these developments on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is not being reviewed.

We therefore support the draft decision and we urge the State Party to take note of all the requests, including the formation of a task team as recommended or discussed by ICOMOS, and to implement all the actions in the draft decision. We do, however, recognise that there are often difficulties in the time frame for States Parties inviting a Reactive Monitoring mission and drafting a state of conservation report. We would like to hear from the State Party as to how they feel about the time frame proposed in the decision.

Thank you. “

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. It is regrettable that the Stone Town of Zanzibar has been subjected to concerns for so many years. This wonderful town has for years being reviewed by multiple missions and Committee sessions. However, successful results are scarce; the attributes conveying the Outstanding Universal Value are vulnerable or in decay whilst projects with adverse negative impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value are proceeding without adequate regulation.

We do hope that having a possible new inscription on the in Danger List gives a new hope that it will provide a momentum for positive incentive. In this case, we also believe that in Danger Listing could be a means for a sound development that should eventually be applied.

However, Norway supports the amendment made by Zimbabwe to allow for reviewing the outcome of the joint Reactive Monitoring mission to the site which will take place in 2019 as in the draft decision to be examined at the 44th Session of the committee in 2020, as the logical time frame.

Also, we stand with Brazil in the reasoning for a dual task of looking at more Swahili heritage sites when this mission takes place.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. L'Angola à son tour aimerait remercier le Secrétariat et l'ICOMOS pour les informations qui nous ont été fournies. Nous avons noté effectivement qu'il y a assez de manquements par rapport aux recommandations précédentes. Entre temps nous constatons aussi qu'il y a un grand besoin effectivement que l'État partie puisse prendre en compte toutes ces recommandations.

Il nous semble aussi que l'État partie serait encouragé même sur le plan de besoin financier il y a l'expression d'une solidarité externe et nous ne pouvons que demander à l'État partie de mieux se préparer et qu'une mission, disons d'accompagnement, soit mise en place pour pouvoir aider ce pays.

Nous sommes d'accord avec l'amendement présenté par le Zimbabwe en ce qui concerne le temps imparti pour pouvoir donner plus de temps à l'État partie de s'exécuter par rapport aux recommandations qui lui sont faites.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any more comments or do I give the floor to the State Party to reply? No comments. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, the United Republic of Tanzania wants to assure the Committee of its full commitment to protecting and to conserving the Stone Town of Zanzibar and of its Outstanding Universal Value. Madam Chair, the Stone Town of Zanzibar is among the very few cities in any developing country which is still the capital of the country and the centre of its commercial activities, because of the main port as well as the social and cultural hub of 1.5 million inhabitants.

To better face the challenges of this rapidly growing urban complex, Tanzania has been pioneering a pilot of implementation of UNESCO recommendations for urban landscapes in Africa. Madame Chair, on draft decisions and concerns of the members of the Committee, Tanzania has already taken concrete steps by halting the development of the Bwawani project; the Heritage Board was launched this May, the new Conservation and Management Plan is under preparation. With the support of the World Bank, the State Party is now preparing Heritage Impact Assessment on the Darajani Business Corridor to mitigate all negative effects of the project.

Tanzania will create a detailed matrix of all proposed measures and it will set up a high-level cross-cutting task team to supervise the implementation. As such, the delegation of Tanzania appeals to the members for this minor amendment of the draft to give the State Party a reasonable period of two years instead of one year to implement all the measures.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to ICOMOS for their comment.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Should I begin by highlighting the perspective provided by the honourable delegate from Tanzania and say that ICOMOS is very pleased to learn that the Heritage Board has now been launched, but would also observe in passing that it is this very issue about the multiple users of the site as a centre of commercial activities, as well as a World Heritage property, that creates the systemic challenges with management and organisation?”

We hear some of the actions taken by the multiple actors involved are not always founded in decisions that reflect the conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value. This is why the agreement to establish the high-level task force is very welcome and ICOMOS would emphasise the Committee is of the mind to provide the extra time before reporting back. It is nevertheless important that the high-level task force actually be convened immediately, because the problems are urgent and systemic. While the intervention from the honourable delegate from Angola is welcomed and acknowledged, these problems relate to much more than financial constraints; there are constraints that have arisen from the actions of multiple actors.

ICOMOS was asked a specific question by the delegation from Uganda. It is absolutely true that they are common issues with properties in this part of the world and ICOMOS will take on board the suggestion that there should be a common strategy and perhaps some liaison or even common personnel in the mission teams, although it must be observed that the ICOMOS experts who contribute to the advisory mission and the ICCROM experts as well also do so by contributing an enormous amount of time and energy, so commissioning both Lamu and Zanzibar onto just one expert may be an overwhelming workload. Nevertheless, coordination between the Advisory Bodies and the Centre I think we would welcome and take on board the suggestion that there might be a common strategy, perhaps framed in terms of the United Nations’ recommendation on Historic Urban Landscape.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have received one small amendment from Zimbabwe on this draft decision. In the last paragraph, if we could scroll down. During the discussion, we heard that the amendment by Zimbabwe was supported by Brazil, Norway, Angola and Uganda. This amendment, as explained during the discussion, would allow more time for the State Party by moving the examination of this property from the 43rd session to the 44th Session of the World Heritage Committee.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. The Cuban delegation would also like to support the amendments submitted. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you Madam Chair. China fully supports the amendment made by Zimbabwe and other delegations to change the wording from the 43rd Session to the 44th Session in 2020, to give the State Party more time to prepare the report.

China has concerns with regard to the last sentence of this paragraph due to the fact that we should not prejudge this report, at least any nomination on the in Danger List. China would like to recall a proposal that the delegation of Brazil made from examining the site of Kathmandu Valley yesterday, so we should make a change *‘with a view to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property’*.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you Madam Chair. We also support the amendment noted by Zimbabwe and also we think it is not good to have prejudgment for the last sentences and we support China’s suggestion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you Madam Chair. If I understood the previous discussion, the task force referred to on paragraph 13 has now been formed and is operative. If that is the case, then maybe we could change the wording to simply say, *‘the progress of the task team’*.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would also like to support the proposal of Zimbabwe to give more time for the State Party to prepare a report and also the proposal of China with regard to prejudging or preconditions and we believe that we need to be consistent with the previous decision and we support the proposal of China adding, ‘*maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property*’.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have accepted the discussion to be postponed to 2020, since that was the will of the Committee, but to accept again that the reference of in Danger listing is not incorporated in this paragraph, I think the emergency level of the situation should be reflected looking at the reports of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. We would not mind looking at it at the 44th session, but retain the last sentence of the decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to agree with the proposal by China and others to remove the last part of the paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway supports the proposal made by Bahrain in this case. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. With a little hesitation, Hungary agrees with this proposal to postpone the deadline for the report of the site, so we agree with the proposal of Zimbabwe, but at the same time we support the proposal of Bahrain.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda would like to support the proposal made by China, Kuwait and Azerbaijan to remove the negative sentence in the draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, Australia would like to support the proposal by Bahrain and the other countries to retain the final sentence of the final paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, comme hier où il a été dit que l'esprit devrait être positif, on ne peut pas préjuger les résultats d'un rapport donc nous appuyons la proposition du Zimbabwe ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just a couple of clarifications. As I understood the report from the honourable delegate from Tanzania, it is not the high-level task force which has been formed but actually the Heritage Board of the development control unit and ICOMOS and ICCROM would still regard the formation of the high-level task force as extremely pressing and urgent.

I would also observe, just in terms of the mission report, which has itself in terms given rise to the question of in danger listing and compliance with the conditions present in Paragraphs 178 and 179: It would seem to be reasonable in terms of openly informing the political decision made as within the State Party that the state of conservation of the property is such that it is on the precipice of those paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am sorry that my delegation is taking the floor for the second time on this topic. Brazil conceived this formulation yesterday ‘*maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property*’; I would like to add myself to the proposal made by China to write this. The idea is that we say the same thing but in a positive and constructive way.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair. Thank you to ICOMOS for the clarification on the task force; we withdraw the amendment we were proposing to paragraph 13.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you have any comments? Can you read the draft decision paragraph by paragraph?”

The Rapporteur:

“Madam Chair, there seems to be an agreement about the postponement of the examination. However we have two opposite views regarding the last part of the paragraph. I would read now what the paragraph would look like with the amendment made by China and supported by Uganda, Angola, Brazil and others:

- *Requests furthermore the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 December 2019, a report on the state of conservation of the property, and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020; with a view to maintaining the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;*”

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you have any comments or objections with regard to the paragraph, the final wording of the paragraph? No objections? I repeat are there any objections? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.51 adopted.

I now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you madam Chair. The list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion are:

- Aksum in Ethiopia, Le Morne Cultural Landscape in Mauritius, Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape in South Africa, the Ruins of Kilwa Kisiwani and the Ruins of Songo Mnara in the United Republic of Tanzania.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any objections from the Committee with regard to these state of conservation reports? I see none. I declare the Decisions read out adopted.

We now move to the Arab State region with Petra in Jordan. I will now invite Ms. Nada Al-Hassan, Chief of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the cultural properties located in the Arab States Region and opened for discussion. You have the floor.”

Madame Nada Al Hassan :

“Thank you madam Chair.

On va aborder la liste du patrimoine avec Pétra. À la demande du Comité l'année dernière une mission de suivi réactif conjointe a eu lieu à Pétra en novembre 2017. Bien que le site soit culturel, l'UICN y a pris part afin d'ajouter leurs expertises au vu des valeurs et qualité naturelle du site et de sa zone tampon.

La mission a procédé à une analyse détaillée des enjeux et menaces concernant le bien à savoir : la croissance et l'empiètement urbain, la réglementation régissant la zone tampon projetée, la protection du paysage, la conservation et la gestion de l'archéologie, la gestion des risques et notamment des risques d'inondation, les effets du tourisme sur les enfants et les adultes, les effets sociaux donc, et le mauvais traitement des animaux utilisés pour visiter le site.

Les images devant vous montrent le site de Pétra qui est un site fantastique, comme beaucoup sur la liste, mais pour celui-ci j'ai une affection spéciale. Pour ceux qui ne le connaissent pas, c'est un site merveilleux que l'on découvre petit à petit dans la gorge. Ici, illustré à l'écran, vous pouvez voir le village de Wadi Musa voisin qui ne cesse de croître et deux projets. La route qui a été réalisée au sein du bien et dont la mission questionne la qualité paysagère et architecturale et le chantier du prénommé ecovillage où vous voyez ces structures en béton qui sont les fondations de ce village.

Ce projet d'écovillage devrait être dans la zone tampon projetée. Le chantier a été arrêté suite à notre mission. Lors de notre mission qui a eu lieu il y a sept mois l'État partie nous a montré un engagement clair pour répondre à nos interrogations par des mesures structurées et concrètes. La grande qualité du Plan de gestion intégré pour Pétra élaborée de manière participative par l'autorité responsable, Pétra Development and Tourism Authority (PDTRA), et le département des Antiquités avec le soutien de l'UNESCO facilitera substantiellement ses efforts dès que son commencement imminent sera lancé. Ce qui est une très bonne nouvelle.

L'État partie devrait être félicité pour ses décisions importantes visant à atténuer l'impact des chantiers de construction en cours aux environs du bien, y compris le remplacement du projet d'agrandissement de l'hôtel Crown Plaza. Vous voyez ici à votre gauche le projet d'extension de l'hôtel. Ce projet a été abandonné, l'État partie a décidé de maintenir la structure existante dans la zone tampon sans agrandir l'hôtel.

La révision est en cours pour d'autres projets d'infrastructure touristique afin d'en limiter l'impact environnemental y compris pour l'écovillage que je vous montrais avant et dont le projet a été révisé.

Le classement imminent du parc archéologique en zone naturelle de protection constituera une étape importante pour protéger les ressources naturelles et culturelles de Pétra. Protéger son paysage et agir comme une zone tampon ainsi que favoriser le développement du tourisme durable et de l'écotourisme.

Le gouvernement s'était également engagé afin que le département des Antiquités remplisse pleinement ses obligations légales liées à la conservation et à la recherche archéologique ainsi qu'à tous types d'interventions paysagères ou architecturales, afin que l'intégrité archéologique et paysagère de Pétra soit préservée au sein du bien dans sa zone tampon et dans son cadre plus large.

Mesdames et messieurs, je pense que les défis auxquels Pétra fait face sont similaires à ceux rencontrés dans vos pays respectifs, à savoir un site du patrimoine mondial très connu, un emblème national au centre de développement économique du pays. Un site qui attire les convoitises et parfois les divisions où chaque partie prenante pense avoir le droit à plus de bénéfices qu'une autre. Ainsi, j'en appelle à votre attention, si notre Convention réussie à Pétra elle en sortira renforcée pour chacun d'entre nous, je pense à Machu Picchu au Pérou à Ngorongoro en Tanzanie, aux pyramides de Gizeh en Égypte, à Venise en Italie, à Lijiang en Chine.

Sachant que la nouvelle équipe qui gère Pétra est ici présente, et je la salue, je sais l'opportunité de notre Comité pour vous dire qu'aujourd'hui l'avenir de Pétra tient à leur vision et à leur propre engagement, mais aussi à votre implication, vous, les membres du Comité, car à chaque changement il faut renouveler les vœux. L'expérience montre que la conservation des sites du patrimoine mondial tient à des personnes, à leurs engagements personnels et acharnés. Nous sommes donc arrivés à un tournant pour Pétra. Aujourd'hui, soit les bonnes décisions sont prises et mises en œuvre tel que recommandé dans notre rapport, soit le site évoluera vers une urbanisation croissante qui va l'engloutir jour après jour.

La diapositive sur la croissance urbaine, à votre droite à l'écran, nous montre cette évolution même si les images ne sont pas bonnes. La croissance urbaine avance très vite. La question est comment ? C'est la politique du développement durable que vous avez adopté en 2015 qui nous en donne la clé. Nous proposons d'aborder le futur de Pétra à travers une vision nouvelle, à travers une planification territoriale intégrée qui voit plus loin et plus large que les limites administratives actuelles, au-delà de la zone tampon projetée.

Une planification visant à renforcer le développement social et économique durable et à diversifier les sources de revenus économiques de Pétra afin d'alléger la pression que subit ce site. Nous proposons qu'une vision et qu'un plan national multidisciplinaire soit élaboré pour la région de Pétra au sens large par des urbanistes, des juristes, des sociologues, des économistes, des environnementalistes et les autorités locales, régionales et centrales.

Cette vision devra être accompagnée d'un moratoire permanent sur les nouvelles constructions dans la zone tampon dans la zone des hôtels à l'entrée du site, et ainsi sur les constructions visibles à partir du site. Elle nécessite de trouver des solutions juridiquement et financièrement viables pour les propriétaires de ces terrains. C'est donc une entreprise colossale pour le pays.

L'implication active des communautés locales et des organisations de la société civile sera très importante, c'est ce qui se passe aujourd'hui heureusement en Jordanie, nous répondons à leur besoin en matière de développement économique et social et à leurs problèmes comme le travail des enfants et le décrochage scolaire, problèmes aigus à Pétra. Nous éviterons aussi les tensions sociales.

La décision vous est proposée à la page 109 en anglais et en français. Mais au-delà des mots, furent-ils dans la décision, c'est un élan de la part de tous dont nous avons besoin pour concilier protection du patrimoine mondial et développement durable. Je me permets donc de vous demander de participer activement à la discussion qui va suivre cette présentation.

Madame la présidente ICOMOS souhaite prendre la parole ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, go ahead.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. ICCROM and ICOMOS are pleased to know the progress made at this property, particularly from decisions taken by the State Party and its agencies to reduce or avoid the impact of ongoing construction in the vicinity of the property, including replacing the Crown Plaza extension project with a low environmental renovation and not proceeding with other high-impact tourism infrastructure projects.

There is a need for the strong engagement of the Department of Antiquities in the ongoing management of the property and the proposed Memorandum of Understanding between the Petra Development Authorities and the Department of Antiquities is welcomed. There is also emphasis on the property on sustainable development, including efforts to involve local communities and civil society organisations in decision-making and local development actions and to address their economic and social needs.

However, urban growth and encroachment remain a major threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The proposed integrated territorial master plan, which does allow for sustainable economic social and environmental development, will be a vital tool to protect the property from urban growth and development pressure. The proposed minor boundary modification including delineation of the buffer zone clarification of protective urban regulations will assist in the integration of this integrated territorial Master Plan and it is essential to easing planning and development pressures on the buffer zone.

In this regard, the designation of the Petra Archaeological Park as a natural protected area will reinforce protection of both natural and cultural resources. The November joint Reactive Monitoring mission has undertaken a thorough assessment of current issues, threats and needs of the property in consultation with local authorities and it is now of great importance that all of the recommendations of the mission are fully implemented.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or enquiries on the matter at hand? I see none. Rapporteur, please, are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur

“Thank you madam Chair. We have not received any amendments. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.54 adopted. Jordan, please, you have the floor.”

Jordan

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Jordan highly appreciates the Committee’s efforts towards the protection of Petra. In this sense we assure this Committee that the government of Jordan and all other stakeholders are working on the implementation of the recommendations contained in your decision. It is also worth mentioning that the government of Jordan has already taken steps on a number of recommendations in your decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please”

Tunisie :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. La Tunisie voudrait à la fois remercier le Centre sur la présentation édifiante sur ce très beau site et le problème que l’on voit un peu partout dans différents contextes entre les nécessités de protection et de préservation et les situations de développement à la fois économique social et parfois démographique.

Je voudrais en profiter pour souligner avec satisfaction l’intervention de l’État partie qui nous rappelle, et on lui fait pleinement confiance, de la nécessité de son engagement à donner tous les moyens à ce site d’être protégé et que par rapport à l’hypothèse présentée dans le rapport on va aller plutôt dans une direction rassurante et positive ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Ms. Rössler has some announcements.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We are a little late in our agenda and I would like to recall that this morning at the Bureau meeting we agreed that we start this afternoon the session with the Pirin National Park in Bulgaria. I would also like to inform you that the text of the drafting group on Lahore is being distributed in the room so that you can adopt it this afternoon.

Thank you very much.”

Secretariat:

“Concerning today’s site events, there are many, with five of them. That first is at 1:00 pm: Conservation at the Margins of Extractive Development: Outlooks and Opportunities for Natural Heritage Sites under Threat at 1:00 pm in the Tylos room. Reconstruction of Built Cultural Heritage: Impacts on Identity and Memory, organised by ARC-World Heritage in Room Hawar, at 1:00 pm. World Heritage and Sustainable Development in Africa by AWHF in coordination with the World Heritage Centre in room Muharraq, at 1:10 pm. Benefits of natural World Heritage-launch of new guidelines for site-level assessment of benefits and ecosystem services organised by IUCN in room Manama in the Advisory Bodies space, at 2:10 pm. ICOMOS thematic studies in room Manama Advisory Bodies’ space as well. Of course we should not forget the Budget group, which starts at 2:00 pm in room Rifa.

Thank you very much.”

FOURTH DAY – Thursday 28 June 2018

EIGHTH SESSION

3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Maria Edileuza Fontenele Reis (Vice Chairperson - Brazil)

The Chairperson:

“Dear colleagues, as decided this morning, we will now examine the state of conservation of Pirin National Park in Bulgaria. I therefore give the floor to the delegation of Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair and congratulations on assuming the post. First of all, I would like to thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our position on the item of Pirin National Park World Heritage property. We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the work done by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in preparing the draft decision and supporting documents. We welcome with satisfaction the fact that the advisory mission, envisaged in our previous decisions, has been carried out successfully.

We consider that the decision reflects the positions that differ from the previous decision of the Committee. However, we do not find some circumstances justifying the current draft of the decision and the text of the decision in our view entails some commitments which are hardly feasible.

The State Party of Bulgaria has always complied with the Committee’s decisions and has not allowed the construction of the ski sports facilities within the property. Currently, there is no change of circumstances leading to adoption of a decision by a Committee inconsistent with those already adopted. Following the decision from the 40th Session of the Committee, a screening procedure of the new Management Plan has been performed and resulted in the decision that a full Strategic Environmental Assessment is not needed. This decision is currently subject to a judicial review and the result of the procedure depends on the outcomes of the court case.

In this line, we do not find appropriate that the Committee would commend and make references to court decisions which are even not final and not yet enforced. We believe that the property is not threatened by activities of the State Party and we hereby request the discussion on this draft decision to be open.

With this in mind, my delegation proposes some amendments to the draft decision, and I am very pleased to say that these draft amendments were negotiated and agreed with the IUCN.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Excellency. I would now like to invite IUCN to respond to this comment. You have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. IUCN and the World Heritage Centre had a meeting with the State Party of Bulgaria earlier this week. During this meeting, the State Party provided further information and clarification regarding the current situation of the ski facilities in the buffer zone of the property and the interventions planned to avoid overcrowding.

Assurances were provided that such interventions were of a limited nature and upgrading existing infrastructure was aimed at better service demand. IUCN welcomes this information given by the State Party and the assurances given that the Strategic Environmental Assessment will be undertaken at the stage of spatial development planning.

In that regard, IUCN notes the amendment proposed to the draft decision, in particular the request for the State Party to ensure that maintenance, upgrade or increase of the capacity of skiing infrastructure in the buffer zone will not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. IUCN would like to bring the Committee’s attention to paragraph 6, as amended, which includes an important but subtle distinction between the current Management Plan as amended and the proposed new plan. IUCN considers that both these plans need to be guarded by strategic planning and adequate Environmental Impact Assessment through the established procedures as advised by the State Party of Bulgaria. The language under paragraph 6 therefore accommodates this distinction.

In the view of IUCN and the World Heritage Centre, the new Management Plan is the appropriate place to envisage a long-term vision for the property, clear prescriptions on the limitations in conditions under which development may be allowed in the buffer zone and the necessary safeguards to protect Outstanding Universal Value.

Madam Chair, as noted in the proposed amendment to the draft decision, the December 2017 changes to the current Management Plan now do not prohibit the construction of water catchment facilities within the property. In this regard, IUCN welcomes again the assurance provided by the State Party, during our meeting here in Bahrain, that such facilities only concern the provision of drinking water. However, as these could be located within the property, IUCN recommends that the Committee requests the State Party to provide further precision regarding potential extent, location and impacts.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for your report. I now open the floor for comments from delegations and I can see that Bosnia has requested the floor. It is yours, please.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“Thank you madam Chair. The position of Bosnia-Herzegovina on the item of Pirin National Park World Heritage property: we would like to express our support to the amendment to the draft decision proposed by Azerbaijan and some by us. It appears that the draft decision contains some inconsistencies with previous decisions adopted.

The decision further disposes on the State Party commitments which are currently subject to judicial review. In this respect, we do not find appropriate the decision to comment and to refer to court rulings which are not final or enforced. We also think that there are no

changes in the circumstances and respectively there are no grounds for examination of the property. Moreover, the court proceedings are still pending.

It is enough for the State Party to provide a progress report to the World Heritage Centre with dated information of the results of the court proceedings as proposed in the amendments. Hereby, we request the Draft Decision be amended.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you for your comments. I would like to pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Indonesia would like to comment on the work that has been taken by the Advisory Bodies and notes the recommendation conveyed to the State Party, Bulgaria. We would also commend the State Party in conserving the Outstanding Universal Value of Pirin National Park. We should keep in mind, however, in addition to the obligation of the State Party to conserve the Outstanding Universal Value, that there are certain development activities on the site that are unavoidable.

Taking this into account, we are of the view that it is acceptable for the State Party to replace and increase the capacity of skiing infrastructure. This matter is necessary in order to keep the flow of tourists on the site under control. In the end it will have positive impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. We would also encourage the State Party to continue working together with the Advisory Bodies and expedite the finalisation of the new Management Plan for the property that includes the Strategic Environmental Assessment, in order for both sites to have clear guidance in conserving the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the distinguished representative of China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. In our opinion, the original draft decision reflects a position which differs from previous decisions from the World Heritage Committee, in particular, Decision 36.COM.7B.18 from the 36th session in St Petersburg and several decisions from following sessions which allowed further development of the buffer zone.

As far as we are informed, the State Party of Bulgaria has always strictly followed the decisions of the Committee. We consider there is no change in the circumstances leading to the adoption of the new decision not corresponding to the already-adopted position of the Committee regarding the property and the buffer zone. Therefore, China fully supports and co-signed the amendment submitted by Azerbaijan and other States Parties.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. The floor is to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“The delegation of Kuwait supports the draft amendments submitted by Azerbaijan and other States Parties. Simply because we believe the report is mainly based on decisions that have not been taken yet from the court judgement, the focal point of the issue. Until that issue is resolved, we support Azerbaijani amendments and we also appreciate the Advisory Bodies for their continuous dialogue and communication with the State Party.

Thank you madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. Hungary, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The World Heritage Committee in its 36th session took note of the conclusion on the World Heritage Centre and IUCN monitoring mission back in 2011, that the capacity upgrade of ski facilities undertaken in the buffer zone of the Pirin National Park did not appear to have any negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. On the other hand, the Committee in its same decision requested the State Party to ensure developments in the buffer zone were assessed to make sure they do not create negative impacts on the property.

In the view of the Hungarian delegation, these two requirements of the 2011 Committee decision are sufficiently met by the amended and consolidated draft decision. Hungary would also like to underline that the possibility of any infrastructural development project on a World Heritage property should be evaluated by a detailed Environmental Impact Assessment as well as appropriate assessment procedures, as requested by article 6 of the Habitat Directorate of the European Union and take into account the fact that the entire World Heritage property, including its buffer zone, is part of the Natura 2000 nature protection of the European Union and also that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property largely overlaps with natural processing ecosystems, habitat and species protected by the Habitat directive.

Furthermore, we strongly encourage the State Party to implement these legal procedures through open and independently mediated communication processes in which all stakeholders, governments, NGOs, and local communities of the State Party are involved.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now ask for the comments of Australia. Please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia acknowledges the work of Azerbaijan to develop amendments to the draft decision and we would like to foreshadow our intention to propose additional minor amendments with the intent to clarify the amendments to the draft decision proposed by Azerbaijan.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the delegation of Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Considérant le rapport sur l'état de conservation du parc national de Pirin en Bulgarie, site inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial depuis 1983 selon les critères (vii), (viii) et (ix), ma délégation voudrait remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pour le travail qui a été réalisé.

Dans les recommandations proposées dans le rapport pour conserver la valeur exceptionnelle du bien, nous encourageons l'État partie à poursuivre leur mise en œuvre avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'UICN. Il est notamment demandé à l'État partie de fournir une étude environnementale et sociale complète du nouveau plan de gestion du bien qui intégrera une évaluation spécifique des impacts potentiels sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, notamment les impacts liés aux éventuels aménagements et développements envisagés sur le territoire du bien et de la zone tampon.

Pour mener à bien ces études afin d'assurer une meilleure conservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien, il serait nécessaire pour l'État partie de disposer des moyens et de temps nécessaire pour la conduite de ces études. De ce fait, et en lien avec le projet de décision, le Burkina Faso voudrait qu'un temps raisonnable soit accordé à l'État partie de Bulgarie notamment une année supplémentaire, soit d'ici le 1 février 2020 pour soumettre un rapport actualisé sur l'état de conservation du bien, pour examen par le Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 44^e Session en 2020.

Notre pays soutient de ce fait l'amendement porté par le projet de décision de l'Azerbaïdjan et les autres États parties.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would now like to pass the floor to the delegation of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to say that Zimbabwe is one of the cosponsors of the draft amendments introduced by Azerbaijan and we would like to commend the State Party and IUCN for the constructive dialogue they had in order to align the new draft decision with the recommendations of the 36th session of the Committee, as well as not to pre-empt the administrative court judgement, which is still to be made.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. The floor is to the delegation of Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. Cuba is grateful for the information that has been given to us regarding this draft decision. We feel it is very important to have this communication between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party and therefore we are supporting this amendment to the draft decision which allows us to give a resounding response in order to saw off the urgent issue.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. L’Angola a bien pris note du dialogue qui a été établi entre les Organisations consultatives et l’État partie et nous avons également remarqué qu’il y a un certain blocage au niveau du pays pour la prise de certaines décisions qui dépendent de la justice et nous savons parfois que ce sont des procédures qui prennent du temps.

Nous aimerions donc que du temps soit accordé à l’État partie pour qu’il débloque cette situation, en fait, d’être en mesure de pouvoir répondre aux exigences des recommandations faites par les Organisations consultatives. Nous sommes donc d’accord pour appuyer les amendements proposés par l’Azerbaïdjan.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I pass the floor to the delegation of Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Uganda urges the State Party of Bulgaria to balance any proposals of skiing developments with the Outstanding Universal Value of this heritage property and to undertake a Strategic Environmental Assessment of the draft Management Plan which respects the original draft decisions.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. Now we have the last speaker, the delegation of Tunisia. Thank you.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie, qui fait partie du groupe de pays qui ont proposé cet amendement, voudrait souligner d'abord avec grande satisfaction le dialogue entrepris entre l'État partie et les structures consultatives et l'on a vu que cela a déjà abouti à des résultats significatifs. Nous encourageons leurs continuations.

Également, nous devons être sensible et responsable à l'effet de la décision et notamment l'applicabilité de nos décisions. À partir du moment où il y a dans l'État partie une procédure en cours, je crois que nous devons être attentifs à cet élément pour assurer à l'arrivée une cohérence entre nos décisions et celles qui seront prises de manière souveraine par l'État partie. C'est pour cela que nous souhaitons que cet amendement soit adopté ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to our Rapporteur, as we have one proposal of a minor amendment by the delegation of Australia. Could you please take the floor? Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Madam Chair, we have received a set of amendments that you can see on the screen, submitted by Azerbaijan, Cuba, Burkina Faso, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Tanzania, Tunisia, China, Zimbabwe, Brazil, Kuwait and Angola. As was noted during the discussion, this is a text that has been negotiated with IUCN which has negotiated in turn with the State Party and the World Heritage Centre. I believe you have all received these amendments in advance, but during the discussion we heard that the delegation of Australia might make small amendments to these proposed amendments.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“As I believe all the other delegations are in agreement with the text negotiated, maybe, I consult you, Australia could just introduce the proposed amendment and the other countries would kindly say whether they are in agreement with it or not. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Our first proposed amendment is to clarify the fact that there are actually two court decisions, one which applies to our current Management Plan and one which applies to the new Management Plan. It is our understanding that the court decision regarding the new Management Plan of the property is not yet available.

Our suggestion is for 6.a, to add, as it currently reads *‘implement the Supreme Administrative Court’s final decision regarding the SEA procedure for the new Management Plan of the property when it becomes available’*. Then, 6.b we propose: *‘ensure that a SEA will be undertaken for the special planning based on the December 2017 amendments to the current Management Plan as a matter of priority’*. The rest of 6.b stands.

I repeat that 6.b starts: *‘ensure that a SEA will be undertaken for the special planning based on the December 2017 amendments to the current Management Plan as a matter of*

priority'. And then delete '*upon the spatial development plan based on the December 2017 amendment*' because that has been covered in the earlier clause.

Let me repeat it: '*ensure that a SEA will be undertaken for the special planning based on the December 2017 amendments to the current Management Plan as a matter of priority*'. And then: '*This SEA will include. 6.d, and it reads: 'Once the results of the decision of the Supreme Administrative Court concerning the SEA for the New Management Plan become available. The rest stands.*'

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Are there any objections to the amendments proposed by Australia? Azerbaijan you have the floor."

Azerbaijan:

"Thank you madam Chair. We thank the delegation of Australia for this amendment and we have no objections. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Uganda you have the floor. Thank you."

Uganda:

"Thank you very much. Let me also add my voice to Azerbaijan's to thank the delegation of Australia. This amendment as proposed by Australia is very much in line with the contribution we made earlier, so we support it in total. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Since there are no more comments, I think we can and we shall declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.72 amended and adopted.

I now give the floor to the observer who has requested it. Actually, I am sorry I made a mistake: I understand the State Party would like to take the floor; I am sorry, I did not see them.

Thank you so much and I ask for your understanding."

Bulgaria:

"Madam Chair, members of the Committee, ladies and gentlemen, we take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for their support in the protection and sustainable development of the World Heritage sites in Bulgaria.

On behalf of the Bulgarian government and myself I would like to express our satisfaction for the adopted decision and the consensus achieved. This will help to find a way out of the issues accumulated for years. We need balance between the protection of the

Outstanding Universal Value of Pirin National Park and the sustainable development for the existing ski zone.

The State Party has always given priority to the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Bulgarian World Heritage properties and to all ecological challenges. This position will remain unchanged and consistent in the future. We would like to express gratitude to all State Parties who gave us their support for this decision despite yesterday's cyber attack.

In conclusion, we would like to assure you that all the actions of the Bulgarian government will continue to be focused on the overall protection of Pirin World Heritage. We would like to wish success to this forum and also invite all of you to Pirin National Park. Thus you will have the opportunity to witness the unique nature of the property and visit the ski zone.

Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for your intervention. The floor is now to the observer who requested it.”

Observer:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. I was lucky to go to Pirin when I was only seven years old and nowadays I take my son. Pirin is home to a centuries-old forest and of timeless limestone peaks. A 13th-century Bosnian Pine tree is the oldest on the Balkan Peninsula. You wonder what stories it could tell you from the past millennium. Pirin is part of the national anthem and the name is chanted in hundreds of traditional songs.

Pirin's case is simple. It all comes down to depleting centuries-old forest to build ski ramps. In the year 2000, NGOs warned about the coming construction of a ski zone; ten years later the World Heritage Committee excluded two ski zones from the property because, and I quote: *'the property is being repeatedly and significantly impacted by the development of ski facilities and ski ramps'*. One does not learn from history.

All of this is not in support of the local people. The current ski zone in Bankso town has not prevented population reduction, decreases in property values, seasonal employment and continuous State subsidies. The draft Management Plan and the amendment to the current Plan of Pirin stirred an unprecedented reaction. This revised draft decision will fail the thousands of people, from citizens of Bulgaria and abroad, who have been protesting in the streets to save Pirin in freezing temperatures this winter. The draft decision is now revised beyond recognition. If we fail to save Pirin with its protection on national, European and global levels how can we succeed anywhere else?

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We are moving to the discussion on the archaeological site of Carthage and I would like to pass the floor to Ms. Nada Al-Hassan. You have the floor now to make your presentation.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Je vous présente le site archéologique de Carthage en Tunisie. Un autre site merveilleux. Le rapport sur le site archéologique de Carthage se trouve dans le document 7B.Add à la page 59 en français et en anglais.

Le site archéologique de Carthage fait face à plusieurs défis relatifs aux questions foncières de déclassement reclassement de certaines zones archéologiques au sein du bien et à l'absence de limites et de zone tampon. Le Plan de gestion du site que la Tunisie appelle le Plan de protection et de mise en valeur du bien tarde à être adopté.

Le Centre du patrimoine mondial a reçu des informations récentes après la publication du rapport que vous avez reçu faisant état d'atteinte à l'intégrité du bien comme suite à la construction d'un bâtiment au sein du site archéologique à proximité direct du port punique. Nous avons également été informés de la vente de terrains dans la zone classée sur lesquels des autorisations de construction seraient accordées l'année prochaine.

Un dialogue a été aussitôt établi avec l'État partie. Par conséquent, monsieur le ministre de la Culture de Tunisie a informé le Comité du patrimoine mondial de la décision du gouvernement d'arrêter tout de suite les travaux de construction en cours. Des discussions au niveau national sont aussi en cours en vue de démanteler cette construction. En outre, nous avons été informés hier que le ministre de la Culture a pris des dispositions pour que le ministère concerné par les ventes de terrains dans la zone classée retire immédiatement des avis de vente ; de belles nouvelles.

Par conséquent, nous souhaiterions saluer vivement la réactivité de la Tunisie par rapport à ces développements et les actions entreprises par monsieur l'ambassadeur de Tunisie auprès de son gouvernement, et nous les invitons à mettre en œuvre les décisions annoncées par le ministre de la Culture à savoir : le gel de la construction et son démantèlement ainsi que l'interdiction de vente de terrains classés. Cela sera indispensable pour le respect de l'intégrité du bien.

Ces événements récents démontrent la nécessité d'adopter des limites claires pour Carthage et sa zone tampon, ainsi que le Plan de gestion, accompagné de réglementations nationales qui éviteraient de gérer les crises et qui privilégieraient une gestion durable de Carthage, site archéologique emblématique de l'Afrique du Nord ayant été jadis au cœur d'une des campagnes internationales de l'UNESCO comme on en fait plus, campagne qui en avait révélé la richesse et la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Le projet de décision vous est soumis à la page 60 en anglais et en français. Madame la présidente l'ICOMOS souhaiterait prendre la parole avec votre permission.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci infiniment. I would like now to know whether there are any comments on the appreciation of this topic. ICOMOS please”

ICOMOS :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le site archéologique de Carthage est constitué de plusieurs ensembles qui sont insérés dans le tissu urbain de la ville. Les progrès réalisés par les autorités pour le contrôle du foncier dans la zone archéologique devraient être confortés par l'adoption et l'application du plan de protection et de mise en valeur du bien.

Cet outil réglementaire qui permet de protéger le site et vise à assurer une meilleure gestion du développement foncier et de l'infrastructure dans le bien. Il doit intégrer également la gestion globale du site en termes de conservation et de maintenance afin que les conditions de l'intégrité du bien continuent d'être respectées. Par ailleurs, la structure de la gestion du bien devrait clarifier les fonctions, les attributions et les mécanismes de coopération entre les différents acteurs de la conservation, de la mise en valeur et de l'aménagement du bien qui est indissociable de son environnement urbain.

L'environnement du bien est vulnérable, aussi est-il essentiel d'établir les critères de définition de la zone tampon et les réglementations et mesures existantes qui la régissent. L'ICOMOS a pris note des projets d'aménager et de mettre en valeur deux sites remarquables, le cirque romain et le complexe hydraulique. Il considère qu'il devrait faire l'objet d'études d'impacts avant que des décisions définitives soient prises pour leurs mises en œuvre.

Je vous remercie madame ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like now to give the floor to the delegation of China which has some comments to make.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Before we start to examine the draft decision, we would like to say that we acknowledge with satisfaction the efforts undertaken by the State Party with the aim of preserving the archaeological site of Carthage. We also appreciate the efforts of the Tunisian authorities as shown in the report presented by the Tunisian government to the World Heritage Centre.

Therefore, we would like to encourage the State Party to continue its efforts in the field of heritage protection related to the issue of land control and the adoption of archaeological strategy. With your permission madam Chairperson, we would like to invite the delegate of the concerned State Party, Tunisia, to provide more detailed information.

Thank you madam chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the distinguished delegate of Tunisia. Actually, I am sorry but before Tunisia speaks, we would like to hear from the delegate of Uganda. Thank you.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The delegation of Uganda congratulates the State Party for the efforts already undertaken in the field of land control of the area of Carthage in the protected zone and encourages it to continue the good works so far. My delegation will support the amendment as proposed by China.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the distinguished delegate of Spain.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I would also very much like to hear the explanation of the State Party relative to the efforts that have been undertaken, considering the various challenges that this property faces. We would like to recall that the protection of this particular property has been a constant concern to the Tunisian government and we would now like to hear more details about the various measures that the State Party has taken with regard to the protection of the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the delegate of Indonesia. Please.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I agree with the view of China and the other delegates and I encourage the State Party to give more information on the effort situation that has been taking place in the site. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe commends Tunisia for the recovery of cultural materials that were stolen from the site Museum of Carthage; we also commend the State Party for carrying out the recommendations of the 2014 commission, which relate to the conservation, protection and management of the property.

However, we continue to encourage the State Party to continue the dialogue with the Centre going forward. We support the amendments as proposed.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan. Please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Azerbaijan also joins the previous speakers in commending the State Party’s efforts for land control in the area located in the classified zone and also I would like to thank the State Party for its efforts for the protection of this site and taking into account the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies.

We would like to add our voices in supporting the amendments proposed by China. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the distinguished delegate of Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. The State of Kuwait also thanks and appreciates everyone involved in preserving this site and the continuation of maintaining its integrity and we also thank the State Party for maintaining and working hard, especially amid the local and regional challenges they are facing. We support China’s amendment and we thank again everyone involved in this project.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now pass the floor to the distinguished delegate of Tunisia for his comment. Thank you very much.”

Tunisie :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Je suis extrêmement heureux d’avoir l’occasion d’intervenir sur un point aussi interpellant pour l’ambassadeur de Tunisie que je suis, mais également pour donner une occasion unique qui s’offre à un État membre du Comité du patrimoine mondial de vérifier que lorsqu’il est d’un côté ou de l’autre sa propre théorie et lecture reste dans la même ligne et rectitude.

Carthage, a dit madame la responsable du Comité du patrimoine mondial, est un site emblématique pour l’Afrique du Nord. Absolument, mais également nous regardons Carthage comme un site emblématique de 1972 et du système qu’elle a induit. Carthage ayant été l’un des premiers sites classés dans la mise en œuvre de cette Convention et la Tunisie est très heureuse de l’abriter.

Nous sommes absolument conscients des situations diverses par lesquelles est passé ce site au travers d’une évolution sociale, démographique sociologique et même politique de la Tunisie. En mars 2011, soit deux mois après la révolution, le gouvernement de mon pays est revenu et a annulé les textes juridiques et les décrets qui avaient déclassé le site, dans un contexte politique qui ne vous échappe pas, au profit de la prédation immobilière qui sévissait dans mon pays à cette époque.

Et je suis très heureux que la nouvelle Tunisie issue de cet élément n’ait fait que corroborer cela. Madame Al-Hassan vient de souligner que pendant la session en cours, ici même à Manama, des décisions positives ont été prises. Je ne vais pas les sérier, je voudrais tout simplement appuyer cet élément.

Des questions m'ont été adressées et je les trouve légitimes et je les approuve. Il me plaît de rappeler qu'en janvier 2018, le Comité national du patrimoine a adopté la proposition de révision de délimitation du site. Nous sommes en train de travailler sur sa mise en œuvre par un décret qui ne serait tardé. Une fois cet élément juridique existant, cela nous permettra de mettre en place le plan de protection évoqué.

Nous sommes très heureux d'être tout à fait en conformité et prêts à mettre en œuvre toutes les dispositions arrivant à la fin de la décision proposée et donc nous sommes extrêmement ouverts. Nous sommes aussi soucieux avec le reste de la communauté internationale de maintenir l'exemplarité de ce site et de sa gestion ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. As I understand there are no objections to the amendments proposed, I would now invite you to adopt draft decision 42 COM 7B.60 concerning this property. Before doing so, I would like to pass the floor to the Rapporteur and ask her if she has received any further amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We have received one small amendment from Azerbaijan, Cuba and China and during the discussion we heard support for this from Uganda, Zimbabwe and Kuwait. You can now see the two small amendments on the screen; they concern paragraph 5, which has the last part deleted and paragraph 6, which is slightly redrafted.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any other comments to these small amendments proposed? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.60 adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

I now invite Ms. Nada Al-Hassan to read the list of the cultural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Arab States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Les biens qui sont soumis à votre approbation sans discussion sont :

Memphis et sa nécropole ; les zones de la pyramide de Gizeh et Dahchour en Égypte, la citadelle d'Erbil en Iraq ; Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) en Jordanie ; Byblos au Liban, le fort de Bahla à Oman ; la ville historique de Djeddah ; la Porte de la Mecque en Arabie Saoudite et l'ensemble de Gebel Barkal et des sites de la région napatéenne au Soudan.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Would any observer delegation like to express themselves about one of the properties we have adopted the decision for without discussion? If there are no objections from the Committee on the state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted. No further comments, so we can proceed.

My dear colleague, as you know it was decided to establish a working group on the draft decision on the historic centre of Shakhriyabz in Uzbekistan. I understand that the group finished its drafting. I therefore would like to give the floor to the representative of Brazil in his capacity as chairperson of the group to present to the Committee the outcomes of the discussion. Brazil you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Vice-chair. The drafting group met two days ago and we had a discussion for about an hour or so on a common text, taking into consideration the amendments presented by a number of countries and the concerns raised during the debate. After consultation during the meeting and bilateral meetings during the Committee session yesterday, we managed to come up with an agreed text that took into consideration all of those matters, including the concerns of ICOMOS, of the Secretariat, of the State Party and of all those countries that raised their flags to join the working group; all were taken into consideration.

This is the result; a concession text. I believe no one is happy, with the exception of myself, with the final text, because everyone had different positions; I am very happy with the outcome. If no one is happy, they still had to give in and in a spirit of compromise we came up with this text.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Congratulations for the work done. I would also like to congratulate all the other delegates in their efforts to reach a compromise and to reach, I hope, a consensual solution. However, I can see that the distinguished delegate of Azerbaijan would like the floor. Please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to express our thanks and commend your delegation in chairing this challenging task to come up with all concerns and accommodate all the rather different positions in one consensual text. I would also like to commend the flexibility shown by all stakeholders taking part in this drafting exercise. Of course, as the delegate of Brazil said, this is a consensual decision, but I believe that it reflects the spirit of our discussions here, so we fully support this draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the delegation of China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China would like to join the colleague from Azerbaijan to express its thanks to the delegation of Brazil in coordinating this draft working group and China fully supports its outcome. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Many thanks Chairperson. Hungary agrees and congratulates the drafting group for this compromise drafting, because we see the dangerous situation which came up from changes inside the World Heritage site in Uzbekistan. We were faced with two choices; first, the total destruction of the site and the final loss of a World Heritage site and the other solution where somehow, partially or in some areas, it could be preserved.

In this draft decision I can see the compromise and the possibility that this World Heritage site can be saved. This is why Hungary warmly greets this proposal.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We would also like to thank and commend the effort of the State Party of Brazil and the drafting group from Azerbaijan, Spain, Norway, China and Tunisia for their time and effort to achieve this difficult outcome and we would agree with the draft decision as presented.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would give the floor to the distinguished delegate of Tunisia, however, in order to save time to progress with our heavy agenda, I would ask the delegates to take the floor only if they are against or do not agree. If there is consensus, I am grateful for your support in this regard.

Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I am sorry to interrupt, but I do think that it would be helpful for all of us gathered here in the Plenary to be able to see the final decision on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“I will give the floor to the Rapporteur so that she can show the text. Thank you so much.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. You can see the decision on the screen and, as noted during the discussion, this is the outcome of the drafting group of Committee members who met over the past few days. I trust you will have the opportunity to see these amendments. They are quite heavy and complex and I will not proceed to read them. However, I wish to note that with these amendments, the historic centre of Shakhriyabz would be retained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“I take it that the decision is the subject of consensus, therefore I trust that you all agree with this proposal. Being so, we adopt it as a whole. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Dear colleagues, we are now moving to the analysis of the Shalamar Garden in Lahore and I pass the floor to Ms. Rössler for some comments. Thank you.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. The outcome of the working group has been distributed on blue paper, so that on the blue paper is the last version. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“As you know, it was decided to form a working group on the draft decision on the Fort and Gardens of Shalamar in Lahore, Pakistan. I understood that the group finished with its work and I therefore would like to give the floor to the representative of Spain in her capacity as Chairperson of the group to present to the Committee the outcomes of the discussion. Spain, please, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. Thank you to the Centre for just clarifying which document actually is the one which contains the consensus reached. Different members of the Committee met to try to reach a decision that would be consistent with previous decisions and with the recommendations that the State will have to respect in the future.

I would like to thank all of those who took part in the drafting group and, as has already been said, this was the fruit of concerted actions and our common objective is to maintain the protection of this site and to make sure that the State Party actually implements all of the mitigation measures that are the fruit of the various recommendations. Indeed, the State Party will have to show it respected these recommendations at the next session.

I would like to thank Brazil as well for their contributions to our work and I would like the text to be put up on the screen for everyone to see. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for the marvellous work done. I would like to congratulate all the other countries that joined in this effort. I will now open the floor to comments. I understand that the delegate of Azerbaijan has a comment. Please take the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Similarly, we would like to thank and commend the efforts of the delegation of Spain in leading us in this drafting exercise. We would like to thank other members of this drafting group for their flexibility and for the spirit of cooperation and the constructive dialogue that we had yesterday and we achieved the commonly agreed language which was acceptable to all of us. We would like to thank all of them for this effort.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Since there are no more comments, I take it that this decision is the subject of consensus, therefore I trust that you all agree with this proposal. Since there are no objections, I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.14 adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

We move on to item 62 of our agenda; Trang An Landscape complex in Vietnam. I now invite Ms. Nao Hayashi of the Asia-Pacific Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to present the reports on the state of conservation of the mixed properties located in the Asia-Pacific Region and opened for discussion. You have the floor.”

Ms. Nao Hayashi:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The summary of conservation issues for this property is available in working document 42 COM 7B on pages 119 -121 of the English and 122-125 of the French version.

In 2017, the State Party of Vietnam revised the Management Plan established for the property in 2015, focusing on archaeological heritage and vegetation and they elaborated the Action Plan for actual implementation. Meanwhile, the number of visitors was reported to have increased by 11 per cent between 2015 and 2016. The estimate of two million visitors by 2020 therefore had to be substantially revised to 3.5 millions.

Actions concerning archaeological management are consistent with the objectives laid out in the revised management plan and they include protection of the historic archaeological site, research conservation, capacity-building and training. An *ad hoc* Management and Scientific Advisory Committee on archaeological heritage management was formally established.

With regard to the governance, importantly, the property management Board was transferred to the newly-established provincial Department of Tourism, which supervises and controls all activities on the site. In March of 2018, national media reported on the illegal construction of a one-kilometre-long concrete walkway at Cai Ha Mountain within the property, and in May, 2018, the State Party provided further information on the construction

and the measures taken to dismantle it. The dismantling of the structure started on the 30th of March, 2018, and is reported to have been completed.

The Committee may wish to commend the State Party of Vietnam for its efforts in further developing management tools, as requested by previous decisions, in particular the drawing of two Action Plans with active involvement of a number of stakeholders and technical input aiming at the improvement of vegetation management and archaeological heritage preservation. The challenges remain with the issue of governance, given the variety of issues stemming from the high numbers of visitation which should go beyond initial expectations.

In this regard, scientific studies to enable a better understanding of its impacts on the property of Outstanding Universal Value should apply to solid methodological approaches and measurements of the impact beyond visual observations and visitor feedback, both on cultural and natural components of the property.

The World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS consider it essential to ensure an integrated approach to tourism development, heritage preservation and conservation of natural assets through enhanced governance. In particular, the establishment of an appropriate consultation mechanism within the Management Board and among the stakeholders of the property is recommended, to address various issues in considering more need for sound preservation and promotion of the property.

A clear protocol concerning any new and major developments would lead to a proactive approach in the regulation and control of tourism developments. The wider understanding of heritage bodies by all stakeholders seems key to the successful management of this beautiful property in an evolving context.

Madam Chairperson, distinguished committee members, considering that four years have passed after the inscription, it is recommended for the Committee's high consideration to suggest a Reactive Monitoring mission led by UNESCO, the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and ICOMOS, which could be highly beneficial under current circumstances to assess its current state of conservation and to engage in the collaboration with various stakeholders, so that the State Party may be accompanied in its continued effort in refining the strategies for governance, management and decision-making and also for increasing awareness on heritage bodies.

This collaboration with the State Party of Vietnam could lead to good practice, demonstrating how to create a balance between social and economically sustainable development and the conservation imperatives.

Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.60 can be found on pages 121–123 of the English and pages 125 to 127 of the French version of the working document. Madam Chairperson, with your kind permission, IUCN and ICOMOS would be invited to also provide further comments.

Thank you”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN recalls the management planning workshop that took place at the property in September of 2015 with the participation of ICOMOS and IUCN and acknowledges the State Party's continuous effort to refine management of the property.

However, IUCN notes with significant concern the sharply increased visitor number and substantially revised future estimates. These underline the pressing need for adequate management capacity and strict enforcement of visitor regulations. The illegal construction of

a concrete walkway inside the property emphasises IUCN's concern, as noted in our 2014 evaluation report, that the greatest threat to the nominated property is from inadequately planned and managed tourism, along with its associated infrastructural support and service provision development.

While the walkway has been since dismantled, as confirmed by the State Party in a meeting with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, this case clearly highlights the need for stronger regulations and enhanced tourism management. The State Party report notes a number of other planned developments such as the visitor centre at Tam Coc wharf's private tourism facilities, a car park and a small temple. A clear process needs to be elaborated for Environmental and Heritage Impact Assessments to be carried out prior to any development within the property and its buffer zone, in order to ascertain that these will not have a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

In light of these concerns, it is recommended that the Committee requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property in order to assess its current state of conservation and to provide further technical advice to support current management efforts in addressing sharply increasing visitation at this small and vulnerable property.

Madam Chair, ICOMOS would also like to make a brief comment.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. ICOMOS is also concerned that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property is threatened by an apparent desire to accommodate burgeoning visitation rather than enhancing understating of impacts, necessary limitations on carrying capacities or presentation of the values that underpin the inscription of this property.

The construction of a replica movie set of the movie *King Kong Skull Island* to promote the property, for example, firstly serves to exacerbate this threat but also extract awareness of the real cultural and natural significance of the property and has an adverse impact on its authenticity.

The archaeological resources of the property warrant greater focus, particularly through staff training and capacity-building, so that resources are available for their long-term successful conservation and management. A substantive change in trajectory is imperative to prevent any loss of Outstanding Universal Value. The proposed Reactive Monitoring mission would provide an opportunity for much-needed constructive input for the conservation and management of the property at this critical time and should occur in the timeframe which enables collaborative input to the revision to the Plan of management.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. After the reports of the Advisory Bodies, I would like to know whether there are any comments on the side of the delegations. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. Trang An is a site of immense natural beauty, providing its visitors with incomparable impressions and memories. Geologically and archaeologically the area is a gem and is also home to around 14,000 people today living in

a landscape which has seen continued human occupation and utilisation for more than 30 thousand years. Today, the property is seen and used without precedent, with an estimated 3.5 million tourists coming to the site in 2020.

Once of sustainable use where visitors were conveyed through the landscape in traditional *sampans* propelled by local guides, we are deeply concerned by the fact that suggested measures to address overcrowding and carrying capacity seem to only facilitate increased tourism, not taking into account changes in traditional ways of life, identities, social cohesion in local communities and populations, as well as threats to the natural values of the property.

We encourage the State Party to serve Paragraph 119 of the Operational Guidelines concerning sustainable use and we encourage the State Party to construct its tools developed through the UNESCO World Heritage Sustainable Tourism Programme.

Norway supports the draft decision, including the request for a Reactive Monitoring mission to ensure that Trang An continues to be an important economic factor for the local community, providing a pristine and sustainable natural and cultural experience to its guests.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the delegation of China. Please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. With an amendment on Draft Decision 42 COM 7b.62, China would like to highlight the efforts made by the concerned State Party to protect and conserve the World Heritage site of Trang An Landscape Complex.

China understands that the State Party has been undertaking dialogue with the Advisory Bodies before and during this Committee session. China also expresses its appreciation for the availability of the Advisory Bodies for several in-depth discussions before submitting this amendment. Through this dialogue, quite a number of clarifications were made, misunderstandings dealt with and a consensus reached. China recognises the State Party’s commitment to the Convention as demonstrated in the complete dismantlement of the illegal walkway construction. Compliments to the State Party’s willingness to remove the replica film set, as advised.

All of this demonstrates the State Party’s efforts to implement a Management Plan, the Visitor’s Management Action Plan, an Archaeological Management Action Plan as well as important archaeological and biological research. Considering that the State Party submitted a state of conservation report at the end of 2017 with the will to strengthen management, including tourism management, it would make sense if the Committee allowed more time to see the effects of these major changes.

China understands that the State Party is ready to invite a Reactive Monitoring mission to provide advice for the implementation and upcoming revision of the property’s Management Plan for December, 2019, and to submit another state of conservation report to World Heritage Centre by December 1st, 2019.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Distinguished delegate of Uganda, you have the floor.””

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Having reviewed Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.62 and its related documents, Uganda appreciates the efforts of the Advisory Bodies in monitoring the property. Uganda further recognises the efforts of the State Party in responding to this Committee’s advice and those of the Advisory Bodies that are related to the previous Committee decisions.

Madam Chair, we realise that the one kilometre concrete pathway was impacting on the visual values of the site. The review of the property Management Plan plus the submission of the Action Plan has also been done. Madam Chair, this is an indication that the State Party is committed and therefore complying to the requirements identified by this Committee.

In the view of the above, Uganda concurs with the amendments particularly to paragraph 6 as proposed by China, Indonesia, Cuba and Azerbaijan. I submit, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the distinguished delegate of Indonesia.”

Indonesia

“Thank you madam Chair. Indonesia would like to comment on the work of the Advisory Bodies and notes the recommendations conveyed to the State Party. We are of the view that the government of Vietnam at this point has done its utmost effort to comply with the desired state of conservation of the property.

The increase in the number of tourists to the site after inscription is a logical consequence that all State Parties should anticipate on the potential negative impact of tourism to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. We commend the efforts that have been taken by the State Party to conserve the Outstanding Universal Value, such as the dismantling of the illegally built concrete walkway at the mountain. The State Party has also stated its commitment to remove the temporary replica film set from the area.

To keep up the positive progress, we encourage the State Party to continue to consult and work with the Advisory Bodies and to implement the necessary measures with state officials and other stakeholders to keep preserving the Outstanding Universal Value of this site.

We are also of the view that the proposed timeframe requested to the State Party to submit an updated report on the state of conservation is sufficient enough to make more positive progress.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. I give the floor to the representative of Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, the United Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of Vietnam for its commitment to protecting and conserving the Trang An Landscape despite increased pressure of urban and tourism development. Tanzania also commends the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for a comprehensive draft decision.

Tanzania congratulates the State Party for taking concrete steps over an illegal construction, the dismantling of the illegally built concrete walkway at the mountain is an example. Tanzania notes with appreciation that the State Party is already taking measures to revise the Management Plan to prepare Action Plans for visitation management and Archaeological Heritage Management.

Madam Chair, the delegation of Tanzania encourages the State Party to continue working with the Secretariat in consultation with the Advisory Bodies to address challenges to the property.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ma délégation appuie les propositions faites par la Chine, l'Ouganda et la Tanzanie pour les raisons suivantes : premièrement les efforts considérables déployés par l'État partie pour la conservation du bien et pour limiter les difficultés de gestion et les impacts réels ou supposés des pressions sur le bien. Dans ce cadre, l'État partie a travaillé et continue de travailler en collaboration avec les experts du Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pour élaborer le Plan de gestion, assurer son application et au besoin son ajustement.

Face à l'augmentation du nombre de visiteurs, l'une des mesures prises par l'État partie a consisté à la mise en œuvre d'une série de mesures allant jusqu'à la fixation de quotas journaliers éventuels et la réalisation d'études sur l'impact du tourisme. Ces mêmes études permettent, madame la présidente, de mesurer les menaces et de les prendre en charge en vue d'une préservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site. À ces efforts s'ajoute la disponibilité de l'Etat partie, comme il a été souligné à plusieurs reprises, à développer un dialogue constructif et à maintenir une coopération étroite avec tous les acteurs sur le nouveau Plan de gestion et il s'engage également à enlever tout ce qui n'est pas approprié à la conservation du bien.

De ce qui précède madame la présidente, nous encourageons l'État partie dans ses efforts et recommandons au Centre du patrimoine mondial de lui donner un délai supplémentaire pour poursuivre avec les mesures de conservation et de soumettre un rapport complet sur ses bonnes intentions et sa disponibilité à agir pour le lieu.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson for your kindness. Cuba would like first and foremost to express its gratitude for the information that has been given to us, particularly with regard to the willingness to cooperate with the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. They have provided so much information that it will enable us to have all elements in mind when the time comes to take the decision.

We would also like to recognise all the efforts made by the State Party. We support the modification of the draft decision; the essence is to make things more feasible in terms of implementing the requirements presented to the State Party which do maintain the concern of the committee relating to the general pressure generated by tourism on the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the delegation of Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“According to the report of the Advisory Bodies, factors affecting the property are the following: first of all the management system and the second is tourism impact. The State Party has already paid attention to these issues and revised the management system. Priority was given to the conservation of natural and cultural landscapes, archaeological sites, architectural monuments, traditional villages and intangible cultural heritage values.

We welcome the efforts of the State Party to dismantle an illegally built concrete walkway and the State Party has no intention of building a new university within the area. At the same time, the State Party has already stopped the new construction of tourism facilities. The buffer zone remains fully effective in safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property. The recent rise in visitor numbers has been accompanied by monitoring and the study of environmental and social pressures. The environmental social and management assessment and carrying capacity of the property have been carefully calculated and projected in the future. Strict limits have been placed on the maximum number of visitors both on daily and annual bases. All recent studies demonstrated that no adverse impact of visitors on the Outstanding Universal Value on the property occurred today and none is expected in the foreseeable future.

We support the decision that the State Party invites a joint monitoring mission of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. At the same time, the State Party should closely collaborate with the World Heritage Centre and keeps the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. We fully support the amendments submitted by China.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, Australia and Angola would like the floor. I would ask you to be as brief as you can because we have a long list still ahead of us and time is running very fast. Thank you. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, we will be very brief and just say that we applaud the State Party for removing the concrete platform and for what we thought was a very comprehensive submitted state of conservation report. Australia would like to join Zimbabwe and Azerbaijan in support of Hungary’s amendment and we support the ongoing dialogue that the State Party has been having with the Advisory Bodies and the great advice the Advisory Bodies can give.

I just would like to note that these pressures from tourism and the need for adequate planning and management of the impacts of increasing tourism numbers are something that we are all sharing in all of our World Heritage sites. The bringing together of as much information and as many tools, as was alluded to by our friends from Norway, is what all need be doing in supporting the State Party, especially in places such as Vietnam.

We would want to say that we support the draft decision with the amendment provided by China. We have one small further amendment that we would like to make in paragraph 9, which we can discuss. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous joignons notre voix à tous ceux qui nous ont précédés et comme le temps nous est cher, nous aimerions tout simplement faire référence aux observations qui ont été faites de manière globale, l’appréciation positive des Organisations consultatives et la sensibilité du gouvernement pour un bien qui vient d’être inscrit il y a à quatre ans et qui prend des mesures rigoureuses pour protéger la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien et nous appuyons le projet de décision présenté par la Chine ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I will be very brief. I would like to congratulate the State Party for all measures adopted. They have been very effective. We would like to congratulate the Advisory Bodies for the work accomplished and let me also say that this is the example of the very spirit of the convention and this is why we support the draft decision as amended.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.62 and in this direction I would like to give the floor to the Rapporteur to show the text, as I understand that there are some minor amendments that will be proposed. After the amendments are shown, as I understand there is a wide consensus about the text, I would like you to ask for the floor only if you do not agree with the proposal made, which will be presented by Australia. Thank you so much.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I have received amendments from Azerbaijan, China, Indonesia, Cuba and Burkina Faso to this draft decision as you can see it on the screen. The amendments touch several paragraphs; notably, there are small changes in paragraph 4, 5 parts of paragraph 6 are deleted and we have minor modifications to paragraph 7, 8, 9 and 10; basically to all of them.

Regarding paragraph 9, Australia has already flagged that they wish to make an amendment and I would just like to point out that in the last paragraph we will postpone the examination of this property from the 43rd session to the 44th session.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor, please.”

Australia:

“It is just a very minor point on paragraph 9. I would think it is probably sensible to remove the texts ‘*upcoming revision*’. It is assumed that the revision is happening and it is tied to the Reactive Monitoring mission so it is just ‘*upcoming*’ it does not have a date or a time frame to tidy the wording.”

The Chairperson:

“Sorry could you repeat please?”

Australia:

“Simply to remove the word ‘*upcoming*’. It is on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I believe that there are no delegations against this. The floor is to the Rapporteur for a comment.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I apologise for taking the floor. I wanted to wait for this comment because I thought that the delegation of Australia also wanted to flag the same thing that I want to add for paragraph 9. A small suggestion as regards the wording: It states now: *‘Requests furthermore the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ ICOMOS/IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property to provide advice for the implementation of the property management plan’*, this includes the Australian addition.

I would like to propose that it reads: *‘IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to review the implementation of the property management plan*. Instead of to *‘provide advice’* I wish to propose the wording *‘to review’* which seems more in line with the Reactive Monitoring mission.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to the amendments proposed? I see ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“I am sorry for this intervention madam Chair, but both IUCN and ICOMOS believe that would significantly change the meaning of this paragraph. The bases of the very productive discussions that have been held with the State Party and delegates from China agreed that the mission would be held to provide advice that would contribute to the revision of the plan, not to review its implementation. These are different things; I believe we need to keep the words as they were. Or, if we are going to change the syntax: *‘retains the notion that the purpose of the mission is to contribute collaboratively to the revision of the property management plan.’*”

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much for this explanation. Of course, I will withdraw my comment and we can stick with the original formulation. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think we can now move to the adoption. I see no more comments. I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.62 adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

I now invite Ms. Hayashi to read the list of the mixed properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Asia-Pacific States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Ms. Nao Hayashi:

“Thank you madam Chair. There is only one property in this category, which is Tasmanian Wildlife in Australia and the Decision number is 42 COM 7B.61. Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the committee on the decision on this report, I declare the decision read out adopted. I would like to ask whether any Observers’ delegation would like to express themselves about the property we adopted without discussion. There is no request for the floor, so we proceed. Thank you.

No mixed properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Latin American and the Caribbean region is proposed for discussion this year. I will therefore invite Mr. Mauro Rosi, Chief of the Latin America and the Caribbean Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Mauro Rosi:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The only mixed property inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in Latin America and the Caribbean region for which the report is proposed for adoption without discussion is the Ancient Maya City and Protected Tropical Forests of Calakmul, Campeche in Mexico. Decision 42 COM 7B.63.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the Decision read out adopted. I would like now to ask whether any Observers’ delegation would like to take the floor. I see none. Let us proceed.

No mixed properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Africa region is proposed for discussion this year. I will therefore invite Mr. Edmond Moukala, Chief of the Africa Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The list will read as follows: Ennedi Massif: Natural and Cultural Landscape in Chad and the Cliffs of Bandiagara (Land of the Dogons) in Mali. Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decision read out adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any Observers’ delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decisions without discussion. I see none. Let’s proceed.

No mixed properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and located in the Arab States region is proposed for discussion this year. I will therefore invite Ms. Nada Al-Hassan, Chief of the Arab States Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Madame Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ces sites sont les Ahwar du sud de l'Iraq : Refuge de biodiversité et paysage relique des villes mésopotamiennes en Iraq, et la Zone protégée de Wadi Rum en Jordanie. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any Observers' delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decisions without discussion. I see no request for the floor. Thank you very much. We shall proceed.

I now invite Mr. Feng Jing to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage located in the Asia-Pacific States region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Feng Jing:

“Thank you Madam Chairperson. These natural properties include Keoladeo National Park in India, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.68. The next site is Western Tien Shan in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.69 and finally the site of Sagarmatha National Park in Nepal, Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.70.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any Observers' delegation would like to express themselves about one of the properties for which we have adopted the decisions without discussion. I see no request for the floor. Thank you very much. We shall proceed.

My dear colleagues I now invite Ms. Isabelle Anatole-Gabriel to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Europe and North America region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Ms. Isabelle Anatole-Gabriel:

“Thank you madam Chair. The list of natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Europe and North America region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion is the following:

Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Other Regions of Europe in Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Germany, Italy, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Ukraine; Gros Morne National Park (Canada). Madam Chairperson, the Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.73 is proposed for adoption by the Committee with a slight correction in

paragraph 8 in order to reflect clarification on the state of conservation report submitted to the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. The last part of the sentence is erased in full agreement with the State Party, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre: *'tourism is not a threat to the property as the extractive industry'*. The correction reflects this.

I go back to the list: Plitvice Lakes National Park in Croatia; Golden Mountains of Altai Russian Federation; Lake Baikal, Russian Federation; Natural System of Wrangel Island Reserve, Russian Federation; Virgin Komi Forest Russian Federation; Volcanoes of Kamchatka Russian Federation; Western Caucasus, Russian Federation; Gough and Inaccessible Islands in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

As for Grand Canyon National Park in the United States of America, madam Chairperson, again the Draft Decision 42.COM7B.82 is proposed for adoption to the Committee with a slight correction that reflects a clarification from the State Party of America received after the publication of the report. In paragraph 5 the second part of the sentence is struck out: *'since there is no jurisdiction above the Navajo Nation which is fully sovereign on its territory'*. This modification is in agreement with the State Party, IUCN and the World Heritage centre.

Thank you madam Chairperson."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted with the minor corrections proposed by the Secretariat. No objections. They are adopted.

I would now like to ask whether any Observers' delegation would like to express themselves about the property for which we have adopted the decisions without discussion. Please you have the floor."

Observer:

"Thank you madam Chair. On behalf of WWF Russia, I would like to draw the attention of the distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee to the situation with the Western Caucasus and Virgin Komi Forest World Heritage properties that are located in the Russian federation; the decisions on these areas have just been adopted without discussion. As reflected in the decisions, the Outstanding Universal Value of these properties is threatened by the planned development on them or near their boundaries of major economic projects.

On the territory of the Western Caucasus property and directly on its boundary, a large-scale construction of a large ski resort is planned. For this purpose the legislation has been amended in Russia and land plots on the border of the property have been leased for rent. It is noteworthy that one of the resorts is planned to be built on the Reach, a unique territory on the boundary of the property, where the construction of Olympic facilities were planned prior to the Sochi games in 2014, but under threat of inscribing it into the World Heritage in Danger List, the president of the country at that time ordered to move all the facilities from this territory. Also, the Ministry for Caucasus plans to build the Kislovodsk Sochi Highway: all variants of the route passes exactly through the properties.

The Russian authorities did not abandon the plan within the boundary of the Virgin Komi Forest property. Despite the repeated demands of the Committee and the decisions of the Russia High Court the license to develop the Chudnoe gold ore field within the boundaries of the property has still not been reversed. Instead, its operation has been

extended and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Ecology of Russia continues to insist on the fact that this issue is not regulated.

We believe for both sites that there are potential threats to the Outstanding Universal Value, which is the basis for inscribing them in the World Heritage List. We ask the Committee to pay attention to these properties and to take measures provided by the Convention to prevent their destruction.

Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the delegation of Mongolia.”

Mongolia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Dear committee members, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen, at the onset my delegation wish to present its sincere appreciation to the Kingdom of Bahrain for the excellent organisation of this session.

With regard to the decision on Lake Baikal 42 COM 7B.76, the State Party of Mongolia would like to briefly inform the Member States on the recent progress on the transboundary issue. Indeed, the government of Mongolia acknowledges the significance of the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Baikal. Considering Mongolia’s vulnerability to climate change, adversity and its commitment to the implementation of the Paris agreement on climate change, it forces the country to take relevant measures to protect its resources and increase the share of sustainable energy sources. This aligns with the Global Institute target as well.

Mongolia aims to increase the share of renewable energy by up to 20 per cent by 2020 and 30 per cent by 2030. It has a great potential to develop a hydropower energy system to substantially reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In addition, the construction of water reservoirs will protect rivers from frequent drought due to global warming and drastic temperature fluctuations, floods caused by snow peaks and permafrost melting and ensure sustainable management for proper water use and storage.

In relation to the section 11 of the decision 7B.76, Mongolia has initiated to conduct a regional Environmental Impact Assessment in the Selenga River basin and Lake Baikal. According to the terms of reference for regional environmental assessment, an Environmental Social Impact Assessment project was drafted. Drafts of the terms of reference were publicly consulted at 14 locations in the Russian Federation and 19 locations in Mongolia in 2017. For additional comments from the related stakeholders and interested parties, drafts of the terms of reference and other related documents are made publicly available for immediate completion.

Mongolia has strived to engage actively in the effect of cooperation with the Russian Federation. There have been well-established transboundary cooperation mechanisms and annually organised bilateral intergovernmental meetings for the past decades. Therefore, the State Party of Mongolia appreciates to the Secretariat that the draft decision acknowledged the establishment of cooperation between the two countries.

The State Party of Mongolia would like to express its gratitude to the State Party of the Russian Federation for its support and engagement in the bilateral collaboration. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite Mr. Mauro Rosi to read the list of the properties for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Mauro Rosi:

“Thank you madam Chair. The natural list of the properties of the Latin America and the Caribbean region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion are the following: Iguazu National Park (Argentina), Iguazu National Park (Brazil); Galápagos Islands (Ecuador); Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico); Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama); Pitons Management Area (Saint-Lucia).

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on this state of conservation report, I declare the decisions read out adopted. There is a comment from the delegation of Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam chair. In regard to decisions 83 and 84, Brazil would like to point out that the two Iguazu sites are individually protected, each in its own right, and hold Outstanding Universal Value. Therefore, Brazil would like to ask that future decisions and draft decisions avoid the use of the term ‘transboundary’ in any paragraphs that refer to both sites. Brazil favours the use of the term ‘bilateral’ in such situations.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think that the Secretariat has taken note of your comment. I understand that there is an NGO who would like to take the floor. Please go ahead.”

NGO - Centre for Biological Diversity for the defence of fauna and flora:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam chair. Distinguished members of the Committee, State Parties, I am a proud Mexican citizen and I am speaking on behalf of the Centre for Biological Diversity for the defence of fauna and flora.

Indeed, IUCN has carried out two missions to Mexico in order to assess the situation of the islands protected in the Gulf of California of Mexico. We agree with the comments made in the report. However, the decision to postpone its listing on the World Heritage List in Danger to 2019 has been an error. It is also regrettable that the property was not discussed during this meeting, knowing the vaquita, an endanger species, was one of the reasons the site was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The threats come from fishing nets and the illegal fishing of turtles and other species. For these reasons we thought that this property should have been subjected to a discussion during this session. The only solution to protect these species would be to fight illegal fishing, something that the government of Mexico is yet to implement. The decrease in the population of vaquita has resulted from promises not held and lack of enforcement of measures.

For this, Mexico and international institutions, such as this Committee, would have the determination to take part in reviving the vaquita population before the species is extinct forever. We hope to be working with IUCN and UNESCO and this Committee so that the vaquita and its unique habitat be considered as protected.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. After the adoption of the decisions on the properties for which the reports were proposed without discussion, we now move on to our next item on the agenda 7B.

To start with the examination of the Natural properties in the Africa Region, I would like to now give the floor to the delegation of Zimbabwe to present to the Committee the reason why it requested to open the state of conservation report on Dja Wildlife Reserve in Cameroon. You have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. We requested the opening of the Dja Wildlife Reserve because the State Party felt the draft decision was harsh, it was not encouraging, and it did not recognise the efforts that the State Party has made in terms of addressing previous Committee decisions and recommendations of several missions. We therefore have a draft amendment to the decision which will be introduced by Burkina Faso. We would also like to request that the State Party be given the opportunity to speak.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ma délégation remercie le Comité du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pour le rapport concernant l'État de préservation de la réserve de faune du Dja bien inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en 1987 suivant les critères (ix) et (x).

Les recommandations formulées par le Comité du patrimoine mondial au sujet de la conservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien de la réserve de faune du Dja sont pertinentes au regard des préoccupations exprimées et qui portent notamment sur la présence de grands projets autour de la réserve, notamment la construction du barrage hydroélectrique de Mékin, la mise en place de la plantation agro industrielle Sud Cam

Hévéa, la mise en œuvre insuffisante d'un plan de gestion environnementale et social de certains projets, la nécessité de mener une évaluation environnementale et sociale stratégique prenant en compte tous les projets structurants autour du bien et les menaces venant du braconnage et de la déforestation autour du bien.

Madame la présidente toutes ces préoccupations l'État partie les partage et c'est pour cela qu'avec l'appui de ses partenaires techniques et financiers il s'est engagé dans la prise de mesures et la réalisation de certaines activités. En ce qui concerne le projet de développement de la station hydroélectrique de Mékin, il a élaboré un plan de sauvetage de la faune, procédé à la relocalisation des populations affectées par le projet et leurs indemnités effectives, engagé un programme de sauvetage des sites archéologiques et développé des activités génératrices de revenus au profit des populations locales.

S'agissant du projet agro industriel de Sud Cam Hévéa, la superficie de la nouvelle concession a été réduite de 30 409 hectares à 13 000 hectares pour tenir compte des couloirs de migration de la faune et de l'espace agroforestiers au profit des populations riveraines et le projet de construction de l'usine de traitement du latex au sein de la concession a fait l'objet d'une étude d'impact environnemental et social.

En ce qui concerne la lutte anti-braconnage et le suivi écologique du bien, les efforts des parties consenties ont permis d'améliorer le taux de couverture du bien à au moins 70 % et de nombreuses saisies ont été effectuées parmi lesquelles la saisie de 216 défenses d'éléphants en décembre 2017. Des observations récentes indiquent une grande présence de la faune dans sa diversité confirmant la préservation de l'intégrité du bien.

L'État partie mène actuellement une évaluation environnementale et sociale et stratégique des projets structurants autour du bien en vue d'évaluer les impacts cumulatifs desdits projets afin d'atténuer les effets négatifs.

Madame la présidente toutes ces mesures et activités démontrent une volonté de l'État partie qui mérite d'être reconnue. Cette dynamique de coopération doit être encouragée. Aussi le projet de décision nous paraît-il très pessimiste, comparé aux efforts déployés par l'État partie. C'est pourquoi ma délégation souhaite que le projet de décision 42 COM 7B.90 soit formulé de manière encourageante en faveur de l'État partie. À cet effet, notre pays a introduit un projet d'amendement de la décision.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I will now pass the floor to the delegation of Cameroon, asking you, however, to be as concise and brief and possible as we are running out of time to analyse a long agenda. Please, you have the floor."

Cameroun :

« Merci madame la présidente pour cette opportunité que vous offrez à la délégation camerounaise et nous remercions la présidente de cette session.

Nous voulons effectivement appuyer ce que vient de dire le représentant du Burkina Faso pour mettre en évidence les efforts considérables que le gouvernement camerounais a déployés notamment pour renforcer la surveillance dans la réserve du Dja, la mise en place de caméra piège pour capter la présence de la faune et des braconniers à l'intérieur du bien et pour renforcer les capacités des écogardes au suivi écologique et à l'utilisation de nouveaux

outils de surveillance, mais également pour accroître les capacités techniques et matérielles des écogardes.

Nous insistons sur le fait que nous avons amené à la réduction de 47 % de la superficie provisoire du projet agro industriel Sud Cameroun Hévéa situé au voisinage du bien, à sa périphérie, mais non à l'intérieur du bien. Nous signalons également que la saisie de 200 pointes d'ivoires en décembre 2017 et révélatrice de la vigilance constante et permanente des autorités camerounaises par rapport à un phénomène qui ne concerne pas seulement la réserve du Dja, mais les pays voisins, les forêts autour de la réserve du Dja de pays voisins. Il ne s'agit pas de saisies qui révèlent une très forte pression du braconnage sur notre réserve.

Au regard de cela, il y a un certain nombre de mesures qui ont été prises par rapport à l'évaluation environnementale, sociale et stratégique conformément aux standards internationaux appliqués au bien du patrimoine mondial en cours de financement par l'État camerounais et une mission de conseil à l'initiative de l'UNESCO est en cours pour évaluer le projet agroindustriel à proximité du bien.

Nous concluons en souhaitant au regard des efforts faits et des projets tangibles enregistrés que le Comité du patrimoine mondial encourage le gouvernement camerounais, lui manifeste son soutien en levant la menace d'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci. I would now like to reiterate my request for concision, please, Angola, the floor is yours.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Depuis Istanbul, l'Angola faisait partie des pays du Comité qui avait demandé que l'on donne à l'État partie une prolongation de deux ans, pour pouvoir améliorer la situation sur le terrain. Là, nous sommes face à un exercice positif, des efforts ont été faits pendant les deux ans, et les Organisations consultatives le reconnaissent évidemment et nous reconnaissons également que l'État partie montre sa profonde volonté de continuer à travailler dans le sens d'améliorer davantage la situation sur le terrain.

Nous encourageons l'État partie à continuer à travailler avec l'UICN et le Comité du patrimoine mondial dans le sens d'améliorer davantage la situation et que ce site puisse continuer à être maintenu sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Avec le Burkina Faso nous avons soumis quelques amendements au projet de décision.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci beaucoup. I would now invite Mr. Guy Debonnet and the Advisory Bodies to respond to the comments so far presented. Thank you.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you madam Chair. The World Heritage Centre would like to note that the further extension of the Sud Cam Hévéa plantation remains of serious concern, as you can see from the map on the screen and the yellow striped area where the plantation is. It is located on the boundary of the property and has incurred massive deforestation which is important for the integrity of the property as the forest also harbours important biodiversity, including great apes.

As mentioned in the decisions, no Environmental Impact Assessment has yet been submitted to the World Heritage Centre. We also note the negative impact of the Mékin Dam on the property, as it has already flooded some parts of the property and will also affect the ecology of the Dja River.

In summary, we recognise, of course, the efforts of the State Party and we are working together with the State Party on a number of issues, including the advisory mission, which was managed by His Excellency the Minister. But this area remains of high concern and that is why we expressed these concerns in the decision.

Thank you.”

UICN :

« Merci madame la présidente. L’UICN aimerait tout d’abord remercier l’État partie pour le temps qu’il nous a accordé pour nous donner plus d’informations sur les efforts qu’il a consentis.

Nous sommes d’accord avec les commentaires du Centre du patrimoine mondial. Nous apprécions l’intention des amendements qui sont proposés au Comité. Notons toutefois que la saisie de 200 pointes d’ivoire, bien que cela témoigne de la vigilance de l’État partie, met aussi en exergue la pression du braconnage et donc l’UICN aimerait proposer que le Comité exprime quand même sa préoccupation quant à la pression du braconnage sur le bien. On note également avec satisfaction les efforts consentis par l’État partie pour adresser cette situation.

En ce qui concerne l’extension de la concession du projet agroindustriel d’hévéa et les impacts négatifs causés par la mise en œuvre du barrage du Mékin. Nous souhaiterions que le Comité exprime ses préoccupations quant à ces développements tout en reconnaissant la volonté de l’État partie de trouver des solutions.

Merci madame ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. My dear colleagues, after listening to the comments of the Advisory Bodies then of those of the Member States I now invite you to adopt the draft decision. Before that Australia would like to comment. Please you have the floor, but please, be as concise as possible. Thank you.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, it would be extremely helpful to all committee members if we had the possibility of seeing an English version of the amendments which has not been circulated. At the very least, we ask for the amendment to be put on the screen so that we have the possibility to actually consider what is proposed.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to the Rapporteur who will answer your comment.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I have received amendments to this item from Burkina Faso and Angola, which can now be seen on the screen. As I understand, these have been circulated rather late and only in the French version. I will try to quickly present them to the Committee members.

In the proposed draft decision with the amendments: paragraphs 1 to 3 remain unchanged. In paragraph 4 the change is ‘*notes with satisfaction*’ instead of ‘*notes with concern*’. Then paragraph 5 would remain unchanged.

Paragraph 6 would read: ‘*Also takes notes of the extension of the rubber agro-industrial project, and request the State Party to Submit the Environmental and Social Impact to the international standards applied to World Heritage properties*’;

On paragraph 7, it is also slightly amended and I am going to read it out:

7. ‘*Further takes note of the efforts of the State Party in view of limiting the negative impacts on the local communities, their plantations and on the forestry ecosystems due to the partial impoundment of the Mékin dam, and requests the State Party to continue to implement the Environmental and Social Management Plan (PGES) and to pursue the relocation plan of local communities affected by the impoundment.*’

Paragraph 8 would remain unchanged. We have a slightly redrafted paragraph 9, which would read:

9. ‘*Also takes note of the willingness of the State Party to welcome an advisory mission to assess the impacts of the agro-industrial projects on the property and to continue to closely collaborate with the World Heritage Centre and IUCN in the implementation of the recommendations enabling the State Party to undertake the necessary corrective measures to limit the impacts on its Outstanding Universal Value;*

Finally, in paragraph 10, we have a proposal to delete the last part, so that it would read:

10. ‘*Further requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by 1 February 2019, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019.*’

These are all the amendments we received. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would ask the delegation of Australia if you are satisfied with the text just shown. Thank you.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, I think I need to make an overarching observation into the way things have been unfolding in the Committee over the past couple of days. I will not oppose the amendments that have been put forward and in the end I may suggest one addition. But Australia is concerned at the pattern emerging in the Committee whereby the substance of carefully considered draft decisions is being stripped out on the misplaced grounds that to criticise or even to provide guidance is somehow disrespectful to the state party whose property is under scrutiny.

I must ask my distinguished colleagues, how is the Committee to provide clear direction to a state party on difficult matters, imbued with the sense of urgency and gravity of circumstance that is required, if we are not able to use words that accurately express what is known and what is needed?

If we are disappointed in the actions of a state party, we should be freely able to say so; not engaged in acts of self-censorship because we fear causing offence.

I have not seen anything in the language of the draft decisions that could cause offence; discomfort yes, but offence, certainly not.

It is the role of the Committee to call out actions that are inconsistent with states parties obligations to protect the sites of outstanding universal value for which they are the custodians; just as it is our role to work constructively with states parties through the Centre and Advisory Bodies to help them respond effectively to these concerns. We need to find a balance.

My deeper concern, however, is that in these proposals to water down and strip out the substance of the decisions, we collectively are not fulfilling the responsibilities entrusted to us by our fellow State Parties to the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

We must think very carefully indeed about what this means for the credibility of the World Heritage Committee. The consequences may reverberate through the World Heritage system for years to come.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Concerning the text we are analysing now, do you have any amendments? I will pass the floor now to the delegation of Uganda. Please be as brief as possible.”

Uganda:

“Thank you Chairperson. Very quickly to the point: For paragraph 6, I would like to add an omission after ‘(ESIA) to the World Heritage Centre using the international standards applied to the World Heritage properties;’ Then paragraph 7 the second line at the end cross out ‘on’ and it should read ‘and associated forestry ecosystems’. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway has the floor.

Norway:

“As the case was open very late to the Committee Session and the amendments came late, we would like to ask for an adjournment of this debate in order to end the proceedings here. I do agree we should commend and encourage the State Party for their efforts; that being said, we fully support and share the concerns expressed by the distinguished representative of Australia.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I understand that you have no amendment to suggest to this text. Thank you very much. The floor is to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you Chairperson. We also wanted to echo the intervention made by Australia. I think it is critical for us to slow down and study the paragraphs thoroughly and to make sure that any amendments will not have any repercussions in the future that would complicate matters further with regard to conservation of any property listed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there are no other comments, I now invite you to adopt Decision 42 COM 7B.90. Before doing so, I ask the Rapporteur whether she has received any amendments to the decision.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have received small amendments from the delegation of Uganda, which are now reflected in the draft decision and I submit them to the consideration of the Committee to review this amended decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any other comments or observations on the text? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.90 adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

I now invite Mr. Guy Debonnet to present the reports on the state of conservation of the natural properties located in the Africa Region and opened for discussion. You have the floor.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you madam Chair. The next site is Lake Turkana National Parks in Kenya. The report can be found in your document 7B on page 195 of the English and 202 of the French version.

The main threat to Lake Turkana remains changes to the water flow regime of the Omo River in Ethiopia, linked to the Gibe III Dam and the Kuraz development project, which will draw on the Omo River for irrigation. In addition, the 2012 mission to the property and the 2015 mission to Gibe III Dam site also noticed the possibility of two further dam projects on the Omo River entitled Gibe IV and Gibe V. Following the 2012 and 2015 missions, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN expressed concerns that the accumulative impacts of these developments were not assessed and that the existing Environmental Impact Assessment for the Gibe III Dam was made after the project had already started and did not consider potential impacts on Lake Turkana in Kenya.

On this basis, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN recommended that the property be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger at the Committee's 36th, 37th and 38th sessions. However, the Committee decided not to inscribe the property on the List of in Danger, but urged the State Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to address this issue on a bilateral basis and to conduct a Strategic Environmental Assessment. The latter is intended to assess the cumulative impact of all developments impacting on Lake Turkana basin in order to identify appropriate corrective measures to maintain the water level and seasonal variations of the Lake with a view to protecting its Outstanding Universal Value.

In decision 39 COM 7B.4, adopted in 2015, the Committee strongly urged the State Parties of Kenya and Ethiopia to ensure that the Strategic Environmental Assessment be completed by 1st of February, 2018. As of today, we regret to inform the Committee that the Strategic Environmental Assessment requested by the Committee has not yet been commissioned while the terms of references and arrangements for bilateral oversights of the process have been made. Meanwhile the construction of the Gibe Dam has been completed and the dam is moving into operation.

The Kuraz Sugar development project is also in an advanced stage. On the 13th of June, 2018, Ethiopia submitted to the World Heritage Centre an update on the Gibe II impounding and Lake Turkana water levels as well as supplementary information regarding the implementation of the Kuraz Sugar development project. The data provided indicates changes in the seasonal variation of the water levels since the start of the filling of the dam in 2015, which appears to confirm the concerns expressed by the 2012-2015 missions and was reiterated in the 2018 state of conservation report.

As you can see from the graph, before the start of the impounding of the dam there was a regular pattern of flooding in Lake Turkana and this pattern has been completely disturbed since the dam impounding started. The seasonal flooding regime of the lake creates a unique flooding ecosystem and is extremely important to maintaining the large mammal fauna in Sibiloi National Park and crucial for the fragile ecology of the lake and in particular its fish populations, which are also at the basis of the livelihoods of many local communities.

In the continued absence of a Strategic and Environmental Assessment and the potential severe impact of the Gibe III Dam, the Kurduz sugar development project and other associated developments that are under way, the World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the conditions for potential danger to the properties Outstanding Universal Value are met in accordance with paragraph 180 of the Operational Guidelines.

It is therefore recommended that this Committee inscribed this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Considering the continued critical situation, it is also recommended that the Committee requests the State Party of Kenya to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property.

The Draft Decision can be found in your working document, on page 198 in English and 204 in French. IUCN has further comments on this property.”

The Chairperson:

“IUCN please, go ahead.”

IUCN:

“Madam Chair. In the interests of time, all the issues have been already addressed by my colleague at the World Heritage Centre and IUCN is fully in support of the matters raised, so I do not think at this point we wish to add substantially to what my colleague has said.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this topic? China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Committee has asked the State Parties, Kenya and Ethiopia, to carry out a joint Strategic Environmental Assessment. The study would have helped the Committee to have made an informed decision. Concerning the draft decision, since paragraph 6 asks the State Party to hold its development project, we should ask the State Party to provide sufficient information on the stage of development of the project and an update on the progress in undertaking impact assessment.

Moreover, as the Lake is a transboundary Lake found in the territories of Ethiopia and Kenya, the potential threats on both sides should be listed before the paragraph that decides to list the property in Danger. Therefore, the decision under paragraph 8 should come at paragraph 10 instead of where it is now. All of the sources of threats should come before the decision paragraph. This is also consistent with the trend followed by other decisions of the Committee.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Madam Chair, the delegation of Uganda appreciates and thanks the Advisory Bodies for their monitoring mission work and the results and advice provided at this Committee. Madam Chair, considering the issues and the evidence provided here in this room, my delegation sympathises with Kenya, as we see that some of the threats are not originally coming from the territory of Kenya. Kenya is in an intricate situation, for the threats are external and it has no control over them in most cases.

The above notwithstanding, my delegation urges Kenya to explore all possible measures, including bilateral dialogue and development of third party arbitration, to ensure protection of the Lake Turkana basin. Nevertheless, madam Chair, for this basin to be saved

Uganda supports the draft decision that will facilitate Kenya's access to possible financing mechanisms that will enable the State Party to accomplish the work required of it, as outlined in the draft decision.

We submit, Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to Tanzania."

Tanzania:

"Madam Chair, Tanzania appreciates the comprehensive review of the Advisory Bodies on the state of conservation of the property which is currently experiencing many threats related to developments since 2012. While acknowledging the complexity of the ongoing projects and the impact thereof on the property, especially on Lake Turkana's ecosystem, we generally concur with the Advisory Bodies' analysis and conclusions.

However, we do not see it as feasible, both logistically and technically, to make it conditional for the third party of Kenya to engage on a fresh review of an already completed Strategic Environmental Assessment for the LAPSSET project, as provided for in paragraph 9 of the draft decision.

Accordingly, we have submitted minor amendments to the draft decision. At this juncture, we also wish to strongly urge the States Parties of Ethiopia and Kenya to continue engaging in friendly dialogue and consultation in order to help resolve some of the outstanding transboundary threats facing the property.

I thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I would now like to pass the floor to the delegation of Tunisia."

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je voudrais intervenir dans deux directions différentes. La première pour soutenir l'amendement parce que, à nos yeux, il apporte une plus grande cohérence textuelle et une meilleure lisibilité du texte, donc nous le soutenons dans cette direction.

La délégation de Tunisie se félicite également de l'esprit dans lequel ce dossier est traité et qui nous ramène à une cohérence globale de la Convention celle de ne pas voir, comme on l'a senti dans le traitement de certains dossiers, que le classement dans la Liste en péril est perçu comme une sanction. Or, nous voyons aujourd'hui que c'est presque vertueux d'aller dans cette direction tant elle apporterait une meilleure protection et une sortie favorable dans la situation dans laquelle se trouve le site. C'est pour ces deux raisons que nous soutenons le texte et son amendement. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The delegation of Hungary has the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. According to the understanding of the Hungarian delegation, the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Turkana National Parks in Kenya is influenced by a number of negative impacts.

First of all, the Kuraz development project and the three dams that have impacts on the natural water regime of Lake Turkana. Hungary is concerned about the fact that the necessary Impact Assessment procedures had not been conducted and completed before the Kurraz development project became operational. In this way there was no chance to implement mitigation measures in the development project. It is to be noted that there are other developments; LAPSSET and Turkana Wind Farm projects, as well as ongoing activities of unsustainable use of natural resources like poaching, overgrazing and fishing, which all have negative influence on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

For these reasons, the Hungarian delegation supports the inscription of Lake Turkana National Parks on the list of World Heritage in Danger and encourages the State Parties concerned to invite a joint World Heritage Centre, IUCN Reactive Monitoring mission to the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the delegation of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Zimbabwe would like to thank the Advisory Bodies and the Centre for a comprehensive report on the situation in Lake Turkana and are grateful that the State Party sees the benefits of being on the World Heritage List in Danger. We urge the two States Parties to continue dialogue bilaterally, but also within the East African community in order to find a solution to this problem.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the delegation of Kenya.”

Kenya:

“Thank you madam Chair. We want to thank you for giving us the opportunity to share our views about the conservation of Lake Turkana National Parks, World Heritage site. Kenya takes note of the highlighted conservation issues and factors impacting Lake Turkana.

Of the highlighted areas, I wish to state that the issue of oil exploration did not happen in Lake Turkana National Parks as the Oil Company was given a no-go commitment

in the area of the Parks. I also wish to clarify that the issues of poaching and illegal livestock grazing in Lake Turkana Parks is under control. In connection to this, several interventions have been made by Kenya to address water access problems by pastoral communities in the Lake Turkana property vicinity.

Madam President, I wish to inform you that the recommendations of the 2012 and 2015 missions have been taken into consideration during preparation of The Lake Turkana National Parks Management Plan, which was finalised earlier this year. The plan has designed corrective measures to address the problem of poaching, illegal grazing in the Parks and illegal access to the property.

Madam President, it is Kenya's position that the outstanding activity for the sustainable management for Lake Turkana is the proposed SIEA study, which will propose a more realistic approach to the sustainable management of Lake Turkana. Kenya believes that an amicable solution will be found on the issue of water resources under the unit supporting the transboundary water assessment programme. Several bilateral meetings have been held between the two State Parties to agree on the modalities of conducting a SEA study. All documentation necessary to conduct the study has been done and shared with the World Heritage Centre, except the pending identification of the most suitable consultant to carry out the study, mobilisation of the funds and the commissioning of the work. This has been slowed down by funding challenges.

Kenya, therefore, calls for international support to conserve a critical habitat of Turkana National Parks as well as the future livelihoods of downstream communities who are estimated to be of 300,000 individuals. Kenya wishes to reiterate that it welcomes technical and financial assistance for sustainable management of the treasured heritage of Lake Turkana World Heritage site to support SEA study.

Finally, madam president, Kenya has no reservation on the draft decision."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. My dear colleagues, may I invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.92 concerning the property? Unless we have one more request for the floor. I am sorry I did not see. Please, you have the floor. Please, could you be as concise as possible due to the pressure of time? Thank you so much."

Ethiopia:

"Thank you madam Chair. A significant portion of Lake Turkana is located in Ethiopia. The Lake has several tributaries found in Ethiopia and Kenya. As a result its conservation could be potentially affected by development activities in both countries.

The State Party of Ethiopia reiterates its commitment to the preservation and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of Lake Turkana National Parks. A property which is transboundary in nature. In this regard, the State Parties of Ethiopia and Kenya have engaged to take steps to undertake SEA on the Lake Turkana Parks. Accordingly, the two State Parties have adopted terms of reference for the consultant that will carry out the study, have established a joint panel of experts to oversee the work and prepared the call for proposals. The study was not in the timeline set by the Committee due to several challenges we are facing.

Therefore, the State Party of Ethiopia requests the Committee to give more time for the study before inscribing it on the List of World Heritage sites in Danger. The draft decision concludes that the property is in danger due to development activities that are located only in

Ethiopia, targeting only one side of the Lake basin, while Ethiopia has available information indicating otherwise. Ethiopia finds paragraph 6 of the decision that asks Ethiopia to halt its development project inappropriate and untimely. The Kuraz Sugar project is extremely behind schedule, contrary to the plan; we have managed to develop only one line of the project – further it does not disrupt seasonal flow from Ethiopia to the Lake.

The draft decision undermines Ethiopia's efforts to balance development with preservation of the World Heritage sites. Therefore, Ethiopia would like to request the World Heritage Committee to give more time for the joint efforts of Ethiopia and Kenya to bear fruit. This would give incentives to the party to finalise the SEA in the required time frame. The State Party of Ethiopia believes that the completion of the study will provide scientific data that will enable us to identify the impacts and the mitigation measures.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. I would now like to declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.92 adopted, but before I would like to hear the Rapporteur for the amendments. Afterwards, we will listen to the NGO as per rules of procedure.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We have received an amendment from the delegation of Tanzania on this draft decision and, as you know, this property is proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and the proposal from Tanzania would not change this.

Paragraph 9 with the amendment of Tanzania would read: *‘Notes with concern that the Lamu Port-South Sudan-Ethiopia Transport (LAPSSET) Corridor Project may have potential impacts on the property’s Outstanding Universal Value, and requests the State Party of Kenya to conduct Environmental and Social Impact Assessment Studies on specific projects of the LAPSSET clarifying how mitigation measures are implemented and monitored.’*

Also during our discussion, the distinguished delegation of China flagged that they might want to move paragraph 8, which would inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger further down below to be the new paragraph 10, if I understood correctly. We are going to reflect this now on the screen.

These are the amendments that we have right now, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there are no further comments, I therefore declare draft decision 42 COM 7B.92 adopted. Thank you.

I now give the floor to the NGO that requested to speak. Please.”

NGO - Heritage Watch Network:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. I am again speaking on behalf of the Heritage Watch Network. We commend the Committee’s decision to inscribe Lake Turkana Parks as a

World Heritage property in Danger. This is because such an inscription, in this case, is the last hope for preservation of this property for urgent implementation of a plan to achieve the desired state of conservation.

Lake Turkana has been degraded through long-term non-compliance with decisions of the World Heritage Committee; the requirement that a Strategic Environmental Assessment should be carried out has not been fulfilled since 2012 and the recommendation to hold development was not implemented either. We, therefore, urge the Committee to require or recommend that no further dams should be built on the River, especially considering the devastating effects on Lake Turkana documented in the report you adopted.

It will also call to urge the parties involved respecting the rights of local indigenous populations to participate and be consulted and to provide their free, prior and informed consent in the consultation planning in operations related to the World Heritage property.

Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now like to give the floor to the delegation of Zimbabwe to present to the Committee the reason why it requested to open the state of conservation report on the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas South Africa.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Madam Chair for giving me the floor. We have requested the opening of the Cape Floral Region Protected Areas for discussion due to the recommendations that have been made after wildfires and water problems and the drought that the region has faced. There are some recommendations which are in fact not in line with what the State Party has done in terms of mitigating. There are recommendations related to movement of people in other areas.

I would like to request through you, madam Chair, that you give the State Party an opportunity to respond. We have also presented a draft decision to clarify those particular areas.”

The Chairperson:

“The delegation of Azerbaijan has requested the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would just like to mention two points which are reflected in the original draft decision’s paragraphs 7 and 8. First is the identification of lands to accommodate housing needs and secondly paragraph 8 about water extraction.

As we understand it, these two paragraphs were drafted based on information given by certain stakeholders. At the same time we were informed by the State Party that they do not fully reflect the current reality on the ground. As we mentioned in the early days of the session, we still believe that any information provided to the Committee should go back and be verified by the State Party concerned as well. In this regard we also support the proposal of Zimbabwe to give the floor to the State Party to provide clarification on those points.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. South Africa you have the floor, please.”

South Africa:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The national state of disaster mentioned earlier as declared in March, 2018, lapsed on the 13th of June, 2018 and our government announced that it will not renew it. This decision was informed by an assessment conducted by the National Joint Drought Coordinating Committee which showed that acute phase of drought in the Western Cape in particular is at its end, and now entering the resilience-building phase.

It should also be noted that the directive issued in terms of the environmental management act was only effective whilst the national state of disaster was enforced.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to invite Mr. Guy Debonnet and the Advisory Bodies to respond to those comments. Thank you.”

Mr. Guy Debonnet:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN will provide the comment.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. We had the opportunity to have several exchanges with the State Party of South Africa and we understand the clarifications and concerns. We are in support of these and we are happy to address any questions the Committee might have. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Just a minor amendment bearing in mind what the Minister said on paragraph 8 where it says: *‘and also takes notes on the declaration of the Province as a National Disaster Area;’* to change it to: *‘and further notes that the Province is no longer a National Disaster Area’*.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I think this is an excellent series of amendments and Australia strongly supports them.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, we also support the amendments as submitted by Zimbabwe. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.94 adopted. Thank you.

I now invite Mr. Edmond Moukala to read the list of the natural properties inscribed on the World Heritage List located in the Africa region for which the reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.”

Mr. Edmond Moukala:

“Thank you Madam Chairperson. The list is the following:

Okavango Delta (Botswana); Simien National Park (Ethiopia); Lake Malawi National Park (Malawi); Rwenzori Mountains National Park (Uganda); Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania); Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe).

Thank you madam Chairperson”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there is no objection from the Committee on these state of conservation reports, I declare the decisions read out adopted.

I would now like, before we close our session, to give the floor to Ms. Rössler who will give us some orientation on a number of items.

Thank you.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Just to clarify, we have still open Socotra in Yemen, as we discussed at the Bureau; there is an agreed text between IUCN and the World Heritage Centre. We will do that and find time on Monday. As you all know, tomorrow at 3:00 pm the Plenary starts with the nominations and we cannot change that.

I would also like to recall that tomorrow morning there is no session as it is prayer time and the budget group will start at 1.30 pm until 2.30 pm. The Bureau meeting 2.30 pm until 3.30 pm and 3:00 pm sharp we start with the nominations. We have a full agenda as you know. Bahrain would like to make an announcement.”

Bahrain:

“For the event tonight, for those who have an invitation with your families, you can take the bus and for logistical reasons arrival with private cars will not be possible. The delegates with an invitation from the Royal Palace by Her Royal Highness Princess Sabika should take the bus which looks like this. Delegates invited to houses number 2 to 8 should take the shuttle located on the other side of the hotel; this is what the invite looks like. Bus number 1 will depart at 7.15 pm from the Ritz Carlton. Other buses will depart at 7.30 pm also from the Ritz Carlton. Invitations are not transferable.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We see you tomorrow in the afternoon. Thank you.”

End of the June 28, 2018, afternoon session

FIFTH DAY – Friday 29 June 2018

NINETH SESSION

3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon to all of you, before we start I wish to inform you that at the Bureau we discussed the proposal put forward by Australia to open a generic discussion or a general debate on item 8. Yet, the Bureau considered that this debate should rather occur in conjunction with item 12A on Tuesday. Thereby, we will not discuss it today; we will discuss it with item 12A on Tuesday.

As for the time-management issue, please we will cut down time to three minutes for members and two minutes for observers, as time is running out.

We will now proceed with our agenda item 8A, devoted to the Tentative List, Draft Decision 42 COM 8A. I invite Mr. Balsamo from the World Heritage Centre to briefly present documents A to E. Please you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Document 42 COM 8A presents the Tentative List of all State Parties submitted in conformity with the Operational Guidelines as of 15th of April 2018.

The particular Annex 1 presents the overall situation relative to the Tentative List. Annex 2 of document 8A presents all the new Tentative List or additions to the existing Tentative List which have been submitted by the States Parties since the World Heritage Committee took place at the last session in Cracow. Annex 3 presents a list of all properties on the Tentative List received by State Parties in alphabetical order. As of the 15th of April, 2018 of the 193 State Parties which have ratified the Convention at the date, 183 have submitted a Tentative List in accordance with the requirements specified in the Operational Guidelines and 10 States Parties have not submitted any Tentative List.

All the nominations submitted for examination in 2018 are included on the Tentative List of the State Party concerned. Since the preparation of document 8A for the 41st Session of the Committee in 2017 up until the 15th of April last, 36 States Parties submitted their new Tentative List or modified their existing List and the number of new properties added to the new existing Tentative List is 88, which brings the total of sites currently included in the Tentative List up to 1,714.

Decision 42 COM 8A is on page 2 of both the English and French versions of the document you have in front of you.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Mr. Balsamo for your presentation. I would like to know whether you have any comments about the agenda. I now invite you to adopt Draft Decision 42 COM 8A, but before doing so, I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments on the draft decision proposed?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Good afternoon to all colleagues. We have not received any amendments to the draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Dear colleagues, I would like to recall the proceedings of the examination of item 8B that all congratulating comments should be made outside the Plenary because we do not have time to just take the floor and congratulate, it would last too long. So, please, all congratulatory messages should be conveyed outside the Plenary. Thank you very much.

I therefore declare that Draft Decision 42 COM 8A is adopted.

It is now time for us to consider nominations of properties to the World Heritage List. I would like to recall that the relevant working documents concerning nominations are: 8B and 8B.Add. The Advisory Bodies’ evaluations can be found in the information documents: ICOMOS INF.8B1 and INF.8B1.Add and IUCN INF.8B2 and INF.8B2.Add.

Let me also recall that document INF.8B.3 presents the list of all the nominations received by the 1st of February, 2018, with the indication of those which were deemed complete. These nominations will not be discussed during our debates here, as they are foreseen to be examined at our next Committee session in 2019.

Document INF.8B.4 presents factual errors identified by States Parties in the Advisory Bodies’ evaluations and it was distributed to you on Monday, the first day of the Committee session.

I now invite the Secretariat to present this document and read out the list of nominations for which factual errors and notifications have been received and to add some explanations. Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. In accordance with paragraph 150 and the annexes of the Operational Guidelines, the notification of factual errors, as submitted by the concerned States Parties and reviewed by the relevant Advisory Bodies, are presented in the language which they have been submitted in.

It is important to recall that annex 12 of the Operational Guidelines is the official format of submission of factual errors identified on the Advisory Bodies identification and only notifications received by the statutory deadline and submitted in their appropriate form of annex 12 are being made available and included in document INF.8B.4. The comments made by the Advisory Bodies in the right column indicate whether the information submitted is considered as a factual error or not.

This year we received 18 factual errors concerning the following nominations to be examined at this session:

Iran, Arasbaran Protected Area; Canada, Pimachiowin Aki; Mexico, Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: Orinary Habitat of Mesoamerica; Belgium, France, Funeral and Memorial sites of the First World War Western Front; Belgium, Netherlands, Colonies of Benevolence; China, Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton); Denmark Aasivissuit – Nipisat, Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea; France, Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes; Germany, Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke; Iran, Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region; Italy, Ivrea, industrial city of the 20th century; Italy, Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene; Japan, Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region; Oman, Ancient City of Qalhat; Korea, Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea; Saudi Arabia, Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape; Spain, Caliphate City of Medina Azahara and Turkey, Göbekli Tepe.

Before the presentation of the nominations by the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat will announce the related factual error notifications received. If the notifications of factual errors have an impact on the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the amendment is included in the text that will be shown on the screen in track changes.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Mr. Balsamo. Are there any objections or comments? I see none.

Let us now move to the first draft decisions of Document 8B, concerning proposed changes to names of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. I invite Mr. Balsamo to present this item.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. The first request for a name change concerns the site of Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church in Denmark, inscribed in 1994. The draft decision of this proposal, following the technical review of ICOMOS of this proposal, is for not approval. I will stop for each of the draft decisions if you allow me so we may consider this first proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or comments? I see none. I now invite you to adopt Draft Decisions 42 COM 8B.1, 8B.2, 8B.3 and 8B.4, but before doing so, I would like to ask the Rapporteur if she has received any amendments on the draft decisions proposed?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We did not receive any amendments to the draft decisions thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decisions 42 COM 8B.1, 8B.2, 8B.3 and 8B.4 adopted.

Our next point deals with withdrawals of nominations to be examined by this session of the Committee. I invite Mr. Balsamo to read out the list of nominations withdrawn at the request of the concerned States Parties.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. A total of five nominations were withdrawn: two of them prior to the publication of Document 8B, while the other three were withdrawn after the publication of this document and the five withdrawals are the following:

Canada, Tr’ondëk-Klondike; Germany, The Jewish Cemetery Hamburg, Altona; Japan, Amami-Oshima Island, Tokunoshima Island, the northern part of Okinawa Island and Iriomote Island; Indonesia, Age of Trade: Old Town of Jakarta (formerly Old Batavia) and 4 Outlying Islands (Onrust, Kelor, Cipir and Bidadari); United Arab Emirates, Khor Dubai, a Traditional Merchants’ Harbour.

Following these withdrawals, the Committee will have to examine 28 nominations; among them 5 are for natural sites, 3 for mixed sites and 20 for cultural sites.

Let me take this opportunity to remind you that the complete version of all the nominations that are examined at this stage has been made available for consultation on a secure web page of our web site.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I see none. As we begin with the examination of nominations, I would like to take this opportunity to recall that Committee decisions are based on objective and scientific considerations, and any appraisal made on its behalf must be thoroughly and responsibly carried out. The Committee recognises that such decisions depend upon: a) carefully prepared documentation; b) thorough and consistent procedures; c) evaluation by qualified experts; and d) if necessary, the use of expert referees.

The Committee is requested to examine the draft decisions presented in the relevant documents, and in accordance with Paragraph 153 of the Operational Guidelines, take its decisions.

I wish to stress that for a referred nomination there is no new nomination file to be prepared and there is no evaluation mission of the relevant Advisory Body foreseen to the site. Also, in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Outstanding Universal Value is recognised at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and no recognition of Outstanding Universal Value is foreseen prior to this stage. I would like to appeal to you all for a strict respect of these important rules during our debates and our decision-making.

We can now proceed with the examination of nominations. This year we will begin with cultural nominations, we will then proceed with mixed nominations, followed by natural nominations. The order of the examination of nominations is listed on page 3 of both the English and French versions of document 8B and I would kindly ask you to follow this order

to the extent possible. For ease of reference, the page numbers of the evaluations in the Advisory Body documents are also shown in the PowerPoint presentations.

I am going to call on ICOMOS and IUCN to be concise in their presentations, as you will be allocated 5 to 8 minutes to present each nomination depending on its category. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Before we start examining nominations, I give the floor to the Advisory Bodies for a brief presentation. ICOMOS and IUCN, you have the floor. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site, Kenya. The draft decision concerning this nomination can be found in document 8B.Add. ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Thimlich Ohinga is a referred back nomination which was first considered by the World Heritage Committee in 2015. At the time the property was presented as a cultural landscape and the Committee recommended to re-conceptualise the nomination as an archaeological site with an augmented comparative analysis. The Committee suggested cooperation between ICOMOS and the State Party also in view of a needed boundary and buffer zone extension. An advisory mission to the property was undertaken in October, 2017.

Thimlich Ohinga is a complex of dry-stone walled settlements, called ohinga or ohini in the plural, dating from the 14th century. These are located northwest of Migori Town in the Lake Victoria region.

Thimlich Ohinga comprises one main ohinga with several extensions and three adjacent ohini. The overall size of the property is 21 hectares which is surrounded by a buffer zone of 33 hectares. The main Ohinga is referred to as Kochieng, while the others are Kakuku, Koketch and Koluoch. Each ohinga has internal enclosures as well as smaller extensions adjacent to them which accommodated homesteads, craft industries and livestock.

The dry-stone enclosures in Thimlich Ohinga document specific concepts of sustainable land use with different socio-economic and linguist groups through time. Its sustainability was ensured through the continuous transmission and maintenance of tradition and knowledge of the traditional masonry techniques through apprenticeship. The walls range from 1.5 to 2.5 metres in height with an average thickness of one metre.

Circular depressions are associated with food preparation and storage. These depressions may also have had other functions, including fire pits or drying grain. Thimlich Ohinga archaeological sites illustrate interior enclosure structures of various kinds, including cattle grass pens and garden fences. From 2007 onwards, the systematic archaeological study was carried out by the National Museums of Kenya to determine the content and possible functions on some of the features found within or in association with the large stone wall enclosures. Further archaeological research was conducted in 2017 to better substantiate the referred back nomination.

Thimlich Ohinga exhibits a sophisticated system of dry-stone wall masonry which creates a meticulously arranged, three-phased area of undressed stone walls, which have remained structurally stable over centuries. The walls are constructed in a three phase design; an outer and an inner phase of neatly arranged stones walls shapes and sizes and a middle phase consisting of smaller stones, with the middle holding the stones of the inner and outer phases of the wall together.

The nominated property serves also as a meeting venue for the community where issues affecting them are deliberated on. It also remains a location for community rituals, in particular in times of crisis. Based on the additional information provided, ICOMOS is now pleased to conclude that the property meets criteria (iii), (iv) and (v) and that the conditions of authenticity and integrity have been demonstrated. Integrity will be further transcended once the full protection of the visual setting of the property is insured.

To ensure this, ICOMOS recommends to further expand the property beyond the extensions already proposed at its south eastern end and to fully correspond with the decision of the Committee at its 39th session, as well as to further expand the buffer zone. ICOMOS recommends that Thimlich Ohinga, Kenya be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii), (iv) and (v). ICOMOS further recommends establishing a single database bringing together all available information on the property to establish a comprehensive monitoring system and to consider any further infrastructure or other development on the site or in the vicinity carefully by means of Heritage Impact Assessments for their approval.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now ask for comments. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. At the onset, Brazil would like to thank ICOMOS for its presentation and commend the State Party for proposing this nomination. It is clear, madam Chair, that the case before us shows how much a State Party can benefit from upstream advice. Even though the Committee decided at its 39th session to refer this nomination back to the State Party, the content of this decision was rather of a deferral which allowed Kenya, with the support of ICOMOS, to present a new, revised nomination with extended research, documentation, mapping and stronger comparative analysis and justification of the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Committee when it wishes to change deferred recommendation into decision of referral should at least take a clear stance on what has been recommended to the State Party and on the possible role that can be played by ICOMOS. We therefore congratulate Kenya and ICOMOS for the joint work to make the dossier ready for inscription at this present session.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to the delegation of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe joins Brazil in thanking the government of Kenya and ICOMOS for working on this dossier over the last few years and ensuring that we now get a well-completed dossier. Coming from Zimbabwe and seeing the images of the archaeological site, I am reminded of the Great Zimbabwe Ruins and therefore I am happy to find a relative on the World Heritage List.

I therefore would like to really commend the State Party for this site and to congratulate them on the inscription of this property which is the largest and the best preserved of these dry-stone walled enclosures. I really hope that we will be working together very closely in the management and preservations of our sites.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I would like now to pass the floor to the delegation of Australia.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, Australia also supports the inscription of Thimlich Ohinga in Kenya. We are very pleased to do so and like previous Committee speakers congratulate the State Party for having addressed all the concerns from the 2015 decision and to have worked so closely with ICOMOS.

In reading this dossier, we were fascinated and impressed by the technique, skills and aesthetics of the dry-stone walls and the distinctive patterning of the traditional pastoral settlement. The property is an excellent addition to the site types and the values represented on the World Heritage List. An important inscription also addresses the objectives of the Global Strategy in increasing the representation of Africa on the List.

Congratulations to Kenya. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you Chair. I wish to open by saying that this Convention is the most recognised and most powerful tool for protection and conservation of the most precious natural and cultural heritage we have in the world. We, as members of the Committee, have been elected by 193 States Parties to this Convention to be the guardians of the Outstanding Universal Value.

What makes the World Heritage unique among the many other very important conventions and mechanisms is the Outstanding Universal Value which we recognise at the time of inscription. Also we would like to emphasise that the Outstanding Universal Value is carried by the three pillars of criteria, authenticity, integrity, and protection and management. We would also like to emphasise the importance of working in line with the principles of the Global Strategy, but we still have a long way to go.

Finally, our decision at the Committee must be based on objective and scientific considerations. We should aim at constructive work together to contribute to consensus decisions in line with the requirement of the Operational Guidelines and advice provided and this is what I want to say: *pongezi* [swahili], congratulations.

We have before us a World Heritage property which is a wonderful example of an African site with a traditional management system that enhances and supplements the formal

legal protection and management system. The property remains a place for community rituals and meetings and the formal mechanisms are thus significantly enhanced by traditional rules and taboos maintained by community elders who insist on protection of the property as well as its surrounding fauna and flora. It is of utmost importance that this strong, community-based involvement and attachment is ensured for the future. Any facilitation for development projects and further tourism to the site must be sustainable and respect the true guardians of this remarkable site.

We are taking note of the very successful collaboration between Kenya and ICOMOS, realising the full potential of the upstream process, allowing the State Party in due time to return to the World Heritage Committee with a successful, high-quality nomination.

Norway fully supports the draft decision and we have full confidence that the State Party will observe in particular paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision. Norway would strongly welcome this site to the World Heritage List.

Asante [swahili] madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Spain.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much madam Chair. First of all, I would like to thank and congratulate the government of Kenya for the wonderful example of fortifications in dry-stone, which is very similar to some that can be found in Mediterranean countries. It is also a very good example of work done by a State Party with the Advisory Bodies. The deferral in 2015 has led to a much more solid, consistent file and we are certain that in the future this will improve the protection and conservation of this site.

Congratulations and thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I pass the floor to the delegation of Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie voudrait exprimer sa satisfaction de voir le processus d’aboutissement de ce site devant nous aujourd’hui mené de concert entre toutes les parties, notamment avec les composantes consultatives de notre processus. Ainsi, le processus de conseil en amont a porté pleinement ses fruits. Nous nous félicitons de cet état d’esprit et nous appuyons absolument cette inscription et nous voulons souhaiter à ce site de se faire une place significative dans notre patrimoine universel ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Cuba would like to add its voice to those countries that have recognised the wonderful work done by the State Party to reformulate its file on the basis of the remarks that had been presented. We are favourable to the inscription of this site on the List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, you have the floor.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. The State Party of Uganda joins all the other delegations in commending this heritage site for its nomination. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Bosnia.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Nous voudrions aussi nous joindre aux autres collègues en félicitant l'État partie pour l'excellent travail dans la préparation de ce dossier et nous pensons que ce dossier montre la très bonne coopération entre l'État partie et ICOMOS. Nous voudrions aussi nous féliciter d'une forte participation de la communauté locale dans la préparation du dossier et nous félicitons encore une fois l'État partie pour l'inscription.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Azerbaijan also would like to congratulate the State Party for this excellent nomination which testifies the settlement pattern and special community relation in the Lake Victoria basin. Also, it testifies to the successive occupation by different people from various linguistic origins during an important episode in the migration and the settlement of the Lake Victoria basin in the 16th and 17th centuries. It also gives a reference to habitation patterns, livestock, cultivation and craft practices prevalent in communal settlements at this time.

Azerbaijan commends the conservation and management efforts of the State Party and also the cooperation with the Advisory Bodies which resulted in this successful nomination and that is why we would like to join in congratulating the inscription.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. China wishes to join all the other speakers in congratulating Kenya, the State Party, for the successful inscription of Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site. It was a wonderful collaborative work between the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. We congratulate you.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Tanzania wants to take this opportunity to commend Kenya for this nomination and to also encourage Kenya to make all possible efforts to implement the recommendations of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for expanding the property’s boundaries, establishing a single data base and a monitoring system and, furthermore, undertaking comprehensive Environmental Impact Assessments for any infrastructural development in and around the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I do not think there are any other comments. Rapporteur, did you get any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have not received any amendments, but if I may, I would like at this point make a request to the distinguished members of the Committee. When submitting revisions of amendments you have already submitted, please, use track changes because without track changes we run the risk of involuntarily omitting something from your amendments. Please, if you send a revised version of the amendments, send them with the track changes.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.14 adopted. Let me congratulate Kenya on behalf of the entire Committee for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. Kenya, you have the floor.”

Kenya:

“Madam Chair, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen,

The inscription of the Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site marks one of the happiest moments in the World Heritage Convention. I wish to thank the distinguished Committee for giving us an opportunity to share with the world this outstanding site. As was indicated by ICOMOS, the site was initially discussed during the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee in 2015.

Through the Committee the site was referred for more work that included, but was not limited to, augmenting the comparative analysis and extending the boundaries of the site. Through the support of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS, Kenya received financial technical support to revise the nomination dossier.

The State Party of Kenya therefore wishes to sincerely thank the World Heritage Centre for its financial assistance and ICOMOS for its complete support, made through numerous kind meetings with the National Museum of Kenya's scientists. Further, I wish to thank ICOMOS for the mission to the site in the framework of the upstream process that announced the nomination dossier. Our gratitude also goes to the experts from Uppsala University and their role and participation in delivering a successful dossier.

Madam Chair, we have a lot of faith in the upstream process; we have seen it work. We wished the Committee would give us a second chance for this site and for your favourable decision. I wish to pledge on behalf of the State Party, Kenya, that we shall endeavour to implement the five recommendations in the decision to further enhance Thimlich Ohinga Archaeological Site: to advance the boundary of the sites and to acquire more land on the southeastern section of the site. We shall make the requested reports within the time frame indicated in the decision.

It is our hope that with continued support from the Advisory Bodies, Kenya will enhance protection of this site and advance on other fortifications in Kenya which numbers over 500 dry-stoned fortifications of the same period as Thimlich Ohinga. Kenya also extends an invitation to interested researchers in the disciplines of archaeology and architecture to consider further research in dry stone in Kenya.

In Swahili I say *asante*, thank you all.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Ancient City of Qalhat, Oman. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to announce that we received a factual error notification concerning the nomination of the Ancient City of Qalhat, Oman. This nomination is

to be found on page 76 of Document INF.8B.4 and on page 80 of the same document in the French version.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Now, I give ICOMOS the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam chair. The Ancient City of Qalhat, Oman was an important port on the east Arabian coast which flourished from the 11th to the 15th centuries CE under the rule of the Princes of Hormuz.

Following Portuguese attacks, it was abandoned in the 15th century and has remained an archaeological site. The port city is located at the eastern coast of the Sultanate of Oman, approximately 20 kilometres north of the city of Sur. The former settlement stretches across a length of 1,600 metres and covers an overall area of 35 hectares. The nominated property includes the entire ancient city of Qalhat, demarcated by its inner outer walls as well as areas outside the walls where a necropolis is situated.

The Ancient City of Qalhat represents an exceptional testimony to the Kingdom of Hormuz, which flourished in the region of the Strait of Hormuz from the 11th until the 17th century. It was one of the few major trade hubs which came under the rules of the Princes of Hormuz, who profited tremendously from its geopolitical position in the region.

In the 13th century, Qalhat likely controlled most of the Indian Ocean trade. The city was not only visited and seasonally resided in by various rulers but it also served as a refuge during times of conflict and was a place of exile. It held as a strategic trade and defence importance but also political relevance to the Kingdom of Hormuz.

The historic city has been divided into several quarters for the purpose of archaeological excavations. The central quarter is located between two *wadis* and has been identified as the most ancient part of the city, dating back to 1100 CE. Other quarters are dominated by private dwellings with clusters of residencies and other functions organised around square. Recent excavations discovered a small mosque, private dwellings and what was likely a store. The urban planning of the excavated buildings of Qalhat show features and characteristics particular to the Kingdom of Hormuz and the archaeological remains are its most complete representation and give further potential for a more detailed understanding of its life and trade.

In addition to the architectural and urban attributes, the property is supported by societal traditions, including visits made to the Bibi Maryam Mausoleum by the local population for blessings and offerings. Before the property was closed to public for conservation, the section of the site around Bibi Maryam was protected by the residents of a neighbouring village and this guardianship tradition will be reactivated as part of the future visitor concept.

As an abandoned archaeological site, Qalhat’s architecture, urban fabric and form remained authentic, almost untouched, as does its setting, with the exception of a highway touching the southwest boundary. The property was systematically inventoried by means of digital photogrammetry, GIS and documentation of the visible structures *in situ* as part of archaeological research and conservation activities.

A site-specific documentation centre has been established to provide a central archive of site-related information and conservation works are presently underway and aim to be completed by 2019.

In June of 2018, the State Party with a factual error letter submitted a revised map with adjusted boundaries and a finalised Management Plan which seems to have been formally adopted. However, this information arrived too late to be considered within this evaluation report. Therefore our evaluation report concludes in recognising that criteria (ii) and (iii) have been demonstrated but that integrity needs to be improved by means of a boundary adjustment. This is also reflected in this overview where boundaries are required to include the sea shores as documented in the latest map received and the management and conservation plans remain to be finalised.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommended a referral based on this missing element as well as to strengthen human capacities, in particular in relation to continued site management and conservation methods and skills. ICOMOS further recommends approaching future developments with extreme caution, to always supply a Heritage Impact Assessment before any developments has been approved as well as to follow a minimum intervention approach to the conservation of archaeological remains.

Thank you very much madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or questions? Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We commend the State Party of Oman for submitting this nomination to the World Heritage List and, as ICOMOS has just expressed, two criteria have already been met in addition to the protection and other critical elements for the inscription.

It is our understanding that the State Party has already taken some measures to ensure protection and management of the site and we would kindly ask you to give the floor to the State Party to present to the Committee these efforts that have been made, which I think have addressed the requirements needed for inscription. We have submitted an amendment with regard to that.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. In appreciation of ICOMOS about their recognition of the value of the Ancient City of Qalhat, we would like to highlight the commitment demonstrated by the State Party by promptly responding to ICOMOS’ recommendations on the site, particularly those which are concerned with integrity in the light of inclusion of the shoreline and exclusion of the highway out of the property.

The issue of the highway was addressed due to the use of two different projections of the coordinates by different institutions; this has been adjusted. Therefore, the highway is excluded from the borders of the property. As for the shoreline, although it was protected by the government of the State Party, the Ministry of Heritage and Culture included it within its properties.

As for the site Management Plan, it has been finalised, adopted and shown to the Advisory Bodies. The Plan addressed almost all concerns that came in the recommendations including human resources strengthening and the local community's engagement in the decision-making process and the general Heritage Impact Assessment. Although visitor management is considered and the already-prepared site Management Plan designed, the State Party is in the process of developing a comprehensive Visitor Management Plan to include a visitation master plan and more elaborated Heritage Impact Assessment in conformity with the ICOMOS 2011 guidance and also to address any future infrastructure within the site.

My delegation commends the State Party for its prompt response and commitment and we believe that this exceptional site deserves being inscribed under criteria (ii) and (iii). Therefore, we are in full support with the amendment of the draft decision presented by the State Parties of Bahrain, Tanzania and Tunisia.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Azerbaijan congratulates the State Party for this very successful nomination, which indeed provides exceptional archaeological evidence of trade exchanges between the East Arabian coast and India, reaching as far as China and Southeast-Asia. As such, the property provides evidence of the Indian Ocean trade networks which predated the arrival of the European powers. At the same time, the city was a twin city of Hormuz and the second capital of the Kingdom of Hormuz, which acted as a refuge during periods of disorder and conflict.

As already stated by ICOMOS, criteria (ii) and (iii) have been justified by this nomination. The only missing elements were the minor boundary modification and the management plans which have already been provided by the State Party to the Advisory Bodies. With this in mind, my delegation would like to join the previous speakers and support the amendments for the inscription of the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor goes to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. While thanking ICOMOS for its report, Brazil wishes to express its deep appreciation to the State Party of Oman for presenting the nominated property which, if inscribed, would surely enrich the World Heritage List.

Brazil goes along with ICOMOS that exhibits present traces of the unique interchanges of the unique Kingdom of Hormuz both culturally and commercially enjoyed with Africa, China, India and beyond to Southeast-Asia. Hence, confirming the justification of criteria (ii) and (iii) even though criterion (ii) was not proposed by the State Party concerned.

We believe that the conditions of authenticity and integrity are fully demonstrated, though Brazil highly recommends minor boundary modification procedures; that the State Party excludes the highway from the site borders and considers including the shoreline within the boundary, due to the significance of the sea in these exchanging values that are reflected in the property.

In our point of view, we should inscribe the property at this session, considering all the recommendations proposed by ICOMOS, especially with regard to the proposed boundaries and the final adoption of the Management Plan met by the State Party. A draft amendment has been circulated in this regard, which has the full support of Brazil.

We would like to ask a question to ICOMOS as to whether it is in agreement with the proposed statement of OUV.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Indonesia would like to commend the work of the Advisory Bodies in validating the nomination of the Ancient City of Qalhat. We know that further consultation has been undertaken between ICOMOS and Oman, in particular in validating the criteria that could be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List.

In this regard, Indonesia supports the proposal of Tunisia and other delegations, Bahrain, Kuwait, etc. that made a statement to inscribe the Ancient City of Qalhat based on criteria (ii) and (iii) that have been justified in the nomination report. We would also like to commend the State Party in its proposal to reduce the criteria for inscription. This, in our view, will make it more viable for the State Party to conserve the Outstanding Universal Value from the property following inscription.

We encourage the State Party to take further steps in implementing the Committee's recommendations. We underline the importance of management planning, and ensuring the preservation, protection and conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by enhancing the human resource capacity. We look forward to analysing the Management Plan in a holistic manner.

We are also of the view that the State Party could also take into account other recommendations, particularly in strengthening monitoring systems and undertaking Heritage Impact Assessments.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia. “

Tunisie :

[Interprétation vers le français] « Merci madame la présidente. Je voudrais affirmer par cette intervention l'appui de la Tunisie à l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Ce site est certainement très important pour notre patrimoine à tous. Nous voulons saluer l'État partie pour ce dossier de très grande qualité technique et d'avoir répondu positivement à toutes les recommandations des Organisations consultatives.

C'est pour cela que nous appuyons l'inscription de ce site sur la Liste. Pour nous, ce site va renforcer notre Liste, notre patrimoine mondial et celui de l'UNESCO. Merci. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have before us a highly interesting and important archaeological site which carries a significant potential for inclusion on the World Heritage List. We wish to emphasise the importance of serving the Global Strategy and, furthermore, our appreciation of seeing more World Heritage properties coming from the region in which we now have the privilege of being humble guests.

We commend the State Party for having followed up closely on the advice provided by ICOMOS in various aspects of this nomination. We can only strongly encourage the continuation of what appears to be a scientific, fruitful and cordial collaboration with mutual learning. We will strongly welcome the Ancient City of Qalhat once the State Party has followed and implemented ICOMOS' recommendations and refined an already excellent nomination accordingly.

We will listen very carefully to the State Party's clarifications and we also wish to second the wise intervention by our distinguished colleague from Brazil and we look forward to the response from ICOMOS.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Zimbabwe notes that the Ancient City of Qalhat represents a testimony of exceptional archaeological evidence for trade exchanges within the East Arabian coast, India and reaching as far as China and the rest of Southeast-Asia. As such, the property provides evidence of the Indian Ocean trade networks which predated the

arrival of European colonial powers. The property exhibits physical evidence of cultural and commercial interchange of values standing to the east of Africa.

Zimbabwe therefore seconds the justification for inclusion of criterion (ii) on the basis of culture and commercial interchange of values within the trading range of the Kingdom of Hormuz. Zimbabwe is of the view that the decision on the Ancient City of Qalhat proposed for nomination by the State Party of Oman be changed from referral to inscription as it has managed to demonstrate with no doubt the presence of Outstanding Universal Value through criteria (ii) and (iii). In addition, it has also fulfilled the conditions of authenticity as set out in paragraphs 79 and 86 of the Operational Guidelines of the World Heritage Convention.

We therefore support, as Zimbabwe, the amended decision proposed by Bahrain and other State Parties. I submit madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China takes note of the cautious support of ICOMOS in the evaluation process of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Ancient City of Qalhat. ICOMOS underlines that the Ancient City of Qalhat exhibits the values of commercial and cultural interchange along the maritime trade route of the Kingdom of Hormuz and as an important node city along the intercontinental trade route. The Ancient City of Qalhat has preserved the multicultural heritage left over from the medieval cosmopolitan city.

Therefore, China fully supports the amendment of the draft decision proposed by Bahrain and other Committee members to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. China believes that the State Party will continue its further study and take action on the site to better implement the suggestions in the evaluation report.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam chair. Australia thanks Oman for the nomination of this wonderful site of Qalhat. Certainly its long history as a centre of trade and power over many centuries is remarkable. While we particularly note the integrity of the site as being exceptional and having archaeological vestiges that have remained undisturbed since the 16th century and illustrate the role of the city in the network of trade, we are very pleased to hear of the progress of the State Party in addressing some of the recommendations in the evaluation report and we look forward to hearing from the State Party.

Australia will also support the draft amendment put forward by Bahrain and others to inscribe the properties on criteria (ii) and (iii). We look forward in future to learning much more about this site through further exemplary archaeological research.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Kyrgyzstan.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Kyrgyzstan joins the amendment proposed by Bahrain and other countries to inscribe the Ancient City of Qalhat Oman, on the World Heritage List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the delegation of Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis believes the State Party has adequately met the criteria for the site and the conditions for authenticity and integrity and commends the work done in this nomination. We too support the amendment for the inscription of the Ancient City of Qalhat as already been indicated by previous speakers.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Spain would also like to reiterate the things that have just been said by previous delegations, when it comes to the value of this archaeological site, which does fulfil criteria (ii) and (iii). As has also been pointed out by the delegation of Brazil and that of Norway, we would be interested in knowing more about the state of the implementation of the recommendations of the original draft decision and we would also be interested in hearing response from ICOMOS regarding Brazil’s question.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chairperson, the United Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party on the detailed and excellent work on this dossier of inscription of the Ancient City of Qalhat in the sultanate of Oman. Tanzania takes notes of the extraordinary effort realised by the State Party on the preparation of the dossier on this Ancient City of Qalhat, which was an important

port on the Arabian East coast during the 11th until the 16th centuries under the rule of the Hormuz Princes.

The delegation of Tanzania appreciates the comprehensive evaluation of the nomination dossier by ICOMOS, which considered that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this property on the World Heritage List. Tanzania notes that ICOMOS fully agrees that criteria (ii) and (iii) are justified.

Madam Chair, as ICOMOS and the State Party agree on the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity and also admit the management system of the site could be enhanced with some modifications, the United Republic of Tanzania proposes that the Ancient City of Qalhat be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Tanzania joins Bahrain and Tunisia in the proposed amendment draft.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The Hungarian delegation supports the recommendations of ICOMOS which advises that the nomination should be referred back to the State Party for slight additions and modifications. The most significant modification which has to be made was that of the boundary of the proposed property in order to include the shoreline along the sea, as it had great significance in the trade interaction at the time. Without this modification the property could not have fulfilled its entire significance as a World Heritage site.

Hungary congratulates the modifications made by the State Party and now supports the draft amendments submitted by Bahrain and other countries to inscribe the proposed property of the Ancient City of Qalhat on the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Cuba would also add its voice to the congratulatory statements made by the other delegations when it comes to all the endeavours undertaken to enhance this outstanding archaeological site, the Ancient City of Qalhat.

We do feel that it really does symbolise the intercultural dialogue and trade at the time and also the dialogue and exchanges that have been undertaken between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party. I think this is a shining example and they have done much to improve the chance of inscription and Cuba would also like to endorse the nominations of this site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. The questions asked by the honourable delegation of Brazil concerned the changes of the boundaries as well as the statement of Outstanding Universal Value that has been proposed. As mentioned in the presentation earlier, the State Party has indeed submitted a changed map which indicates changed boundaries, parts of factual errors of procedures, and these boundaries do cover the shoreline and exclude the highway as was requested in our evaluation report.

With regard to the statement of Outstanding Universal Value, in the evaluation of nominations for which ICOMOS recommends referral but acknowledges that Outstanding Universal Value has been demonstrated, ICOMOS thus prepared a statement of Outstanding Universal Value which then, usually as a standard procedure, is integrated into decision on a provisional basis, which gives the State Party and ICOMOS the opportunity over the course of the year to finalise this statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which is then formally adopted in the following session.

We have only received the amendments now, so we did not have the opportunity to analyse the text submitted, but the usual procedure would be that the provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value that was prepared by ICOMOS would be integrated into the decision.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor is to our Rapporteur. I ask her whether she has received any amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As it was noted during the discussions, we have received draft amendments from Bahrain, Kuwait, Tunisia, and Tanzania and we have heard a great deal of support for these amendments from the floor. As you know, the original draft decision called for this property to be referred back to the State Party and the proposed draft amendments would inscribe this property on the World Heritage List. Subsequently, these draft amendments now include a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value and include the identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed, an assessment of the conditions of integrity and authenticity and we also have a statement on the protection management requirements.

Madam Chair, in the interest of time, I am not going to read out all the proposed draft amendments, you have them in front of you and on the screen. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The draft decision is on the screen. Are there any objections or any amendments? Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you very much madam Chair. In relation to the proposed changes, not to the actual inscription itself, but perhaps, I was wondering if the sponsoring countries could actually explain why they want to include recommendations that are taken from the original proposed Draft Decision. Is it because they think it is a common sense choice or they think these recommendations to the State Party on the part of ICOMOS to encourage a further dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party from the technical perspective in some way enhance the protection, for example? Can we hear on that please?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I would like to seek clarification; if we could scroll back to the text just above the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value. Could you go up please, it is really hard to see? Thank you. I just wanted to be clear that the word ‘revision’ was in there as you zoomed past very quickly. Thank you, it is good.”

The Chairperson:

“Is the text acceptable or do you need clarification? Bahrain would you like the floor?”

Bahrain:

“Yes madam Chair. As I have stated in my previous intervention, the State Party has already fulfilled some of the recommendations from ICOMOS and I have requested kindly to give them the floor so that they can express to the Committee all the efforts they have made and to reassure the Committee on their commitment to conserving and managing this site in an appropriate manner that would meet the requirements of a World Heritage Listing. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Oman.”

Oman:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. We would like to thank ICOMOS for recognising the Outstanding Universal Value of the Ancient City of Qalhat on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii), its authenticity and integrity. As the work at the site has been continuing, the government of Oman has taken immediate actions to address all issues and most of the

recommendations that the ICOMOS evaluation report indicated. All of these actions have been clearly presented, as was stated earlier in the form of the submission of factual errors, as shown in the document INF.8B4.

Among these actions, the projection of the boundaries were officially adjusted and the shoreline was included in the property. This is officially attested in the property document of May, 22, 2018, issued by our Ministry of Housing. The site Management Plan is completed and now officially approved and endorsed by the Minister of Heritage and Culture and in the process of implementation. The site Management Plan is published in paper and electronic formats and plans to strengthen the management capacities for protection and maintenance of the site in the view of the reopening of the site to the public in the future is also included. It also addresses Tourism management and recommends the preparation of guidelines.

The State Party fully agrees with ICOMOS's recommendations on the importance of conducting Heritage Impact Assessment and considers that as a priority for the Ministry of Heritage and Culture. Meanwhile the conservation guidelines already in preparation will include Risk Management and Disaster Response.

The excavation and conservation work have been joint since 2013, with the beginning of the Qalhat development programme and there is a strong and coordinate interaction between the two actions. The Qalhat development programme was in line with the proposal of increasing the archaeological and historic knowledge of the site, preserving its remains and enhancing its importance for the public, all in respect of its authenticity and integrity.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any more clarifications or queries? Shall we adopt the text as it is in front of you on the screen? Are there any objections? I see none. Can we adopt the decision? I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.15 adopted.

On behalf of you all, I can congratulate Oman and I give the floor to the representative of Oman.”

Oman:

[English interpretation] “In the name of God the most compassionate and most merciful. First of all, thank you very much and congratulations on your election as Chair of this session of the World Heritage Committee. I want to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its outstanding hospitality and its generosity to everyone here. We are most grateful. We want to thank to the World Heritage Committee and the World Heritage Centre for the successful inscription of this site on the World Heritage List. This site is our fifth site inscribed on the World Heritage List. It was on the Tentative List as of 1998, 20 years back.

The authorities of my country wanted to see one of the great pearls of my country inscribed on this List because its topography has protected it from modernity and recent development. The unanimity shown today for the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List will serve to ensure that this site is protected as a treasure for all of humanity. This property was an important node of trade between several different civilisations in its day. It was the first pre-Islamic capital of Oman.

We are firmly committed to undertaking further archaeological excavations which will surely enable us to uncover further treasures of this outstanding site. This will attract in turn more tourism and will increase the revenues to local communities. We confirm before this Committee that Oman will strictly comply with its Management Plan for the site and the safeguarding and protection of it and of its Outstanding Universal Value.

Again, thank you to the members of the Committee, thank you to the Advisory Bodies, in particular ICOMOS and its team of experts. They have really left no stones unturned when it came to assessing the nomination file for this property and thank you very much to the Centre and the Committee for everything you have done for us and the World Heritage.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape, in Saudi Arabia. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Just to remind the Committee of a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the nomination of the Al-Ahsa Oasis is to be found on page 83 of the English version of Document INF.8B4 and on page 81 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Al-Ahsa Oasis consists of palm groves and water channels as well as buildings, urban fabric and archaeological sites that together seem to represent the evolution of an ancient cultural tradition in the Gulf region of the Arabian Peninsula from the Neolithic period up to the present day. In terms of cultural properties, this is a serial nomination of 12 sites; it is also a nomination of cultural landscape.

The map shows the location of the property in the East of the Arabian Peninsula. The Al-Ahsa Oasis lies between the desert and coast on a vast plain where groups began to settle in the Neolithic era, attracted by the abundance of water and the favourable natural environment. As the climate became drier, the oasis developed during the third millennium before the Christian area.

Defining the characteristics of Al-Ahsa Oasis are the cultivation of dates and its complex water irrigation management system, which appear to have been introduced between the third and the second millennia BC, based on water management techniques from Mesopotamia. As the area grew enough crops to trade prosperously, it became linked to maritime routes around the Gulf and overland trade routes through the Arabian Desert. The Oasis extended in the Islamic period and by the 16th century there were more than 50 villages and two towns.

Until the 1960s, the enlarged Dilmun structures still persisted. The distinctive water distribution system that circulated water from around a number of springs and wells to the palm groves through herring-bone patterned channels and then drained it to the Asfar Lake. An ensemble of villages and agricultural towns that managed the trade. The oasis has become the largest in the world. Today, the Al-Ahsa Oasis is described in the nomination dossier as having been transformed from changes undertaken to the irrigation system and from urban growth based on the oil industry.

In 1967, an irrigation project was launched to address the waning efficiency of water distribution and a new layout of canals was laid. Although the new layout has affected the traditional aspects of the property, the modern canals mostly followed the path of historic ones. Until the 1960s, the sharing of water was undertaken in a communal way, based on agreement between farmers. Now the Al-Ahsa Irrigation and Drainage Authority is in charge of this aspect.

As a result of the changes the farming system has moved from a community-led to a market-led economy. Villages have almost disappeared with only one, now unoccupied, having survived. The second rapid transformation was the development of urban areas brought about by the development of the oil industry and the rebuilding of traditional structures in the existing towns.

Twelve component sites have been nominated which together are seen to cover all the morphological elements of the oasis' structured landscapes. They consist of three large palm groves with their irrigation channels, the Al-Asfar Lake, that collects the water from the canals, two archaeological sites, 'Ain Qinas and Jawatha, with evidence of neolithic pottery and Islamic irrigation systems. Part of Al-'oyun village, which includes fragments of the unique typology of houses that persisted until the 1970s. Also included are the Jawatha mosque, said to have been built over the traditional site of the second Mosque in Islam and the Al Battaliah Mosque, also recently restored. The remaining components are two forts, a complex of Ottoman period buildings and the 19th-century souk, Al-Qaysariyah.

The property is nominated as an Evolving Cultural landscape and one which has changed dramatically since the 1960s. But the evolution has not primarily come about with the agricultural community in central players. Although the water channels still for the most part reflect their earlier alignments, the Oasis cannot be said to reflect mainly traditional practices.

In most cultural landscapes some modern interventions have been introduced to support the persistence of practices at Al-Ahsa, the interventions all but replaced such practices. Al-Ahsa is no longer an overall eco-cultural system in which the technical and social management of water allows palm cultivation to support a social newness in a sustainable way.

ICOMOS considers that the Oasis systems which spread from Saudi Arabia across to the Maghreb is a settlement typology which is underrepresented on the World Heritage List. But at Al-Ahsa, the components do not combine to reflect the traditional structures of an oasis landscape in which the attributes that convey its value have persisted over time. ICOMOS does not consider that criteria (iii), (iv) and (v) can be justified. The Oasis no longer primarily reflects cultural traditions, as interventions have interrupted the long-standing relationship between people and the natural landscape and it can no longer be seen as a testimony of cultural tradition or as an outstanding example of human settlements.

The property also does not reflect in an outstanding way, the periods of history that have shaped its development. In terms of integrity: development has engulfed part of the oasis and changed its settings dramatically. Traditional villages have been replaced by modern urbanisation to a degree that impacts on the integrity. Authenticity is in our view not

demonstrated overall for the series in terms of its ability to reflect the long-standing tradition of the oasis and its social structure.

ICOMOS notes that Al-Ahsa has been nominated as an Evolving Landscape rather than as an evolved one, which, as defined in the Operational Guidelines, reflects the way it has evolved throughout time and needs to be sustained in the future. The idea of an evolving landscape appears to mean that the limits of permissible change are not clearly defined nor precisely what has not changed and this implies that its value could also evolve over time. ICOMOS also has concerns in terms of boundary protection, conservation and management, where we consider further work is needed.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that the Al-Ahsa Oasis as nominated as an Evolving Landscape should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or queries? Kuwait, you have the floor.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you. I want to talk about a very special case, a piece of land that gave life to endless generations, a piece of hope, of history, a true piece of life, Al-Ahsa Oasis. We are talking about the largest and most famous Oasis in the world. Please, allow me to make three points today.

Yes, the Advisory Bodies have given their negative decision, but this Committee gathered today makes the final decision and there is a precedent over the disallowance and alternate decisions. We respect the procedure and we do not want to change the dignity of the procedures, but exceptions are made and from exceptions come progress and change. Many countries do not understand the vital importance simply because they have never historically faced harsh climates or do not have such large desert areas to cross. Thus, the Advisory Bodies may not take these things into consideration. Simply because it is not part of their historical struggle and survival. This is a unique case and we need to give it a second, unique look.

Number two, under this oasis, lies the largest supply of oil, one that daily produces more than Norway, Azerbaijan and Indonesia combined. Yet, 50 years ago, a royal decree was taken to ban any oil infrastructure within 120 kilometres of its premises. Why? Because over 1000 years this Oasis has given water, shelter and life to endless caravans, traders and others who pass through. It saved too many cultures and generations not to be recognised. The government not only spent money, but so much selfless effort and time to maintain the oasis' dignity. This oasis provides life.

Today it is the home of antiquities that are over 2,000 years old. A true home to a region and culture, way before Islam. There is true love and passion for this oasis. Just take a moment and look at the numerous research done by American and western historians, such as those who lived there for several months in the 1950s, or go back to 53 BC when it was mentioned for its importance as a cultivated and culturally rich region. Yes, there are records from over 2,000 years ago.

In conclusion, I would like to make a plea, an emotional plea. If I think of thousand years of beautiful palm trees and archaeological sites which are part of an empirical plea, I

think of the deep and complicated role this oasis has played on the survival of so many cultures and people of this peninsula. It is part of an urgent plea, which is our chance to show the world that, although this may not be the typical cultural landscape that they are familiar with, it is definitely worth having an Outstanding Universal Value because without a doubt it has Outstanding Universal Value. Outstanding in its own survival through the worst climate possible with dust and high temperatures; universal in giving life through the numerous people and cultures who passed through for over a thousand years; values in the antiquities that are still preserved.

The State of Kuwait requests other Committee members to support and approve the inscription due to the significance of the site and its uniqueness.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le Burkina Faso soutient le projet soumis par le Koweït pour l’inscription de l’Oasis Al-Ahsa, un paysage culturel en évolution, pour les raisons suivantes : j’avais un développement à faire concernant le rôle important joué par l’eau dans l’histoire des civilisations du monde, mais je crois que mon prédécesseur a déjà fait cela.

Je vais dire que dans le passé Al-Ahsa était source de développement agricole, mais aussi d’un savoir-faire particulier ancien datant du néolithique jusqu’à nos jours. Son importance liée essentiellement à la production des dates n’est plus à démontrer. Nous connaissons bien le rôle que cet aliment a joué dans la fixation des peuples du Sahara et du Sahel et en Afrique et partout dans le monde.

Avec ses différents secteurs interconnectés, l’Oasis de Al-Ahsa nous donne encore à découvrir un complexe traditionnel d’irrigation sans pareil et je crois que le fait de dire que c’est un paysage culturel en évolution n’est pas le fait du hasard. L’État partie a par ailleurs montré sa disponibilité à promouvoir les deux sites archéologiques néolithiques et islamiques qui s’y trouvent et à prendre toutes les mesures nécessaires au respect de l’authenticité et de l’intégrité du site.

De tout ce qui précède, je souhaiterais à nouveau réitérer le fait que mon État partie appuie le projet de décision soutenu par le Koweït.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would now give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very madam Chair. Al-Ahsa is the knowledge of the first urban civilisation of the third millennium and of the experience of the desert people, the unique example of the

union of sustainability characteristic of the community of an oasis with the dimensions of hydraulic societies.

In the current hydro-cultural network it is possible to read the whole creative process, the efforts to transform the desert into a green landscape created by humans and to realise the skills necessary to combat desertification and the progress of sand in a continuous evolutionary process. Al-Ahsa is an exceptional example of a vast oasis where archaeological remains, historical structures, crops hydraulic machines, canals, distribution methods, water recycling and the landscape of all decisions of a formation for the oasis and its evolution are still present.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China supports the draft submitted by Kuwait for the inscription of Al-Ahsa Oasis and Evolving Cultural Landscape for the following reasons. Al-Ahsa is located in the geological and morphological area characterised by a meeting of different ecosystems; rocky desert mountain, sand desert and coastal depressions. These particular environments and the landscape differences are among the determining factors and the genesis and the development of the Oasis as a successful practice in the creation of living conditions in harsh conditions.

Al-Ahsa is a type of oasis characterised by the historical presence of numerous springs, around which the original oasis’ nucleus is created. From the water springs the water flows into the depression where the water runs mixed with coastal marine water. An interchange is created between the nomadic environment, the farmer and the fishermen.

These conditions, typical of Gulf areas, have characterised the origin of the first oasis into the ancient flourishing civilisation, thanks to trade between Mesopotamia and the Indus valley, where Al-Ahsa’s economy contributed to the production of dates. China would like to listen to the Saudi expert respond to the following question. The property is composed of 12 components with 7 buffer zones. Can the Saudi experts elaborate on how these components are related?

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Uganda.

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Uganda aligns with the statements made by Kuwait, China, Burkina Faso and Bahrain in support of the inscription of Al-Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape, for the following reasons:

1) The palm groves of Al-Ahsa are among the largest in the world and the only ones preserved on that scale. 2) The historical characteristics of cultivation and hydraulic systems

based on traditional techniques remain, even in the face of continuing past and present technological evolutions. 3) Al-Ahsa shows a pattern of man-made transformations of the desert landscape on a scale unrivalled and unmatched in the world and carried out according to unique methods developed in harmony with the various climatic and natural conditions of the area over thousands of years.

I thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

[Interprétation vers le français] « Merci madame la présidente. Avant de parler de ce projet de décision, la Tunisie a présenté cet amendement. Nous parlons de l'oasis Al-Ahsa qui est très rare, un phénomène naturel et humain et civilisationnel. Il est caractéristique de la région, très ancien, et il a aussi des particularités uniques au monde que l'on ne retrouve dans aucun autre pays avec des oasis. Je sais de quoi je parle sachant que la Tunisie en compte de nombreux.

Les systèmes d'irrigation démontrent l'interaction avec l'homme et le développement de l'agriculture et de l'architecture en sont la preuve. L'homme a su s'adapter au climat difficile de la région grâce à ce site. Il y a trois critères qui ont été examinés les (iii), (iv) et (v). Ces critères permettent de considérer que ce site dispose de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Les réponses des Organes consultatifs parlent de protéger le site par un cadre législatif, un arsenal de lois. Il faut rappeler qu'il y a plusieurs lois et règlements qui ont été adoptés en Arabie Saoudite à cette fin. Je parle ici de décrets du Royaume qui remontent aux années 1970, 2014, 2015 et 2016. Je rappelle qu'il y a également une décision de la Cour suprême saoudite de 2009 qui interdit le parcellement des terres dans cette région et ce site. C'est pour cela que je souhaite que les experts nous répondent notamment par rapport à ces trois critères que nous avons évoqués.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. As you know, water is essential in terms of survival in the desert. And, indeed, we see that all practices which involve collecting and distributing water are still important. This Oasis is an example of a rather uncommon topography rarely found in the World Heritage List and it deserves to be included in the List. The nomination of Saudi Arabia is something I believe we need to inscribe and accept this amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, the floor is yours.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The nominated property of the Oasis of Al Ahsa is made up of 12 components; gardens, canals, springs, wells, drainage, as well as historical buildings, urban fabric and archaeological sites. It is the largest oasis in the world, with more than 2.5 million palm trees.

The nominated property represents the evolution of an ancient cultural tradition and the traces of sedentary human occupation in the Gulf region of the Arabian Peninsula from the Neolithic period up to now. The environmental protection of the property is covered by walls of concrete for the strengthening of the management of the site; the new management scheme formed a higher Committee and the site management will be based in Al Ahsa municipality.

From my point of view, the comparative analysis justifies the consideration of this property for the World Heritage List, the integrity of the nominated site justified by structural and landscape integrity, integrity of use, development of the human settlements and the control of the sites. The nominated property keeps the required Outstanding Universal Value by the following criteria: a unique cultural landscape resulting from the interaction of man and nature in a particular geographic and geological position with preserved material remains representing all stages of the oasis’ history.

It is a testimony to human occupation for thousands of years up to the present. It includes historic buildings, religious sites and agricultural landscape elements and it is the largest oasis in the world, containing more than 2.5 million palm trees.

We can see that the proposed property meets criteria (iii), (iv) and (v) and integrated requirements.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. We would like to welcome the work that has been done in order to protect the palm groves of this oasis. We believe that the nomination file is very well drafted and there has been a real effort to try and highlight the fact that properties such as this oasis are under-represented on the List.

Therefore, we believe that this site should be inscribed. It is fundamental in the Arabic culture. We also believe that we have to continue working on the nomination because there are also certain issues that need to be spoken about, such as making sure that the buffer zones are clearly indicated, perhaps that is why we also need to hear the State Party. This is why we would like to listen to some clarifications, because in the report that has been presented by Saudi Arabia there was such affirmation made about integrity or authenticity of the property which supposedly is testimony to the evolving nature of this oasis.

However, we are evolving away from the original state of this oasis. We would like to know how the State Party has actually responded to all the different concerns that have been raised by the Advisory Bodies. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. At the onset, Brazil would like to thank ICOMOS for the presentation of its report and commends, Saudi Arabia for proposing this very interesting nomination of a property which typology would be represented on the World Heritage List.

The Brazilian delegation considers that the nomination of the Oasis of Al Ahsa has significant importance since it presents exceptional examples of gardens, canals, springs, lakes and of an evolved urban fabric in a dramatic and long-dated dialogue with the desert. It represents the significant example of human occupation of the Arab regions carved by environmental conditions since ancient times. These features present important elements for the identification of attributes that could potentially convey the Outstanding Universal Value of this property.

We believe that the precious evaluation of ICOMOS could be a welcome base on the exceptionality of the component sites in relation with the human appropriation of the land, tangibly expressed in the whole oasis or a substantial part of it, with regard to the management of scarce water resources in a desert landscape.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Guatemala, you have the floor, please.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. We would also like to congratulate the State Party for this nomination and we would also like to thank ICOMOS for the draft decision. The landscape of the oasis includes gardens, architecture, historical sites and 2.5 million palm trees in this area. We also have to take into account the existence of the archaeological site which shows the existence of ancient civilisations and it is a site which has elements of artefacts from the Neolithic area up to the present.

The oasis allows us to trace the long history of human development and the relationships humans have with nature. It also shows human capacity, the ability to change a given environment and how it evolves through the ages. By protecting this type of site, humanity can learn more about how to adapt to certain extreme weather conditions, such as those brought about by climate change. This is why Guatemala adds its voice to the proposed amendment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair, The Al Ahsa Oasis, an Evolving Cultural Landscape, has been nominated under criteria (iii), (iv) and (v) of the Outstanding Universal Value, as a property that covers a vast landscape with many features, gardens, caravans, springs, wells and agricultural drainage lakes and historical buildings. The vastness of this property makes it taxing for the State Party to meet the expected criteria for justification.

To take into account the criteria justified by the State Party, we see that based on its historical values the property can still be considered to meet the essence of the criteria. We therefore encourage the State Party to consider implementing a monitoring mission at the property and submitting a clear management plan for the property and to maintain dialogue with the Advisory Bodies for the inscription.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor to reply, but Australia is ahead of you.”

Australia:

“Sorry, I raised the flag in your blind spot, Chair. Thank you for the opportunity. Oases have been an integral part of the history of this region, where we are meeting, for thousand of years and are a remarkable demonstration of the interaction between people and their environment. We consider that the inscription of an oasis such as this on the World Heritage list would make a very positive contribution to meeting the aim of the Global Strategy for representative balance to a credible World Heritage List.

Australia has carefully reviewed the nomination dossier and the evaluation and the additional information by way of factual errors. The overarching assessment is that with the Al Ahsa Oasis nomination we do see the kernel of Outstanding Universal Value. What we also see is that the nomination would be strengthened if the State Party was able to clearly express the contribution made to the Outstanding Universal Value of the irrigation and water systems of the Oasis from the period prior to the 1960s, and this goes in particular to clarifying the attributes that demonstrate the authenticity and integrity of the evolved landscape.

Logically, to Australia, this would best be achieved by deferring the nomination and asking the State Party to seek the advice of ICOMOS in reshaping it. However, as we listened to the interventions of distinguished colleagues on this nomination, it seems there is good will towards the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

In the spirit of the consensus-building that has been the hallmark of this meeting, Australia will not stand in the way of inscription of the Al Ahsa Oasis on the World Heritage List. We do hope, however, that in finalising its Outstanding Universal Value for future endorsement by the Committee, the State Party is able to address the matters raised in the evaluation related to the integrity and authenticity of the site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The honourable delegates of Azerbaijan and Tunisia asked to hear from experts on the criteria and I assumed they meant ICOMOS. Before commenting on the criteria, may I just say one thing? In reaching its conclusion for it not to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, the ICOMOS panel was not saying that Al Ahsa Oasis had no values, but rather it could not justify the Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of the nomination of an Evolving Cultural Landscape as presented by the State Party. I would just like to make that clarification.

Within that context, we analysed the justification for the criteria in terms of whether as an Evolving Cultural Landscape these criteria were met. In our view, with the justification of the idea that the property as it stands could be seen as an exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition, or, indeed, as an exceptional example of traditional human settlements, we did not think that either of these things were quite appropriate in terms of what has been nominated. We are therefore saying that it is the format and scope, the way the nomination has been presented at this stage which does not meet the criteria, in our view, for justifying Outstanding Universal Value. That would not preclude it in the future; some other formulations being considered that ICOMOS could not see a way forward in the immediate time. I hope that gives some clarification.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to Tunisia. Are you satisfied with the reply?”

Tunisie :

[Interprétation vers le français] « Merci madame la présidente et je remercie ICOMOS pour ses clarifications. J’avais demandé précisément à entendre l’État partie mais en tout cas je remercie madame la représentante de l’ICOMOS pour ses clarifications ».

The Chairperson:

“I give the State Party, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia the floor for the clarification. Thank you very much.”

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. First of all, allow me to offer some responses to the questions or requests for clarification that have come out of the room.

The Al Ahsa Oasis is an outstanding example and is unique in the world, particularly with regard to human beings’ adaptation to their environment. A few hundred years and even thousand years ago all of this began and once upon a time Saudi Arabia was a green space, but obviously, as the climate changed, things became different and despite the changes the people living in the region in that climate and environment were able to adapt to the conditions around them and managed to live in those climatic conditions.

So, it is true that we have traces of human settlements from around the region from the Mediterranean with the Phoenicians and in this area there are numerous examples

which illustrate that this oasis was indeed a place encompassing many different sizes and vestiges of human settlements. From the 1950s onwards a lot of research, in particular American-backed research, has been undertaken which has attested to the importance of this Oasis.

Saudi Arabia had decided to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of this Oasis and to ensure that any oil prospecting is undertaken as far away from the site as possible.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente pour la parole. Après avoir entendu plusieurs États parties sur les analyses et surtout après avoir pris note des éclaircissements apportés par l'ICOMOS, nous avons également eu cette impression que les éléments, les attributs pour justifier de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle sont bien présents. On souligne aussi l'importance de l'oasis et comme beaucoup l'ont remarqué la valeur de l'eau pour la vie et les communautés qui vivent dans cette région.

Nous avons également cette impression qu'il y avait plutôt un problème au niveau de l'articulation de tous ces attributs par rapport justement aux normes de rédaction et de présentation du document. Avec toutes ces précisions apportées par l'ICOMOS, l'Angola va s'aligner avec les autres membres du Comité qui appuient évidemment l'inscription de ce bien et nous encourageons l'État Partie à pouvoir renforcer certaines mesures sur la protection et également la conservation pour que ce bien puisse donc être inscrit sur la Liste et y rester et que les populations qui y vivent puissent en bénéficier énormément.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments before we refer to the Rapporteur? I see none. Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As it has been noted during the discussion, I have received amendments to the draft decision proposed by Kuwait, China, Tunisia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Cuba, Bahrain, Burkina Faso and Uganda and we have general support from the floor for these amendments. The original draft decision proposed that this property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List and the amendment proposed that this site should instead be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Subsequently, the draft that you see on the screen right now has a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value that includes the identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed. It has assessments of the conditions of integrity and authenticity and we also have a statement on the protection requirements and the management requirements.

Madam Chair, at this point if I may, I would like to make a small editorial suggestion to the authors of the text, just for the sake of having a clear and coherent standardised text. If

we could just scroll up a little bit, in the paragraph below management and protection requirements we see different ways of expressing dates. I would like to suggest, with your permission, if we could use all the way through the text the standard format of dates, which is the day followed by the month and the year, so that we have a coherent and precise text.

Other than that madam Chair, I will not read out the amendments as everyone has them in front of them and on the screen. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or clarifications? Saudi Arabia or other members of the Committee? The Secretariat, please.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Just to remind you that, if the Committee is going in that direction, we have to take note of the statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the version we have here did not mention it, but I see that this has been inserted on the screen.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. If there are no objections, can we go ahead and adopt the decisions as amended? I therefore declare draft decision 42 COM 8B.16 adopted as amended. Thank you very much.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton), China. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat; Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.

I forgot to ask whether the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia would like to make a statement after the adoption of the decision related to the Oasis; please, you have the floor.”

Kingdom of Saudi Arabia:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I should like to extend our warmest thanks to you personally but also to the Committee members. Thank you to the World Heritage Committee for having inscribed the Al-Ahsa Oasis on the World Heritage List. We wanted to reassure all that we are truly committed, as are the government and the people to safeguarding and protecting our heritage and the heritage of the entire world. Our thanks go to you madam Chair for your excellent stewardship of this session of the World Heritage Committee.

Thank you again.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite Mr. Balsamo to present the Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton). You have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo.

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to remind the Committee that we received a factual error concerning the Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) and this is to be found on page 31 of the English version of Document INF.8B.4 and on page 35 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam chair. This is the presentation of the ICOMOS evaluation of the Historic Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou, or Zayton, in China.

Quanzhou, known as Zayton in Arabic and western texts, was a prominent node in the maritime trading routes in the 10th to 14th centuries during the Song and Yuan dynasties of China. These formed part of the Maritime Silk Routes, a counterpart to the land-based route that is already reflected in inscriptions in the World Heritage List. This serial property consists of 16 components, including the remains of historical dock structures, bridge, pagodas, archaeological sites, inscriptions, statues, temples and shrines of diverse phases.

The 16 components are divided thematically into three groups; there are 8 components associated with maritime navigation and trade, including two pagodas, the remains of docks in ports and estuaries and the porcelain kiln sites are included, as are the temples for the worship of the Taoist deity and God of the sea, the Tianhou temple for the worship of the sea Goddess and a series of Wind-Praying rock carvings.

The second category is the multicultural sites and include the Confucius temple and a stone statue of the founder of Taoism, the Kaiyuan temple with both Buddhist and Hindu elements and a temple and statue of Mani, the world’s only remaining stone statue of the founder of Manichaeism. Quanzhou Mosque and a pair of Islamic tombs are also included.

The final category consists of two sites of urban infrastructure. The archaeological site of the Deji Gate and the stone Luoyang Bridge. The Maritime Silk Road is a relatively recent term that describes a number of historical periods and regional counters. These are not single, continuous avenues but represent multiple smaller movements that together connected vast territories. Transnational research on the possible World Heritage thematic framing of the Maritime Silk Route has just started and the State Party does not consider that this nomination needs to wait for the work to progress.

Discussions with the State Party have focused on how this nomination has been conceptualised. The State Party approach has been to nominate a group of monuments and sites that are linked in their ability to express a specific historical period. However, ICOMOS does not consider that the potential Outstanding Universal Value is clear if linked only to its historical period. The State Party has also clarified that it is not nominating Quanzhou as a cultural route or as a port city. However, the historical background rests on the existence of maritime routes and the comparative analysis compared Quanzhou with other port cities.

The State Party submitted additional information in February of 2018 which offered a revised justification of the Outstanding Universal Value focused on social and cultural traditions that are demonstrative of interchanges through trade and as an outstanding

tradition of stonework craftsmanship. These were not accompanied by sufficient comparative studies and evidence, but these new ideas received at a later point in the process underscore the view of ICOMOS that this proposal is still a work in progress with much new and interesting work yet to be undertaken.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis does not justify this specific serial approach of the election of the components. The authenticity of the individual components in relation to the historical period proposed is vulnerable and the integrity of the series is not justified, due to the unresolved question concerning the selection of components. ICOMOS does not consider that any of the proposed criteria (ii), (iii), and (vi) are demonstrated. The approach taken to nominating 16 sites in three different categories has also made it difficult to effectively apply three criteria across the entirety of the property.

ICOMOS considers the boundaries mostly adequate, although the buffer zone's protection could be simplified. The threats vary due to the diversity of the components and the urban, suburban and scenic area settings. In general, the most significant precious components are those associated with urban and port development. The legal protection is adequate and the management system is appropriate, although the coordination could be further streamlined.

ICOMOS considers that without further work on the thematic framework for the Maritime Silk Route it is difficult to establish the Outstanding Universal Value of the monuments and sites of Quanzhou. Despite many sincere exchanges with the State Party, this specific orientation of this nomination remains unclear. A number of arguments have been presented but each of these required specific types of evidence, comparative analysis and more work and cooperation.

ICOMOS therefore finds with regret that the nominated serial property does not demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value and recommends that the historical Monuments and Sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) China should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie tient tout d'abord, après l'étude de ce dossier, à remercier ICOMOS pour avoir présenté un rapport sur les sites historiques et monuments de l'ancien Quanzhou ou Zayton pour lequel ICOMOS néanmoins a émis un avis de non-inscription.

En réalité, la Tunisie considère, au vu des éléments qui composent ce dossier, que les critères (ii), (iii) et (vi) peuvent être regardés comme existants et pleinement existants. La place importante du port de Zayton en relation avec les routes maritimes de la soie a permis le développement d'une civilisation urbaine particulière entre le XI^e et XIV^e siècles dont sont témoins les vestiges qui composent le bien en série et qui sont en état de conservation remarquable. Ils pourraient déjà à eux seuls justifier du critère (iii).

Les composants proposés pour inscription montrent par ailleurs la coexistence et l'interaction entre plusieurs cultures et religions, taoïsme, bouddhisme, confucianisme, hindouisme, islam, manichéisme et croyances locales ; ainsi les critères (ii) et (vi) sont

entièrement justifiés. Il y a par ailleurs un grand nombre de monastères, de pagodes en pierre qui témoignent de l'influence combinée du bouddhisme du confucianisme, de l'hindouisme et des divinités locales, choses assez rares par ailleurs. Où peut-on trouver un temple encore en activité qui abrite la seule sculpture connue de Mani, représenté assis sur des lotus et qui est toujours l'objet de dévotion par les populations locales ? Où peut-on encore trouver une sculpture monumentale de Lao Tseu dans un paysage impressionnant de collines et de forêt entièrement préservé ?

Nous regrettons que l'importance de ces éléments n'ait pas été relevée et que cela ait été relégué à une étude technique, qui devrait être faite, et une étude thématique sur les routes de la soie. En réalité, cette étude a été menée dans le cadre initié par l'UNESCO et intitulé étude intégrale des Routes de la Soie, route du dialogue, de 1988 à 1997 ou plus de 90 experts de 25 pays avaient été impliqués. L'importance exceptionnelle de l'ancien Quanzhou avait déjà été soulignée dans cette étude. Nous avons par ailleurs noté que cette étude à laquelle nous avons fait référence n'avait pas trouvé écho dans les éléments qui ont permis la position annoncée en premier.

De concert avec d'autres États membres de ce comité nous proposons de ne pas aller vers la direction de la non-inscription, mais plutôt de se contenter d'un renvoi qui serait ainsi accepté afin de permettre à l'État partie concerné de poursuivre ses soutiens et contributions au suivi de l'étude thématique mentionné et au développement d'un dialogue transnational à ce sujet en collaboration avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'Organe consultatif pertinent.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, you have the floor.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. The importance of sites of the World Heritage in the broader senses is to provide a steering in which populations can imagine and conceive the encounters of others and remind us of the time zones such encounters produced, what was then a new reality, new ways of bringing knowledge and novelties.

During times of conflict and an unprecedented era of cultural cleansing and wars that falsely claimed a religious agenda, we believe that it is our duty as custodians of World Heritage to remind ourselves and highlight evidences of coexistence, cross-cultural dialogue and harmony among different belief systems. Sites that demonstrate peace, harmony and integrated multicultural society should be encouraged and the tangible manifestations of such values should be our priority.

As an assembly of multi-realisation of masterpieces featuring unique and exceptional physical forms and cultural richness, the historic monuments and sites of Ancient Quanzhou (Zayton) demonstrate exceptional outcomes of exchange of values among human cultures. The component of the property exhibits a fusion of diverse cultures, an architecture, landscape, decorative art, as well as an aspect of spirituality and customs.

The serial components of the sites are also recognised by the integral study of the so-called Roads of Dialogue, a ten-year UNESCO scientific research project with the participation of more than 100 experts from across the world conducted from 1988 until 1997, and we suggest the need to refer to such important studies during the process of evaluating the nomination dossiers.

The Kuwaiti delegation supports the amendment to the draft decision to refer it back to the State Party for further work.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Having looked at the document related to the property of ancient Quanzhou, as well as having listened to the Advisory Bodies’ description, we, Zimbabwe, do not agree with the draft decision as it stands, but rather recommends that this property be referred to allow for further work and clarification.

The property clearly illustrates the bringing together of all the religions which are preserved at this site. The linkages between the referred aspects and the different sites are clearly shown and are actually evident at this site. The Advisory Bodies had some concerns with the authenticity and integrity of the property. However the main basis for not inscribing the property was the global thematic study on the Maritime Silk Road, which has not yet been carried out. We do not think that it is fair to not take action on the basis of studies that have not been carried out.

The delegation of Zimbabwe is of the opinion that this nomination was submitted in terms of the Global Strategy for a representative and tangible Heritage List, Paragraphs 55 to 58 of the Operational Guidelines, which seeks to strengthen and fill gaps in the World Heritage sites and we believe that this property does fulfil this missing link, where you find a place where the religions are there, but also the trade routes to the different parts of the world are preserved and clearly illustrated.

Zimbabwe is therefore a co-sponsor of the draft decision to refer this nomination to allow the State Party to work with ICOMOS in clarifying the grey areas and to resubmit this site to the next meeting of the Committee. We also state that whatever thematic studies are required should be carried out as soon as possible.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Azerbaijan also supports the amendment proposed by the delegation of Tunisia to refer this nomination back to the State Party. We carefully examined the ICOMOS report and the response of the State Party to the ICOMOS evaluation. Pertaining to the combination of the philosophy of the 16 components of the nomination mentioned by ICOMOS, the delegation of Azerbaijan thinks that this combination philosophy is well justified.

The nomination is composed of gates, bridges, temples, mosques and many other monuments; they combine to form the serial property as a set of monument sites that feature diverse physical forms and significance and exhibit the historical functional attributes of ancient Quanzhou. These interrelated components demonstrate cultural representativeness, mutual attraction, complimenting within the context of interchange of diverse cultures, infrastructure, necessary for such interchange and significant achievements and contributions that occurred over a long period, for centuries.

This component supports a logical serial combination with their respective forms, features, growth and significance. There are, therefore, indispensable and irreplaceable. As this is integral evidence to testify to an interchange of diverse civilisations and cultures, the serial nomination steers interrelated functional elements and causal relationships necessary for exchanges among civilisations, and thus presents a unique cultural phenomenon and combination of philosophy and also contributes to the spirit of this Convention and the UNESCO values in general.

It is an integral whole that typically reflects the social, cultural and functional needs as required for a serial property in article 137 of the Operational Guidelines. Therefore, Azerbaijan is in the view that this nomination should be referred back to the State Party and we encourage the State Party to work with the Advisory Bodies to address those recommendations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, you have the floor.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, the delegation of Uganda has closely examined the nomination dossier and the evaluation of ICOMOS and finds that this serial property demonstrates exceptional capacity for Outstanding Universal Value. Each of the 16 components of the property are by themselves extraordinary in their own individualism; monasteries and stone pagodas which testify their combined influence on Buddhism, Hinduism and local beliefs, including the unique sculpture of Mani, still worshipped by the local people, as well as the Islamic tombs which possess two renowned followers of the prophet Mohamed. All of which demonstrate the peaceful coexistence and the prosperous interaction between different characters and religions in the 10-14th centuries when Quanzhou played a pivotal role in the maritime trading networks.

My delegation notes that there seems to be some misunderstanding between ICOMOS and the State Party. The evaluation of ICOMOS is more concerned about the thematic study on the Maritime Silk Road while the State Party considers the Maritime Silk Road as a context for the nominated serial property which demonstrates the interchange and fusion of diverse cultures and civilisations resulting from maritime trade.

As pointed out several times by many Committee members from the beginning of this session, we need to strengthen the dialogue between the State Parties and the Advisory Bodies. My delegation therefore agrees with the delegations of Tunisia, Kuwait, Zimbabwe and Azerbaijan to refer the nomination back to the State Party so that additional information could be provided to ICOMOS to clarify the misunderstanding.

Madam Chair, I conclude with a humble request that you accord the State Party of China the opportunity to provide its response to the concerns of ICOMOS. I thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The nomination of this site, which is made up of 16 different components, is without a doubt a very interesting and complete nomination. The Advisory Bodies in their report recognised the efforts that have been made by the State Party in the Tentative List of China as well as its effort to have this property inscribed on the World Heritage List. Taking into account the actions of the State Party to try and promote the Outstanding Universal Value of this site, we believe that this nomination should be referred to the State Party.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Brazil endorses the amendment to Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.18. Brazil also thanks ICOMOS and the Secretariat for the summary reports on the nomination of the Historic Monuments and Sites in Ancient Quanzhou. The nomination by the State Party of China contains historical buildings with different technologies linked to the time of high activities in Quanzhou’s history and bearing witness to the intense exchange of culture, knowledge, technology and trade. The serial property represents the most significant characteristics permanent in cultural and good exchanges from the 10 to the 14th centuries, including the evidence of Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism, Islam, Manichaeism, Hinduism and local belief systems.

The nomination proposed has a high potential of Outstanding Universal Value, as, if I am not mistaken, recognised by ICOMOS. The ICOMOS report anticipates as a methodology the thematic studies on the Maritime Silk Road and takes notes of the insufficiency in this respect. It is positive on the high potential of nomination as well as its boundaries and buffer zones and the state of conservation.

Brazil therefore, thinks that the nomination is a good embodiment of UNESCO’s values of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. In the spirit of encouragement and conservation, Brazil supports the Tunisian amendment of the decision to referral of the nomination to the State Party for further dialogue with the Advisory Bodies in order to demonstrate its Outstanding Universal Value.

If you allow me madam, as a general comment, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the need for an in-depth analysis of the procedures and conceptual framework of serial nominations. We understand that broader discussion should be fostered in order to produce some new technical input for both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies as well as to the State Party in the context of the preparation and presentation of nominations and in the subsequent management of the enlisted sites, with a view to adequately assuring the Outstanding Universal Value.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, Angola, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente pour la parole. Après avoir examiné avec attention le rapport présenté par l'ICOMOS sur la proposition d'inscription de l'ancien Quanzhou, nous pouvons dire que nous sommes devant un bien d'une grande importance historique en illustrant bien le réseau de routes commerciales maritimes qui a facilité les échanges entre l'Europe et l'Asie du X^e au XIV^e siècles.

Bien que certains ajustements et approfondissements méritent d'être apportés dans la proposition d'inscription présentée par l'État partie relative à l'analyse comparative, nous avons constaté que les attributs potentiels et justifiants la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien sont présents, notamment en ce qui concerne les critères (iii) et (vi) qui démontrent le caractère multiculturel de l'histoire de Quanzhou. Ces valeurs sont mises en évidence par la richesse et la diversité de tous les chefs-d'œuvre de l'architecture en pierre de l'artisanat de l'ancien Quanzhou et par les pratiques traditionnelles exceptionnelles à travers le mode de production et de vie local lié aux exploitations maritimes, le respect mutuel, l'intégration et la cohésion sociale qui concourent à la culture de la paix dans cette région.

Madame la présidente, au regard de ce que nous venons d'exposer, nous appuyons pleinement le projet de décision amendé par la Tunisie et recommandons que la proposition d'inscription présentée par l'État partie soit renvoyée pour donner à l'État partie concerné la possibilité de poursuivre ses efforts dans l'amélioration de son dossier en retravaillant les aspects liés à l'intégrité et à la gestion, en développant ce dialogue transnational recommandé en collaboration avec le Comité du patrimoine mondial l'ICOMOS et d'autres parties intéressées.

Je vous remercie madame la présidente. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Bosnia”

Bosnie- Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Nous considérons que le bien proposé justifie les critères (ii), (iii) et (vi). La place importante du port de Zayton en relation avec les routes maritimes de la soie a permis le développement d'une civilisation urbaine particulière entre les X^e et XIV^e siècles dont sont témoins les vestiges qui composent le bien en série et qui sont dans un état de conservation remarquable. Nous pensons que cela serait suffisant pour justifier le critère (iii).

Les composantes proposées pour l'inscription montrent par ailleurs la coexistence et l'interaction entre plusieurs cultures et religions. Les critères (ii) et (vi) sont ainsi à notre avis justifiés. Nous ne pouvons pas partager l'avis de l'ICOMOS qu'avec cette candidature il faut attendre une étude thématique sur les Routes maritimes de la soie. Comme nos collègues de Koweït nous voudrions rappeler qu'une étude a déjà été faite dans le cadre du projet UNESCO d'étude des Routes de la soie, Routes du dialogue 1988-1997, sur laquelle on

travaillé 85 experts de 25 pays et cette étude a déjà reconnu l'importance exceptionnelle de l'ancien Quanzhou.

Par conséquent, la Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient l'amendement présenté en proposant l'adoption d'une décision de renvoi. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you Madam Chair. The State Party has nominated a property as an independent city that flourished during the Song and Yuan dynasties. Taking into account the evaluation done by the Advisory Bodies which we would like to commend, Indonesia is of the view that the site deserves to be included in the World Heritage List and along with this inclusion we would recommend that the nomination be referred back to the State Party.

We encourage the State Party to come up with a clear plan to refine the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value, more precise definition of the boundaries and buffer zones, to strengthen the coordination of management between the components of the serial property and consider stronger engagement of maritime and port organisation within the management system. We also encourage the State Party to maintain close work with the Advisory Bodies and explore possibilities of further conserving the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chairperson. Tanzania wishes to thank the State Party of China for coming up with this wonderful nomination that demonstrates a prominent node in the maritime trading route in the 10 and 14th centuries. Tanzania also commends the Advisory Bodies for the in-depth analysis of this nomination, which has resulted in a number of recommendations before this Committee. The serial property consists of 16 components that are proposed for nomination, representing the dual cultural influence and the intercultural exchanges between China, Southeast Asia and East Africa.

Chair, the Advisory Bodies and ICOMOS in their analysis considered that criterion (ii) is relevant to the importance of cultural interchange that occurred during the transcontinental maritime trading in the 10th to 14th centuries. However, they are saying that not all the components are relevant in this nomination. The present identification by the State Party on criteria (iii) is not well-integrated into the argument for the Outstanding Universal Value and too little information is presented to sustain this as a possible identification for the criteria. The cultural characteristic period of Quanzhou history is potentially demonstrated by the nominated components and can be assessed in various regions but there is not sufficient evidence to establish these criteria.

Excellency Chair, Tanzania, having reviewed the analysis of ICOMOS, noted that criteria (ii) could be used to nominate the nomination as would criteria (iii). However, there is some work to be done before we can conclude this nomination. We, therefore, the Tanzanian delegation, wish to conclude by allowing the State Party, in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, to be given adequate time to further work on the interesting nomination dossier by referring the nomination back to the State Party.

Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia has the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia also appreciates the very large amount of work that has gone into this nomination and we do consider that this work illustrates the great significance of the city as a node of international maritime trade and in the network of international trade from the 10th until the 14th centuries. We also agree that the 16 components of the nominated sites are remarkable and illustrate the architectural and sculptural forms shaping the cultural and religious diversity of the City.

We would like to thank ICOMOS for their evaluation of the nomination dossier and in particular for taking the thematic approach that they have to identify potential Outstanding Universal Value.

We do consider on the basis of the information we have been presented that there is a potential for this property to demonstrate Outstanding Universal Value against criteria (ii) and (iii). However, further clarification of the potential Outstanding Universal Value and of its attributes is needed. For this reason, Australia considers that the decisions to defer the nomination is logical, to allow the State Party to work with ICOMOS to further define the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the site.

However, on hearing the comments of our distinguished colleagues in the room, we see that there is a move for referral of this dossier. Australia can support the amendment presented.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary has the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you Chairperson. Regarding this nomination, Ancient Quanzhou was the centred of maritime silk road connections between China and the western world in the 11th-14th centuries CE. The significance of the site therefore does not raise any questions or doubts. The nomination dossier elaborated and submitted explains this fact. It is also to be emphasised that Quanzhou was in this period a very important meeting place, used for religious practice and different cultures, as proven by the great number of shrines, sanctuaries and temples of Hinduism, Buddhism, Confucianism and other beliefs.

However, the nomination has some deficiencies regarding the successful definition of the Outstanding Universal Value, as well as the full description and evaluation of the

connections between the property and the Silk Road Programme, with special attention on the thematic study. Despite these deficiencies and according to the Hungarian delegations, the Outstanding Universal Value could be proven by the State Party, therefore Hungary recommends that the decision should not be of non-inscriptions but deferral or referral and the committee should provide the State Party the possibility to work further on the nomination.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, you have the floor.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The delegation of Kyrgyzstan carefully studied all the documents provided with the nomination and also studied information exchange between the State Party and ICOMOS. In order to save time, I will not repeat what has been already said by distinguished delegates of other countries at the Committee session.

We would just like to mention that the selection of components meets criteria (ii), (iii) and (vi) and also we should note that the selected components retain a high degree of authenticity and integrity over the history, as clearly evidenced by historical documents, inscriptions and archives. The state of monuments and sites are under the highest level of protection by the State Party. The serial nomination is protected and managed in accordance with international professional rules and procedures. All repair practices comply with the spirit and the requirements expressed in the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention.

Therefore our delegation supports the amendment proposed by other countries.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Guatemala, you have the floor.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. We congratulate the State Party for the nomination and we also thank ICOMOS for the analysis regarding this nomination and the encouragement of the State Party to continue working on the thematic theme of the Maritime Silk Route. We have no doubts about the historical and architectural wealth of this property, and it also bears witness to different belief systems and intercultural phenomena of the past.

Indeed, we cannot doubt cultural diversity as a tool for a dialogue for peace. We therefore, support the amendment and hope that the State Party will continue working towards improving this nomination, working alongside experts so they can fully respect the recommendations that the Advisory Bodies have communicated to the State Party.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you, madam Chair. Norway would like to take this opportunity to commend the State Party for the excellent management of World Heritage in China. In this regard, with good Chinese tradition, we are convinced that the State Party will continue to keep doing so in the future. We also commend the State Party for its highly valuable contributions to capacity building and other ways of promoting protection and good management of World Heritage in the Asia-Pacific region and worldwide.

Even though the State Party has recently provided important additional information to the Committee on the nomination in question, ICOMOS still has several remarks. Based on the information thus far, it is Norway’s view, like Australia and Hungary, that a more comprehensive description of this nomination could still be further developed. Norway therefore supports the amendment for referral and encourages the State Party to continue the constructive dialogue with the Advisory Bodies.

Norway welcomes and encourages the thematic study on the Maritime Silk Route commenced a year ago and the potential for serial World Heritage nominations within such a frame. Hopefully, the State Party will continue its significant support and contribution to this important study in collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. We simply wish to support the amendment that has been presented by the other delegations because we think that the State Party needs to be given time to be able to go further with proving the Outstanding Universal Value of this property. We also believe that the Advisory Bodies are ready to support them in this in order for them to reach the objective.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to China to answer questions.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. As many distinguished colleagues have mentioned, the Ancient Historical Monuments and Sites of Quanzhou or Zayton is a serial property that features outstanding achievements and the contributions from the interchange of several cultures both tangible and intangible through the maritime route of the 10th until the 14th centuries. The serial property also has maintained a high level of integrity and authenticity within the framework of diversity.

However, in its report, ICOMOS has set nomination preconditions for this project, data not supported by the existing World Heritage rules and practices. These must be included with the integral thematic study on Ancient International Maritime Trade associated with the nomination under the attributes and the features of the nomination as an ancient port and the node of cultural interchange and urban fabric. It seems that ICOMOS in its evaluation report does not fully consider the commonly used way which is indeed the logical and practical way of presenting water heritage sites that feature as monumental sites.

Furthermore, ICOMOS' evaluation report also questions the authenticity and character of the nomination with ambiguous arguments that are not supported by the country's information and related analysis. ICOMOS even seemed to neglect the fact that some major restoration work was carried out in the 10th to the 14th centuries, but did not include the modern period.

The comparative analysis by the State Party of other sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List has already been done, but ICOMOS in its evaluation report stated that the comparative analysis is needed, as the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value were not demonstrated. This would mean that ICOMOS acknowledges the fact that these monuments have an Outstanding Universal Value that can be demonstrated, but we need to wait for completion of the thematic study of the Maritime Road. This confuses us. I apologise for repeating comments already made.

We believe that the evaluation mission sent by ICOMOS had importantly identified some gaps in the interim report but we answered these requirements and we do not understand what they meant. When can ICOMOS make that link with the thematic study? The State Party asks the Committee to re-examine. We are sorry to have to do so.

Thank you again."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur with regard to the amendment."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you, madam Chair. I have received amendments on this draft decision presented by Angola, Azerbaijan, Bosnia, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Cuba, Guatemala, Indonesia, Kyrgyzstan, Tunisia, Tanzania and Zimbabwe. As you know, the original draft decision proposed that this property should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage. The presented amendment proposes that this nomination be referred back to the State Party.

As such the draft decision that you can see on the screen right now is amended and details what additional information would be requested from the State Party and it also contains two new paragraphs with further recommendations to the State Party as well as to the World Heritage Centre to give special attention towards the preparation of the comprehensive Thematic Study on the Maritime Silk Road in collaboration with the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you very much madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Azerbaijan please, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have just as small precision in paragraph 2b where instead of ‘*define*’ we would like to propose ‘*describe*’ which will fully comply with the recommendation and the evaluation report of ICOMOS. This word ‘*describe*’ was reflected in the evaluation report of ICOMOS, so we would like to keep it, as it was in the ICOMOS report.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? No. So we can replace the word. Can we adopt the whole decision? I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.18 adopted.

The floor is to Ms. Rössler to clarify some points.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you Madam Chair. I have heard a question or comment from Brazil on the issue of serial nominations and sites. I would like to inform the Committee that there have been reflections on this topic, the so-called interim report, which is actually on our webpage, but it is a couple of years old. You have experienced quite a number of new serial nominations and serial transboundary nominations which came in from 12 countries.

I think the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre would be very happy to continue the reflection with the Committee to encompass some of the concerns that were raised here in the Committee. I see China would like to take the floor before the announcement.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China appreciates and commends the decision adopted by the Committee. China expresses its sincere gratitude to the members and experts of the World Heritage Committee for their scientific spirit, professionalism and impartiality.

As stated in the dossier submitted by China, the project is to understand the Outstanding Universal Value required by the World Heritage List and the values it carries are not only important for historical significance but also of positive relevance to the world today. China is ready to engage in dialogue and strengthen cooperation with the Advisory Bodies in order to inscribe this important nomination in the World Heritage List at its earliest possible date.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you so much. Now we have the announcement.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair. Tonight at 6:30 pm you have the Making of the Policy Compendium, which is in room Muharraq and at 6:30 pm also the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve Systems, the power of collective action, in room Hawar, which follows the great success of the removal of the Belize Barrier Reef from the in Danger List and as usual we have the bureau tomorrow at 9:30 am.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Today’s session has come to an end. We will see you tomorrow.”

SIXTH DAY – Saturday 30 June 2018

TENTH SESSION

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Could you please all sit, as we do not have much time and we have ahead of us 24 reports. Please be seated. Good morning to all; we start the proceedings and continue with the inscriptions. As said, we have 24 nominations to review today and I can see that Spain would like the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. In a spirit of facilitating our discussions, as we look at these nominations, I should like to offer a general remark given that a lot of the documentation that we receive actually tells of major changes and not only amendments, as provided for by the guidelines. Sometimes, we really are given documents that could even be considered as newly submitted in support of nomination.

The State Parties that give us these documents, could they explain why they have done so and then we can optimise our short time when we review them? Also, when the State Parties have a chance, could they also explain some of the technical rationales behind any new documentation?

What we are doing in this Committee in article 23 of the Operational Guidelines? We are here to look at the technical aspects in great details and other aspects of a nomination. We are hoping to achieve a consensus which should come after a discussion on the technical issues under consideration. If we make changes in opinions or opinions that differ from the experts, it is through those relevant discussions that we will be able to reach a consensus. And consensus has always been our *modus operandi* at UNESCO and in this governing body.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“I have to say as a newcomer to this Committee, Norway finds it very challenging to work under the circumstances we experienced. It was emphasised in the opening of this meeting that we should indeed try to follow the requirements of rule 32 of the Rules of procedure. As things are progressing, we find it very challenging to work in line to what is expected from us according to paragraph 23 of the Operational Guidelines stating that ‘*our decisions should be based on scientific and objective considerations*’.

Cases are open late, amendments are coming late with significant changes. I need to ask: do we really understand the consequences of our decisions? I fear that we do not, at least on our behalf. Therefore, we strongly echo the wise intervention from the distinguished representative of Spain.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Good morning, I just wanted to support the comments made by our distinguished colleagues from Spain and Norway. We do not think that we can go on with submissions of draft amendments and so on, to be proofed the way we are working. Indeed, it is very important that we are able to reflect deeply on the decisions we are taking so that we understand the future implications of them.

On a very small point, when it does come to the consideration of amendments, we would very much appreciate it if we could scroll more slowly through major amendments at the end, so that we all have the opportunity to read them and understand clearly, as they have not all come to us.

Just in the spirit of early notifications, I just wanted to indicate that Australia is working on some proposed amendments to the decision in relation to Sites of Memory and we will bring forward with Belgium and France amendments for the deferral of consideration of that property as opposed to the postponement as is suggested at the moment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I see no other interventions. Let us start today’s agenda. I am sorry I did not see Brazil. Please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I would like to express that the Brazilian delegation shares the concerns expressed by Spain, Norway and Australia. In the sense that it is very difficult to re-analyse a whole new draft minutes before the discussion of the item and it is also very difficult for experts as they have analysed the draft decision before coming and taken a position and when they arrive here, they are confronted with a completely new text, with changes of criteria for the inscription or changes of the basis for the inscription of a certain item.

We would very much like to bring this to your consideration. It is important that countries that make those new amendments or not amendments, but new draft decisions could be able to explain, so that our experts could better understand what the motivations are.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. As there are no further interventions for the floor, we will start our agenda items. We start with India. I give the floor to ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai, India.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The nominated property is located in the south of Mumbai; it comprises an urban ensemble of 94 historic buildings of 19th century Victorian Gothic and the early 20th-century Art Deco, with the open green space of the Oval Maidan. They represent modernisation endeavours in architectural development planning to turn the city into a commercial hub.

The properties include Indo-Saracenic and Edwardian neoclassical buildings to the north of the Oval Maidan and to the east and south a Victorian Gothic group. The other core buildings extend to a road along Marine Drive. The nominated ensemble is surrounded by a buffer zone which also encompasses the Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus, World Heritage property.

The erection of the nominated urban ensemble was made possible first by the demolition of the fortifications in the 1860s, which freed land for development and marked the transformation of the city from a fortified outpost into a world-class commercial centre. The Backbay Reclamation Scheme in the early 20th century offered another opportunity for the City to expand with other residential cores, commercial and entertainment buildings and the creation of Marine Drive.

The property has been nominated as it represents an unparalleled ensemble of Victorian and other core buildings, creating a formidable architecture dialectic influencing the narrative of modernism in Asia with a distinct architecture change, western in form and Indian-inspired.

After the reception of the interim report, the State Party has submitted further information that complements the justification for the Outstanding Universal Value. This urban ensemble of Victorian and other core buildings created a distinct entity, an urban response to the growth of the trade in the colonial city by the sea. The selected criteria are (ii) and (iv).

Indeed, the comparative analysis has demonstrated that the Victorian Gothic and the Art Deco ensemble exhibited an important exchange of views of European and Indian human values over a span of time. The additional information, sent in February, 2018, clarified the connection of these two ensembles, styles and patterns of buildings, as both parts of two major urban expansions and the modernisation of the city. Criterion (iv) is justified through the architectural style, construction materials and techniques, urban planning philosophies. These ensembles are witness to the development of Mumbai from a small coastal fort to a prominent commercial city, a global financial capital and the gateway to India.

Following clarification from the State Party, ICOMOS considers that the nominated property includes all elements necessary to express the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. However the speed of urban growth may visually compromise the property. The nominated property can be said to retain its authenticity in terms of forms, designs and functions. However, no written records of the history of modification for each building have been made available to understand the transformation they pass through and would be needed in the future.

The legal protection of the property and buffer zones is based on the statute of the government of Maharashtra's Heritage Regulation for Greater Mumbai and the fort and the Marine Drive precincts are protected as heritage precincts. All proposals for changes and development must be screened by the Heritage Conservation Committee. This also applies to the CESS buildings, as confirmed by additional information sent by the State Party in February of 2018. Explanation records of the work of the Heritage Conservation Committee, however, would need to be further detailed for the future.

Management relies on the existing mechanism section 62 of Greater Mumbai Development Plan implemented by the Heritage Conservation Committee. A Management Plan exists. However, clarifications would be needed on the implementing structure and tools.

In summary: The comparative analysis has proved that the Outstanding Universal Value and the criteria have been demonstrated; integrity and authenticity are met with caveats concerning urban pressure. The rationale for the delineation of the boundary has been clarified and now appears adequate. Legal protection is in place and implemented, although not sufficiently documented. Conservation can be considered overall fair, although some buildings need urgent measures. Management exists and some clarifications, as explained before, would be needed, confirming organisation and staffing levels.

ICOMOS therefore considers and recommends the nominated property is inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (ii) and (iv) and there are some additional recommendations on protection, conservation and management. ICOMOS finally recommends changing the name of the property into the Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble, Mumbai.

Thank you."

The Chairperson

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments from the experts? Are there any comments from the members of the Committee? Norway, you have the floor."

Norway:

"Thank you very madam Chairperson. Let me start by congratulating India and the City of Mumbai for this magnificent nomination that will place Mumbai's vital role in history. We find, however, that it could be useful if ICOMOS could explain to the Committee how this nomination relates to the World Heritage site of the Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus and whether it would be relevant in the future to consider whether the Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus could be included in the World Heritage site of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai.

I asked for this because that site is inscribed with the same criteria and it could seem that the building already inscribed could very well fit in as a serial component of the nomination we have in front of us.

Mumbai's role in the world and as a trading centre that binds west and east together in two significant and different periods in our history is clearly demonstrated in this property and we have to welcome this nomination.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia supports the inscription of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai. We were very appreciative of the clarity of the nomination, especially the clarity with which the history and development of the property is presented and the systematic description of the various architectural components in both written and visual material. This clearly justifies how the value of the property has reflected in the fabric of this distinctive architectural heritage. We congratulate the State Party of India.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. The current dossier pays tribute to the modernisation phase of Mumbai when to highlight the important exchange of culture and human valour the combination of this explained in the gorgeous building of Art Deco style which spread all over the Indian subcontinent, reflecting more than two centuries of the influence in architecture and urban planning.

The Brazilian delegation is very pleased with the inscription of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai and would like to convey congratulations to the State Party of India for the successful nomination of the magnificent cultural site.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, you have the floor.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Comme les autres collègues, nous voudrions aussi féliciter l'État partie pour l'excellent dossier et pour dire que nous serons honorés que ce magnifique patrimoine soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe joins other colleagues in congratulating the State Party of India for the well-deserved achievement of its inscription of this property, the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai, under criteria (ii) and (iv). We think this property is a good addition to the World Heritage List and we would like to encourage the State Party to continue working with the Advisory Bodies to implement the recommendations

relating to boosting the work of the Heritage Conservation Committee in order to maintain the good work and management that they have shown on this site.

Zimbabwe congratulates India. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The nomination reflects the solid studies and concise justifications that the State Party has carried out in respect to the property that bears Outstanding Universal Value. China supports the inscription of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie souhaite féliciter l'État partie d'avoir présenté un dossier de si grande qualité. L'Ensemble victorien et art déco de Mumbai est un exemple de très bonne facture de présentation qualitative et il témoigne aussi de la très belle circulation des modèles architecturaux et artistiques et dans un très bel état de conservation, et témoigne aussi d'un grand effort d'appropriation et de compréhension par l'État partie. La Tunisie souhaite les féliciter d'avoir présenté un dossier de si haute facture ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, you have the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis wishes to associate itself with the comments made by Norway, Australia and others and congratulates the State Party of India on the inscription of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai under criteria (ii) and (iv). We note the excellent work done by the State Party and encourage India to consider the recommendations of ICOMOS as outlined in the draft decision.

Thank you, Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. First of all, we would like to congratulate India for the inscription of this prosperity and for their undertaken work. This is a nomination which will enrich the List as it is included both in terms of the typology of the property and also the 19th and 20th centuries’ urbanisation processes and all of this in a context of outstanding significance.

Here, we see the mix of European and local expertise and in Mumbai it goes even further than other Asian sites, where you see issues of development, identity and all of this has been adequately protected over the recent years thanks to the protective measures in place.

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please Hungary, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary would like to congratulate the State Party for the successful nomination dossier for the work done to prove the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. The Victorian and 20th-century Art Deco buildings of Mumbai represent not only a significant architectural ensemble in this region but also the cultural and economic relations in this era in the region and in the world.

The conservation and management of the property seem to be adequate and under the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv) the inscription is justified. The State Party should follow the instructions of the Advisory Bodies.

Let me congratulate it again for this success. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would like to join the previous speakers in congratulating the State Party for this perfect nomination which indeed represents the very essence of the Art Deco architectural style. We would like to encourage the State Party to put in place all the protective safeguarding measures of this indeed excellent heritage site. We would like, at the end, to congratulate the State Party for the inscription.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, Tanzania joins hands with the other States Parties in conveying our warm congratulations to the State Party on the nomination of this unique site. Indeed, the interaction of European and Indian human values and their development in architecture and urban planning have over time laid solid bases for the Outstanding Universal Value of this property.

In order to maintain the already-existing Outstanding Universal Value of this property, we wish to encourage the State Party to take note of the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies, including the completion of the 2013 inventory and revival of the Art Deco Eros Cinema. Finally, madam Chair, we fully support the draft decision to inscribe this property in the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv). Once again, congratulations India.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. To answer questions I give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. There was only one question, from the delegate of Norway, regarding whether this property could be seen in relation to the Victorian Terminus of Chhatrapati Shivaji. The ICOMOS panel has discussed this aspect at length. Although the criteria are the same and could be seen as similar, in fact the nominated property includes an urban dimension which is not part of the previous inscribed property and also encompasses Art Deco buildings. So, we do have two phases that reflect one urban design developed in different phases and this could not be considered applicable to the Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus.

In consideration of the fact that serial properties need to reflect the full scope and phases of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value, the ICOMOS panel considered that this was not the case in this particular nomination and that would probably have complicated the understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value of the Chhatrapati Shivaji terminus and that of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai. I hope I have clarified ICOMOS’ position.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to France as an Observer.”

France :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ma délégation souhaiterait simplement féliciter l'Inde d'avoir déposé ce dossier et de l'avoir poussé jusqu'au bout. C'est un magnifique dossier qui prouve tout ce que les grandes puissances ont apporté au monde au XIX^e siècle, les traces qu'elles ont laissées à travers la planète, et surtout, que nous sommes là en quelque sorte pour reconnaître ce qui dans la civilisation mondiale interdépendante, il y a de valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Encore une fois, un grand bravo à l'Inde pour ce magnifique dossier ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to our Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good morning to all distinguished colleagues. We have not received any amendments on this draft decision. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“As there were no amendments, I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.19 adopted. On your behalf I congratulate India and I give them the floor.”

India:

“Thank you madam Chairperson, *namaste*. As India takes the floor for the first time in this 42nd session we would like to commend you, madam Chairperson, on your efficient supervision of this Committee and offer our special thanks to our gracious host, the Kingdom of Bahrain, for its excellent hospitality.

On behalf of the government of India the government of Maharashtra and the citizens of Mumbai, this delegation of India would like to thank the Committee of the World Heritage Centre, the Secretariat and ICOMOS for their invaluable efforts towards the inscription of the Victorian and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai to the List of UNESCO World Heritage.

We take note of the observations made during the evaluation and assure the Committee that these will be given due consideration by the State Party. We also accept the change to the name of the proposed site to Victorian Gothic and Art Deco Ensemble of Mumbai with the assessment that the site represents a dialogue between the two different architectural styles, the 19th century Victorian Gothic and the 20th century Art Deco.

The City of Mumbai, with over 15 million people, has, over the last century or two, emerged as India's financial capital, the gateway city, the city of Indian cinema, of Bollywood and now the city with three World Heritage properties. We would like to dedicate this inscription to the proud citizens of Mumbai, Mumbaikars, who have always put great value on their heritage and work consistently to protect it.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now we will move to the Islamic Republic of Iran and the site of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars Region. I give the floor to ICOMOS to present this nomination, but before the floor is to Mr. Balsamo on behalf of the Secretariat.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to remind you that we received a factual error notification concerning the nomination of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars Region which is to be found on page 38 of document INF.8B.4 in the English version and on page 43 of that French.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars Region includes fortification structures, palaces, relics and city plans that date back to the Sassanid Empire, which spread in the region and dates back from 424 to 650 CE. It is a serial nomination of eight selected archaeological site components in three geographical areas: Firuzabad, Bishapur and Sarvestan, all located to the south-western Fars province of Iran.

The overall nominated area encompasses 693 hectares. The northernmost of the Firuzabad component is Qaleh Dokhtar, a fortification to the northern entrance of the valley which was selected as a stronghold by Ardashir Papakan, the founder of the Sassanid Empire, when preparing its revolt against the Persian kings.

The second serial component illustrates stone bas-reliefs with dimensions of 3.5 x 7 metres, which depict Ardashir’s investiture by Ohrmazd, the Zoroastrian creator God, who is standing behind and investing Ardashir over a fire altar. In the vicinity are the remains of a bridge described by the State Party as the best example of Sasanian masonry from the 5th century.

At the southern end of the Tang-i Ab valley, here forming a gorge, is the third site component, a rock carved bas-relief of Ardashir’s victory. Leaving the gorge southwards onto the open plain, one finds the remains of Ardashir’s capital city, Ardashir Khurreh. This circular city was constructed in a previously swampy area, created through water transfer from Tang-i Ab River.

At Ardashir Khurreh are the archaeological remains of a city laid out in a perfect circle with a diameter of close to 2 km, divided into twenty equal sectors by means of a precise geometric system of twenty radials and several concentric streets. It was surrounded by a defensive wall, a 35 metre wide ditch and another outer wall. The circular city expanded beyond its walls into the wider setting. The radials, consisting of traces of canals, paths, walls, and field boundaries continue up to 10 km from the central tower. The serial component of Ardashir’s Palace is located on one of these three axes, two kilometres from the capital city.

The remains of the key city created by Ardashir’s successor, Shapur I (reigned 243-273 CE), named Bishapur (the city of Shapur), are located about 100 km west of Shiraz. The remains of the rectangular city with orthogonal streets and four gates covering an area of 155 hectares. The settlement was surrounded by two walls; one which encircled the royal quarter in the west of the city and a significant defensive rampart which encircled the entire settlement. All architectural structures were built using stone, lime and gypsum mortar. Much of this Sasanian City, however, has been built upon during the Islamic era, so that very few areas have been excavated which visibly testify to the Sassanid era.

In the narrow gorge close to the city one finds seven rock-carved stone reliefs depicting different scenes and portraits. The gorge ultimately leads to Shapur’s Cave, the second site component in the Bishapur group. This cave exhibits a 6.7-metre-high statue of Shapur I, carved out of a stalagmite formed *in situ*.

The third archaeological group consists of only one component, the eighth and last site component of this nomination, Sarvestan monument. This monument was originally also considered to be early Sassanid. However, radiocarbon samples undertaken date it to the Late 7th, mid 8th and late 9th centuries respectively. This leads to the conclusion that it illustrates transitional architecture at the end of the Sassanian and, more predominantly, beginning of the Islamic era illustrating the continued use of Sassanid- inspired designs in the Islamic era.

ICOMOS concludes that the property does not currently meet any of the criteria nor integrity based on too-narrow boundaries and the composition of the series. However, ICOMOS notes that a reduced series specifically excluding the Sarvestan monuments could have the potential to meet criteria (iii) and (v). In terms of conservation and management conditions, ICOMOS observes that several components are very fragile with a state of conservation at times critical and requiring immediate attention. ICOMOS also observes that the boundaries are by no means sufficient to reflect the notion of an archaeological landscape, as they do not include important attributes of value concepts in the topographical surroundings of the archaeological sites.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the Sassanid Archaeological Site of the Fars region be deferred to the State Party to exclude the Sarvestan monuments from the proposed series and expand the property boundaries to reflect the important topographic setting of the property. ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party undertake further geographical surveys and establish a comprehensive monitoring system for the property.

Thank you very much madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. Are there any comments or questions? Spain, please, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The Sassanid archaeological landscape of the Fars region has a great cultural personality and it was a great contribution to the world’s civilisation through the representation of the ability to integrate several architectures and planning on the use of territory and water into a natural context in that region, the cradle of the Sassanids, one of the most powerful dynasties in the ancient world that governed a lot of Asia from the 3rd until the 7th centuries.

This site shows the creation of a notion of this civilisation that made contributions to the Islamic culture and also influenced the cultural transitions and cultural interchange with Roman architecture as well as the influence of urban planning in the Islamic area. This is a perfect example of the strength of architecture and of the Sassanid religious tradition in the early Islamic period through sculpture and other elements.

The delegation of the Kingdom Spain considers that the clarifications and the comments provided by the State Party offset some of the objections raised in the ICOMOS document; therefore, Spain considers inscribing this property under criteria (ii), (iii) and (v) to the List of the World Heritage. We presented an amendment to that effect.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Australia considers that the nominated Sassanid archaeological landscape of the Fars region is outstanding and pays exceptional testimony to the Sassanid civilisation. We agree with ICOMOS’ finding that the serial components of the property do not project the complete range of the Sassanid Empire but we are satisfied that the components nominated do reflect the architectural forms and designs that pay testimony to the Sassanid Empire.

We do recognise that there are other important Sassanid sites in Fars that have not been included in the region. But it is noted in the ICOMOS report that the property does include Firuzabad and Bishapur which are key sites relating to the establishment of the Sassanid empire.

We agree with the findings of ICOMOS that the eight archaeological components of the property as nominated cannot be considered as an exceptional landscape under criterion (v) and that criterion (iv) has not been clearly justified. We do, however, consider that there is a case for inscription of the property under criteria (ii) and (iii) and support the inscription of the property on this basis.

Authenticity varies across the components of the site. Restorations in the past have been undertaken using inappropriate material and we urge the State Party to ensure that conservation activities are undertaken in consultation with specialists and use proper materials and techniques and that further reconstruction on any of the components be avoided. Legal protection is adequate and includes regulations to manage development in the core and buffer zones. However, a comprehensive management plan is needed for the property and needs to include a monitoring system.

We have submitted amendments that reflect these concerns, but also our support for inscription of the property on criteria (ii) and (iii). Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Sassanid Empire created one of the most remarkable links in history between the west and the east from the 3rd until the 7th CE. It has to be underlined that the nomination covers part of the Fars region and not the entire territory of the empire. Although this region was the birth place of the Sassanid Empire, the nomination only intends to cover the first period of the Sassanid culture. However, at the heart of the nominated site at the most important time in the early period when fortresses and towns were built there might be a discrepancy in the consistence and structure of the nomination.

However, Hungary believes that this slight inconsistency is on the one side not significant and on the other side an optical illusion. It is clear and proven that significant influence and architectural knowledge have been taken over and redefined by the Sassanid Empire. First of all, from the classical work of the Roman Empire, the cultural interaction between the two empires and later that of the Eastern or Byzantine Roman Empire is one of

the most significant elements of the nomination. Even only by taking this fact into account, the proposed property for Hungary seems to fulfil the requirements of the Outstanding Universal Value.

According to the first evaluation of the Advisory Bodies, although the Qal'eh Dokhtar reliefs should have been incorporated in the nomination, it is a different acceptable approach on how to nominate a site of the Sassanid Empire. But according to the delegation of Hungary, the nomination elements of the State Party are also acceptable. Further, the same can be said of the incorporation of Sarvestan in the nomination, because it has proven existence and evolution during the entire Sassanid period under the basis of excavation findings and due to the significant of the Sassanid monuments in early Islamic art.

Hungary is therefore in favour of inscribing the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape and supports the amendments submitted by Australia and other State Parties in order to inscribe it on the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway appreciates the efforts made by the State Party for promoting the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars region. There are certainly good reasons to nominate archaeological monuments and structures on this very important cultural heritage. We take notes of the recommendations from ICOMOS about refocusing the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value, adjustment of the boundaries of the remaining components, combining the serial components of Firuzabad and the two serial components of Bishapur into one site.

Recently, the State Party has given new information about factual errors in the ICOMOS evaluation. It is very positive and important that the State Party informs the Committee members. We consider that misunderstandings easily can arise in the dialogue when evaluations are done.

We consider that there are some important uncertainties concerning the values and the criteria if they are met and we would therefore recommend the Committee to refer the nomination back to the State Party.

We have also looked carefully at the amendments and take note of the differences between them and we would suggest that it might be wise to have a drafting group to look further into the amendment trying to combine them.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The nomination of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars region represents a proposal of a strong culture. It shows the great contribution that the Sassanids provided to civilisation through the representation of its ability to integrate several architectural arts, urban planning, land use and water management in the context of the region of Fars, the cradle of the Sassanid dynasty. The Sassanid Empire was one of the most powerful empires in the ancient world, which ruled vast areas of Asia from the 3rd until the 7th centuries.

Fars is the most adequate of the empire’s regions for illustrating the formation, evolution of the Empire over a span of 400 years of this civilisation. The nominated property also provides evidence of the influence of cultural interchange with Roman arts and architecture as well as a significant impact on urban planning, architecture and art of the Islamic areas. In this respect, Sarvestan is a splendid example of the strength of Sassanid architectural and religious traditions during the early Islamic period.

We consider that the last clarification provided by the State Party responded to the concerns raised by the Advisory Bodies. We would say that the proposed property meets criteria (ii) and (iii) and the authenticity and integrity required.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China agrees with ICOMOS’ conclusion that the nomination has Outstanding Universal Value, especially the first two component areas, demonstrate the unique creation of the early civilisation of the Sassanid Empire. Therefore, for the purpose that this important early period heritage site could gain better identification and conservation, China would like to join the amendments to the draft decision submitted by Spain to support the inscription of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars region onto the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, you have the floor.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The nomination of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape particularly exhibits the important interchange of human values and provide an exceptional representation of the Sassanid innovation and architecture, which had such a strong importance for the development of the architecture of the early Islamic era and the creation of the domed halls represents one of the main heritage legacies of Sassanid civilisation to the cultural World.

This was evidenced in the Sarvestan monument which was excluded by the Advisory Bodies. This monument testifies to the transition from the Sassanid to the Islamic era, being constructed around the end of the dynasty, in the 7-8th centuries. We believe this transitional

phase is equivalently as important as the early stage of the Sassanid Empire and constitutes an import part of the whole story.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie se félicite de cette belle proposition d’inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial des paysages archéologiques de la région de Fars. La Tunisie félicite l’État partie pour cette proposition, car elle vient combler une lacune de la Liste et elle vient renforcer la représentativité de la Liste. Elle permet ainsi d’inclure sur la Liste les témoignages de l’une des plus brillantes civilisations du monde antique.

La Tunisie félicite également l’État partie pour le beau dossier préparé et le travail important réalisé pour présenter sa proposition. Elle prend bonne note et partage un grand nombre des remarques pertinentes d’ICOMOS auquel l’État partie a fourni un certain nombre d’éléments de réponse.

La Tunisie s’associe à la proposition d’amendement de l’Espagne et appuyée par d’autres États parties et demande que l’on donne la parole à l’Iran pour nous apporter plus de précisions aux réponses fournies aux demandes d’ICOMOS.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Brazil considers that the nomination presented by Iran embodies elements of great importance for the understanding of mankind’s civilising process. We further understand that the property presents unequivocal Outstanding Universal Value and supports inscription of the property based on criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (v).

The Brazilian delegation is ready to support the amendment in this regard and recommends that the State Party, in close consultation with ICOMOS, arranges for an Advisory Bodies’ mission with a view to implementing the adjustment regarding the interrelation of the serial components and the relationship with the surrounding landscape, as well as establishing the necessary strategies for the promotion and integrated management of the property.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe supports the proposal to amend the draft decision for the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of the Fars region from deferral to inscription. This is due to the importance of the landscape as one of the most powerful political entities of the ancient world from the 3rd to the 7th centuries CE. For the purposes of management, the State Party has decided to focus on the archaeological sites as a group of sites with the surrounding land now part of areas covered and protected with the buffer zones for these remnants of the former State.

It is important to note that an extensive buffer zone has been proposed that will cover the surrounding lands of the archaeological site of the Sassanid Empire, as required by the Operational Guidelines from Paragraphs 103 to 107. Architecturally, we believe that the property is also significant, as it is a development of the Sassanid architecture with tombs, and other buildings. This satisfies criteria (ii) and (iii) as proposed by the State Party.

The archaeological landscape also provides evidence of cultural traditions in architectural and urban planning knowledge and legitimisation of power, ritual ceremonies and the hierarchy of power. It is important that such major historical matters be conserved as they attest to the development of mankind and are a reminder of past, powerful, political formations in this world.

In addition, we have also noted that the government of the Islamic Republic of Iran has taken adequate measures to ensure the protection and management of the nominated property. Madame Chair, we therefore fully support the amended draft decision to inscribe this site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Tanzania commends the State Party of Iran for coming up with such a rich archaeological site in terms of science, history and culture. Thanks also to the Advisory Bodies for the work undertaken on this particular nomination. This is a serial nomination consisting of archaeological site components in a geographical area context. All the architecture is located in the southeastern Fars province, stretching across the region.

Chair, this Sassanid archaeological site is an example of a site that triggered an important exchange of human values and which presents evidence of cultural traditions and architectural and urban planning knowledge, ritual ceremonies and the hierarchy of power.

Chair, the Tanzanian delegation supports the amended draft decision by Spain seconded by other members to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List on the bases of criteria (ii), (iii) and (v).

Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Guatemala, you have the floor.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. Guatemala welcomes the presentation given by ICOMOS regarding this property which shows very clearly the importance of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape. In agreeing with the proposal, we believe that this is a property which shows very clearly how humans can adapt to a region and indeed, as has been said in the amendment presented by Spain, we can consider that the Sassanid Empire was one of the most powerful and significant civilisations of the ancient world for more than 400 years of history.

It also shows us how human development evolved through the archaeological aspects that we see in this region. We therefore support the amendment proposed by Spain as we believe that this property should be inscribed as it fulfils criteria (ii), (iii) and (v).

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. Cuba is not going to repeat what other States have already said regarding the value of this property. We just wish to say that we support the amendment to inscribe this site on the List. However, we believe that the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies should give some more explanations given the priority is to make immediate conservation activities to preserve this property. We would like to know a little bit more about these management and conservation plans.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le Burkina Faso remercie l'ICOMOS pour les observations faites et félicite l'État partie d'avoir proposé l'inscription de ce site majeur qui favorisera sa valorisation et sa meilleure conservation pour le bonheur de l'humanité tout entière. Je ne vais pas revenir sur les observations que mes prédécesseurs ont déjà présentées concernant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site ainsi que les critères (ii) et (iii) qui sont bien remplis et que l'ICOMOS a particulièrement fait comprendre.

Nous disons simplement que le Burkina est heureux de soutenir l'amendement proposé par l'Espagne pour l'inscription du paysage archéologique sassanide de Fars à partir des critères (ii) et (iii).

Je vous remercie madame la présidente. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, you have the floor.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“We would like to support the amendment put forward by Australia and other members of the Committee and to emphasise the importance of this site, especially for education on architecture, because the majority of Fars’ relics is the subject of architectural education on this architecture of the Sassanids, a part of the Iranian territory today.

What is important for us, we believe, is that it fulfils all the criteria and we would like to emphasise a good collaboration with the Advisory Bodies, the directorate and the State Party in this case. We believe that can also be applied to other cases in the future.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Finally Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much Chair. Uganda is in unison with the submissions of Tanzania, Zimbabwe and all other delegations in support of the amended draft decision to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway’s initial position was to refer this nomination back to the State Party for further elaboration. Now that we have listened carefully to our distinguished colleagues in the Committee, we are ready to join the majority in favour of inscription. But we have two amendments in front of us that differ on the use of criteria. We would like to ask ICOMOS if they could elaborate a bit more about the use of criteria in the two amendments please.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to ICOMOS to explain.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. ICOMOS appreciates the recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value by the honourable Committee members and notes the

general wish to see this property inscribed. I would like to start with the last question first and respond to the honourable delegation of Norway on the use of criteria.

Indeed, ICOMOS stated in its evaluation that the site has a very strong potential for Outstanding Universal Value as a testimony to the early Sassanid Empire and archaeological landscapes that integrate those early Sassanid settlements of great importance into a rather unique landscape setting in this context. This is why ICOMOS noted that criteria (iii) and (v) had very strong potential to be meant by a future reduced series, notably excluding the Sarvestan monuments. Criterion (iii) for this site as a testimony to the establishment, commencement and early expansion of the Sassanid Empire, as indicated by its archaeological and architectural testimony, as well as criterion (v), as a unique archaeological landscape showing the integration of the topographic features, settlement design and the defensive use of the area.

Criterion (ii), however, which is suggested in the proposal, in ICOMOS's view would only relate to one of the eight site components, the Sarvestan monuments, which as a monument of the Islamic era shows the adaptation of Sassanid design principles at a far later stage and it is also quite separate in geographical terms, being located 200 kilometres from the other two components. We do not think that the other seven components could make a valuable contribution to criterion (ii) and would therefore support focusing on criteria (iii) and (v) in this context.

With regard to the question of the honourable delegation of Spain related to the conservation challenges at the site: Indeed, the state of conservation at some of the site components is rather fragile. There is a large, comprehensive need for a programme of conservation approaches. It is really a big task that needs to be systematically undertaken and that is why ICOMOS requested a comprehensive conservation plan to be prepared that also includes risk-preparedness and disaster management concerns, even if this is located in a highly earthquake-prone areas as well as encouraging local capacity-building to enlarge the ability of the local team to respond to the vast needs for conservation to be undertaken.

And, last but not least, with regard to the different suggestions that were presented by the various honourable delegations. There was a mention of a possible advisory mission of ICOMOS that could take place post-inscription. And if the Committee considered an inscription under criterion (v), then this would indeed be something that ICOMOS would highly appreciate, as we do believe in this inscription, the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value in relation to criterion (v) are not currently located in the property's boundaries and such a mission could enter dialogue with the State Party and consider the possibility of a future boundary extension to encompass these particular attributes.

Last but not least, should the Committee consider establishing a drafting group for this decision, ICOMOS would happily offer its services as an advisor if this group was to be formed.

Thank you chairperson."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia, please."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. My question was just a point of clarification from ICOMOS, which I think we have just heard. It was around the nominated property that we are considering. ICOMOS has not found criterion (v) as it is more a group of sites rather than a

landscape under criterion (v). If we inscribe under criterion (v) it has not met it, but it seems to me that ICOMOS is saying that if we do that they will have an advisory mission to discuss with the State Party about boundary modification.

I am just trying to clarify whether we recommend boundary modification in the future or we inscribe now with the possibility that the site has not met the criterion but that in the future it will.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Before I give the floor to the Rapporteur, may I ask the State Party of Iran whether they would like to give us more clarification or information? But first Bahrain would like the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to reflect on some of the discussions that took place. With the two amendments, we believe that there is at least a consensus on criterion (iii) by the majority of the Committee members. We also had the suggestion by Norway of looking at the decision in a working group and we thank ICOMOS for their offer of assistance to make sure that any criteria use for inscription would reflect the values of the property. I think one criterion would be sufficient for an inscription and not necessarily to have all three for the inscription as the latter seems to be the general direction of the Committee. ”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. We just wanted to respond to the question from Australia in their last comment and perhaps provide again a simplified version of the Outstanding Universal Value in response to each of the criteria. ICOMOS believes that criterion (ii) is not relevant to seven out of eight components, only relevant to one of the components but not fortified by any of the other components.

Criterion (iii) is qualified by seven of eight components and would be the strongest supported in the ICOMOS field. Criterion (v) is relevant to also seven of the components, but with the exception that some of the attributes that would contribute to criterion (v) are currently located outside the boundaries of the nominated property. However, ICOMOS considers these attributes are very strong and that it would be regrettable to lose protection on these attributes by not considering this criterion at all.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Iran if they would like to say something before we move on to the Rapporteur.”

Iran:

“Thank you very much madam Chair for giving us the possibility and opportunity of taking the floor. The State Party wishes to thank ICOMOS for the collaboration in this process and also to illustrate the justification of Outstanding Universal Value for the inscription of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars.

Spain has already presented articulated answers to the two main objections raised by the draft decision which suggests removing the city component of Sarvestan and to refer the justification of the Outstanding Universal Value on the beginning of the Sassanid Empire and also to combine the five serial components of Firuzabad and the two serials of Bishapur into one side component boundary for each. I hope the Committee will agree on these remarks, based on consideration of scientific as well as management order.

They say the Sarvestan monuments fully belong to the Sassanid architectural and religious tradition despite it being dated to the first century of the Islamic period. Its architecture is a development of Sassanid architecture with its stones and features and its function is that of the sanctuary of the Zoroastrian religion, the old religion of Sassanid Iran. Thus, Sarvestan shows us the continuity and Sassanid cultural tradition in Fars and the strength of the Zoroastrian communities who managed to build this splendid sanctuary under the Arab rules.

The nomination provides evidence of influences of the Achaemenid and Parthian cultural and ritual traditions of the cultural interchange with Roman art and architecture as well as the Sassanid impact on urban planning and architecture of Iran.

The State Party wishes to propose the criteria (ii), (iii) and (v) and certainly welcomes an Advisory Bodies’ mission by ICOMOS for further discussion.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to our Rapporteur to tell us about the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As acknowledged during the discussions, we have received two sets of amendments to this draft decision. One was submitted by Spain, China, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cuba and Kyrgyzstan and the other one was submitted by Australia. The original draft decision calls for deferral of the nomination, both amendments put the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List.

I am going to go and read through the amendments from the top. Both sets of amendments support the complete deletion of paragraph 2. Paragraph 3 would now become the new paragraph 2. Both amendments support the inscription, the set of amendments that was sent in by the group of countries would inscribe this property on the List on the bases of criteria (ii), (iii) and (v). The amendment received by Australia would support the inscription of this property on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iii). As we had discussions which just took place, may I request from the delegation of Australia whether they indeed wish to delete the reference to criterion (v)?”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. We are happy to include it following clarification from ICOMOS. Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. In that case, we are going to amend it on the screen. Now we have both amendments that support the inscription of this property on the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (v). Australia proposes to keep some parts of the paragraph amended and put them below the provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value. We will come back to this later.

Going further down below for the new paragraph 3, consistent with the inscription, we find the provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value, and consistent with what we just heard from the distinguished delegation from Australia, I suggest that we keep the justification of criteria (v). Then we have the assessment of condition of integrity and authenticity as well as the management and protection requirements.

This is followed by new paragraph 4 which would be made of sections of the former paragraph 3 and I will read it out:

3. ‘Recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following:

- Refocus the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to reflect the criteria for which the property has been inscribed on the World Heritage List.*
- Finalize an integrated conservation and management plan for the property, including strategies on risk preparedness and disaster response,*
- As part of the overall conservation and management plan, prioritize immediate conservation activities at all serial components which are at risk of collapse or in a condition of serious deterioration;’*

Further down paragraph 5 with two options. The amendment submitted by the group of countries is for a new text for paragraph 5 which would read:

5. ‘Recommends the State Party to facilitate the organization of another mission by the Advisory Bodies to Iran in order to adjust some relevant concerns related to the property’.

The amendment proposed by Australia would be essentially to keep the original wording that we had. This is followed by a new paragraph 6 from Australia, which would read:

6. ‘Requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December, 2019, a report on the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendations for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 43rd session in 2019’.

If I may, madam Chair make a small suggestion, just taking into account Paragraph 169 of the Operational Guidelines, I believe that the deadline for the submission should be the 1st of February, 2019, for an examination that would take place during the 43rd session.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway supports the amendments from Australia, paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 including the mission, thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, would like to say something? No. In that case I give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. In the name of consistency, I believe that the additional recommendations put forth by Australia in this amendment do indeed contribute to strengthening this draft decision, so we support them.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to bring up again the point of the criteria. If members of the Committee decide to retain criterion number (v) we believe that the paragraph on the modification of the boundary should remain as expressed by ICOMOS, as these critical elements are currently excluded from the boundaries. I think this reference should be retained if the Committee decides to keep this criterion as the basis of the inscription to make sure that those elements are included in the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are just going to agree with the previous comment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Kyrgyzstan, you have the floor.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Our delegation thinks that these two sets of amendments can be combined, so we agree with the proposal of Australia.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very madam Chair. After this discussion, you will see on the screen that we have noted that the delegations of Bahrain and also Australia support, the new paragraph 4 maintaining the small c which now would become a small b about the adjustment of the boundaries. From the other intervening Committee members, we have heard support overall for these amendments.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.21as amended adopted. On your behalf I congratulate Iran and I give them the floor.”

Iran:

“Thank you madam Chair. This site, the Committee decided to inscribe, is part of what has remained of the Sassanid Empire, and indeed its motherland is an outstanding evidence of the splendour and might of this great empire.

Thanks to Committee members, thanks to ICOMOS, the Secretariat and the hospitality of the hosting country. May I say two lines of a poem I wrote about that?

These wondrous, numerous worlds welcome you with delight,
to visit them as a newly inscribed World Heritage site,
the richness of a great empire stretching over territory vast,
whose monuments bear testimony to this glorious past,
a perfectly-built City astonishes our eye,
as fire temples and fortress towers against the sky,
scenes of royal triumph are in living rock engrave,
while the mighty statue of an emperor is embraced within a cave,
most importantly Sarvestan monument is indeed the home
of the perfection of the world’s square corner domes,
an architectural element invited during this golden age,
and which surely deserves its place in history’s world stage,
our dear World Heritage continues its journey of the recognition
of one and other heritage values, thought and tradition.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Our next site takes us to Japan. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region, Japan. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have received a factual error notification concerning the nomination and evaluation for the nomination of the Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki region. This factual error was recognised by the Advisory Bodies that implied changes to the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value and these factual changes have already been integrated in the text. The factual error notification can be found in page 72 of the English and page 76 of the French version of Document INF.8B.4.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. I am now presenting the ICOMOS evaluation of the Hidden Christian sites in the Nagasaki region of Japan. The text for this evaluation can be found on page 113 of the document INF.8B.1.

Located in the Nagasaki and Kumamoto prefectures in the northwestern part of Kyushu Island of the Japanese Archipelago, the serial nomination consists of 12 component sites, made up of ten villages, one castle, and one cathedral dating from between the 17th and 19th centuries.

The 12 serial sites comprise an overall area of 5,569.34 ha and are surrounded by buffer zones with a total area of 12,152.43 ha. Together they reflect the earliest activities of Christian missionaries and settlers in Japan, including the earliest phase of the encounter, a subsequent era of prohibition and persecution of the Christian faith and settlers, as well as the final phase of the revitalisation of Christian communities after the official lifting of the prohibition in 1873.

These 12 components are categorised into four stages, mainly demonstrating each historic stage of the distinctive cultural tradition of Hidden Christians and will be presented according to these four categories.

Stage one: the event that triggered the ban on Christianity and the subsequent formation of the Hidden Christians’ religious tradition is illustrated by the remains of Hara Castle, which is component 1. Stage two: the development of the Hidden Christians’ religious tradition in different ways, illustrated by five components: that first, Kasuga Village and Sacred Places in Hirado, components 2 and 3; the third, Sakitsu Village in Amakusa component 4; the fourth, Shitsu Village in Sotome component 5; and Ono Village in Sotome component 6.

Stage three: the migration strategies that the Hidden Christians used to maintain their religious communities is illustrated by four components: the first, Villages on Kuroshima Island component 7; the second, remains of Villages on Nozaki Island component 8; the third, Villages on Kashiragashima Island component 9 and the fourth element, Villages on Hisaka Island, component 10. Stage four: the event that triggered the new phase and the transition, and the ultimate end of the religious tradition is illustrated by two components; the first is Egami Village on Naru Island, Egami Church and its Surroundings, component 11; and the second is Oura Cathedral, component 12.

In this evaluation, ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies consideration of this serial property for the World Heritage List and that the serial approach is justified and the selection of sites is appropriate. The nominated property meets criterion (iii) and conditions of authenticity and integrity.

ICOMOS also considers that the boundaries of the nominated property and of its buffer zone are adequate; legal protection in place and the protective measures for the property are also considered adequate. The conservation strategies are commendable and conservation activities undertaken are largely adequate.

ICOMOS recommends that the Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki Region, Japan, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii). ICOMOS recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following four points:

- a) Recording and archiving the fabric of abandoned villages, churches and cemeteries;
- b) Developing a communication strategy to inform local community groups and individual owners about the financial assistance which is available for conservation projects from local, prefectural and national governments;
- c) Undertaking a study on the 'carrying capacity' and management of potential tourism at the components of the property, having particular regard to the physical and social circumstance constraints of each component and
- d) Assessing new developments within the property in accordance with the ICOMOS Guidance on Heritage Impact Assessments for Cultural World Heritage Properties.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Spain please, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Indeed, the delegation of Spain would like to congratulate Japan for this nomination and the excellent work carried out. This nomination came already in 2015 and deferral was proposed. The State Party together with ICOMOS carried out a splendid work to present a much more consistent file. Today, I think that it deserves inscription on the List.

The State of Spain supports this inscription. Moreover, we are pleased with this sort of nomination that shows the presence and traces of European missionaries in the Far-East, Japan, to preach. St Francisco Javier, a Spanish priest, headed them. There was a cultural interchange between east and west which has been handed down to our days. I think therefore it deserves to be inscribed.

Spain endorses and supports the inscription. Thank you very much Japan and thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We have in front of us 21 sites we do not really have time for congratulations. If you have any objections we can share with you your views, but if you accept I do not think we have time for congratulations.

The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. It is with great pleasure that we warmly congratulate the State Party and welcome this outstanding nomination to the World Heritage List. As already mentioned, the State Party withdrew the nomination during the ICOMOS evaluation process the last time, in conjunction with a deferral and asked for assistance in order to reconfigure the nomination and it has now returned with a successful nomination to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Japan, Norway would like to thank you for this good practice example of how to work with nominations, showing the Committee and the State Party to this Convention, that persistent, scientifically-based efforts, patience and close collaboration between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies indeed pay off.

The end result is a high-quality nomination in conformity with the highest standard and expectation we all have to World Heritage. We wish to say *Arigatōgozaimashita*, thank you in Japanese for adhering to the principal of the Convention and the Operational Guidelines.

We have full confidence that the State Party will observe the recommendation in paragraph 4 of the draft decision and in particular the concerns regarding tourism and the role of the components with related communities.

Thank you so much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Brazilian delegation considers that the serial property composed and proposed presents, along its 12 components, a site of centuries of history and intertwining elements of the encounter between east and west. The Brazilian delegation would like to commend the efforts undertaken by the State Party with the study of the carrying capacity and management of potential tourism, taking into account the physical and social circumstance constraints of each component.

This is a positive example on dealing with the challenging issue of conciliating the promotion of tourism and the management and protection measures of the property. The hidden Christian Sites undoubtedly bear unique testimony to human history and we

congratulate Japan in this very special moment that sheds light on the cultural bridges between countries.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Our delegation would also like to join the other delegations in congratulating the State Party on this file. For the sake of time, let us just underscore the importance of such a nomination, which also sends a message of tolerance, respect, interreligious respect and the need for greater dialogue between States.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Indonesia would like to commend the high quality of the nomination of the State Party and the comprehensive work of the Advisory Bodies to make the inscription possible. We are pleased to know the commitment of the State Party to take concrete conservation strategies of the property. It signifies the Christian religious tradition in this era and is justified along criterion (iii) that bears the unique and exceptional testimony of the cultural tradition or to a civilisation which has disappeared.

Despite extensive components of the property, with 12 villages, a castle and a cathedral that date back from the 17th to the 19th centuries, Japan successfully conserved the integrity and authenticity of the property, applied adequate boundaries and appropriate management of the properties and involved local government, local community groups and local owners. This property will be a valuable addition on the World Heritage List following inscription.

Congratulations Japan.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the representative of Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We also support the inscription. We just wanted to know that we were particularly impressed by the discussion on authenticity and integrity in the nomination dossier and in the ICOMOS evaluation. This discussion ties these requirements to both tangible and intangible attributes by highlighting the continual use and function of the place over the centuries. This connection between contemporary communities and the place

associated with the Hidden Christian tradition is recognised as a key attribute of the property and I think this is very important outcome of this nomination.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie souhaite relever avec grande satisfaction la qualité technique de ce dossier relatif aux sites chrétiens cachés dans la région de Nagasaki et qui témoigne aussi d'une remarquable collaboration entre l'État partie et les organes consultatifs de notre convention. Ce dossier nous interpelle de manière très, très importante tant les situations que peut rencontrer la condition humaine est productrice dans n'importe quelle situation de cultures et de civilisations fut elles à un certain moment soumis à des conditions de restriction et de persécutions.

Ce dossier est à souligner de manière positive également, tant il laisse transparaître un travail d'implication des autorités locales ainsi que de la société civile locale. Ce qui est un gage de marque d'une plus grande protection et de préservation de ce site. La Tunisie partage amplement l'avis d'ICOMOS quant à la rencontre entre ce dossier et le critère (iii) et même et peut-être au-delà de ce critère. La Tunisie appuie avec énergie l'inscription de ce site. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will be short. From time to time, this religion could not really be practiced, but the Christian communities retained their beliefs and strong solidarity. The nomination has proved that the State Party supports these communities of Hidden Christian Sites that are flourishing again, which clearly proves the openness of Japanese society. The nomination of the Hidden Christian Sites of Nagasaki and its region shows this fact; a positive movement in order to create a balanced consideration.

Therefore, this property can be an excellent and important example in the current conciliation and creation of free and friendly relations among nations and religious communities. Under the basis of the above-mentioned reasons, the Hungarian delegation supports inscribing the property on the World Heritage List and congratulates the State Party for the successful nomination.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Tanzanian delegation congratulates the State Party for having undertaken such a successful nomination dossier under criteria (iii). This site bears unique testimony to the history of people and their communities in the wake of religious recognition for over two centuries. With this understanding on the nomination of such a unique site, the Tanzanian Delegation further encourages the State Party to implement the recommendations of the Centre and its Advisory Bodies, which among other things, include recording and archiving components within the property.

Therefore, madam Chair, Tanzania fully supports the draft decision to inscribe the property in the World Heritage List. Congratulations Japan.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Azerbaijan congratulates the State Party not only for a quality nomination, but also how the work was done with the Advisory Bodies to present this nomination and get this high appraisal of the inscription. Indeed, this property, which consists of 12 components reflecting the different periods of the introduction of Christianity into Japan, bears a unique testimony to human history and the communities who secretly transmitted their faith in Christianity.

Azerbaijan joins the others in congratulating Japan for this inscription. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of Japan on the work done on this significant nomination that chronicles the hidden Christian faith over two centuries in Japan, during times of prohibition and its subsequent revitalisation thereafter. The serial nomination in the 12 sites identified is an excellent addition to the List and we encourage the State Party to consider the recommendations of ICOMOS, especially in areas of potential tourism and the carrying capacity of the component.

Saint Kitts and Nevis congratulates Japan on the inscription of the Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki region. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, Uganda supports the nomination in the inscription of this heritage property on the World Heritage List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe joins others in commending the State Party for this excellent nomination, which illustrates the resilience of people during prohibition. We would like to particularly commend the State Party for the protective measures that have been put for each of the components in accordance to the national heritage laws and regulations.

We particularly want to mention the laws like the Cultural Properties and Landscape Acts and other laws and regulations which the State Party has put in place to make sure that the negative impacts will not destroy and will help to preserve the site. We also want to thank ICOMOS for the work that has been done together with the State Party and would like to endorse what was said about the cooperation between Advisory Bodies and the State Party.

Thank you madam Chair.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I have not received any amendments on the proposed draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Accordingly, we go for the adoption. I declare draft decision 42 COM 8B.22 adopted. On your behalf I congratulate Japan and I give them the floor.”

Japan:

“Thank you madam Chair. On behalf of the government of Japan, I express my deepest appreciation to all the member States of the Committee and ICOMOS for deciding inscription of the Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki region.

This is a testimony that values the distinctive tradition of faith in Christianity nurtured in the Nagasaki region during the two centuries of prohibition now recognised by the international community.

I wish to share this historic moment with everybody concerned in particular people of the Nagasaki region who helped along to maintain and inscribe the property and our commitment to preserving and protecting in the future.

Now I invite Mr. Nakamura, governor of Nagasaki Prefecture, to say a few words.”

Mr. Nakamura:

“My name is Hôdô Nakamura, the governor of Nagasaki region. I am greatly pleased that the Hidden Christian Sites in the Nagasaki region, to further honour our forbearers, have been inscribed on the UNESCO World Heritage List. This history of the Hidden Christians, I believe, contains a universal message of peace which is still relevant, even today.

We will make every possible effort to preserve this heritage and share its history with people around the world. I hope it will become a source of pride for the people of Nagasaki while making a positive impression on visitors who come to see it. To conclude I would like to extend my deep gratitude to all of you here and everyone who helped through the nomination process.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

““Thank you very much. Our next site is in the Republic of Korea. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea, Republic of Korea. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat; Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you Chair. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Sansa, Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea which is to be found on page 79 of the English version of document INF.8B.4 and on page 83 of the French document. The Advisory Bodies recognise the factual error that implied changes to the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value and these factual changes have been already integrated in our text.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“This is the presentation of the ICOMOS evaluation of the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea.

Sansa are Buddhist mountain monasteries located throughout the southern provinces of the Korean Peninsula. A serial nomination of seven temples has been proposed to represent these ancient and continuing centres of spiritual practice. The temples have historical associations with different schools of Buddhist thought and contain many individually notable historic structures. The nominated monasteries were all established between the 7th to the 9th centuries and cover the main schools of Buddhism that prevailed in the peninsula. The spatial arrangement of the seven components demonstrates common traits of Korean Buddhist monasteries, including one or more *madang* or open yard and mountain settings.

The monasteries selected for the World Heritage nomination have survived until the present as living centres of faith and daily practice, despite centuries of suppression and the impacts of Japanese invasion at the end of the 16th century.

The three kingdoms of Korea were united by Silla and the first mountain monasteries were established in the 7th century. Buddhism became a religion of the masses at this time. Seon Buddhism, which places emphasis on self-realisation through meditation, spread through Korea in the 9th century. During the Joseon Dynasty, Confucianism was promoted and Buddhism was suppressed. The number of monasteries were reduced during the 15th and 16th centuries and mountain monasteries became the lifeblood of Korean Buddhism. Japanese invasions (at the end of the 16th century) severely damaged a number of the mountain monasteries, which were then rebuilt.

The temples nominated demonstrate typical aspects of Korean Buddhist monasteries such as the arrangement of buildings within their natural topography and their spatial configuration. However ICOMOS considered that the focus on the spatial layout was not convincing given that this feature is very common. Through sporadic exchanges with the State Party, it was possible to more clearly articulate the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the Sansa based on intangible and tangible aspects of Korean Buddhism.

The Operational Guidelines requires that each component of a serial property should contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value in a substantial and specific way. Therefore, the method selecting the seven components from the 952 Buddhist temples in Korea, 785 of which are located in mountainous areas, was the focus of the exchanges with the State Party.

ICOMOS concluded that some components were more strongly justified than others in terms of their historical significance and ability to represent the proposed Outstanding Universal Value. Bongjeongsa, Magoksa and Seona monasteries are weaker than the other four components.

The comparative analysis was improved greatly during engagement with the State Party; while ICOMOS considers that it supports the potential for Korean Buddhism Mountain monastery to be included in the World Heritage List, it does not justify the inclusion of all components. The integrity of the series as a whole is justified through four components only.

ICOMOS considers the conditions of authenticity and integrity at the end of each individual site has been met. In relation to their criteria, ICOMOS considers that criterion (iii) has been demonstrated for four components. These sacred places provide an exceptional testimony to the long tradition of Korean Buddhist practice. ICOMOS does not consider that the other criterion by the State Party, criterion (iv), is demonstrated.

ICOMOS considers that the boundaries and buffer zones are adequate and the nominated monasteries are very well kept. The main threat to the property is forest fires and potential future pressures include tourism growth and new building construction projects within complexes.

ICOMOS recommends that four of the seven components forming the nominated series of Sansa, namely Tongdosa, Buseoksa, Beopjusa, and Daeheungsa, be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii) and that the remaining components should not be inscribed. A statement about Outstanding Universal Value is provided and ICOMOS also made several further recommendations.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much. We would like to congratulate the Republic of Korea for the inscription of Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries on the List. Indeed this property is a composed of several sites that are part of the Buddhist culture. The Advisory Bodies want to only inscribe four of the seven components. However, having looked very closely at the nomination, Spain believes that all seven components are complete and necessary for understanding the importance of these monasteries through the ages. We have to take all seven together to truly understand the importance of this site.

These monasteries illustrate the importance of different types of schools of Buddhism and we therefore believe that all seven components need to be inscribed in the List under the same criterion. Even in Spain, we have the church of Mudejar, the works of Gaudi, and all of the landmarks along the Camino de Santiago Route as well as caves and paintings in certain parts of our country. All of these properties are inscribed on the World Heritage List and perhaps not all of them have exactly the same value, but they all have Outstanding Universal Value and the same should apply for the current property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. ICOMOS evaluated that the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea meet the requirements of Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criterion (iii) and recommended the property’s inscription on the World Heritage List. They consider Sansa to have an Outstanding Universal Value on the ground and that it demonstrates history of Buddhism from its foundation in the 7th century to present day.

However, ICOMOS wants to exclude three out of the seven nominated components. We would like to recall that Sansa is a serial nomination composed of seven temples. According to Paragraph 137 of the Operational Guidelines, the serial property has a whole Outstanding Universal Value, only with inclusion of the three temples currently being excluded. The evolution of Korean Buddhism and its living tradition are perfectly explained and demonstrated. Sansa presents its Outstanding Universal Value of living cultural traditions within this well-preserved Buddhist sanctuary not only the monastic beauty, but the reclusive, contemplative and scholarly vocations have remained substantially intact.

Historically, Magoska served as a base for monk militias in the 16th century and has been a centre for monk artists. Seonmansa established a morning ritual which is one of the most intangible Buddhist heritages in Korea. Bonjeongsa is one of the rare examples which avoided damage from the war and has preserved some of the oldest wooden structures in Korea. These essential components justify continuity of Korean Buddhism. Therefore there is no compelling reason to exclude three temples in the aspect of continuity of tradition and significance of social role which are also recognised by ICOMOS.

In conclusion, all three monasteries currently being excluded by ICOMOS make a significant contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value of Sansa, which demonstrates the history of Korean Buddhism from its foundation in the 7th century to the present. We would like to stress that it is impossible to tell the whole story of Sansa without the three temples. Therefore, we submit the amendments, being convinced that all seven monasteries should be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have before us a document of a nomination that reflects excellent work from the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. We recognise that the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monastery in Korea, which is composed of seven temples, has an undeniable value to be inscribed as World Heritage. The seven selected components all reflect Buddhist monasteries or temple complexes of great age and continuity.

Indonesia is of the view that all seven components are well-preserved, protected and managed. The key architectural elements of the property are well-maintained as are their spatial arrangement, landscape setting and living spiritual practices. The three other temples that are recommended not to be inscribed, also represent an outstanding example of the rich history and evolution of Korean Buddhism. All seven components offer an exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilisation which is still living, which is criterion (iii) under which the property is nominated.

In this regard, Indonesia recommends the property with all its seven elements to be inscribed as a World Heritage in its entirety.

I thank you Madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much Chairperson. The serial nomination submitted by the Republic of Korea is a well-elaborated selection of seven significant Buddhist mountain monasteries from a lot of monasteries with similar significance. While the Advisory Bodies agreed with the selection, they noted that three of them should be excluded from the nomination. However, the State Party in its reflection and factual errors could point out the relevance of the nomination of the selected seven sites.

Distinction should not be made only on the basis that three of them are not on the same level as the other four; only in some respects, because in a full evaluation approach they are on the same level of extraordinary significance and rightfully have Outstanding Universal Value.

Therefore, Hungary supports the current nomination and recommends it for inscription with all the proposed seven elements and congratulates the State Party for the successful nomination dossier.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, ICOMOS recommended the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries to be inscribed on the World Heritage List in its evaluation report. However, my delegation notes ICOMOS’ exclusion of three out of the seven original components in its recommendation to comment that the three are considered to present a weaker historical significance.

Madam Chairlady, Sansa serial property is a living testimony to Korean Buddhism from the 7th century which has already been acknowledged by ICOMOS. However, in all the seven temples the most distinctive features of Sansa which have accommodated the vast beliefs over the centuries based on the regional schools are manifested as incorporating a vast cultural treasure trove.

Commending the efforts by the Republic of Korea to establish a coordinated management system for the seven monasteries, we would therefore like to join the other delegations in conveying our fervent support for the amended draft decision to inscribe the Sansa Buddhist Monasteries of Korea with all the seven components on the World Heritage List.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Two very brief comments. That first is to commend the State Party of Korea for the high technical quality of this dossier, which accurately presents the Korean Buddhist monastic culture over the last centuries. The second comment is to convey that the Brazilian experts understand that all seven monasteries are essential and indispensable to feature the aspects of the evolution of Korean Buddhist heritage and its living tradition with regard to the constitution of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

We believe that this living tradition is another very important aspect of this nomination, which has dimensions of intangible heritage linked to this property. This reaffirms the inevitable dialogue between the 1972 and the 2003 cultural conventions of UNESCO, very brilliantly demonstrated in this nomination.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“Thank you very much Chair. Bosnia-Herzegovina is supporting the amendment concerning the inclusion of all seven monasteries in the inscription of the proposed sites. As with previous speakers, we think that with the inclusion of the three temples currently excluded, the evolution of Korean Buddhism and the living tradition could be completely understood.

We also consider the inclusion is also justified from the point of view of criterion (iii). Therefore Bosnia-Herzegovina supports the inscription of the whole site proposed by the State Party.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. The Republic of Korea has presented a nomination which brilliantly outlines the specificity of Korean Buddhism through a series of mountain temples that trace back to the 7th century up to the present day. We are aware of the exchanges between the State Party and ICOMOS and we are very pleased to find the recommendation under criterion (iii). We warmly congratulate the State Party with a nomination of very high quality and standard. We also wish to thank ICOMOS for a well-prepared presentation and thorough evaluation of this complex nomination.

Having carefully studied the supplementary information provided by the State Party, we fully recognise the historical significance of the three temples set aside. Norway initially supported the draft decision in line with ICOMOS’ argument that integrity can only be met with the other four temples. We consider that this argument was further strengthened by ICOMOS’ statement that criterion (iii) is demonstrated for these four proposed components.

We have, anyhow, listened carefully to the argument presented by our distinguished colleagues in the Committee and we would, if time allows, ask for a clarification from ICOMOS following the arguments we just heard from the room. We would like to say *chughahae* and thank Korea for this nomination and warmly welcome this nomination to the World Heritage List.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, you have the floor.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We would like to remind the Committee that a serial property as a whole is to be of Outstanding Universal Value, as we can see from Paragraph 137 of the Operational Guidelines. ICOMOS recommended Sansa to be inscribed on the World Heritage List and recognises the value of Sansa as it has kept the distinctive monastic culture of Korean Buddhism from its foundation in the 7th century until the present, which is truly appreciated.

We completely agree with the distinguished delegation of China that the reason for the exclusion of three temples seemed unclear and there was no rationale to it. We believe that Sansa, with only four components, cannot meet the requirements of integrity, which as a serial property is a key and important point. It cannot fully demonstrate how Korean Buddhism has been maintained and evolved. Therefore, we believe that all seven components should be included in Sansa and on the World Heritage List for the recognition of the strong attributes displaying Outstanding Universal Value in the property of Sansa.

We hope the State Party establishes and maintains a coordinated management system for the seven monasteries as a serial property. We are convinced the Republic of Korea will continue its effort to keep the property well-preserved, as it has been doing for years and has established cultural heritage maintenance plan as recommended by the Committee. I know we are all in this Committee because of our passion and drive in preserving our World Heritage. It is after all one world and instead of reading about this fantastic and timeless monastery, we are the ones to keep their stories alive.

Therefore, the State of Kuwait supports the amendment put forward by the State of China and would like to have all nominated monasteries inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie souligne avec grande satisfaction la qualité technique du dossier présenté par l'État partie. Ce haut lieu de culture bouddhiste avec ces traditions encore vivantes nous interpelle et l'ensemble des éléments présentés nous semblent mérités dans leur totalité une inscription qui permet d'avoir une cohérence et une éligibilité qu'il serait dommage de ne pas avoir dans notre décision.

Je ne reviendrais pas sur les arguments techniques puisque la Tunisie est co-sponsor du projet d'amendement de la résolution. Nous apportons notre appui à l'inscription de l'ensemble des composantes de ce site ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Zimbabwean delegation welcomes the draft decision to inscribe the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries in Korea under criterion (iii). However, we note with concern that only four out of the seven components forming the nomination series, namely, Tongdosa, Buseoksa, Beopjusa, and Daeheungsa are proposed for inscription. We believe the integrity of all the individual components has been demonstrated and that the conditions of authenticity of the site that comprise a series was fully met.

While Bongjeongsa, one of the components excluded, is smaller in scale, it nonetheless has the elements that make up a Buddhist monastery that included a distinct spatial configuration similar to the other six components. In addition, Bongjeongsa also represents the same religious schools and beliefs of Korean Buddhism and the continuity of the religion through to the present day. As such, what is more important is the value rather than the scale in comparison to the other six components.

On the second matter onto which the Advisory Bodies argued that the historic significance of the excluded components was weaker, it is not clear how they measured this historical significance and came up with that conclusion. For instance, Bongjeongsa is the enshrinement of the two Buddhist beliefs, the Sakyamuni and Amitabha. It also has the oldest wooden structures in Korea, thus attesting to the period with the other components proposed for inscription by ICOMOS.

The other two, Magoksa and Seonamsa, also belong to the same period of the 8th century like those proposed for nomination. It is important to note that the property is being nominated on the basis of living cultural traditions which are all exhibited in seven components.

As such, Zimbabwe supports the draft amendment to inscribe all the seven components of the Sansa Buddhist Monasteries as submitted by the Republic of Korea and would like to congratulate the State Party for bringing out such an important nomination.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. First of all, we would like to congratulate the State Party for the quality of the nomination and also like to thank ICOMOS for the information they have given us, which allows us to have a much more thorough analysis when taking our decision. We take note of the justification of Outstanding Universal Value as set out in ICOMOS’s report which allows us to understand that there are common elements that justified the inscription under criterion (iii). Elements were looked at such as typology or the teaching of Buddhism since the 7th century.

Our delegation wishes to support the amendments which justified the inclusion of the other three temples that ICOMOS is currently suggesting excluding from inscription. We believe that we need to include all of these components under criteria (iii) and (iv).

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We also support the inscription of this property under criterion (iii) for all seven components, rather than the recommended four. We would like to say that this support is based on supplementary information circulated by the State Party only recently. It does make a compelling argument for inclusion of all seven of the components.

We are concerned that we only received this information recently and ICOMOS did not have access to this information during its evaluation process. We suggest that this further evidences the need to review the time frame for nomination and evaluation.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, you have the floor.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le Burkina Faso soutient les amendements proposés en vue de l'inscription du bien sur la base du critère (iii) et avec ses sept composantes.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Tanzania joins hands with other distinguished delegates in conveying our warm congratulations to the third party of Korea on the nomination of this unique site. Tanzania notes that the seven selected components include some of the best preserved and mostly influential Korean Buddhist monasteries founded in the 7th century. We also commend the analytical work of the Advisory Bodies on this particular nomination.

Chair, while connected in their functions as comprehensive monasteries, the seven components continue to maintain their traditions. Sansa fulfills its social role of integrating the society as well as the leading role of healing the cause of the war in the 16-17th centuries through their religious rituals. Chair, in order to maintain the existing Outstanding Universal Value on this property, Tanzania wishes to encourage the State Party to take note of the implementation and recommendations as advised by the Advisory Bodies.

Finally, Chair, Tanzania supports the amended draft decision to inscribe the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries, which include the seven components in the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii).

Once again, congratulations Korea.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. First, we would like to add our voice to the rest of our distinguished representatives of the State Party and to congratulate the Republic of Korea on the exceptional and valuable, comprehensive and very well-prepared file for nomination for the Buddhist Mountain Monasteries.

While ICOMOS recommended only four components of the Sansa Buddhist Mountain Monasteries to be inscribed on the World Heritage List, ICOMOS pointed out that the other three are considered to present weaker historical significance. In our view, all the seven temples are living heritage, where monks who have been practicing Korean Buddhism until today live their lives and continue their practices. The traditional way of life and living quarters are also well-preserved to sustain a sustainable life and monastic culture. We believe that Sansa is a valuable heritage presenting interdependence between the tangible and intangible culture of World Heritage.

However, in agreement with the Advisory Bodies’ concerns on future visitor pressure, we hope that the Republic of Korea develops appropriate measures to mitigate the pressures to protect the monastic community and its intangible cultural tradition. Therefore, we would like and we are pleased to add our voices again to the other State Parties and to agree to the amended draft presented by the distinguished State Party of China for the inscription of the property with the seven outstanding monasteries as whole.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Azerbaijan supports the amendments with a strong view that this proposed nomination property, Sansa, bears in its totality the Outstanding Universal Value. We believe that the seven selected components include some of the best-preserved and most influential of Korean Buddhist monasteries and that their international significance is evident. They demonstrate the historical and contemporary importance of Buddhism in Korea, continuing spiritual practices, and illustrate both common and distinct facets across the main temples.

With this in mind, Azerbaijan supports the inscription of the site with all its components. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. Once again, we would like to thank ICOMOS and the State Party for the nomination and the work carried out. We believe that the seven components put forward for inscription represent in their entirety an example of the evolution of Buddhism over the years since they were established in the 7th century. They show the characteristics and the values that have already been mentioned by other members of the Committee. We also believe that there is a link between this site and safeguarding intangible cultural heritage as well as ancestral practices.

Therefore, this added value deserves to be recognised by this Committee, as has already been said by Brazil and other States Parties. Taking into account the analysis of the integrity and authenticity criteria, we believe that this site should be inscribed on the List and we are sure that the Republic of Korea will put in place the best practice possible in order to ensure that tourism and the carrying capacity of the sites will be respected. We therefore support this amendment.

Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, you have the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis adds its own congratulations to the Republic of Korea on the inscription of this serial nomination. The Sansa Buddhist Mountain monasteries in Korea are a significant representation of Buddhism in Korea. As has been indicated by previous speakers, we too support a proposal of including the seven components instead of four as was recommended. We commend the State Party of the Republic of Korea for the extensive work on this nomination.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous n'allons pas répéter ce que les autres membres du Comité ont déjà souligné sur l'importance de ces sites. Nous aimerions toutefois rajouter un élément important. En disant qu'il est impossible de mieux apprécier et de mieux interpréter les symbolismes d'un lieu sacré sans prendre en compte tous les éléments qui constituent le système cohérent complet du lieu.

Par conséquent, l'Angola appuie l'inscription de ce site en prenant en compte tous les éléments qui sont proposés comme étant un système complet et cela a justifié bien évidemment l'intégrité du bien. Nous félicitons l'État partie de la Corée pour ce merveilleux travail accompli pour que ce bien soit inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sous les critères (iii) et (vi).

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor to clarify please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair and distinguished delegates of the World Heritage Committee. Just to answer the questions raised by Norway, Zimbabwe and others about further explanations of the reasons for the way which we brought this recommendation to your attention.

I think before I do that, I must say that ICOMOS and the State Party of the Republic of Korea went through a long journey together to reach a point of common understanding on this file. I really thank them for their openness and willingness to do that. However, Paragraph 137.b, which was revised in 2007 after an expert meeting, asked for a tight evaluation on how each component should contribute to nominations and must be able to be justified in a contribution and a substantial, readily-defined and discernable way. This is the basis on how we undertook this particular decision.

In this particular case, where they are hundreds of potential sites, how are we to select from such a large number? We had many exchanges on this point with the State Party. It is true that all seven are extremely significant places with many important buildings, similar or different histories and many individual differences and we would wholeheartedly agree with many comments made by Committee members about the importance of the intangible dimension of this property and the importance of recognising the intangible significance of these temples as part of the Outstanding Universal Value.

It is hard to explain in a brief presentation how our thinking went, and I am grateful to have the chance to explain more. We did not compare the seven with each other to find out, if you want, which was the best or the most significant, but rather how each of the seven contributes in a specific, discernable and non-duplicating way to the revised understanding of the Outstanding Universal Value. We were aided in this regard by the State Party itself very significantly, and by many scholars who contributed to our work through desk reviews. We ended up with a perception that the important aspects that we were looking for were the two main periods of historical development of these monasteries, these being the 7th and the 9th centuries, the different school of Buddhism that they can each represent and also the degree to which the site today can represent through historical and contemporary practice what we would call the full monastic function of Korean Buddhism.

It was on that basis that we found that some were more weakly justified than others because they bore similar, but less well-elaborated aspects to the series. However, we do not wish to entertain a kind of disagreement with the general consent that is emerging from the Committee discussion. Just to refer to yesterday's discussion when the distinguished delegate of Brazil brought to this discussion on another case entirely, a desire to reflect further on the processes of evaluation of serial properties. We were not able to say so at the time, but I think ICOMOS would strongly welcome that opportunity.

I think that in this year's cases where there is information that is documented and clearly set out, we found the issue of selection of components in serial properties to be a very common difficulty for ICOMOS's role and that of the State Party and we have to work very significantly and deeply with States Parties to resolve many issues that would fall generally within this category of our work, and we were very grateful to the delegation of Brazil for bringing that suggestion yesterday. I thank you for the opportunity to mention these things.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, do you have any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I have received amendments on this draft decision presented by Angola, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Bosnia, Burkina Faso, China, Guatemala, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Indonesia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Spain, Tunisia, Uganda and Tanzania. While the original decision would have inscribed only four of the seven nominated serial components, the proposed amendment would inscribe all seven of these nominated components.

Madam Chair at this point, I would like to make a suggestion on the text in paragraph 2. Actually, you can see it reflected on the screen. The amendments that we received under paragraph 2 would have proceeded to all seven nominated serial components, but as the sense of the proposed amendment is to inscribe all the serial components there seems to be no need to name each one of them, and it would seem more appropriate to simply refer to the original name of the nominations, should the authors of the amendments agree with this suggestion.

In the rest of the texts we have smaller amendments, all aimed at making it very clear and coherent that all seven components would be inscribed on the World Heritage List. These are the amendments that we received.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Would anyone like to comment? The Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I apologise for taking the floor again, but we wondered whether there should also be a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value given that it has been altered from the one drafted by ICOMOS in its evaluation report.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Yes, indeed, we are going to add the word provisional right now on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I can go to adopt the decision. I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.23 adopted as amended. On your behalf I congratulate the Republic of Korea and I give them the floor.”

Republic of Korea:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The delegation of the Republic of Korea thanks all the Committee members for their wide support for the inscription of the Sansa Buddhist Monasteries in Korea. With this decision, all relevant Buddhist monasteries of Korean Buddhism have now been united as one World Heritage site. Our delegation greatly appreciates the invaluable encouragement and decision by the Committee.

I would like to invite Korean Authorities and the Buddhist community for their remarks.”

Republic of Korea Cultural Heritage Administration representative:

“Distinguished Committee members, as representative of the Cultural Heritage Administration, I am pleased that Sansa has been inscribed on the World Heritage List. I promise that we will protect our new World Heritage site for Sansa as a serial property and the Republic of Korea will do its utmost to install a coordinated management system. Also, we will carefully implement all the recommendations taken by the Committee. In line with the Operational Guidelines, we will inform the Committee on future projects that may impact the property.

Again, many thanks to the Committee and the Kingdom of Bahrain.”

Buddhist Monk:

“I am head of the cultural department of an order of Korean Buddhism. I would like to thank all the experts and everyone involved who have put in so much effort in the inscription of Sansa. As a Buddhist monk myself, I am part of the living heritage of the monastic culture, the legacy of Korean Buddhism.

With the inscription of Sansa, the World Heritage will be able to understand the Buddhist heritage of the Korean monastic culture. We will continue to protect and enhance the Sansa Heritage so that the history of Korean Monastic culture can be recognised and be part of the heritage of humanity.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now we go to the next two sites number 9 and 10 as you can see in front of you. We will start with number 10 as we received a lot of amendments for number 9 and we want to allocate time for 9. So we move to number 10. I now invite ICOMOS to present the transboundary nomination of Colonies of Benevolence, Belgium and Netherlands. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you very much. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Colonies of Benevolence, nomination put forward by Belgium and Netherlands. This factual error notification is to be found on page 21 of the English versions of INF.8B.4 and on page 25 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Beginning in 1818, the Society of Benevolence founded agricultural colonies in rural areas of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands. The aim was to create an alternative to the living conditions of the urban poor. By moving this population to the countryside, the cities would be relieved of a major social problem. Later ‘unfree’ colonies were also founded with the institutions of particular groups of disadvantaged people.

In terms of categories, this is a transnational serial nomination of seven sites. Of the seven colonies, five are in the Netherlands and two in Belgium. The colonies were founded in the early 19th century by the Society of Benevolence, whose aim was to provide for large numbers of poor people from the rapidly growing industrial cities, a new, beneficial and industrious way of life as self-sufficient farmers. In so doing they relieved social problems.

The colonies took over areas of rough ground and turned them into productive farm lands. The Colonies could be called a social experiment inspired by the ideal and ideas of the European enlightenment; people’s lives could be changed for the better in better surroundings. The experiment was underpinned by the Dutch tradition of reclaiming lands. The Colonies were not haphazard creations but carefully planned units with long rows of well-designed houses and small farms set in a pattern of rows shaded by avenues of trees.

The early colonies, created between 1818 and 1821, were called free colonies, as people volunteered to join and three have been nominated. Frederiksoord, seen here, was the original headquarters of the Society of Benevolence and includes the house of its founder. In all the colonies, farm buildings were improved in the mid 19th century and it is largely these later buildings that have survived.

The free colony of Wilhelminaoord absorbed two smaller colonies. All the three colonies are what now might be called ordinary villages. Willemsoord, the third free colony, has no structure remaining from the founding period; the western part of this component has now grown into a 20th-century village, separated by a railway and highway.

These three colonies never really achieved their aim of self-sufficiency, as the farm plots proved to be too small to provide for families. Manure for fertilisation had to be imported. The Society of the Netherlands had to find other sources of funds to keep the colonies going. This led immediately to the founding of unfree colonies, hosting groups of orphans, beggars and vagrants who lived communally and undertook work on large farms under contract from the State.

Four unfree colonies have been nominated; three constructed between 1819 and 1884 and the fourth being converted later to an unfree colony. All these unfree colonies now

accommodate institutions and for three sites this estate dates back from the early 20th century.

Part of the original farm complex is the Ommerschans, now surrounded by the modern buildings of a maximum, high-security psychiatric hospital and large modern farms. At Wortel, the oldest structures reflect the Belgian building programme that started in 1870 and the buildings of one farm and staff housing. The large central vagrant institution is now an active prison to which new buildings have been added.

Some buildings from the founding period at Veenhuizen survived, as have several handsome late 19th century institutional buildings that now host two active prisons. At Merksplas, where most structures date from the late 19th century, the large central institutional building is now also used as a prison surrounded by modern churches including one used as a centre for illegal immigrants.

The unfree colonies also suffered from problems, as many of the inmates were simply too weak to undertake heavy physical work. In 1859 the government took over the unfree colonies of Ommerschans and Veenhuizen, leaving the Society to run the remaining three free colonies. Eleven years later the Belgian State took over the unfree colonies. By then, the idea of individual families improving themselves had given way to an institutionalised organisation. In the 1920s the colonies in the Netherlands were sold.

ICOMOS consider that the Colonies of Benevolence should be understood in a wider economic and political context in the early years of industrialisation in Western Europe in order to demonstrate why some of them might be considered exceptional. A revised comparative analysis provided by the State Party has demonstrated that among programmes used in agricultural labour as a means to reform the individual, none operated on the scale of the Colonies of the Netherlands. Moreover, it was the ideas to which they were associated that set apart the colonies of the Netherlands from the many State-sponsored institutional poverty reduction schemes that were operating in most industrialised countries of Europe in the early and late 19th century. The proposed justification of Outstanding Universal Value mainly relates to this idealistic founding period of the colonies, where they were seen to be a social experiment rooted in the ideas of the Enlightenment.

In evaluating this series, one of the key issues has been how far the series as a whole and each of the colonies individually might be said to reflect those ideals. The opening of the nomination dossier states that the Colonies of the Netherlands represent one of the earliest initiatives to exterminate poverty on a national scale. Based on the ideas of the enlightenment, the colonies established a utopian concept to educate the poor.

ICOMOS fully agrees with this but does not consider that the subsequent development of unfree institutionalised colonies can be seen as utopian. Moreover, in ICOMOS' view, it is not the ongoing evolution of these colonies that is the value, but the way they reflect the ideals which promoted their foundations. Consequently, ICOMOS considers that one or two of the free colonies might have the potential to justify criterion (iii), but not the series as nominated, with the inclusion of unfree colonies that reflect completely different matters of poverty reduction.

We do not consider that criterion (v) is satisfied, as it is not the ongoing interaction of people with the land which is the value but the initial aims and purposes of this social experiment. And for criterion (vi), the link with the enlightenment cannot be seen a sufficiently strong to realise outstanding universal significance. Integrity has been impaired by the loss of early buildings, by the overlay of new housing and by the new ancillary buildings related to prisons and psychiatric institutions. Not all the original colonies have been included within the boundary.

In terms of authenticity, the main issue is the way the colonies no longer clearly reflect their purposes, making the changes to the building structure, particularly the use of closed institutions of four unfree colonies. The original layout may have survived, but not the patterns of the building related to it. The boundaries are currently inconsistent in terms of what they include. Not all colonies have protection and protection needs improving to the wider landscape. Management also needs to be strengthened.

ICOMOS considers that the original Colonies of Benevolence experiment did reflect in an innovative way a spirited idealism. ICOMOS considers that there could be potential for one or two free colonies to be considered for inscription to the way they clearly reflect those ideas. The selected colonies would need to be able to convey these associations through adequate attributes and how they are integrated into a whole.

The way the colonies were used and the memories of those who lived in them also needs support, a better understanding of their organisation and how they impact on the lives of their inhabitants.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that the nomination of the colonies of the Netherlands should be deferred in order to allow the State Party with the advice of the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre, if requested, to refocus the nomination on one, two or three colonies. We have further recommendations that are set out in the working document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Brazil, please.”

Brazil

“Thank you madam Chair. The Brazilian delegation went through this evaluation with great interest and wishes to highlight the very interesting theme conveyed by this transboundary serial nomination proposed by Belgium and Netherlands. We draw special attention to the proposal’s innovative character regarding its psychology, related to a social engineering experiment for the improvement of individuals.

Brazil thinks that the Colonies of Benevolence represent striking testimonies to a historically relevant approach to poverty alleviation in a context of growing industrialisation and urbanisation and the consequent significant social changes thereof, which lays the basis for its potential Outstanding Universal Value.

Brazil respectfully diverges from ICOMOS’ understanding that the free and unfree colonies did not reflect the same ideology. Though the latter had a different approach in settling orphans, beggars and vagrants, they are all, free and unfree colonies, part of one single major utopian model of poverty reduction that guided their foundation in the 1800s.

The Brazilian delegation shares ICOMOS’ concerns with regard to changes in structures and uses in some component parts as perhaps weakening the integrity and authenticity of the overall series as currently presented. But at the same time we support the perception that the basic principles and objectives of the Colonies of Benevolence, as well as the story they tell as a whole, remains somehow largely and tangibly visible throughout the component parts, thus, providing the basis for verifying conditions of authenticity and integrity for the series, in our opinion.

They sustained that only a comprehensive selection of free and unfree colonies could convey the full meaning of significance as a large-scale early 1800s experiment aimed at eradicating poverty through a system of agricultural settlements, which in our view could essentially justify the inscription of the property under criterion (iii). In relation to buffer zones, conservation, legal protection, management and monitoring, Brazil largely echoes the conclusions of ICOMOS.

For these reasons, madam Chair, in the light of the very clear potential of the Colonies of Benevolence to meet criterion (iii) and the conditions of authenticity and integrity, in our interpretation Brazil believes that this nomination should be referred back to the State Party to allow them to adapt the nomination by focusing on the well-preserved cultural landscapes of both the free and unfree colonies. Both understood to reflect the ideas related to a single utopian model for poverty reduction that guided their foundation.

In this regard, there might be a need to revisit the selected components and perhaps an advisory mission could be of help in this exercise. Our delegation has several amendments in that regard madam Chair. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda wishes to congratulate the States Parties of Netherlands and Belgium for this nomination. Furthermore, Uganda shares the views of Brazil and considers this nomination crucially important as it is one among the earliest experiments on poverty reduction.

Since this social issue is still of great importance under the contemporary sustainable development goals, Uganda acknowledges that some issues have to be streamlined; however, we do support the draft amendment for referral status.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We agree with the proposal made by Brazil. ICOMOS recommendations virtually take out the complete theme and we think that the recommendation can be made within a year and therefore we think that the States Parties can make changes to the Outstanding Universal Value as has been clearly demonstrated. We also support the idea that those two types of colonies have to be in the file.

We also think that the two countries should be in it because of the need of geographic representativeness. To be consistent with the Committee that encourages the elaboration of international files, we think that it is a good thing that the States involved should be represented in the List. Therefore, we support Brazil’s amendment that is to refer back to the

member States so that they make the necessary correction and to come back before the Committee for inscription next year.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe commends the States Parties for this nomination which, is a clear example of an experiment in fighting exclusion and poverty in the very early days of industrialisation. We fully support the proposal by Brazil for referring this nomination, so that the States Parties can work together with the Advisory Bodies to address some of the issues relating to the refocusing of the nomination as well as to the management of the proposed nomination.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China notes the new focal areas of the nomination involved with heritage research and conservation which have closer association with our ideas, behaviours or even problems in contemporary society. China supports the endeavours made within the World Heritage framework to assimilate intellectual achievement and to carry out active reflections on modern or contemporary social issues, including urban development issues, along with the continued development of the whole society.

These confirm the dialectical view of Chinese people on history and heritage that features drawing upon history. China also appreciates the property nominated by both countries and supports the nomination to be referred to the States Parties.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We thank Brazil for the amendment that it has presented which leaves the possibility for the States Parties to come up with a new revision of their files. We understand that in the future, perhaps, the idea will be clarified regarding the colonies and their definition as free and unfree and different types of ways we can interpret the use of these or similar themes.

We believe that the amendment presented by Brazil will allow this file to be referred to the States Parties and come back with a more comprehensive review after it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, The United Republic of Tanzania congratulates the States Parties for presenting this interesting dossier of the Colonies of Benevolence. Tanzania also commends ICOMOS for in-depth analysis of the nomination which has resulted in several recommendations to be considered by the Committee and the States Parties for the further inscription of the property.

This is a transnational series of seven sites located in the Netherlands and Belgium which comprise of free and unfree colonies. The seven components are well-described in the dossier. It is an inspiring story that can still inspire communities that live in poverty today. We learn from this dossier that the Society of Benevolence was founded as a voluntary association to address poverty on a national scale.

The delegation of Tanzania appreciates and thanks the Advisory Bodies for a comprehensive comparative analysis proposed in the nomination dossier. Tanzania agrees with the Advisory Bodies and would recommend the States Parties to consider comparative analysis to reflect the ideal that guided the foundation of these colonies. The same spirit could be used to ensure that the statement of Outstanding Universal Value reflects the idea and ideal that characterised their foundation and social experimentation in poverty reduction.

Madam Chair, these colonies are proposed for inscription under criteria (iii), (v) and (vi). If ICOMOS agrees that the series approach is justified, Tanzania believes the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies will find objective arguments to address the few remaining challenges.

Madam Chair, the delegation of Tanzania notes that the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties agreed on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property with justification of authenticity and integrity that could be improved if the States Parties were given time. Tanzania also notes that criterion (iii) is agreed by both parties. As for the management system, Tanzania agrees with the Advisory Bodies to enhance the delineation of the buffer zone, to protect the colony as a landscape.

Excellence, madam Chair, for the reasons underlined above and considering the contemporary context, where poverty alleviation is a global target, the inscription of this property will have a symbolic value and inspiration. Therefore; the Republic of Tanzania proposes that the Colonies of Benevolence be referred to the States Parties. Madam Chair, Tanzania supports the amendment submitted by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Taking notes of the States Parties commitment to maintaining dialogue with the Advisory Bodies that includes designing a clear plan to adjust the boundaries, integration measures to conserve the desired Outstanding Universal Value

and also to invite ICOMOS advisory mission, Indonesia recommends the property to be referred back to the State Party. We may also invite the States Parties to consider reducing the components to be inscribed on the basis of selecting components that best reflect the criteria under which the property is nominated.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We will continue our list: we have Tunisia, Australia, Angola and Hungary after the break, because we do not have any more interpreters.

Thank you very much, see you at 3:00 pm.”

SIXTH DAY – Saturday 30 June 2018
ELEVENTH SESSION
3 p.m. – 6 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon. We have only this afternoon and tomorrow to go through 21 nominations. I rely on your cooperation because we have to finalise at least ten sites this afternoon. This morning we only did three sites. We do not have sufficient time compared to the number of sites. We will continue the debate. I give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme je vous l’ai promis, je vais être bref en tenant compte des contraintes que vous avez évoquées et auxquelles bien sûr nous nous joignons. La voix de la Tunisie sur ce cas va dans le sens de la proposition d’amendement présentée.

Nous nous félicitons de la perspective d’une inscription future d’un site qui souligne cet élément extrêmement important pour nos sociétés, la solidarité humaine et l’appui aux situations et aux franges les plus fragiles de nos sociétés. Nous considérons cette future inscription comme une reconnaissance de ces efforts dans nos sociétés, et bien entendu nous appuyons le sens indiqué par le projet d’amendement ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Félicitations à l’État partie pour les dossiers qui ont été préparés, également à l’analyse objective de l’ICOMOS. Nous appuyons une inscription en série, mais il est évident que dans le rapport, les éléments qui sont soulignés demandent que l’État partie puisse approfondir l’analyse comparative en élargissant au niveau des autres pays européens ainsi qu’également affiner un peu la justification des critères notamment les critères (v) et (vi). Sur cette base, nous sommes en faveur des amendements qui ont été proposés et de renvoyer le dossier à l’État partie.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Chairperson, excuse me for the delay. Hungary believes that this is a very important site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. In this present condition there are some issues with the present nomination underlined in the recommendations of ICOMOS. We can see somehow the same problems and the site at the moment should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List. We agree on the referral.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I refer the matter to our Rapporteur to tell us of any amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good afternoon to all my colleagues. As was noted this morning, we have received amendments on this draft decision submitted by Brazil and we have heard generous support for these amendments from the room. We can now see the text on the screen. The original draft decision proposed to defer the examination of this nomination and the proposed amendment would instead refer the nomination back to the State Party. Consequently, you can see the minor adjustments in paragraph 2 and a new paragraph 3, since now the nomination would be referred and the standard format, the invitation to ICOMOS, would also change. There is also a slight modification in paragraph 4.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. If there are no objections, we will adopt the decision. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.25 adopted.

Let us move back to the site proposed by France and Belgium. I now invite ICOMOS to present the transboundary nomination of the Funeral and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to remind the Committee that we have received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Funeral and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), and this notification is to be found on page 20 of the English document INF.8B.4 and on page 24 of the same document in French.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) is a transnational serial property encompassing 139 sites located between the north of Belgium and the east of France, along the First World War Western Front, where war was fought between the German and the Allied forces between 1914 and 1918.

The components site include different types of necropoleis, military battlefield grounds, hospital cemeteries and regrouped cemeteries, often combined with memorials, evocative monuments and landscape arrangements.

The dossier highlights that the powers in conflict, America, the British Commonwealth, France, Germany and Belgium, among others, developed distinctive models for their cemeteries and important architectural landscape planners were called to lay out the plans for this site. Thereby, the series includes include some prominent artistic achievements and well-known necropoleis.

Around 70 components have been grouped into memorial sectors which encompass settings for the burial grounds in the buffer zone. Usually, these were battlefields where the fallen had fought and were killed. Already, during the conflict, the extensive human losses caused by battles and trench warfare triggered efforts to ensure identification of the fallen and their individual burials whenever possible. Only after the wars were the remains transferred to national necropoleis.

Since the first weeks and months of the war, initiatives of burial were disparate. Soon, collective burials became unacceptable and some regulations were adopted by a special department created to this end and the core element of the memorialisation developed: identification of the dead, inhumation in a coffin, information conveyed carefully to the families, organisation of funerals respecting the religions of the deceased, maintenance of the grave, regrouping into national necropoleis and in certain states the repatriation of the remains and their return to families.

The nomination dossier sees these phenomena as unprecedented in scale and organisation. The justification of the proposed Outstanding Universal Value revolves around the series witnessing a completely new approach toward the fallen in combat, a new cult of the dead as a response to the inhumanity of the war, new architectural practices conceived to immortalise the fallen.

Proposed criteria include (iii), (iv) and (vi). Criterion (iii) revolves, as proposed, around the idea of the cult of the fallen in combat as a new cultural tradition, each of the fallen being buried and immortalised individually. Criterion (iv) refers to the creation of a new typology or decorative architectural landscape artefacts that reflect different cultures' sensitive immortalisation. Sites are also associated with elements related to the conflict. Criterion (vi), as proposed, focuses on the way funerary and memorial sites respond to the desire to perpetuate individual identity of the victims and to rememorize the sites through commemorations and institutionalised events at the international, national and local levels.

Proposing the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War on the Western Front is a vast undertaking and the nomination dossier is an impressive work that produced a recommendation and historical research of great value. The nomination, however, in ICOMOS' view, raises several issues. Some of a mental nature, as it is not straightforward, for instance, what the States Parties are trying to commemorate and this affects the consistency of the selection rationale. Was the focus of the nomination the cult of individuals fallen in combat? Many sites do not match with this justification. The proposed justifications for all criteria also appear problematic.

Criterion (iii) considers the individual interment of fallen soldiers. According to ICOMOS, a criterion to consider the individual interment of fallen soldier in the early 20th century cannot be seen as an outstanding witness of a civilisation or a cultural tradition.

Criterion (iv) proposed a justification that has no reference to the immense tragedy that is behind this undertaking and despite the revised wording provided for criterion (vi), this does not justify in ICOMOS' view how the proposed associations can be seen to be of outstanding universal significance.

Authenticity and integrity are problematic, therefore, given the difficulties in identifying the attributes. In relation to the integrity, the state of conservation of the site also appears uneven and often the maintenance is driven by budget constraints handicapping the consistency with their values.

Several component sites in France still await legal protection under the heritage legislation to ensure transformation in the vicinity does not negatively affect the sites. An overarching management approach is not developed, a transnational management structure has been created, but this has not yet affected how sites are managed individually.

However, more fundamental questions are raised by this nomination in ICOMOS's view with regard to the relevance of the theme to the World Heritage List; how to present a property related to the first global conflict and what message should be conveyed by such a property. The comparative analysis proves to be difficult, despite the initial efforts made by the States Parties. No attempt has been made to see in what ways the series reflect the magnitude and the scope of this war and its inhumanity, perhaps because it is an exercise almost impossible to conceive of.

The selection of the components is problematic and so are the boundaries and serious problems related to management at this stage and their feasibility in relation with the sheer scale of the property and its transnational nature. However, ICOMOS considers that first and foremost, this nomination raises fundamental issues in relation to the purpose and the scope of the World Heritage Convention and its appropriateness regarding commemorating properties related to conflict or war. The selection of World Heritage properties is based on comparative analysis and it appears for ICOMOS to undertake meaningful comparison of suffering, human losses or the scale and scope of this conflict.

ICOMOS has devoted considerable time to assessing this property, as it could set a precedent for future nominations. ICOMOS notes the reservations already expressed by the World Heritage Committee at the time of the inscription of Auschwitz-Birkenau, which are the symbols of that horror and with others it should have remained in isolation. The World Heritage Committee notes sites related to negative memories could include messages in contradiction to the Convention. When the Hiroshima Peace Memorial was inscribed, other reservations emerged and the call was made for a comprehensive reflection on whether and how sites related to divisiveness of memories may be presented for inclusion on the World Heritage List.

However, such a reflection has yet to take place. For these reasons, ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front) be postponed until such a reflection is undertaken. This Committee in fact has already decided under Item 5A to undertake such a reflection through experts' meetings.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Australia fully understands the rationale of the draft decision before the Committee to postpone the consideration of this nomination. At the onset, we acknowledge with appreciation the enormous body of work undertaken by the States Parties of Belgium and France in putting forward a nomination that reflects positively and not negatively on our collective recognition of Sites of Memory. There is much discussion being had on Sites of Memory; the paper on the interpretation of criterion (vi), papers on the interpretation of Sites of Memory and the ICOMOS paper are all valuable contributions.

There is still more to discuss, with many nominations in preparation and in prospect, specifically on the question of how the World Heritage Convention deals with Sites of Memory, the relationship between the materiality of sites and the memories associated with them and how they are understood across generations. This makes all the more important the Committee decision under agenda Item 5A to convene an expert meeting and develop some guidance on this matter.

In these circumstances, Australia believes it is important to provide clarity to the nominating States Parties in the future process. We had contemplated the avenue opened to the Committee to adjourn discussion on the nomination under rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure, but on reflection, this course of action would leave the States Parties in an unhappy limbo. Therefore, Australia proposes that the Committee defers this nomination. This would give the States Parties the opportunity to consider and reflect on the considerable guidance provided in the ICOMOS evaluation as to how to revise and submit a nomination.

In our amendment, we identified some of these areas, including the selection of component parts, the selection of boundaries and the buffer zone. Additionally and importantly, deferral presents the States Parties with the opportunity to work with their partners to improve the legal protection and management of these sites. Lastly, deferral would allow the States Parties to take full account of the guidance to be developed on Sites of Memory. We look forward to considering a future nomination at a future meeting if the Committee should decide today to defer this nomination.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Let me start by complementing Belgium and France for having performed a good and constructive collaboration, as the two States Parties, through the nomination process, have managed the dialogue and ownership of local stakeholders as well as an understanding of fallen soldiers around the globe. That being said, Norway is of the view that a discussion of this nomination must proceed in relation to the decision that we, the Committee, made under item 5A paragraph (vi) and (vii), namely on interpretation of Sites of Memory and sites associated with memories of recent conflicts. We quote:

‘To allow for both philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value of evolving memories, the interrelationship between material and immaterial attributes in relation to memory and the issue of stakeholder consultation, as a prelude to the development of guidance on whether and how sites associated with memories of recent conflicts might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention’.

Madam Chair, this is important because it challenges the Convention on several levels, particularly regarding the universality of the Convention and the importance of the

priority of values. It perhaps even challenges some ideas that are the bases of the Convention. On a more concrete level, debates and reports have shown that we lack the proper scientific tools to deal with this topic.

With reference to the above, Norway finds it very challenging to make a scientific and objective decision as expected through Paragraph 23 of the Operational Guidelines and in further reference to the Rules of Procedure, (rule 31); we would like to propose that this item be adjourned to allow for the activities described above to be implemented in a proper way and further that item be reactivated upon provision of additional information aiming at demonstrating how the outcome of the reflection undertaken apply to it, thus enabling completion of the evaluation by ICOMOS.

In light of this, Norway has also proposed an amendment and we welcome any consideration of this nomination at a later session of the Committee.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary would like to join the previous speakers and delegations. Hungary welcomes the comparative approach of the two States Parties concerning the joint nomination which further challenge the spirit of the Convention.

The Hungarian delegation, even after a careful examination of the nomination file, at this stage cannot make a decision on the property’s relevance to the World Heritage List. Further elaboration is needed on how the nominated property with such a specific concept could have a rightful place on the World Heritage List and how the Committee should acknowledge its rightful importance by different means, probably by creating another subcategory for memorial places.

We believe that setting up an expert group consisting of members of the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat and the Committee could clear up all the conclusions which emerged during the evaluation process. Therefore, Hungary, by acknowledging and commending the States Parties for the careful preparation of the nomination file, supports further discussions, not only for the sake of the evaluation of the present file, but also for sites with similar notions. The Hungarian delegation wishes not to make a decision before a full scope of expert evaluation document is available and the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and therefore its rightful place on the World Heritage List is clarified. Hungary supports the proposed postponement.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to follow up on the comments already made. We fully understand the rationale of the postponement and we are in favour of the proposal made by Norway and others. We think that the postponement should be given a timeframe and not be indefinite.

We would like to ask ICOMOS if the proposed two years would be sufficient to have a proper reflection and evaluation on how the Committee relies on decisions based on scientific bases and I would like to hear from ICOMOS whether this timeframe is sufficient for such a study and reflection.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. While thanking ICOMOS for its presentation, Brazil expresses its concerns about the recommendation presented by the Advisory Bodies and regrets its proposal for postponement of these nominations since there is no provision in the Operational Guidelines for this procedure, as stated in Paragraph 151 of the Operational Guidelines: ‘*ICOMOS and IUCN make their Recommendations under three categories,*’ therefore Brazil urges ICOMOS to make an effort to provide its recommendations under one of these three categories in the future.

On the matter at hand, madam Chair, the Brazilian delegation understands that further consideration should be given to Sites of Memory related to conflicts. In this context, we welcome the decision that the Committee took on Monday under item 5A to convene an expert meeting on Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts to allow a further reflection on the very nature of these properties. Perhaps Belgium and France could step in to make this expert meeting possible, as eventually its conclusions could provide valuable input for a possible revised nomination, if these countries wish to.

We take this opportunity, madam Chair, to commend ICOMOS for issuing a discussion paper on the evaluation of World Heritage nominations related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. First of all, we should thank Belgium and France for all the work undertaken in presenting this nomination; we also want to thank ICOMOS for the information and analysis provided relating to the file. We do think it is a very delicate issue. It is nothing new for the members of the Committee, because we do have expert group set up when thorny issues arise in the framework of the Convention and I think the need for those discussions in such a forum means that, yes, adjourning the discussion on this would be the best way forward.

We also agree with the Norwegian-proposed amendment, because we do think if we had come along with a deferral, as Australia is suggesting, we cannot guarantee that we will have the benefit of the outcomes of the discussion of such an expert group. We would rather have the expert meeting held first and benefit from the time given, rather than putting the cart before the horse. We would rather have things in order, as in the Norwegian amendment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, you have the floor, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Advisory Bodies and ICOMOS for their great report and their concern. We think that they have a point with their concern. We support the Norwegian suggestion to postpone it. We think we will wait for the outcome of those experts before we commit to any deferral or any process.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, l'Angola avait justement proposé dès le début de nos travaux cet amendement de mettre en place un groupe de travail pour approfondir les outils scientifiques d'appréciation et d'évaluation des sites de mémoires. Face à cela et à la situation à laquelle nous sommes confrontés, j'aimerais poser deux questions au Centre et également avoir l'avis du conseil juridique.

Premièrement, en l'absence des outils d'évaluation d'une proposition d'inscription, est-ce que la proposition devrait être reçue par le Centre ? Deuxièmement, le report ne fait pas partie d'une des décisions qui figurent dans les orientations de la Convention et, dans ce cas, qu'est-ce que le conseil juridique nous conseille, nous en tant que Comité ? Quelle décision peut-on prendre face à une telle situation ?

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. I think that the question received has been posed by the honourable delegate of Bahrain concerning the timeframe that such reflection would need. He was asking whether two years would be sufficient. Internally, we cannot set a timeframe

but I believe that two years would be exactly what ICOMOS would like to allow for some time for reflection and at least one or two meetings to address the issue on the methodological framework for assessing these properties and also the principles. Yes, I believe two years would be a good timeframe for such a reflection.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. In the course of the contributions from distinguished colleagues, the question was raised in relation to Australia's proposal for a deferral of the dossier as to whether the States Parties of Belgium and France would essentially be prepared to wait before submitting a new nomination, so that they are able to fully take account of the guidance that comes out of the experts reflection on this process.

It would be good and helpful I think for the Committee to hear from both States Parties if indeed they would be prepared to hold back until such time as material is available for their full consideration in developing a new nomination.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie a suivi avec beaucoup d'attention le débat et l'évolution des propositions ainsi que les éléments qui composent ce texte. Nous comprenons parfaitement la sensibilité de cette question aux yeux des uns et des autres. Il y a des propositions pour lesquelles nous émettons un doute, sous le contrôle de madame la conseillère juridique, qui concerne leurs conformités avec nos statuts et règlements.

Nous proposons d'aller plus loin dans notre programme tout en gardant l'importance de ce dossier. Une petite équipe, un petit comité de réflexion, composés de quelques États parties pour faire aboutir l'ensemble de ces propositions, mais surtout de veiller à ce que l'on prenne une décision en totale conformité avec la Convention et avec nos règles de fonctionnement interne. Je crois que cette précaution protégera notre décision de quelques incertitudes futures. La grande question est comment ce dossier, au vu de toutes ces propositions, reviendra devant notre Comité et sous quel régime juridique. Je crois que nous sommes devant un cas *sui generis* de ce point de vue là ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Mr Balsamo to answer questions on the procedure.”

Mr Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. As regards the first question asked by Angola about the admissibility of the dossier, we actually based our judgement on the completeness of the

nomination regarding the compliance with Paragraph 132 of the Operational Guidelines and the next five paragraphs which basically do not concern the substance of the nomination submitted for the form. So, in this case the nomination submitted from this point of view responded well to all the requirements of 132 and annexes and it was receivable.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The legal advisor, please, to answer the question of Angola”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. If I understood the question correctly, it asked us whether the proposal for an adjournment was something that could be valid on the table, but I am not entirely sure I understood Angola’s question correctly. Was that the question? Clearly, it is within the Rules of Procedure to allow for the adjournment of an item so there would not be any legal difficulties with that, if this is the direction the Committee would like to take. It is clearly provided in the Rules of Procedure.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. India has the floor.”

India:

“Thank you madam Chair. India’s reason for taking the floor on the subject is to recall the contributions of the 150,000 Indian soldiers who participated in the First World War and of whom 9,300 made the supreme sacrifice within the territories of France and Belgium. They are buried in 168 cemeteries spread over France and Belgium and it is regrettable that the history of the First World War places inadequate emphasis on the role played by Indian soldiers fighting a war that sought to support the values of freedom while the same freedom was denied to them in their home country.

While the Indian Memorial at Neuve-Chappelle in France and that of Belgium do form part of the nomination dossier, we would like to underline that they are not burial sites. In the future, we hope to work together with the French and Belgian delegations to ensure that India’s sacrifice and the contribution of its 150,000 soldiers are not forgotten by history.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur to show us the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As has been noted during the discussion, we have received two sets of amendments: One was submitted by Norway, Hungary and Spain, and the other submitted by Australia. We have heard support from Bahrain and Kuwait for the amendment submitted by the group of countries.

The proposal from Norway, Hungary and Spain suggests to adjourn the debate, the consideration of this nomination, while the proposal of Australia is rather to defer this nomination. As there is quite a complex set of amendments, I would like to go through them paragraph by paragraph, starting from the top.

The first paragraph would remain unchanged. Then the original paragraph 2 which reads: *'Recalling the reservations it has expressed concerning the inscription of sites related to negative memories.'* Norway, Hungary and Spain suggest keeping this paragraph while Australia suggests deletion.

For paragraph 3 we have two options. That first, submitted by the group of countries, would read: 3. *'Recognizes that the evaluation undertaken by ICOMOS may be considered effective until its 45th session in 2021;'*

The proposal of Australia for paragraph 3 reads: *'3. Noting the thematic studies on guidance and capacity- building for the recognition of associated values using World Heritage criterion (vi) and the interpretation of Sites of Memory.'*

Then, in paragraph 4 we have the proposal from Norway, Hungary and Spain that would read:

'4. Decides to adjourn consideration of the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France, until a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided whether and how sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines';

The proposal we received from Australia for paragraph 4 would instead delete the original paragraph and replace it with the following:

4. *'Also noting decision 42 COM 5A to convene an expert meeting on sites associated with memories of recent conflicts to allow for broad philosophical and practical reflections on the nature of memorialization, the value of evolving memories, the interrelationship between material and immaterial attributes in relation to memory and the issue of stakeholder consultation and to develop guidance on how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention.'*

For paragraph 5, again, we have two options. The proposal submitted by the group of countries would read: *'Encourages States Parties to provide support to the undertaking of the comprehensive reflection, including through contributions or hosting an expert meeting;'* While the proposal of Australia for this paragraph would read: *'Recognises the international importance of the nominated property.'*

New paragraph 6, and again we have two different options. That first, submitted by the group of countries, would read:

'6. Notes that the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France, could only be considered by the Committee upon further review by the Advisory Bodies in light of the Committee's decision referred to above and upon receipt of additional information to be provided by the States Parties concerned'.

The proposal of Australia would read:

6. *'Welcomes the use by the nominating States Parties of principles to guide development of the proposal including the adoption of the consensual approach involving all*

parties concerned and the use of an inclusive, balanced interpretation framework incorporating the context and history of the site.'

Then we have the proposal for two new paragraphs by Australia. Paragraph 7 would read:

7. ' defers the examination of the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France, on the World Heritage List in order to allow the States Parties with the advice of ICOMOS to reassess the selection of component parts to focus on a clear and consistent typology and sustainability of memorial activity, reassess the boundaries of the component parts and the buffer zone and further reinforce the necessary and the legal measures that are currently in place to ensure proper protection of each site.

Then we have the final paragraph, 8, that would read: 8. *'Encourages the States Parties of Belgium and France to take full account of Decision 42 COM 5A in preparing the revised nomination for consideration by the World Heritage Committee'.*

Madam Chair, as I have just read out, this is quite a complex set of amendments; it might be advisable that the Committee deliberate whether they would to go along with the Australian amendments for deferral or the proposal of the group of countries to adjourn the debate."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Before I give the floor to Australia, I would suggest that you meet together with the Member States that would like to participate in finalising the wording of the draft decision. The floor is to Australia and Cuba."

Australia:

"Thank you Chair. We would be happy to embrace your suggestion. First, we would like to get some clarifications from the legal advisor. We have two essentially different propositions here; one from Australia, to defer consideration of the nomination, and one from Norway, to adjourn debate under rule 31 of the Rules of Procedure. The point I would like to receive clarification on is whether the proposal to adjourn the debate is within the scope of the Committee, to add the substance that Norway has brought forward with its proposal.

It is simply a matter of discussing it and a particular time, or no time at all, or can the Committee add the additional constraint or suggestion I should say from Norway to the adjournment's proposal? I think this is an important matter, to resolve the Committee's consideration of this dossier."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Cuba, please you have the floor."

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] "Thank you madam Chair. Actually, the distinguished delegate of Australia will allow me to be much briefer because we had the same concern with regard to the drafting we are using and the difference between the adjournment and the deferral. I think the adjournment is clear and the Rules of Procedure are clear on that. I am just

wondering, should we be careful with the terminology used? Are we creating an unusual precedent here?"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Hungary, please, you have the floor."

Hungary:

"Thank you madam Chair. It is a very complicated issue and the situation is not very clear. I would like to draw your attention to one point in order to be able to take a decision between the two partly different proposals. I think and I am convinced that if the Committee decides to create a body of a group of experts to look clearly at the situation and to take some general decision on Sites of memory, it would be not good and not right to take a decision on deferral or adjournment.

Between the two propositions, I am in favour of the first possibility; not to take any decision until the different bodies have taken notes and made a decision and how to be able to make such a nomination on Sites of Memory and not only on this case here in front of us.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The legal advisor, please."

Legal advisor:

"Thank you very much. As you know, with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, there are four possible routes that may be followed: inscription, deferral, referral and non inscription. What we have now is two competing proposals; one is a proposal for deferral which can also be seen as a new proposal to defer rather than to inscribe and there is the other, proposal for an adjournment. Obviously, the adjournment proposal is a procedural motion and as such takes precedence over the proposals.

However, the question that was asked by the distinguished representative of Australia related to legitimacy, including the nature of the language in the two paragraphs. In my view, given the language of the rule, it allows a Member State to move the adjournment either *sine die* or to a particular time, to the extent to which that language in the adjournment proposal in fact specifies that, which constitutes a particular time. It would be after the 43rd session; we would have made a decision on the matter in question and then at the 44th session the matter could be taken up again on the basis of additional information and evaluation which will have been provided, taking account of what has been decided at the 43rd session.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Norway please."

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We just wanted to join the distinguished representative of Hungary, who stated what is most important to us, that is to ensure that we have sufficient time for discussion.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Australia, but could you try to find a solution because we would like to save some time?”

Thank you.”

Australia:

“Certainly Chair, I will try to make my question more specific, because I do not believe I have clarity to the answer that I am looking for yet. It is very unclear within the Rules of Procedure that any States Parties and members of the Committee can move for an adjournment and there is a process set out in Rule 31 and it specifically relates to the adjournment of the item and the ability to set a timeframe or not as to when the discussion may resume. What I would specifically like to know is whether in the amendment from Norway, points 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 can be added to a decision to adjourn.”

The Chairperson:

“The legal advisor: Can you answer this question now? Do you want the answer now or can we refer to it later? We are wasting time. I can give the floor to France now. Actually, Zimbabwe first.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. While waiting for the legal advisor, I wanted to find out from Norway whether they would be happy to have the decision just composed of paragraph 4.”

The Chairperson:

“The legal advisor, please.”

Legal Advisor:

“I understand the difficulty of the question from Australia. I think it is quite a complicated case. This is not the sort of matter in relation to which adjournment is usually proposed. It is usually proposed in the course of a much simpler debate; it is now proposed in the course of proposal. The dilemma if we were to have only a paragraph proposing that we adjourn until date x, the rest of the information that has been dealt within relation to the proposal, which is essentially the adjournment, is to go ahead satisfactorily, will not be contained in the decision.

I think it is possible to have both the adjournment language and the additional language that would have been contained in the proposal language because, otherwise, the adjournment simply cannot take place in an intelligible way and it would now want the Committee to decide on the basis onto what the nomination should be considered down the track, once the study and decisions have been made on the handling of sites of this nature. I hope that answers the question of the delegation.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank very much. Do you still want to have your proposal?”

Australia:

“Yes, madam Chair, Australia would prefer its deferral proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Just to save some time, can I call on you to meet together and try to find an acceptable wording for you all please? Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. Clearly, a smaller working group could be established. I just wanted to say that quite a few member States have spoken on the need for some preparatory work on Sites of Memory. Trying to reconcile a proposal for an adjournment and another proposal for deferral seems to be rather difficult to us. We would rather support the proposal of Norway because we think that procedurally, it is going to be a bit simpler. And we think we will also take into consideration the opinions expressed.

This in no way undermines the importance of the property being nominated, but we do think that it is going to be very, very important to set a precedent not only for this site but any other similar sites that may arise in the future in this Committee.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I hope I will make this my last intervention on this matter. The reason that we are proposing deferral is because we believe a deferral best reflects the use of the Operational Guidelines in relation into the consideration of a nomination. We would be very open to a proposal to make clearer and more specific in our deferral proposal that the Committee would not consider this matter before the 44th session or later, so that there is a full opportunity for the guidance that needs to be developed to be taken into account, if that would be acceptable to the States Parties. We really do feel that it is important to frame this

decision within the established procedures of the Committee and the Operational Guidelines around the decision framework of not inscribed, deferred, referred or inscribed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.’

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. If you allow me to reiterate my statement, of course, I will not do so; please take into account what I said. I want to emphasise again that a decision of the Committee independent from the fact of what type of decision (deferral referral or inscribed) is a decision. And Hungary, also Norway and Spain, are for another solution.

At first, the Committee should elaborate the methods of the nomination and decision-making towards this type of nomination and only after this, take any decision. If we make any decision now, in this very case, we give a precedent to a wrong line and in the wrong direction. So, if it is possible, and I could see that it is for the Committee, to postpone, to adjourn the decision then, please, follow this way.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I do promise this is my last intervention. We are very happy to take on board your suggestion that we form a small group to work this through.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, do you agree or would you like to say something?”

Norway:

“We would just like to second the distinguished representatives of Spain and Hungary on their interventions. I am not sure about the idea of a working group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je ne souhaitais pas revenir sur ce qu'est j'ai commencé par proposer, mais malheureusement, il me faut le redire. Nous sommes devant deux positions importantes et chacun des choix porte non seulement notre lecture du dossier, mais porte la gestion globale du Comité de ce dossier sensible.

Toutes les propositions sont honorables et compréhensibles. Nous ne sommes probablement pas en mesure dans un laps de temps raisonnable de le trancher dans un débat ouvert. Je crois bonne l'idée de former un groupe qui travaille non seulement sur la formulation, comme vous l'avez dit madame la présidente, mais aussi le balancement entre les deux choix possibles et nous reviendrons vers le Comité avec un projet de décision. Cela permettra aux idées d'être mieux traitées et développer et à nos travaux d'aller de manière plus rapide. C'était ma proposition de tout à l'heure je la renouvelle à l'instant ».

La présidente :

« Merci beaucoup. Je donne la parole au Koweït ».

Kuwait:

"We also know this is a very sensitive issue, but we think that what is presented by the delegation from Spain is the most reasonable and efficient way to solve this matter.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"I think it is better not to complicate the matter. We will form a working group and tomorrow you come back to the Committee with a proposal, if possible. Australia, Spain and Norway, Kuwait, Tunisia all the others, Indonesia, Hungary please form a group.

Norway, please."

Norway:

"Thank you madam Chair and sorry for taking the floor again. If we understood the rules correctly, the Rules of Procedure are standing above the Operational Guidelines in this issue. Our challenge is that we have not actually had the discussion that we should have had and we think this is very problematic, although we understand the reasoning of our colleague from Australia. We still find it very challenging to actually make this decision without having had the debate that is foreseen in the next two years.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Zimbabwe, please."

Zimbabwe:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. I do not know to what extent a working group would solve this problem and I think maybe what you are asking us is what we feel about this proposal. If we are adjourning, we do not touch the draft decision, we just note that we adjourn. If we have a working group, we discuss this nomination.

It is either we just say the Committee adjourns but we do not touch the draft decision, we do not interfere with it. We agree to adjourn until a study has been done and the meeting has been held and then we leave it at that. We do not interfere with what we were given as a draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, I think we have tried as hard as we can to make the case for this dossier being dealt through a deferral rather than an adjournment, but it does seem that we are the only one that is expressing a view in favour of the deferral rather than an adjournment so on that basis we would simply ask that the Committee make its decision on the adjournment proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Can you prepare the draft?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We just need a moment to prepare the draft decision. Thank you for your patience dear colleagues. After the withdrawal of the Australian proposal, you are going to see on the screen the decision as it would look with the amendments submitted by Norway, Hungary and Spain. Just a second, as I can see that we still have a reference on paragraph 4 to the Australian proposal and this needs to be deleted.”

The Chairperson:

“Let us go paragraph by paragraph, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 2 would read: *‘Recalling the reservations it has expressed concerning the inscription of sites related to negative memories’.*”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 3 would read: *‘Recognizes that the evaluation undertaken by ICOMOS may be considered effective until its 45th session in 2021’.*”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 4 would read:

4. *‘Decides to adjourn consideration of the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France, until a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided whether and how sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines’.*”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 5 would read:

5. *‘Encourages States Parties to provide support to the undertaking of the comprehensive reflection, including through contributions or hosting an expert meeting’.*”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 6 would read:

6. *‘Notes that the nomination of the Funerary and Memorial sites of the First World War (Western Front), Belgium and France, could only be considered by the Committee upon further review by the Advisory Bodies in light of Committee decision referred to above and upon receipt of additional information to be provided by the States Parties concerned’.*”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted. Let me now declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.24 adopted.”

Our next site is the Town of Hops. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Žatec – the Town of Hops, Czechia. ICOMOS, you have the floor. Excuse me, before we go to Czechia I give the floor to France regarding the previous site.

Thank you.”

France :

« Merci madame la présidente, je souhaiterais que la Belgique qui a la direction des opérations sur ce dossier s’exprime en premier. Je vous remercie ».

La présidente :

« Je donne donc la parole à la Belgique ».

Belgique :

« Merci madame la présidente, et merci au Comité pour ce débat très riche. Nous voulons vous remercier pour votre disponibilité à travailler sur cette thématique. Nous restons convaincus que le dossier que nous vous avons présenté n’avait rien de diviseur et qu’au contraire nous voulions rassembler tant la communauté internationale que les communautés locales traditionnelles autour d’un exercice de commémoration.

Dans la liste des sites que nous présentions ce n’était pas loin de 80 États parties dont les mémoires des nationaux étaient honorées et ce sont des milliers de gens qui se sont impliqués dans la préparation de ce dossier : architectes, historiens, communautés locales, représentants des communautés locales qui, jour après jour, veillent à la vie à la préservation de l’intégrité et à la mémoire de ces sites qui sont des sites de paix et de recueillement. À cet égard nous voudrions particulièrement saluer les instances et futurs gestionnaires de ces sites qui étaient à nos côtés depuis le début.

Bien sûr, madame la présidente, c’est avec une très, très grande déception que nous enregistrons la décision d’aujourd’hui. Nous le répétons, nous sommes à la disposition de tous pour apporter l’expertise que nous avons réunie dans la préparation de ce dossier et nous attendons effectivement avec impatience, la reprise de ce débat et donc nous vous remercions encore.

Maintenant je voudrais rendre la parole à mon collègue français. Merci madame la présidente ».

La présidente :

« La France s’il vous plaît ».

France :

« Merci madame la présidente. En complément de ce que vient de dire le délégué de la Belgique, je voudrais faire deux remarques. La première c’est que tout ce que nous faisons depuis le début de la semaine traite de la mémoire. Ce que nous avons inscrit ce matin, le magnifique site de Mumbai, c’est la mémoire de la présence coloniale britannique au cœur d’une très grande ville indienne aujourd’hui et c’est tout à l’honneur de l’Inde

d'avoir préservé cet élément de son passé. Le site que nous avons inscrit de Fars sur cette grande cité sassanide c'est la mémoire de l'Iran avant qu'il ne devienne musulman, c'est la mémoire des populations iraniennes. Là aussi, nous faisons un travail de mémoire.

Il n'y a pas de mémoire négative, la mémoire est toujours négative et positive, bonne et moins bonne, blanche et noire. Le site que nous présentons avec la Belgique, ou tout au moins l'ensemble des sites, est justement là pour démontrer qu'une mémoire peut être réconciliée. Ce qui fait la valeur de ce site c'est aussi, comme l'a fait remarquer la distinguée représentante de l'Inde, qu'il y a là des populations qui sont enterrées sur nos territoires, la Belgique et la France, qui viennent de la planète entière.

Je comprends et nous approuvons le fait qu'il faille continuer la réflexion. Nous soutenons entièrement, et c'est comme ça que nous voyons la décision que vient de prendre le Comité, nous ne voyons pas bien la différence entre un différé et un ajournement, mais c'est un ajournement. Il faut poursuivre les travaux et nous sommes tout à fait prêts avec le Comité du patrimoine mondial et avec l'ICOMOS à organiser dans l'hiver une réunion sur ces sujets sensibles.

Je vous remercie madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Je vous remercie. Now, I invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Žatec – the Town of Hops, Czechia. The Secretariat has nothing to say, so ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Located south of the Ore Mountains, in north-western Bohemia, Žatec – the Town of Hops, is a serial property comprising the Historic Centre of Žatec and its southern 19th-20th centuries expansion known as Prague Suburb, and the Anton Dreher Export Brewery complex.

Historically, the City of Žatec and its surrounding region have played a significant role in the international hops trade. Thanks to qualities of the local variety of aromatic hops sought after key ingredient of beer production and the surplus in crops. In consequence, the City and the wider region have adapted to this agricultural sector by developing specific built-in economic structures tailored to hop cultivation, processing and trading.

It has been nominated for what it represents, a unique locality illustrated hop growing and processing throughout the centuries for the high quality of the Žatec hops for long-term development hop processing in the Middle Ages and the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Because comparison with other relevant sites would indicate that the concentration and a number of buildings, all based on one single commodity, would have no parallel.

Selected criteria for this property include criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). Criterion (ii) is justified as a site presenting a globally known place for the international exchange of hop-related techniques. Criterion (iii) is supported by the unique quality of the Žatec hop as a basis of the tradition of hop growing. While criterion (iv) refers to Žatec being proposed as an outstanding example of a town in which a high number of specialised buildings related to hop processing.

Although interesting for the theme it brings up, hop growing as an aspect of beer making, ICOMOS considers that this nomination poses issues in relation to its scope and what is being nominated in the rationale for the serial approach in the proposed Outstanding

Universal Value and the elected criteria and therefore also in terms of integrity and authenticity.

The nomination revolves around hop growing but it does not include any component or attributes reflecting this aspect. The surviving features relating to hop processing in the old town are very limited; on the other hand, the Anton Dreher's Brewery specifically reflects beer-making only.

The comparative analysis, although it examines many properties, has not provided the necessary support to meet the Outstanding Universal Value, as it misses some key properties in the comparison and focused on criteria rather than proposed Outstanding Universal Value and related attributes. The proposed justification for criteria appeared problematic to ICOMOS.

For criterion (ii), the argument put forth reflect the major phases of the history of Žatec, but does not succeed in justifying it. Criterion (iii) revolves around the quality of the product hops, and not around the property and how it would reflect the hop-growing tradition. Criterion (iv) reflects arguments that might apply only to the Prague suburb and not to the entirety of the nominated property, which only reflects part of the hop processing. This affects authenticity at this stage.

With regard to integrity beyond the non-consistent rationale of the serial approach and the boundary delineation, one problem is represented by the recently built Hop Tower that overshadows the chimneys of the drain kilns, the main features of Žatec's urban landscape. The neglect to which most of the key buildings and potential threats that come from the conversion and the lack of any comprehensive assessment or guidance prepared to orient their transformation in the future represents a major affecting factor for the nominated property.

Legal protection and protective measures are, on the other hand, adequate, although they could be strengthened for the buffer zone. A management system is in place, although it is missing a rehabilitation and reuse strategy for the great number of vacant hop-related buildings, as well as a risk-preparedness strategy.

In summary, the comparative analysis has not succeeded in highlighting the potential significance of the property. Authenticity and integrity therefore have not been validated and criteria have not been demonstrated at this stage. Boundaries are not satisfactory, as they do not encompass what relates to hop growing. Protection, as said, is fine, conservation requires urgent plans of intervention, on the other hand, and the management is in place but could be strengthened.

ICOMOS recommends therefore that Žatec, the Town of Hops, be deferred so as to allow the State Party to deepen the research of the theme of hop growing and processing on the property and its wider settings to bring into focus the potential significance and areas related to hop farming which have been impacted by this activity. If a robust case can be made, then reconsider the scope of this nomination.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments? China, please."

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Despite the evaluation’s conclusion, China can still find the unique values of the town Žatec from the description of the nomination in ICOMOS’s evaluation report. In particular, China is interested in the justification of the proposed criteria (iv) and (vi), as the built environment and urban life is shaped by the specific production activities and the associated intangible cultural elements such as traditional skills, festivals and customs.

China also has sites of liquor brewing and processing. The property provides a very good approach to promoting the sustainable development of a traditional industrial town by making use of cultural heritage resources. China hopes the State Party continues the endeavour to protect and transmit a traditional industrial heritage and its valuable spirit and traditions.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway supports the draft decision. This nomination is about beer making, an activity and a product that has been of universal interest throughout human history, as well as being one that is geographically spread out. As stated by ICOMOS in its evaluation, this nomination is perhaps the first that addresses this legacy. Hence, in the future, there might be room on the list for an inscription that represents a phenomenon that may also contribute to more equilibrium in the representative List.

However, as also pointed out by ICOMOS, there are uncertainties as to whether the property as described in the nomination, is the only and best representative of beer making. Norway endorses Czechia’s initiative as a thematic approach. Undoubtedly, Czechia should have the central role in further discussions. The State Party should also play a central role in defining the best hop ensemble of attributes possible, given the whole scope of the phenomena.

However, Norway would like to encourage the State Party to look at the matter in the broader context in its future work, as the theme might also have a potential as a transnational series. The latter is an option that should be seriously considered as it constitutes an approach in line with the spirit of the Convention. Finally, Norway would like to complement Czechia for its intention to continue the work through the deferral proposed. A deferral is not an expression of distrust or discouragement. Rather, it gives important access to professional expertise and advice to ensure that the final nomination can be further refined.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We have not received any amendments to the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.26 adopted.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination Aasivissuit – Nipisat, Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea, Denmark. But before that we give the floor to the Czech Republic.”

République tchèque :

« Merci madame la présidente. La République tchèque tient à remercier l'ICOMOS pour la fine analyse de notre dossier de nomination et pour son rapport d'évaluation détaillé et très inspirant. Nous avons bien pris compte de tous les commentaires du rapport et, ensemble, avec les représentants de la ville de Žatec, nous avons décidé d'approfondir nos recherches et de continuer nos travaux sur ce thème du patrimoine lié à la culture et au traitement du houblon qui nous tient particulièrement à cœur pour réviser le dossier de nomination d'après les recommandations de l'ICOMOS.

Nous remercions également le Comité d'avoir fait sien l'avis de l'Organisation consultative. La République tchèque espère soumettre bientôt un dossier plus cohérent et convaincant, un dossier qui nous permettrait d'inscrire ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en satisfaisant les critères et les conditions pour l'inscription et dans le plus grand respect de notre Convention.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Aasivissuit – Nipisat, Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea, Denmark. But before I give the floor to Mr. Balsamo.”

Mr Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination and this notification is on page 35 of the English version of document INF.8B.4 and page 40 of the French version of the same document.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. It is my pleasure to present to you the ICOMOS evaluation of the Aasivissuit – Nipisat, Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea, Denmark. Climate and topography in West Greenland along a vast west-to-east transect from the ocean and fjords to the ice sheet contain evidence of 4,200 years of human history. Fisher-hunter-gatherer cultures have created an organically evolved and continuing cultural landscape based on the hunting of land and sea animals and seasonal migrations.

The nominated property is very large, 410,800 hectares in area, and is located north of the Arctic circle in West Greenland. It is approximately 235 km long and up to 20 km-wide – an irregular, rectangular-shaped, west-east transect from the Davis Strait in the outer sea, into and including a span of approximately 40 km of the dynamic ice sheet in the east. Within the nominated area, the State Party has identified seven key localities that demonstrate its cultural histories. These contain archaeological sites, historical and present-day settlements and have been chosen as localities that convey the values of the cultural landscape, including the interdependence between humans and the landscape. The boundary overlaps part of the Ramsar area at its eastern end.

The seven key components are connected by traditional annual migration routes from coast to inland in summer and then back again in late autumn. The surrounding seascapes and landscapes provide the resources for hunting, fishing and gathering. In the interior, caribou is the main game species.

This area of Greenland features steep climate gradients between summer and winter, strong tidal currents and an arid steppe interior. Three major migrations of Paleo-Inuit and Inuit peoples came to Greenland from present-day Canada: and Thule Inuit (from the 13th century). From the 18th century, colonists from Denmark-Norway established settlements on the island of Nipisat. Archaeological evidence of large communal winter houses and communal hunting of caribou using hides are distinctive characteristic of this cultural landscape. Other attributes include graves from various cultural periods that are found throughout the nominated area. The values of the cultural landscape include contemporary cultural traditions in today's Inuit community.

The comparative analysis is appropriately framed and demonstrates the new world Arctic properties and fisher hunter-gatherer cultural landscapes, relatively under-represented on the World Heritage List. The nominated property is distinctive within the Arctic region because of the extent of its landscape elements, the specific chronological historical sequences, seasonal migration routes, communal hunting of caribous and the contemporary traditions.

ICOMOS considers that the integrity and authenticity of the property are demonstrated and that there are few visual intrusions or pressures of development. However, importantly, climate change impacts pose potential threats and continued efforts to document the intangible attributes are needed. ICOMOS considers that criterion (v) has been demonstrated by the transective environments and coastal fractures which demonstrate the human culture of this region and their tradition of seasonal migration. Evidence of culture, natural interaction, dynamic natural landscapes, intangible cultural heritage and continuing hunting and seasonal movements create the cultural landscape.

Based on the arguments presented, ICOMOS does not consider that the other criterion proposed by the State Party, the (iii), is demonstrated. No buffer zone has been provided. Following exchanges with the State Party, ICOMOS concluded that the lack of any buffer zone was acceptable, as it was unlikely to be an issue for long-term protection of the attributes. Sites and structures within the property exhibit a stable state of conservation although many are considered vulnerable due to environmental pressures and future threats from transportation infrastructure, modernisation of the settlements and tourism growth, including hunting-related tourism.

The legal protection of the property was recently protected through an executive order adopted by the Greenland government, which came into force on the 1st of February of this year. The management system is adequate, although the resources for its implementation need to be confirmed. ICOMOS encourages the State Party and the municipality to work with local communities to enhance the benefits for Inuit people arising from World Heritage inscription.

To conclude, ICOMOS recommends that Aasivissuit – Nipisat, Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea, Denmark be inscribed as a cultural landscape on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (v), a draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been provided and ICOMOS has also made a number of further recommendations.

Thank you very much, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Australia congratulates the local community, the government of Greenland and the State of Denmark on the nomination of this outstanding cultural landscape. Landscapes such as these are patterned by the continuing knowledge and practices of the indigenous people as reflected in the use and management of natural resources and over a very long period of time are greatly unrepresented on the World Heritage List as noted by ICOMOS.

We were particularly impressed by the state of the cultural landscape and the way it defines its transect across the country to fully reflect the seasonality of hunting and fishing and associated migration routes. We appreciate the additional information provided by the State Party that explained the roles of local communities in the management of the site and their support for the nomination.

In their evaluation, ICOMOS also notes that the tangible evidence of the practices of hunting and fishing are interwoven with the spiritual and mythical dimensions of the landscape, but we found that these were only minimally detailed in the nomination and if appropriate within the continuing cultural traditions of the Inuit community. We would be delighted to hear more about these dimensions of the landscape in the features. Australia wholeheartedly supports the nomination of this property on criterion (v).”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Norway.”

Norway:

“Madam Chair, Norway would like to congratulate Denmark for this second nomination for World Heritage nomination in Greenland, the second-largest island in the world. As such, it is claimed to be the second new world property on the List, the first being Kujataa in southern Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap.

This inscription gives attention to fisher, hunter-gatherer cultural landscapes, the continuing and contemporary traditions which is a relatively under-represented category on the World Heritage List. Greenland is an evolving modern society with traces of human settlements and nomadic living through the centuries. For sure there are challenges to be handled, as reflected in the draft decision; for example, tourism and strategies that actively engage the cruise ship tourism sector may rise to become urgent in the near future. This is already subject to regulatory interventions in the western Norse region fjords as well as elsewhere, like Glacier Bay in Alaska. Cooperation and exchange of experiences in this field would be beneficial.

Norway has ties to Greenland, historically as well as emotionally, so we are really sharing the feeling of pride with everyone who has contributed to this magnificent nomination.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, Zimbabwe would like to join other States Parties to congratulate Denmark on this day for this successful inscription of their property on the prestigious World Heritage List. This property was inscribed on the basis of criterion (v) which recognises the importance of cultural landscapes. This unique cultural landscape contains evidence of 4,200 years of human history, with well-preserved evidence of fisher, hunter-gatherer cultures which exploited both terrestrial and aquatic resources. It is also important to note that the Inuit people on this cultural landscape have unique intangible cultural heritage, which is important for the continual survival of this property.

Madam Chair, the documentation of the unique Inuit cultural practices and intangible cultural heritage associated with these cultural landscapes showed the continual. Once again, we congratulate the State Party of Denmark for bringing this very important addition to the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, having considered the presentation of the nomination dossier, the analysis of the Advisory Bodies and the recommendations that the site be inscribed as it meets criterion (v), the conditions of authenticity and integrity, the United Republic of Tanzania supports the draft decision that the site be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criterion (v).

Madam Chair, the United Republic of Tanzania’s delegation congratulates the State Party of Denmark for having undertaken such a successful nomination dossier. However, the State Party is encouraged to take into consideration the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies that include developing and implementing the monitoring system with an explicit focus on the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value, including the introduction of regular monitoring, maintenance mechanisms and indicators to monitor the social and physical impact of tourism activities.

Once again, congratulations Denmark.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China thanks the State Party of Denmark for offering such a spectacular nomination in the hot summer days of the Arabian Peninsula that enables us to have an extraordinarily pleasant experience that goes beyond the context of space and time.

China welcomes the inscription of this important heritage landscape of humanity because it fills the gap on the World Heritage List and enables us to pay more attention to the conservation of traditional cultures and the sustainable ecological landscape in polar regions, which is essential to the development of mankind as a whole.

Congratulations to Denmark. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie félicite et remercie le Danemark pour cette belle proposition d’inscription d’un bien qui vient enrichir une sous catégorie encore sous représentées à savoir les paysages culturels. Cette belle proposition vient renforcer la Liste du patrimoine mondial pour sa crédibilité, son équilibre et surtout sa représentativité puisqu’elle permet d’enrichir la Liste d’un bien appartenant aux représentants d’une communauté autochtone et sa culture, son mode de vie et la manière d’exploiter l’espace.

Encore une fois un grand merci et toutes nos félicitations au Danemark. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. My delegation would like to congratulate the State Party for introducing such an outstanding example of traditional human settlement patterns and the cultures of fisher, hunter-gatherers which addresses the gap on the World Heritage List. This interaction between the human and the harsh Arctic environment has contributed significantly to the formation of organically evolved and continuing cultural landscapes for the rich and logical history of tangible heritage as well as the intangible heritage of hunting and fishing traditions that are sustained by contemporary settlements.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Hungarian delegation would like to congratulate Denmark, first of all, for this valuable and unique nomination, which is very important for us from this region, the northern hemisphere. I agree and Hungary agrees with all the former statements and also supports the nomination to inscribe.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis wishes to associate itself with the comments made by Norway, Tanzania and others and congratulates the State Party of Denmark and the indigenous people for presenting such an extraordinary traditional heritage landscape, which combines beautifully the attributes of tangible and intangible heritage from the polar region for inscription on the World Heritage List.

We know the excellent work done by the community concerned and the State Party and encourage them to continue to work on the basis of the recommendations of ICOMOS as stated in the draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Guatemala please.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Guatemala would like to add its voice to the statements of congratulations to the State of Denmark for this nomination and we also agree with other members of the Committee that this is an exceptional testimony to the intangible and cultural aspects of heritage combined.

We do think that given the challenge of climate change, having this kind of site on the World Heritage List will do a lot to raise the visibility of World Heritage. We would like to congratulate the authorities and the State Party for the inscription of this very important site on the World Heritage List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to The Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We did not receive amendments to the proposed draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I will proceed to the adoption. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.27 adopted. I congratulate Denmark on your behalf and I give Denmark the floor, please.”

Denmark:

“Thank you madam Chair. On behalf of the State Party of Denmark and the government of Greenland, I wish to thank the World Heritage Committee for inscribing Aasivissuit – Nipisat, Inuit Hunting Ground between Ice and Sea on the World Heritage List.

First of all, I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its cooperation throughout the entire nomination process. I would like to thank ICOMOS and express our respect for them, their work and knowledge. The nomination is the result of a remarkable cooperation between officials in both Denmark and Greenland, politicians, authorities from the municipality of Qeqqata and settlements, councils and other local stakeholders.

We will do our utmost to protect and safeguard the area, so the next generations will be able to visit a place of best testimony of our cultural heritage in search of outstanding ways, as this area shows. With your permission madam Chair, I will pass the floor to the municipality of Qeqqata, which played an important role in this nomination.”

The representatives of the Qeqqata municipality thanked the Committee for the inscription of the site in indigenous language.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much and congratulations again. We are moving to the next site and ICOMOS will present the Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes, France. Before I give the floor to ICOMOS, the floor is to Mr. Balsamo from the Secretariat to present the site.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to remind you that we received a factual error notification concerning the Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes, which is to be found on page 36 of the English Version of document INF.8B.4 and page 42 of the French version.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. This property was originally nominated under a different name, Nîmes Antiquities and the Present. Following the reception of the interim report in January 2018, the State Party has decided to modify the name into the Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes and it is therefore presented under this new name.

Nîmes features the preserved monuments of a Roman colony and the city that has grown up around them. The Maison Carrée, the amphitheatre, a temple to Diana (part of a temple complex called the Augusteum), and portions of the city walls and gates all date to the 1st century CE, and these were incorporated into the later medieval city.

The property being nominated encompasses a series of districts in the historic centre of Nîmes and is surrounded by a buffer zone incorporating further elements illustrating the proposed Outstanding Universal Value.

As a Roman settlement, *Nemausus*, Nîmes most prosperous period was under the Emperor Augustus in the first century CE, when most of the still-surviving monuments were built. Nîmes then suffered from decline until the 12th century. Between the 17th and 18th centuries, fortifications were demolished, revealing the Roman monuments and leaving space for new expansion. Nîmes has been nominated because it possesses an ensemble of remarkably well-preserved Roman structures which have served as an inspiration for later Renaissance, neo-classical and modern structures.

Originally more focused on the Roman remains, the wording of the selected criteria (ii) and (iv) has been revised by the State Party to make them more consistent with what was being nominated: As ICOMOS noted, a sort of mismatch between the property and justification of the criteria. The updated justification of criterion (ii) states that Nîmes remarkably illustrates the influence of ancient architecture and the arts had on western art and this is seen through the way in which Nîmes and its builders have looked at the ancient monuments. Criterion (iv) is justified on the grounds that Nîmes preserved an exceptional ensemble of preserved and rediscovered ancient monuments which had such an influence that since the 18th century Nîmes has asserted itself as a city inspired by these buildings.

The comparative analysis, although extensive, has, in ICOMOS' view, not been able to bring into the light in what ways Nîmes would distinguish from other cities with Roman ruins that also participated in architectural revival based on antiquities. In fact, in most European-Mediterranean cities, it is common to find such architectural elements. ICOMOS considers that the Roman urban fabric has not influenced or determined the subsequent urban structures, only the 18-19th centuries' interventions have created linkages among ancient monuments. In previous epochs, only the creative elements were borrowed from antiquities, something which in ICOMOS' view is commonplace in most cities with a Roman past.

The ensemble of the Roman monuments in Nîmes are a good testimony of a Roman city in the early imperial Roman period; the comparison has not been demonstrated as to how these vestiges and their later development stand out with respect to other similar Roman buildings within the same geographical area. The integrity therefore appears problematic in relation to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value regarding the inconsistencies of boundaries with justification for the Outstanding Universal Value, but also due to urban development pressure.

Authenticity is as well problematic because features of historical urban fabric do not exhibit the purported continuity of ancient Nîmes. Legal protection exists; however, protective measures do not prove to be as effective in order to prevent development. The management system is based on a set of instruments and mechanisms, but ICOMOS noted that archaeological heritage is not given sufficient attention despite the extremely high protection and the focus of the nomination.

Most affecting factors derive from urban development in the nominated property, for instance the Museum de la Romanité, which is now completed and the Palais des Congrès, which is planned to replace the Hotel Dieu. This new building is planned to be equipped with parking, which will increase traffic. Archaeological remains, as said, are also threatened by development; *in situ* preservation is not likely to occur. Other threats derive from uneven conservation and use and tourism pressures.

In conclusion, ICOMOS found that the comparative analysis did not make a robust case for Nîmes; the criteria were not justified at this stage and integrity and authenticity not demonstrated although protection could be considered in place and management could be improved, especially in relation to decision-making processes.

ICOMOS therefore recommends that the property be deferred in order to allow the State Party to develop a thorough comparative analysis on the Roman buildings of the City of Nîmes to bring into focus as to where the potential significance can be identified. If a robust case can be made, reconsider the scope of the nomination on this basis.

There are also some additional recommendations to control developmental pressures and ensure that archaeology is considered in any project within the nominated property and its setting. I would like to add that France has informed us that they have initiated to undertake Heritage Impact Assessment on the Museum de la Romanité and other projects.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I now give the floor to Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Permettez-moi avant tout propos d’apprécier à sa valeur le grand travail accompli par l’ICOMOS et je félicite également l’État partie pour le grand travail de son côté pour nous permettre d’apprécier la présente candidature. Madame la présidente, l’évaluation qui vient de nous être présentée par l’ICOMOS fait apparaître deux points concernant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien.

Premièrement, l’ICOMOS considère que l’analyse comparative n’a pas démontré en quoi Nîmes est distincte des autres villes romaines et qui, comme Nîmes, présentent un degré comparable de continuité à travers les siècles. L’ICOMOS considère que d’autres propositions pourraient être envisagées notamment considérant le territoire plus grand des monuments entiers de la Narbonnaise.

Madame la présidente, ma délégation a soumis à l’attention de votre auguste assemblée un amendement au projet de décision pour demander l’approbation de la proposition d’inscription sur les critères (ii) et (iv), le bien ayant à notre avis sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle.

Un proverbe burkinabé dit qu’avant de se coucher on s’assoit. Aussi, madame la présidente je voulais qu’avant l’examen de l’amendement que vous permettiez à l’État partie de présenter devant le Comité les orientations scientifiques qui ont été les siennes lors de la préparation de la candidature sur ces deux points qui sous-tendent son caractère unique.

Je vous remercie madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Uganda”.

Uganda:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. My delegation courteously respects the opinion of ICOMOS thus far in reviewing France’s application for the inscription of the Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes on the World Heritage List. Supposedly, draft comparative analysis of Roman buildings in the property has transformed the terms of the property’s significance regarding corresponding Outstanding Universal Value.

My delegation has looked at the draft amendment and is convinced that it is comprehensive, diligent and well-focused. The amendment presents a solid statement of Outstanding Universal Value, associated extent of integrity and authenticity, together with management and protection requirements.

In the view of my delegation, this amendment covers all other issues, such as archaeological considerations, conservation programmes and tourism management plans, all raised by ICOMOS. My delegation therefore urges this Committee to excise an iconic act of good governance hereafter to inscribe France’s Historic Urban Ensemble of Nîmes on the World Heritage List.

I rest my case.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente. Nous félicitons l’ICOMOS pour le rapport produit en collaboration avec l’État partie sur l’ensemble urbain historique de Nîmes formé par les monuments anciens et les édifices de renaissances, néoclassiques et modernes qui relie l’antiquité au monde moderne. Après avoir analysé ce rapport, nous nous sommes rendu compte que l’ICOMOS émet quelques réserves sur l’analyse comparative du bien, qu’elle devrait être approfondie en prenant en compte les territoires des anciennes colonies romaines en dehors de l’Italie.

Cette réserve a remis en cause l’appréciation des attributs potentiels justifiant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site. Toutefois, l’ICOMOS considère que les attributs de ce site pourraient bien justifier du critère (iv). D’autres réserves sont émises par rapport au mécanisme de conservation et de gestion, notamment en ce qui concerne le projet de développement au sein de la zone proposée pour l’inscription, la mise en œuvre d’un plan de conservation et l’élaboration d’un plan de gestion du tourisme.

Au regard des éléments d’analyse que nous venons d’exposer, nous aimerions demander à l’ICOMOS et à l’État partie de nous fournir des éléments complémentaires devant nous permettre de prendre une décision appropriée sur l’inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Roman heritage is present in the entire territory of the Roman Empire; some of it has rightfully been inscribed on the World Heritage List. The nominated property of Nîmes belongs to the important Roman sites during the later development of the ruined town’s the old structures were revived in the form of medieval and later houses and buildings. As in most cases, also, the perimeter of the Roman town as well as the street network was newly formed with few alterations. The nominated property possesses a lot of important and highly-valued remains from many centuries, admired components, and shows its exceptional significance for nominating the site on the World Heritage List.

However, the Advisory Bodies noted that the nomination had some deficiencies which should have been more cautiously elaborated, amended and complemented. It was also pointed out that some new building projects can badly influence the possible Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Therefore, Hungary, agreeing with this evaluation, supports the recommendation of ICOMOS to defer the nomination back to the State Party in order to fulfil the requirements stated in the draft decision and to further refine the nomination file.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Historic Urban ensemble of Nîmes is an ensemble illustrating an ancient heritage that is still present and interpreted today. Based on the working document and the supplementary documents that we have carefully studied, Nîmes possesses a remarkably well-preserved Roman structure. The structure has inspired the development of later architecture in the context of urban and also cultural practices. This activity and initiative of urban development has been carried out to the extent that the city of Nîmes now has different features compared to other cities with similar Roman heritage. In addition to that, the property is also in an excellent state of conservation.

With the aforementioned assessment, Indonesia is of the view that the property has well reflected criteria (ii) and (iv) for which it was nominated. We therefore recommend the property be inscribed as a World Heritage, and further recommend the State Party to further continue the work to preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as suggested by the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Australia would like to thank France for the nomination. Obviously the city of Nîmes has a very rich cultural heritage and this is very evident in the presentation that we have seen. We carefully studied the nomination dossier and the Advisory Bodies’ report provided by the State Party and the additional information provided by the State Party.

Thus, the nomination stands for the information we received; we do not consider what the Outstanding Universal Value would be if we were to inscribe this property. We know that ICOMOS found that the nomination did not show how Nîmes stood out in comparison to other cities already inscribed on the World Heritage List.

As such, Australia supports the draft decision to defer the nomination back to the State Party and the recommendation made by ICOMOS to develop a comparative analysis from the Roman buildings in the city of Nîmes. We believe that the decision to defer the property is important, because it would allow an advisory mission to take place to assist in reformulating the nomination.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. We would also like to direct a question to ICOMOS; has it received any additional information from the State Party, France, regarding the exceptional quality of Nîmes, to perhaps try to make up some of the shortcomings regarding its Outstanding Universal Value for a Roman City? We believe this is part of the Global Strategy.

If we look back to 1994, we also saw that there was an over-representation of historic European Cities on the World Heritage List and it actually invited States Parties to present other types of heritage for inscription. We want to know if we are keeping in line with those recommendations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le site à propos duquel nous discutons ce soir est un site très connu de la romanité méditerranéenne et qui fait face à des sites de la rive sud, dont une partie dans mon pays. La ville de Nîmes a un dynamisme culturel international très connu, nous remarquons aussi que ce dossier a été entouré par un engagement des autorités et des populations locales tout à fait à saluer.

Il n'en demeure pas moins que nous avons relevé les remarques faites par ICOMOS et souligné certaines parmi elles. Nous savons que l'État partie a apporté quelques réponses à ces remarques. Nous souhaiterions l'écouter sur l'ensemble de ces observations, sur les remarques faites par ICOMOS.

Nous vous remercions ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Madam Chair, let us start by complementing France for its hard work for World Heritage in general and on this nomination in particular. However, Norway has several concerns related to the scope and concept of the nomination; one of them is regarding the development of the Palais des congrès, which would undoubtedly disturb the potentially unique aspect of the site.

As already stated in this meeting, we, as a Committee and as guardians of the Convention, share the responsibility to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value is the basis on which we inscribe new sites on the World Heritage List as well as to ensure that a property fits within the Global Strategy's Goals.

As you may have already understood, Norway, as do Spain and Australia, supports that the nomination be deferred to the State Party for further development. As already stated, but still in need of repetition: a deferral is not an expression of distrust; it rather gives important access to professional expertise and advice to ensure that the nomination can be further refined.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to France so that they can answer Burkina Faso's question.”

France :

« Merci madame la présidente. Il y a plusieurs questions qui ont été soulevées par le document et son évaluation par ICOMOS. J'en dégage deux ensembles principaux, et d'ailleurs nous avons d'ores et déjà transmis, y compris à ce Comité, un mémorandum expliquant de manière détaillée les différents points de réponses aux observations tout à fait légitimes de l'ICOMOS.

Le premier de ces deux ensembles concerne la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Il est clair que là nous sommes face à une situation de rattrapage, c'est-à-dire que cela fait 20 ou 30 ans que la ville de Nîmes aurait dû être classée au patrimoine mondial de l'humanité parce qu'elle est l'une des cités antiques les plus préservées.

Il est vrai qu'il y en a d'autres qui ont été inscrites au patrimoine mondial, mais celle-ci est vraiment exceptionnelle. Par exemple, les arènes qui depuis 2000 ans sont d'ailleurs en activité comme lieu animé. Je souhaiterais que l'on nous montre ce que l'on appelle à Nîmes

la maison Carrée qui est en fait un temple dédié aux petits enfants d'Auguste, le fondateur de la ville de Nîmes parce que vous verrez que la façade de ce temple est exactement le logo de l'UNESCO. C'est-à-dire que c'est un temple hexastyle. Ce qui montre bien que la préservation à travers les siècles de ce temple a eu une conséquence, si je peux dire, pour nous qui travaillons dans le cadre du système des Nations unies et de l'UNESCO en particulier et du patrimoine mondial et de son Comité. Je pense que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est là.

En ce qui concerne le deuxième ensemble sur les critères (ii) et (iv) qui ont été soulignés dans le mémorandum. Pour les projets d'aménagement. La ville de Nîmes s'est engagée depuis plusieurs années dans un ensemble d'aménagement et de mise en valeur comme un écrin, en quelque sorte, de cet héritage ancien. Pour ce qui concerne le Musée de la Romanité par exemple, il a été inauguré récemment, il s'intègre parfaitement dans la proximité des arènes et il est là surtout pour bien montrer que tout ce qui a été trouvé dans la ville est à mettre en valeur. C'est un très grand et très beau centre d'interprétation.

Je voudrais également signaler que ce que l'on appelle Palais des congrès, il n'y en a pas, il n'y a pas de centre des congrès. Il y a eu une étude de faisabilité qui a été faite, et il est clair que les remarques de l'ICOMOS et du Comité du patrimoine mondial nous amènent évidemment à remettre en cause ces aménagements. Quand à l'Hôtel Dieu il est protégé et conservé et ne sera pas du tout démoli.

Il y a eu donc un certain nombre d'erreurs dans l'évaluation qui font qu'à notre avis compte tenu des engagements qui ont été pris par la ville de Nîmes, c'est dès maintenant comme le propose le Burkina Faso soutenu par l'Angola, l'Ouganda, l'Indonésie et la Tunisie que nous pouvons inscrire au patrimoine mondial la ville antique de Nîmes.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Je vous remercie. The floor is to ICOMOS."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you madam Chair. I think ICOMOS has received two questions, one from Angola about additional information on the property to better understand the decision and also, from Spain, a similar question.

With regard to additional information, ICOMOS has assessed the information received by the deadline, the 28th of February, when we got this additional information from the State Party, it was the 23rd of February. This was information that ICOMOS could assess according to the Operational Guidelines. On the basis of this additional information, ICOMOS could not see how the property as currently presented could meet the criteria and could justify the Outstanding Universal Value.

In particular, ICOMOS has found that the city of Nîmes, with this Roman background, has a similar pattern of development as other cities that are already on the World Heritage List, and some of them not inscribed. The only area where ICOMOS saw a potential way forward for a nomination concerning Nîmes was to locate the Roman monuments, which are very well preserved, through a thorough comparative analysis because also there are a number Roman vestiges that are already presented on the World Heritage List.

The comparative analysis needs to be very thorough to make the case for these monuments. The nomination needs to be re-scoped. What is currently being nominated is a

portion of the historic centre with different reasons, not only the Roman monuments, but also the influence that these Roman monuments would have had on the subsequent fabric.

ICOMOS does not see that this proposal, as it has been presented by the State Party, has fulfilled the criteria. I hope I have made clear ICOMOS' position with regard to the property as being nominated.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur to give us the amendments or to state them.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As was noted during the debate, we have received an amendment to the draft decision submitted by Burkina Faso and we have heard support for these amendments from a number of countries. The original draft decision would have deferred the nomination, whereas the proposed amendment would instead inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

As such, the amended draft decision now includes a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It also includes the identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed, an assessment of the condition of integrity as well as authenticity and it also has a statement on the protection and management requirements as well as some recommendations to the State Party. Madam Chair, as we heard during the debate opinions supporting both the amended decision and the original draft decision, I would ask through you to the Committee whether we are going to go to the substance of the amended draft decision or if we would rather defer the inscription of this property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I need your input. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. I believe during the discussions there was a proposal from Australia to defer this nomination and if that is still the case, I think we would be in support of this; there are other members of the Committee who are in favour of reevaluating this nomination to the State Party, taking into account the recommendations made by ICOMOS.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We have four for deferral, four for inscription and five for referral. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“I am not sure whether to say something or not. I would only reiterate that Hungary could not change its view, we are for the deferral. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“We are rather divided. Five for deferral and four for inscription. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you Chair. We would just like to join the comment just made by our colleagues from Hungary and would like to see our names joined on screen please. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “We would just like to reiterate what we said earlier. Given what we heard from the ambassador of France, we believe that deferral does not take anything away from the value or the potential of this site. It does not mean that there is no potential to inscribe it in the future. The file, however, we do not believe can be inscribed in its current situation. We are for deferral.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to keep the original draft decision? Can we adopt the original draft decision? Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. In our statement, we supported the amendment as proposed by Burkina Faso and we still maintain our stand. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Is there any objection to keeping the original draft decision? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, Australia just reasserts its position that this dossier should be deferred and I make the observation that you have asked several times whether there are no objections and there are not any forthcoming, so we would be very comfortable with the original draft decision proposed.”

The Chairperson:

“The Rapporteur, could you please read it?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are going to put the original text back on the screen, which calls for the deferral of the examination of this nomination. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.28 adopted. France, souhaitez vous la parole ?”

France :

« Simplement, compte tenu de tout le travail que nous avons effectué avec l'ICOMOS pour exposer nos différentes remarques, nous sommes extraordinairement déçus par cette décision. Nous sommes en particulier déçus par rapport aux décisions qui ont été prises hier sur des sites qui avaient beaucoup moins d'intérêt et dont la valeur universelle exceptionnelle était beaucoup moins évidente et qui malgré ça ont été inscrits pour de pures raisons politiques. Nous sommes donc je dois dire extrêmement insatisfaits de la façon dont ce processus a été mené.

Merci madame ».

The Chairperson:

“Merci beaucoup. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke, Germany. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination from Germany. This notification is on page 37 of the English document INF.8B.4 and on page 20 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Than you Chairperson. I present the evaluation of the Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke, Germany. The text of this evaluation can be found on page 211 of document INF.8B.1 The trading centre Hedeby and the defensive system of Danevirke consists of a spatially linked complex of earthen walls and ditches, settlements, cemeteries and harbours located on the Jutland Peninsula during the first and second millennium. Located in northern Germany, the nominated property comprises of a series of 22 components that extend, marking a border across the peninsula from the 6th to 12th centuries CE.

Attributes of the property comprise archaeological components of Hedeby, including traces of roads, structures and cemeteries. Hedeby is surrounded by a semi-circular earthen rampart, overlooked by a hill fort. In the harbour adjacent to the town are the archaeological deposits related to them, which extend over the water and shipwrecks.

Attributes of the property also include sections of the crooked wall, the main wall, the north wall and the connecting wall and other offshore works and in the east wall with either above-ground vestiges or archaeological remains below ground or under water.

Hedeby, in conjunction with Danevirke, were at the centre of networks of the main maritime trade and exchange between western and northern Europe as well as the core of the borderline between the kingdom of Denmark and the Frankish Empire over several centuries. They bear outstanding witness to the exchange and trade between people and various cultural traditions between the 8th and 11th centuries. The archaeological evidence highlights the significance of Hedeby and Danevirke as an example of an urban trading centre connected with a large scale defensive system in the borderland at the core of major trading routes over the sea and land from the 8th to the 11th centuries.

In its evaluation, ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, that the nominated property meets criteria (iii) and (iv) and the conditions of authenticity and integrity. The serial property is justified and the selection of sites is considered appropriate. The boundaries of the property and its buffer zone are adequate with the legal protection in place, which is also adequate. The property is in a satisfactory state of conservation and appropriate active conservation measures have been taken. The management system for the property is adequate and the monitoring programme is satisfactory.

ICOMOS considers that the main threats to the property are, however, pressures from development, frost damage and tourism. ICOMOS recommends that the archaeological border landscape of Hedeby and Danevirke in Germany be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the bases of criteria (iii) and (iv). ICOMOS also recommends that the State Party give consideration to the following four points:

- a) Keeping the World Heritage Centre informed of the result of the appeal of the refusal of permission to build houses near the Danevirke,
- b) Continuing current management efforts to discourage urban development in the buffer zone, reduce the effect of agricultural practices upon the property, and to mitigate the effects of proposed wind turbines in the wider area,
- c) Completing the planned conservation work on Valdemar's Wall and undertaking follow-up monitoring and mitigation at regular intervals to reduce the future effects of frost damage and vegetation growth,
- d) Closely monitoring tourism levels and potential impacts

Moreover, ICOMOS recommends that the name of the property be modified to become The Archaeological Border complex of Hedeby and the Danevirke.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We are running out of time, I will therefore argue to refrain from taking the floor regarding sites recommended for inscription unless you have an

objection to the draft decision. I thank you for your understanding and cooperation in this regard.

Do you have any comments, objections? I see none. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Madam Chair, we have not received any amendments on this draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.29 adopted. Germany, you have the floor.”

Germany:

“Madam Chair, distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee and of ICOMOS, dear colleagues; first of all, I would like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its great hospitality and the marvellous way this conference has been organised. On behalf of Germany I would like to thank you for your decision to add the Archaeological Border Landscape of Hedeby and the Danevirke to the World Heritage List. We gladly accept the proposed name change.

They were at the centre of a network of trade and exchange between western and northern Europe. They were at the core of the borderland between the Danish Kingdom and the Frankish Empire between the 8th and the 11th centuries. They bear outstanding witness to exchange and trade between people of various traditions, values that are more important than ever for peaceful coexistence and for sustainable development all over the world.

Thus, the new World Heritage, the Archaeological Border complex of Hedeby and the Danevirke, stands for the goal of UNESCO and the World Heritage Convention to foster international cooperation and support. It is my pleasure to hand over the floor to the representative of Schleswig-Holstein.

Thank you madam Chair.”

Representative of Schleswig-Holstein:

“Dear Madam Chair, and members of the World Heritage Committee. Let me first extend our profound gratitude on behalf of the German Federal State of Schleswig-Holstein and also of the region around Hedeby and the Danevirke for inscribing the Archaeological Border complex of Hedeby and Danevirke on the World Heritage List. We would also like to thank ICOMOS sincerely for its professional and constructive evaluation and positive recommendation.

We thank the Committee for inscribing the Archaeological Border complex and thereby a historic border on the World Heritage List, which has just become a token for good cooperation between Germany and Denmark and for the friendly neighbourhood of the German minority and the German minority in today’s border region.

Schleswig-Holstein considers the inscription of Hedeby and Danevirke on the World Heritage List a great honour. We greatly accept the obligation to safeguard, conserve and

preserve these important monuments for future generations and for humanity as a whole. The commitment of Schleswig-Holstein is best showcased by the latest amendment of the Heritage Protection Act of 2014, which was the first heritage legislation in Germany including World Heritage properties specifically.

Dear chair, dear members of the World Heritage Committee, thank you very much for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I congratulate Germany on behalf of the Committee.

Dear colleagues, I would like to inform you that during the Board meeting this morning, a request was submitted regarding the order of the nominations of Italy, therefore it is proposed to examine first Le Colline del Prosecco and then the other site. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene, Italy. Before that, the floor is to Mr. Balsamo.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. This is also to inform the Committee about a letter that we received from Italy in which Italy informed us that confidential information by ICOMOS experts concerning the nomination and its outcome had been published in the press while the evaluation process was still ongoing. According to Italy, this consideration was disclosed before the additional documents were submitted to the evaluation body with negative communicative repercussions on the nomination becoming susceptible to influencing public opinion as well as the experts in charge of the evaluation.

Madam Chair, we also received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene, which is to be found on page 44 of the English version of document INF.8B.4 and page 49 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Member States of the World Heritage Committee, ICOMOS attaches the utmost importance to respecting the integrity of the evaluation process and especially its confidentiality. Contributing to the implementation of the World Heritage Convention is a topic which is regularly discussed during our statutory meetings. Most specifically, regarding the statements made by the distinguished ambassador of Italy, I thank you for giving us the opportunity to bring to your attention the following information.

The ICOMOS World Heritage policy prevents any expert from the same country as a nomination from being present at any panel session where nominations admitted by his or her country are discussed and the recommendation for the nomination is decided. In accordance with this policy, I can confirm that no Italian expert was present during the discussion of the Prosecco case.

Furthermore, regarding the merits of the statement, the remarks reported by some Italian newspapers refer to a matter, i.e. the use of pesticides in the production of Prosecco, which is not even mentioned by ICOMOS in its evaluation reports and did not play any role at all in the evaluation of the site. The statement made by the Italian Ambassador thus appears to us to be without any foundation.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? ICOMOS.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Located in the northern area of the province of Treviso, in the Veneto Region, the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene comprises most of the vineyard landscape of Prosecco Conegliano Valdobbiadene Superiore D.O.C.G. production area. The name Prosecco refers to a grape variety.

The nominated property covers an area of just over 20,000 hectares, taking in 15 municipalities. The boundary of the nomination area covers more or less all the land within the recently designated D.O.C.G. protected area. The landscape is characterised by hogback hills and a diverse patchwork of vineyards. These are laid out around settlements including four towns: Conegliano, Pieve di Soligo, Valdobbiadene and Vittorio Veneto, and these have kept some medieval features, including abbeys, convents, rural churches and fortified walls.

The landscape is said to attest to a 1000-year-old process of adjustment to a remote and rugged land that is symbolic of the agricultural and social challenges that affected European viticulture over the last three centuries. It is also said to reflect community response through scientific and technological innovation in wine production practices at the turn of the 20th century, which impacted on wine production and the landscape and is seen as a redemptive model for wine-making in marginal conditions.

Wine-making has persisted in the region for over two millennia, but this historical development appears largely to mirror the much larger Veneto region, as set out clearly in the dossier. The beginnings of this viticulture date back to Roman times, but in the periods which followed, the territory’s viticulture went through various declines, some of which led to the destruction of vines. It was revived in the medieval period, through monasteries that created vast wine-growing domains between the 11 and 12th centuries. The settlement patterns still reflect some of these monastic structures.

The various documentation concerning the cultivation of prosecco grapes dates back to the end of the 18th century. After the fall of the republic of Venice, Napoleonic domination after 1797 brought about a major reorganisation of agriculture, including its modernisation. The 19th-century Phylloxera outbreak brought disaster to many farmers. The landscape is said to reflect the way science and technology were applied to reinvigorate wine culture as a form of social redemption. This promoted the development and the dense network of small and medium-size farms which survived until the late 20th century. For none of these periods of history does the dossier make it quite clear how they impacted on the landscape of the nominated area as well as on the larger Veneto region.

In recent times, the broader vineyard landscape has seen a dramatic increase in its production area. As for the nominated property, which accounts for less than a fifth of all

production, the growth of vine hectares was more moderate. Although wine-making has flourished in the region over many centuries, the landscape of the nominated property may reflect changes over the past 50 years. Vineyards have extended across orchards and other types of agricultural land as the production of Prosecco has increased in response to its popularity. As it is acknowledged in the dossier, this extension has greatly simplified the landscape where, in parts, 34 per cent of the land is characterised as being of high intensification.

ICOMOS considers that the arguments provided in the comparative analysis are not justified. This tends to position the nominated property as unique among its comparators but does not clarify how the property could be seen as exceptional or outstanding, which is the aim of the comparative study within a World Heritage context and the wider context. The augmented comparisons submitted and part of the supplementary information do not succeed in demonstrating the specificities of the nominated property in a way that could distinguish it as exceptional from other, similar properties.

In terms of Outstanding Universal Value, ICOMOS does not consider that the nominated area can be seen as a landscape that reflects the long-standing tradition of cultivation and wine-making, which together might have shaped the landscape in incremental ways, allowing it to reflect its evolution. It is difficult to appreciate the landscape as an evolved viticultural landscape. Vineyard landscapes need to demonstrate an outstanding dimension, such as the outstanding persistence of long-standing traditions of cultivation and wine-making or the outstanding impacts they may have had on the landscape or the way settlements, vineyards and buildings demonstrate in an outstanding way the processes of production and transportation. The Prosecco landscape cannot be said to be outstanding in any of these dimensions.

Perhaps, in appreciation of these limitations, the justification of Outstanding Universal Value is focused on how the modern landscape of extensive areas of vines within settlements and buildings from the medieval period have survived might be said to reflect traces of three specific aspects of history. The justification of Outstanding Universal Value suggests the landscape is outstanding for the way it reflects the medieval settlement patterns, for its association with Renaissance artists and how it reflects the landscape of redemption.

The settlements and buildings, many of which emerged in medieval times, still mark the landscape, but what has not been demonstrated is how these are exceptional, particularly in relation to other settlements and buildings in the Veneto region. As for the Renaissance artists who were inspired by the landscape, little detail is provided to corroborate the suggestion that the nominated area as a particular part of the Veneto inspired particular artists and how the view corresponding with these paintings has remained largely unchanged.

The third strand of Outstanding Universal Value relates to the way the landscape was reshaped in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, as a means of reviving the local economy through the cultivation of vines for making wine. We are not provided with any detailed evidence of the changes made to the layout of the landscape at this time, apart from the fact that around 50 per cent of cultivated land was planted with vines and we are also not able to compare it with what survives today. It is difficult to view today's landscape as a testimony to an emblematic redemption model for marginality. None of these three strands of Outstanding Universal Value appear to ICOMOS to be justified and nor is it possible to see how in other ways the landscape might be seen as exception for its viticulture or for wine processing.

ICOMOS considers the boundaries of the nominated property could be considered adequate, although they may benefit from a slight adjustment in the southern section, to ensure more adequate protection. The general state of the property and management system is adequate and the conservation measures adopted are generally effective.

Despite this good state of conservation and adequate protection, ICOMOS concludes that there is an insufficient basis for the inclusion of the nominated property on the World Heritage List. Therefore, ICOMOS recommends the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene, Italy, should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous nous penchons en cette fin d'après-midi sur le dossier de Le Colline du Prosecco. Un paysage rural qui possède des caractéristiques, des valeurs et des attributs uniques et pertinents. Uniques configurations géomorphologiques : c'est quasiment le seul paysage qui offre des crêtes en pentes fortes et vallonnées et qui ont été habitées et cultivées durant des siècles grâce à une communauté qui a développé des processus et des procédés de construction dans un paysage agricole et viticole particulier.

Une approche d'adaptation ascendante c'est à dire dirigée par une multitude de petits cultivateurs, une parcellisation du paysage qui a gardé au cours des siècles la même structure ce qui renforce ainsi son authenticité. Une matrice paysagère unique avec une structure rurale et des aménagements spécifiques ; une mosaïque très fragmentée qui comprend non seulement des vignobles, mais aussi de petites forteresses, des tours, des villages et des édifices.

Madame la présidente, la Tunisie ainsi que le Guatemala, la Tanzanie, l'Ouganda, le Zimbabwe, la Hongrie et le Koweït vous propose d'envisager le projet d'amendement qui vous a été soumis en ayant bien entendu lu l'analyse et les propositions d'ICOMOS que nous regardons avec le sérieux qui sied et avec la précision qu'il mérite. Pour autant, nous avons soulevé dans ce rapport un certain nombre d'éléments qui devraient être portés à la discussion de ce Comité.

En matière d'authenticité nous lisons que le site est authentique dans son ensemble, nous lisons aussi dans son rapport que les périmètres et limites du site proposé peuvent être considérés comme adéquats. Nous venons de l'entendre tout à l'heure, l'état général de conservation du site est aussi adéquat, en matière de gestion, ce système de gestion est adéquat, le système de suivi de l'ensemble a été bien construit et structuré. Ce sont des éléments suffisamment importants. Nous n'écartons pas le reste des analyses qui nous paraissent mériter que l'on en discute et que l'on regarde en direction de l'amendement que l'ensemble de ces pays vous propose.

Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. Today, we have in front of us a site that speaks the universal language of culture, identity and the human struggle for adaptation to a fragile and harsh territory. The history of a community of a multitude of farmers. We have in front of us the uniqueness of a very special landscape made up of terraces, vines, villages and farmhouses that all speak for the deep link between nature’s generosity and the skills for the site and the devotion of its inhabitants. This particular landscape reflects the relationship between human beings and their environment, between culture and nature.

The picture in front of us, tells us the story how the sites of the regions have been gradually transformed from marginal lands into a puzzle of vineyards and rural villages dotted with ancient churches, castles and Renaissance-era villas. The landscape thus becomes iconic, expressing the resonance portrayed in the work of great Venetian painters, including the world-wide recognised Titian, one of the founders of Italian Renaissance Art.

The natural features of the environment have been enhanced by agricultural practices dating back to ancient Roman times, later improved upon and refined by the resilience of communities which have preserved the authenticity and integrity of the property. Lastly, and more importantly, this is a site of generosity. A site of brave, amazing migrants who brought with them the knowledge and experience from their fathers and ancestors to far-distant lands in America and Oceania, distant continents where they applied the farmers’ techniques which have helped generations to overcome national challenges, transforming this land to successful development models.

Dear Committee members, without listing this property for the utmost protection which is provided by the Convention, we would lose the original heart of this movement which left traces all over the world.

To apply for the UNESCO convention and protection for the habitat is a way of helping preserve a social tradition and faithfully reflects the deep devotion to a landscape and its protection process. The State of Kuwait supports the amendments proposed by the delegation of Tunisia to inscribe the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have noted the recommendation of ICOMOS and we would like to reiterate the importance of protection and management of this site and we have heard from ICOMOS that these two elements have been met, which is something positive.

It occurs to us that there is a misunderstanding with regards to the value attempted and there is an obvious difference of opinion between the ICOMOS evaluation and the State Party and I think it is essential for us to give the floor to Italy to express some of the points so that the Committee can take a sound decision on this matter.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous sommes devant un site de grande importance historique qui illustre parfaitement, l'interdépendance mutuelle de la valorisation du sol et de la biodiversité et les rapports inséparables entre l'homme et les territoires, la richesse, la diversité des pratiques agricoles traditionnelles des communautés.

Après avoir examiné et analysé le rapport soumis par l'ICOMOS, nous nous sommes rendu compte que l'ICOMOS a émis des réserves sur l'analyse comparative de ce bien en soulignant qu'elle devrait être approfondie en démontrant les spécificités du bien par rapport aux autres bien similaires inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Ces réserves ont certainement eu un impact sur l'appréciation des attributs potentiels devant justifier la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site. Toutefois, nous pensons qu'une évaluation fine des éléments présentés par l'État partie montre que les attributs de ce site justifient à notre avis le critère (v).

L'ICOMOS reconnaît par ailleurs dans son rapport que le système de protection de conservation et de gestion est approprié. L'analyse de certains éléments présentés dans le rapport de l'ICOMOS soulève quelques questionnements sur l'évaluation de ce bien. Je vais citer quelques éléments très rapidement : *“L'ICOMOS considère que la méthodologie proposée par l'analyse comparative est solide”*. Le mot, je le souligne bien. Mais les valeurs et les attributs choisis semblent incomplets et parfois inappropriés. Il y a un problème d'appréciation à ce niveau.

Je cite une autre phrase : *“l'ICOMOS considère que l'influence mondiale a été surévaluée”* et cette phrase-là est répétée plus de trois fois dans le rapport. L'État partie a surévalué certains éléments. Là encore un problème également d'appréciation et un manque de vrai jugement de valeur.

Au regard des éléments d'analyses que nous avons disposés, nous aimerions demander à madame la présidente d'accorder à l'Etat partie la parole pour pouvoir apporter des éléments complémentaires devant nous aider à prendre une décision appropriée.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The Brazilian delegation commends the State Party for a highly technical dossier and would appreciate having additional information on issues raised by the Advisory Bodies regarding boundaries and the historic development of the nominated cultural landscape.

The Brazilian experts understand that the Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene has exceptional value and unique importance for Italy, considering its authenticity and integrity, as well as protective requirements. We also understand that further debate would be welcome when examining nominations with similar features of properties already inscribed on the List, as was the case with Nîmes, which we have just analysed.

Therefore, this nomination should not be dismissed outright. The Brazilian delegation is open to contributing in a positive and constructive way to the case before us, within the framework of the options established by the Operational Guidelines.

Brazil encourages the State Party of Italy to provide additional information, especially on the justification criteria (iv) and (v) as well as the conditions of authenticity and integrity and that confirming the Outstanding Universal Value of the proposed property.

Thank you madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We come to the end of our session of today, as we will not have any more interpreting services. I have in front of me six requests for the floor, from Zimbabwe, Azerbaijan, Uganda, Hungary, Indonesia and Spain. Tomorrow we will start with this and will continue. I remind you that we will have around 14 sites including this one so we have to be very, very careful about our time management.

Thank you very much and have a good evening. There is now an announcement from the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much Madam Chair for giving the floor to the Secretariat to announce the side events. I have the pleasure to inform you that starting at 6:30 pm we have a side event called Revive the Spirit of Mosul organised by the World Heritage Centre. It will be chaired by the UNESCO assistant Director General for Culture, Mr. Ottone Ramirez, and by her Excellency, Shaikha Mai bint Mohammed Al-Khalifa, the President of the Bahraini Authority for Culture and Antiquities.

The Minister of Culture, Tourism and Antiquities of Iraq, His Excellency, Mr. Fryad Rawandouzi, will participate in the meeting as well as Her Excellency, Ruba Al Hassan, Undersecretary of the Ministry of Culture and Knowledge Development of the United Arab Emirates. You are cordially invited to attend the Revive the Spirit of Mosul side event.

There is another side event: The Restitution of the Ancient through Virtual Reality. It is organised by ARCHEOMED in the room Hawar and it concerns 3D viewing tools to stimulate knowledge and awareness of World Heritage. The Mosul event will take place in the Muharraq room, starting at 6:30 pm.

Thank you very much. Have a nice evening.”

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday 1 July 2018

TWELFTH SESSION

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good morning. We have a very long day in front of us with 14 sites to discuss. We will start our session. It was requested at the Bureau this morning to change the order of examination of Roşia Montană Romania, it is therefore proposed to examine this nomination at the end of Item 8B. I trust that you all agree with this proposal.

We will resume our discussion of yesterday with the Italian site of the Prosecco Colline. We now have ahead of us six speakers and that first is Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe agrees with some of the speakers that the State Party should be given an opportunity to explain some of the differences that are in the analysis with that of the Advisory Bodies.

Le Colline is a landmark as well as a system of knowledge developed in the 17th century and which has been carried out in many lands by migrants that left this area. The unique set of techniques and know how and experiments have played their role in the development of agricultural and viticulture in the new territories, but also in Le Colline Valley. It is also a successful development model in terms of working in environmentally marginalised conditions which have provided for the well-being and sense of identity of the communities as well as the migrants that went to the other continents.

The nomination of Le Colline looks beyond the European borders, taking to further lands where it has been a key influence in agriculture in the parts where the migrants landed. The comparative analysis also highlights the influence of techniques in reclamation models which have made agriculture and the knowledge central in the development.

The difference between the Colline Valley vineyards and other vineyards that are on the World Heritage List is that this is based on a struggle of poor farmers as opposed to others which were more organisations working in this area. This is a celebration of the struggle of poor farmers. The farmers have for centuries adapted the hardships of the land and they have managed but also taken this knowledge to other areas.

We do not have this system of values and attributes on the World Heritage List yet. We therefore propose that the Colline Valley be inscribed under criteria (iv) and (v). We are also pleased that ICOMOS does recognise that there are adequate management and other positive attributes. As I already mentioned, we request that the State Party be given opportunity to explain some of the differences or misunderstandings.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The nominated property consists of numerous religious and defensive buildings, compounds of urban settlements and villages which were constructed over a long period since the 11th until the 18th centuries. The Colline de Prosecco nomination could forward several innovative themes to be represented on the World Heritage List.

That first refers to the build cultural rural landscape, the site possesses outstanding scenic aspects that differentiates it from other properties thanks to its morphology and the agrarian solutions used for centuries to keep it preserved and authentic. The second theme refers to the adaptation to tough environment by a multitude of small-scale farms who were not only able to overcome these challenges, but also to become a success story around the world. The third one refers to the migration, the unique set of techniques, know how and experimentation developed in the nominated landscape was exported by migrants of the area along migrating routes to different continents. This would be the first time that the role of migration is explored and the exchange of experience and know ho would be recognised on the List.

Despite this strong potential for wine making in the nominated landscape, the local government adopted a specific regulation to limit the land use and preserve the integrity of the territory. The protection, conservation and management and monitoring systems meet all the relevant requirements. The conditions of authenticity and integrity are met too, whereas the significance of the nominated property and its Outstanding Universal Value is justified on the basis of criteria (v).

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. The rural landscape of Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene holds unique spectacular and imposing characters and heritage attributes that arose a newer and hitherto untested paradigm shift in UNESCO norms of World Heritage listing.

Madam Chair, in their critical reflective stance, the hilly ridges of this property are reminiscent of a unique morphological configuration and cultural heritage geography, inhabited and cultivated over centuries, hardly akin to any other similar or mixed cultural and agricultural landscape worldwide.

Madam Chairperson, globally speaking, this infringing morphology and these centuries-old scientific efforts and artistry used to adapt to it present exceptional veneered architecture, rarely found in other viticultural landscapes.

On the strength of these strong attributes, my delegation consciously stands to differ from the position of ICOMOS and henceforth advocates for inscription of Italy’s Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene to the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Hungary greets the submission of the carefully-prepared nomination file and commends the State Party’s willingness for cooperation and openness to dialogue throughout the whole evaluation process. Hungary feels certain that the comparative analysis underlines the significance of the nominated site, which played an important role also in the development of the viticulture of several other countries.

After the examination of the nomination files and the evaluation of the Advisory Bodies, Hungary is convinced that the nominated site has an exceptional value which should not be overlooked by the World Heritage Committee and therefore proposes the site for inscription.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Indonesia takes note of the objections of the field mission report. We are also noting with concern the diverging views between the State Party concerned and the Advisory Bodies regarding the mission report and the recommended decision. We would like to draw the attention of the Committee members that in terms of comparative study, the landscape of the nominated property of other vineyards already inscribed on the World Heritage List with a geomorphology in the hogback form that required local farmers to find new technology in order to adapt to the harsh environment is singular.

This unique landscape has also serves as an important icon in Europe’s art scene, having been depicted in a number of religious paintings of the Venetians and Italian Renaissance masters. This in itself is recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The State Party has seriously demonstrated its commitment to making conservation efforts and heritage management of the property as recognised in the dossier by ICOMOS. Recognising the unique features of the property, we are of the view that this nomination should not be disregarded altogether; thus, we recommend giving opportunities to the State Party and the Advisory Bodies to have a dialogue and consultation session to iron out all discrepancies in a constructive manner.

The State Party should also be given more time to revise the dossier, in particular by emphasising the unique and outstanding features of the property. We would like to join other Committee members who have invited the State Party concerned to give more information on this nomination in this forum.

I thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. Spain also believes that this unique landscape, with cultural and ecological features that are quite outstanding in description, clearly outlines the topography and the importance of the site for the local economy, and these kinds of bio-cultural rural landscapes are vital for the local communities. Just like those who spoke before me, the proposal for inscription in the draft amendment that we received here at the Committee is based on criteria (iv) and (v) which we think are really justified.

Spain is of the opinion that since there are vineyard landscapes already inscribed on the List, the criteria need to be even more strongly established and this can be usually demonstrated through the comparative analysis. This is why we think that in the nomination dossier, it has not actually been sufficiently and clearly demonstrated in the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. We think it really does have relevant characteristics, as can be seen in the documentation.

Therefore, we think that the relevant exceptional characteristics need to be further developed. We are convinced that regarding the universal characteristics, which have actually been substantiated by other delegations, we would like to see further input. That is why we would actually prefer the original draft decision. We would like to include some mentions of the potential of the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway comprehends the views expressed by the distinguished ambassador of Spain. Let us commend Italy as well for its hard work as guardians of Cultural Heritage and the trust given to this expert Committee.

Norway has very carefully studied the nomination of Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene as well as the information given by the State Party. Norway has difficulties finding the rationale given that criteria (iv) and (v) are fully developed. Further, seen in relation to other World Heritage properties on cultural landscapes, Norway finds it difficult to see as to whether this nomination adds new perspectives and themes to the World Heritage List and does contribute to the accomplishment of the Global Strategy’s goals.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I must, at the outset, say that we are considering in Prosecco, an impressive cultural landscape and we congratulate the State Party of Italy for bringing forward this nomination and we echo the comments of Norway about the enormous contribution that the State Party of Italy brings to the life of World Heritage. It is a tremendous contribution that Italy makes.

We have heard lots of discussion in relation to this dossier already which has focused on the integrity and authenticity of this site and they are evident and not in contention. But we are yet to see a clear case made in relation to this dossier that demonstrates the merits of Outstanding Universal Value. As with Spain, we acknowledge that the potential is there. On this basis, Australia is proposing to move an amendment to the draft decision which rather than not inscribed would defer the property.

This would enable the State Party, with the advice of ICOMOS, to further refine the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the cultural landscape and the attributes to the potential Outstanding Universal Value. It would also enable Italy to reconsider and further elaborate the comparative analysis as an essential basis for demonstrating how this cultural landscape can be considered to be exceptional in relation to other, similar properties inscribed or not on the World Heritage List. We do believe that this would best be done through a support of an expert mission to the site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Our delegation would like to extend its thanks for the information provided in the ICOMOS report. We think that this cultural landscape has a universal value which is encapsulated in criteria (iv) and (v). When it comes to its topography and climate, it is really a unique landscape, in which we have seen the economic activity developed on the basis of smallholder wine-growing properties.

What we also see in this site is the intercultural process where migrants and local farming communities had to show great resilience in order to eke out a living in this difficult landscape by using specialised viticultural techniques. We do think that it makes a significant contribution to this kind of activity and therefore we would like to see it inscribed on the List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Italy to reply to enquiries. Please.”

Italy:

“Thank you madam Chair. Also, thanks to all the countries that have taken the floor so far. Ever since the ratification of the Convention, Italy has abided by the recommendations

of the Advisory Bodies. For 46 years our cooperation with the evaluation body has helped us to improve the protection of our properties.

On this occasion, however, we do not agree with ICOMOS' evaluation, because it is based on prejudice. The recommendation denies the recognition of Outstanding Universal Value affirming that the List is already fully-booked with similar properties. Italy calls for inscription because we believe that this site is unique and fully respects criteria (iv) and (v).

First, the unique hogback of the hilly reach that is not reflected in any other World Heritage site; secondly, the site's unique land and hydraulic arrangements; thirdly, the unique landscape matrix, a highly garmented mosaic representing the first bio-cultural landscape to be inscribed in the List. All these features and values, as shown in the pictures in front of us, testify to the strength of criterion (v) of the nomination.

Furthermore, Le Colline are an example of adaptation to a harsh environment by a multitude of heroic farmers. Thanks to the traditional practices conceived by these communities, this landscape has been preserved today as a remarkable example of sustainable agriculture. There is the universal value seen by the numbers of migrants that brought vineyards and these techniques throughout the world, from Australia to Brazil, South America and North America. This constitutes an outstanding representation of criterion (iv) and has allowed us to preserve its integrity up to now.

With reference to the boundaries, authenticity and historical development, the property has been made and changed over centuries, as demonstrated by the Napoleonic era, 200 years ago.

In conclusion, regarding interference and information leaks during the evaluation process, which I confirm as a member of the Italian government, and I deem what happened a very unfortunate act, I hope it will not occur in the future in the interest of the integrity and professionalism of the Advisory Bodies and for the progress of the convention and the trust of the member States.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would just like to respond to some of the points that have been raised by the honourable delegates during the discussions yesterday and today. The comparative analysis has been raised several times and it was indicated that in ICOMOS' evaluation it was considered sound. Indeed, we did use that word, but we considered what was sound was the methodology used. We also went on to say that the chosen values and attributes were incomplete and in time inadequate and what was compared were not the attributes that were part of the Outstanding Universal Value that was proposed for justification.

There are similar clarifications that I would like to make on authenticity and integrity. We did not consider that either of these have been met. We consider that for authenticity, while the nominated property may be authentic as a whole, as far as architectural forms, styles and materials are concerned, the quote has to be limited to one aspect to the property.

Similarly in terms of integrity, we have concerns. I would like to mention the issue of migration which has also been mentioned quite a number of times. The techniques and

technologies from Prosecco were taken by migrants to different parts of the world. This is mentioned in the dossier, but it is not part of the justification and indeed criterion (ii) has not been put forward to analyse and justify the influence of the migration.

Another theme that has been mentioned several times is that of redemption. The Prosecco landscape is an outstanding example of small-scale farmers being redeemed from work on wine cultivation. Indeed, the Prosecco area was part of this kind of redemptive model in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, but it was not confined to Prosecco and was something that was evident across the Veneto region. In our view, the Prosecco area is perhaps the best example of this redemption idea. Similarly, I would like to comment on the idea of the technical institutes that has been mentioned as part of that redemption model. They were widespread in parts of Italy; they were not confined to Prosecco.

A further issue which has been raised is the struggle, the idea that this reflects the struggle of small farmers to make a living, the idea that this was a resilient landscape. This has been recognised on the World Heritage List. The Pico nomination was an exceptional example of this; the struggle of small-scale farmers in harsh environments, and that is already on the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS has not said that the list is fully-booked. I would like to straighten that point, but rather that, the Outstanding Universal Value of these landscapes has not been justified. Finally, we respect the idea of rural landscapes and cultural landscapes such as these contributing to sustainable development and also to economic development of local communities. That in itself in our views does not justify Outstanding Universal Value.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS again.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I would like to stress again, as I explained yesterday, that ICOMOS strongly sticks to the principal of ethical principles of World Heritage business. I have to stress that confidentiality was strictly kept in the case of Prosecco. I can tell you not only in front of the people in this room but also in front of the people that are observing this session through webcast.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to present the amendments, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Good morning to all colleagues. As we have heard during the discussion, I have received a set of very conflicting amendments to this draft decision. As you know, the original draft decision would not have inscribed this property on the World Heritage List. I have received an amendment from Tunisia, Kuwait, Zimbabwe, Hungary, Uganda, Tanzania and Guatemala which would instead inscribe this site on the World Heritage List.

Then, I have received an amendment from Australia which would instead defer the examination of this nomination and during our debate we have heard support for the amendment proposed by the group of countries and also heard support for the original draft decision. If I may, madam Chair, can I ask the Committee, through you, which set of draft amendments would you like to look at first?

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. In terms of procedure, my understanding is that the Committee should start with the proposal that is furthest from the original. When we are faced with a recommendation not to inscribe and there is a proposal to inscribe, it seems to me that is the matter, we should deal with it first and take it from there.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections? I see none.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I apologise for this delay. As such, the proposal that we have received from the group of countries for the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List is first. As you can see, we have the proposal in paragraph 2 for the inscription and then going further down below, logically we have a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value which includes the identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed, assessment of conditions of integrity as well as authenticity. We also have a statement on the protection management requirements. If we scroll further down below, we also have a set of recommendations to the State Party.

This is the first set of amendments that we have received. To make sure that the Committee is clear, the other proposal we have from Australia would instead defer the examination of this nomination. Subsequently, Australia’s proposal only consists of three paragraphs.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other points of view or do we go according to the rules? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Chairperson, I am quite comfortable with an uncomfortable silence, but as others are not, I think it is quite obvious there are differences of view to do our best to handle this

dossier and, in those circumstances, I think we have reached the point in our deliberations where there is only one means by which this can be resolved and that is by a vote of the Committee, I would suggest.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I just want to make a contribution on this situation. We have heard from many countries, seven, which have supported and mentioned their opinions. Some countries, some, mentioned their objections: If we can encourage the Committee to give their opinion, so we can feel maybe we do not need to go to a vote. We can feel the support on this. In case it should express any objection and then we can go from there. Listen to the silence and then draw your conclusion. This is what I propose.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“I just need to ask in reference to the procedure if Australia asked for a vote whether this is now hanging and we are discussing whether there is more support on the deferral side, if I understood the Indonesian colleague. If we can get some clarification, please?”

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, Norway asked for clarification about the vote, would you like to answer now or I give the floor to Bahrain first. Bahrain, you can go and then China and back to Australia.”

Bahrain:

“We had the same clarification requested by Norway to our colleagues from the Australian delegation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China has the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We are very sympathetic to Italy’s view and the explanation, although we also hear quite contrasting views on this particular matter. I suppose in some way if we do not have to go to a vote that might be the best solution and

perhaps the truth is somewhere in between. Perhaps a good way would be to give more time to the parties involved for considering a little further.

We may leave the case at this particular point and proceed to the next item for the time being, so that there could be more consultation with the States Parties concerned and some of the Committee members that are proposing different proposals. That's China's opinion.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is to Brazil."

Brazil:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. I think that given the paralysis of positions we have seen in the analysis of this decision, I would tend to agree with the proposal made by Australia and also endorsed by our colleague from China, so that we give the States Parties some more time to bring forward its dossier and present it again.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. Australia please, do you have any other views?"

Australia:

"I think really the other observation that I can make is that I have heard now what I believe to be several further members of the Committee expressing views that are supportive of the Australian proposal for deferral of the dossier. It is not obvious to me that given the very different views which have been expressed, one group of Committee members that have spoken in favour of inscription now and another group of States Parties, including Australia, which are not in a position where we could agree to inscription. That difference of view is capable of being resolved in the margins of the Committee through further dialogue.

Australia has already moved to a positive direction in relation with this dossier, which was recommended not for inscription and we have indicated that we see in the dossier the potential for Outstanding Universal Value to be identified, but that the State Party on analysis needs to do further work in order to clearly articulate that Outstanding Universal Value.

The best way for that to happen from Australia's viewpoint is for it to be referred back to the State Party for there to be further substantial dialogue between the State Party and ICOMOS through a mission which would enable Italy to bring forward a dossier, which we are hopeful would ultimately meet with the favour of the World Heritage Committee. On that basis I think it is best that we seek to resolve this matter on the floor of the Committee."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Norway, please, you have the floor."

Norway:

“Thank you again madam Chair. I am sorry for taking the floor again. We are still very conflicted about the situation. I do believe it was offered for a vote before and I do think that the Norwegians would support and would ask for a secret ballot in line with Rule 41 of the Operational Guidelines on the deferral, not an inscription proposition.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, I just want to understand what the Norwegian delegation is proposing...”

The Chairperson:

“Excuse me, according to the rules, we have to close the debate because there is a request for voting. Is Zimbabwe supporting? Australia, please you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Just a point of order madam Chairperson. Norway has now called for a secret ballot, so the first thing I should do is indicate that Australia will also agree with Norway’s suggestion, which means that according to the Rules of Procedure we are now in circumstances where a secret ballot is the requirement under the Rules of Procedure. It is important for us to, however, clarify exactly what it is we are having a secret ballot on.

My understanding under the Rules of Procedure is that the secret ballot would be in relation to whether the property should be inscribed; or whether the amendment to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List should be adopted. If and when we have the outcome of that, we would then have advice about the next step that we need to take. I would think that in the case of a decision to inscribe it is the end of it; if it is a decision not to accept the amendment, then I believe we would move on to consider Australia’s proposal for deferral of the nomination. The legal advisor may wish to clarify these steps and the process for us now.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the legal advisor to give us the steps for the secret ballot, please.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you very much. Very briefly, if the members of the Committee consider the two proposals to be amendments then, as has been said, the amendment which is furthest from the original proposal is the one that would be to be voted on first.

If the members consider the proposal for inscription to be an amendment then that is the proposal that would need to be voted on first and, as two member states have requested a vote by secret ballot, the vote will be conducted by secret ballot. I understand the Secretariat will place the language for the committee members to clearly understand what they are voting on.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I think we will now draft the wording of the decision which you will vote on. Please be seated. During the vote nobody is allowed to talk or move or exchange place. We will start the vote and before that, the legal advisor will give you the clarification of the situation.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you madam Chair. As you know, for inscription and non inscription, in this case inscription, are matters covered by the Convention and a two-thirds majority is therefore required.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Now, the Rapporteur will read the wording of what you are going to vote on. Please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam very much Chair. I am now going to read out the question under which the Committee should be voted on by secret ballot and it is the following: *‘Are you in favour of the amendment for inscription submitted by Tunisia, Kuwait, Zimbabwe, Hungary, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda and Guatemala on Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.31 concerning Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene Italy?’*

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“We are appointing two tellers; Kyrgyzstan and Burkina Faso. Could you please come here to the podium? Thank you. The Secretariat, please, read the names of the countries.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Angola, could you please come forward with your envelope? Angola has voted. Australia please. Australia has voted. Azerbaijan, Azerbaijan has voted. Bahrain, Bahrain has voted. Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bosnia-Herzegovina voted. Brazil, Brazil voted. Burkina Faso please, Burkina Faso voted. China, China has voted. Cuba please, Cuba has voted. Guatemala, Guatemala has voted, Hungary, Hungary has voted. Indonesia please, Indonesia has voted. Kuwait please Kuwait has voted, Kyrgyzstan please, Kyrgyzstan has voted, Norway please, Norway has voted, Saint Kitts and Nevis please, Saint Kitts and Nevis has voted, Spain please, Spain has voted, Tunisia please, la tunisie a voté, Uganda please, Uganda voted, United Republic of Tanzania please, United Republic of Tanzania has voted. Zimbabwe please, Zimbabwe has voted.

This completes the voting process. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“The results of the vote: Committee members absent 0, number of invalids 0. Number of blank ballots 0. Majority required 14. Yes 12, No 9. Therefore, the proposal for inscription did not succeed with the required majority. We will now go to the proposal of Australia for deferral. Are there any objections for deferral? I see none. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Compte tenu de l’analyse que nous avons faite sur ce dossier et après avoir écouté l’ICOMOS l’État partie et tous les autres États membres du Comité, l’Angola est d’avis que l’on renvoie le dossier et non de le différer ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Hungary can agree with the proposal of Angola. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola and Hungary, do you have a written amendment? Hungary do you have any comments?”

Hungary:

“We do not have any comment.”

The Chairperson:

“Guatemala, you have the floor.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. On the basis of the result of the previous vote, we think that there is no consensus around inscription and we can also say that there is no consensus regarding deferral of this file, therefore we would like to second the proposal made by Angola, referral.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Have you drafted a proposal for the referral? The State Party must not attend the meeting please. Please do not go to the Committee members as this is not according to the procedure. The State Party stay in their seats or leave the room. Please. Has Guatemala prepared a proposal for referral? Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie, au vu de l'ensemble des discussions, soutient la proposition de l'Angola pour le renvoi et nous avons préparé un texte écrit en ce sens ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe also seconds the proposal by Angola and endorses the argument of Guatemala. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda supports the proposal by Angola and will work with Angola and others in support to come up with a draft amendment. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

”Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We also support that the amendment be submitted for referral. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. China seconds Angola’s proposal for referral. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. I think we are in a situation where we are discussing whether or not to not inscribe as was the draft decision or the referral. I think the compromise is the proposal from Australia, to defer. We will support Australia in this case.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Cuba seconds Angola’s proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Kyrgyzstan, please.”

Kyrgyzstan

“Thank you madam Chair. We support Angola’s amendment proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia could you please read your wording?”

Tunisie :

« Nous avons déjà remis le texte au secrétariat, au rapporteur, mais si vous voulez que l’on le lise, on est prêt à le faire, il faudra nous le redonner ».

The Chairperson:

“Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much. I would like to make two points. First of all, I would like to know whether we first have to decide on Australia’s amendment deferral and then we are going to look at the proposal that we do not have in written form before us but that will be presented.

Secondly, I would also like to say that there was a debate as to whether it should be referred to next year or deferred, because what is asked of the State Party in either case is different. Therefore, I think that if it is deferral that involves an additional work on the part of the State Party, we would like to support Australia’s proposal.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Could Tunisia please read the text in order for the translators to translate to the other languages? Please.”

Tunisie :

« Oui madame la présidente. Projet de décision 42 COM 8B.31. Le Comité du patrimoine mondial :

“1. *Ayant examiné les documents aux trois références (je ne vais pas les lire).*

2 renvoie la Colline de Prosecco à l’État partie prenant note du grand potentiel du bien proposé à remplir les critères (iv) et (v). Pour :

a. redéfinir la proposition d’inscription en recentrant sur sa valeur universelle et sur les critères (iv) et (v).

b. Définir les limites et les zones tampons du bien proposé pour l’inscription.

c. Compléter le processus d’approbation par les 29 municipalités concernées de la loi technique “Articolo unico”, déjà approuvée par la région Vénétie au mois de janvier 2018.

3. Prend note du fait que l’état de conservation du site est adéquat, que les mesures de conservation adoptées sont généralement efficaces et ses systèmes de gestion et de monitoring sont bien conçus et structurés. Salue l’engagement en matière budgétaire pris par les municipalités concernées.

4. Félicite l’État partie pour le plan de gestion intégré qui assure la coopération entre tous les acteurs publics et privés impliqués dans la gestion du site ainsi que pour l’engagement exprimé par la région Vénétie et les municipalités concernées d’accroître la coopération dans les domaines de la mise en valeur et de la protection du site candidat.” ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Azerbaijan would like to second the proposal from Angola on referral of this nomination.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would very much like to support the amendment proposed by Angola, but we understand the considerations made by our colleague from Tunisia which would better qualify the proposal as a deferral not a referral, as it is the spirit. Therefore, the Brazilian delegation would like, in order to support a referral, to include one amendment saying that:

‘Recommends the State Party to consider inviting ICOMOS to work on the preparation of a proposal for a revised nomination in accordance with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the upstream process.’

I can repeat: *‘recommends the State Party to consider inviting ICOMOS to work on the preparation of a proposal for a revised nomination in accordance with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the upstream process’.*

This proposal Brazil just made, would be the last paragraph; if you would like to take note of it, I can come back to the text.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, nous sommes tout à fait sensibles aux améliorations proposées par le Brésil, mais je crois qu'en termes de méthode et d'avancement dans la séance, commençons à nous mettre d'accord sur le principe de la décision à prendre. Une fois que l'on a décidé de la décision, on va dans ce cas se concentrer sur la formulation optimale de cette option choisie ».

The Chairperson:

“The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. I would like to request the distinguished delegate of Brazil to repeat the proposal so that it can be clearly captured on screen.

Thank you very much.”

Brazil:

“*Recommends the State Party to consider inviting ICOMOS to work on the preparation of a proposal for a revised nomination in accordance with the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee within the framework of the upstream process*’.”

The Chairperson:

“Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. With regard to the reference to the upstream process, I think in accordance with the discussion we had in previous *ad hoc* working group and Committee meetings, an upstream intervention is not accurate at this stage of the nomination. I think it would just add another level of confusion, referencing upstream in a case that is referred. It is by default assumed that there is an already-existing Outstanding Universal Value.

ICOMOS and other Committee members could comment on this matter, but I think it is a case that may complicate matters again when it comes back next year. I would like again to point out that this is a case where there is a strong conflict of opinion between the State Party and ICOMOS and by asking to come back here, we, as Committee members, need to make sure that there will be continuous and constructive dialogue that will assist in identifying the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, so that we are not confronted next year with a similar complicated matter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“Bosnia-Herzegovina supports the amendment made by Brazil. Thank you. “

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Firstly, I would just like to say that having been listening to the discussion as it is unfolding, it does seem to us that a majority of the Committee have spoken in favour of a referral rather than a deferral. My understanding is that if this was the

matter that it would be going to a vote it would be resolved by a single majority and not a two-thirds majority, though I do not think this is a matter that we really want to go to a vote.

We think that the Brazilian amendment to the referral proposal would be fine with the removal of the reference of the upstream process because we do agree with Bahrain that this is not the right reference on this occasion. This is a wise addition to the proposed amendment for referral. I also want to make the observation that this is a very important amendment from Australia's perspective and that we have great hope that the State Party and ICOMOS will be able to work through this dossier in a collaborative way and bring the nomination back to the Committee in a revised form which we would look forward to considering at a future meeting.

I also make the observation that referral does not mean it comes back next year. Referral is referral and there is a longer time frame. We would encourage that, if the Committee does make a decision to refer the nomination, the State Party takes the necessary time to get this right so that we do not find ourselves in circumstances like we found ourselves in today.

Having said all of that, and given our sense of the disposition of the State Parties with a majority who are supportive of a proposal to refer, then Australia would withdraw its proposal for deferral reluctantly, but in the interest of finding a consensus position in the Committee."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.

Zimbabwe:

"Thank you madam Chair. Just to say that Zimbabwe supports the proposal made by Bahrain, seconded by Australia, for removing the reference to the Upstream Process."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Spain, please."

Spain:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Understanding that we have a majority tending towards referral, as Australia rightly said, I would like to point out that we should look clearly at the different paragraphs proposed so that any work done between now and next year be consistent with our requests. We agree with what Bahrain said.

We would like the Secretariat to help us here and see how we can have a consistent draft decision. As for referral for next year, these are issues that require great amounts of work, from the State Party and the Secretariat and ICOMOS as well. Following this constructive spirit, what we want is to have a good referral draft decision, so we will require your assistance so that the text is consistent.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair. Tanzania supports the position of Angola with the amendment proposed by Brazil. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to show us the amendment please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are clearing the text at the moment on the screen and while we do that I will sum up this morning's events. This morning we had a secret ballot vote on the amendment submitted by a group of countries for the inscription of this property. As the required majority was not met, we were left with the original draft decision and an amendment submitted by Australia for deferral of the examination of this nomination.

During the debate, we had a proposal from Angola to instead refer this nomination back to the State Party and we have heard large support for these amendments. Afterwards, the delegate of Australia decided to withdraw its proposal for referral. Now we are going to have on the screen a proposal for referral of this nomination back to the State Party with an additional amendment from Brazil that is going to be the new paragraph 6. We are going to ask for your patience while we clean up the text and we are going to distribute it so you have a clear text in front of you.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“While they are completing the text to make it easier for the Committee, you can take the floor. Norway, please”

Norway:

“I am really sorry for taking the floor again. There is an amendment that has just been circulated now which is very different from what we are having on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“Now, let us read the final text and then we can discuss. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to inform you that we agree with proposals made to eliminate the mention of the upstream process. So Brazil’s proposal would end the sentence at ‘World Heritage Committee’.

Thank you.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to clarify the question from Norway. This was the previous proposal from Tunisia. Not to add to the confusion, we are cleaning up the text. To facilitate your debate it takes a few minutes until you are able to look at it all.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is now to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair and thank you very much for your kind patience while we cleaned up the text. What you are going to see on the screen behind me is an amendment for the referral of this nomination. I am going to read out the whole draft decision from the top.

Paragraph 1 would read:

1. *‘Having examined Documents WHC/18/42 COM 8B, WHC/18/42 COM INF.8B1 and WHC/18/42 COM INF.8B4,’*

Paragraph 2 would read:

2. *‘Refers the nomination of Le Colline del Prosecco di Conegliano e Valdobbiadene, Italy, back to the State Party, taking note of the high potential of the proposed site under criteria (iv) and (v) to:*

- a) Redefine the nomination refocusing the Outstanding Universal Value on criteria (iv) and (v),*
- b) Slightly define the boundaries and buffer zones of the nominated property,*
- c) Completing the adoption process by the 28 concerned municipalities of the tool “Technical rule – Articolo Unico”, which was already approved by the Veneto Region in January 2018;’*

Paragraph 3 would read:

3. *‘Takes note that the general state of conservation of the site is adequate and that the adopted measures of conservation are generally effective, its monitoring and management systems are well-conceived and structured, and the funding commitments by the relevant local authorities are to be saluted;’*

Paragraph 4 would read:

4. *‘Commends the State Party for the structured governance process to ensure cooperation among all public and private actors involved in the site management it also*

commends the commitment expressed by the territorial authorities to increase cooperation for the valorization, protection and preservation of the nominated property;

The new Paragraph 5, which is the one proposed by Brazil, would read:

5. 'Recommends the State Party to consider inviting ICOMOS, to work on the preparation of a proposal for revised nomination in accordance with the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee.'

Madam Chair, if I may have an observation at this point: I believe that the wording for this last paragraph should be slightly revised, so that it could read:

5. 'Recommends the State Party, in dialogue with ICOMOS, to work on the preparation of a proposal for revised nomination in accordance with the recommendation of the World Heritage Committee.'

Or something along this line, if the authors of the amendment would agree.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I think Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Deux petites choses, premièrement le nom de l'Angola disparaît alors que l'Angola a proposé le renvoi. Le nom de l'Angola ne figure pas dans le texte. Deuxième chose, nous sommes d'accord avec l'avis du rapporteur, mais nous aimerions peut-être reformuler un petit peu le dernier paragraphe du Brésil. Nous sommes d'accord avec ce paragraphe, il faudrait le reformuler : *“recommande à l'État partie de travailler en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS”* ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie soutient la proposition du rapporteur sur la reformulation du paragraphe 5 ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just in reference to paragraph 2, I noticed a small amendment. We would very much like to see reference to potential Outstanding Universal Value be stated as *'a proposed site to meet criteria'* rather than having *'a potential'*. The reason for that is, as we have seen in the deliberation, that the Committee is rather divided

on this matter and I would like to avoid any complication on this matter next year and the word 'potential'.

We have seen from Committee members that some terminology has been selected from the evaluation itself and the argument based on it. We have seen that, in particular with the case of the comparative analysis of ICOMOS, which was sound, but only for the methodology, not the attributes. It is a single word, but I think there are many implications for these minor mentions in the draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brésil :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le Brésil est tout à fait d'accord avec les suggestions proposées par le rapporteur et soutenues par l'Angola et la Tunisie pour le paragraphe 5. Juste une question de traduction. Dans le paragraphe 2 il est écrit “le potentiel du bien” dans la version anglaise c'est mieux de dire “*the proposed property*” merci madame la présidente. Merci. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Two small comments only. In 2.a I would propose that we introduce ‘*a potential Outstanding Universal Value*’ and in 2.b also, as we have been having a lot of discussions on boundaries and buffer zones, I would propose that we delete ‘*slightly*’.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Clarification from the Secretariat. Please.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Concerning paragraph 5, the fact is that ICOMOS will collaborate to work on the preparation of the revised nomination; it is not possible to have the same evaluator of the same nomination. I think something on the lines ‘*to work in dialogue with ICOMOS on the implementation of the above recommendation*’ would better follow the normal procedures.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, c'est une remarque de rédaction dans la version française si l'on peut voir le paragraphe 2. Sur la proposition de la Norvège, que nous soutenons, il vaut mieux dire "redéfinir la proposition d'inscription sur la valeur universelle potentielle" et non pas "le potentiel de la valeur universelle" cela ne veut pas dire la même chose en français ».

The Chairperson:

"The Rapporteur, please."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. We have received a number of amendments, some of them smaller, that concerns paragraph 2 that you can now see reflected on the screen. The bigger discussion is on paragraph 5. I have submitted a proposal so that the phrase would read: '*recommends the State party, in dialogue with ICOMOS, to work on the preparation of a proposal for a revised nomination.*' Tunisia supported this proposal while Angola submitted an alternative wording.

If I am to understand correctly what we have just heard from the Secretariat, the issue is that the wording of Angola would imply the collaboration of ICOMOS on preparing nomination that later ICOMOS would actually evaluate. In this sense, this proposed wording would not be consistent. I see that the distinguished delegate who proposed the wording would like to take the floor. Maybe we could request, through you, to hear his opinion."

The Chairperson:

"The floor is to Angola."

Angola :

« Madame la présidente nous sommes d'accord avec la proposition du Secrétariat c'est-à-dire : "travailler en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS dans la mise en œuvre des recommandations ci-dessus décrites ou mentionnées" ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. I believe the real question that we have right now is where we want to say that the State Party should work in collaboration with ICOMOS, or rather in dialogue with ICOMOS. Then we have, of course, the part about the implementation of the above-mentioned recommendation. In my view, the essential question right now is which wording are we going to use? : '*the State Party in collaboration with ICOMOS*' or '*in dialogue with ICOMOS*'.

Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

“Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente. Pour nous “travailler en collaboration” implique un dialogue donc il n’y a pas de problème pour nous de dire collaboration. Cette dernière implique un dialogue de toutes les façons. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“English can be a complex language sometimes. A dialogue is an exchange of views and engagement around the subject matter; a collaboration, to me, implies that ICOMOS and the State Party together would essentially develop the nomination and the point is that this would not be appropriate. Things are usually that the State Party invites an advisory mission. I would suggest that in English the best language would be ‘*to work in dialogue with ICOMOS, to implement the above recommendations and enable preparation of a proposal*’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? I cannot see any. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, dans ce contexte, je souhaiterais que l’on enlève ICOMOS dans le texte comme cela l’État partie met en œuvre les recommandations qui ont été proposées ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you for giving me the floor. Through you, I would like to ask the delegate of Angola if this is the wording he would like to see in paragraph 5: ‘*Recommends the State Party to implement the above-mentioned recommendations*’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Is there any objection from Angola? Please.”

Angola :

« Nous sommes d'accord, car cela est neutre. Le dialogue peut être indirect entre l'État partie et l'ICOMOS ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We are going to clean paragraph 5. If I understand from the room, everybody is in agreement with the proposal of Angola. So that now it would read: *'Recommends the State Party to implement the above-mentioned recommendations.'*”

Then the rest of the paragraph would be deleted. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or comments? Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Sorry madam Chair to take the floor again. I think the spirit behind this paragraph is that we are giving a number of recommendations. There was a debate on the comparative analysis that could not find attributes that could convey the potential Outstanding Universal Value of this property. Could not we, at least in this recommendation, recommend the State Party have initial dialogue in the revised comparative analysis?”

We believe that the spirit is actually to bring them together and have the advisory service of ICOMOS to benefit this nomination. Of course, if the room is inclined to withdraw ICOMOS from this process, then we withdraw our suggestion. Our feeling is that we should keep a reference to a potential dialogue for the benefit of the nomination with ICOMOS.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie a deux remarques concernant la proposition de l'Angola. Si nous nous en tenons aux principes de demander à l'État partie de mettre en œuvre la recommandation et la résolution de notre Comité cela va de soi. C'est la conséquence de sa nature juridique, sauf que nous nous souhaitons que le dossier ait toutes ces chances une fois qu'il sera représenté.

Toutes ces chances cela découlera certainement d'un débat constructif et de compréhension entre l'État partie et les instances consultatives. Nous sommes donc plutôt vers le maintien de la citation et la désignation d'ICOMOS dans le paragraphe ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We just want to add our support to Brazil's proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Let us finalise the matter. The text as it is. Please Rapporteur, read it out.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to clear up the confusion a bit. Now, we are going to put down below the alternative that was proposed before for this paragraph, so that it is clearer to have both options. If I am to understand the delegation of Brazil, it would like to retain some of the original spirit of the proposed paragraph.

In this sense we can see both options for paragraph 5; one proposed by Angola, which is the simple sentence about recommending the State Party to implement the above-mentioned recommendations. The alternative would read: *'Recommends the State Party, in dialogue with ICOMOS, to implement the above-mentioned recommendations.*

Through you madam Chair, I wish to put to the floor these two options. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are in favour of keeping the dialogue with ICOMOS.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie est en faveur de la deuxième version ».

The Chairperson:

“Je vous remercie. The floor is to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. Bahrain agrees to the option of keeping the dialogue with ICOMOS for a more positive outcome. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. It seems that there is a consensus towards dialogue. Can we keep it and move on? Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, on va faciliter les choses. J'avais demandé d'enlever ICOMOS parce que la tendance serait que l'ICOMOS travaillerait avec deux poids et deux mesures. Pour éviter cette confusion, on avait proposé d'éliminer l'ICOMOS. Je suis d'accord de revenir sur le dialogue avec l'ICOMOS. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. There is an agreement and we keep as is. If you agree, we will adopt as a whole, but before the floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Very quickly in paragraph 2, ‘*define*’ is on the screen. Sorry, on 2b, it should be ‘*redefine*’. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? We will adopt the draft decision as a whole. No objections, so I therefore declare draft decision 42 COM 8B.31 adopted as amended.

We are going back to Italy. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Ivrea, Industrial City of the 20th century, Italy. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We received a factual error notification concerning the nomination of Ivrea, Industrial City of the 20th century, which is on page 42 of the English version of Document INF.8B.4 and on page 47 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. ICOMOS please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. This is the presentation of the ICOMOS evaluation of Ivrea, Industrial City of the 20th century in Italy. Founded in 1908 by Camillo Olivetti, the Industrial City of Ivrea is an industrial and socio-cultural project of the 20th century.

The Olivetti Company is known for the manufacture of typewriters, mechanical calculators and desktop computers, and at its height occupied 70 per cent of the municipal area. Ivrea is located in Italy’s Piedmont region. The industrial city was developed by the Olivetti Company on the municipality of Ivrea. The property includes a vast factory, constructed between 1908 and 1958, and the key features of the industrial city are distributed along the Corso Jervis. It includes 27 buildings and architectural complexes.

The nominated property features the main manufacturing and office building established by Olivetti from the earlier 20th century to the 1980s. Other buildings include the company’s canteen and leisure centre, the Olivetti study and research centre, the social services centre and an array of residential buildings. The Olivetti Company continued to develop in the decades that followed the 1960s, including a large office building/data processing centre and the western residential unit. The entire ensemble is connected by a network of streets, parks and public spaces.

Ivrea’s urban form and many of these buildings were designed by some of the best-know Italian architects and town planners of the period. Ivrea was built and operated according to the ideas of the *movimento comunista* or community movement. Olivetti provided its workforce with community facilities, social services and investing in building housing, including family homes, homes for executives and many apartments. At its peak, in 1958, the number of people employed by the company in Ivrea alone was approximately 26,000.

However, from the 1980s, the company declined, due to changes in communication technologies. The company progressively abandoned its large premises in Ivrea and the former industrial park production sites and offices were divided and acquire by private owners. The property includes the spatial plan of the industrial city, the public buildings and spaces and residential buildings developed by Olivetti. The influence of the community movement is an important intangible element, even though some of the non-residential buildings have ceased to exist.

While the comparative analysis could be further deepened; it was improved considerably by the State Party during the evaluation process and now justifies the consideration of Ivrea for the World Heritage List. The integrity of the property is vulnerable, due to factors such as the encroachment of new urban developments and intrusive new constructions, the deteriorating conditions of some key commercial or industrial buildings and building interiors and the loss of the original activities and purposes, due to the decline in manufacturing. The authenticity of the property is demonstrated although there is a risk of a gradual loss. Efforts have been made to develop new uses that are similar in type to the original uses, such as telecommunication production or cultural activities.

ICOMOS considers that criterion (iv) has been demonstrated. However, based on a comparative analysis, ICOMOS does not consider that the other criteria proposed by the State Party, (ii) and (vi), are demonstrated. ICOMOS considers that the boundaries and buffer zone are appropriate, although a small change to the boundary has been proposed. The state of conservation of the buildings varies; while the residential buildings tend to be in reasonable condition, 44 per cent of the former industrial and corporate buildings of the property are vacant or under use and require maintenance.

This system of legal protection is complex and multi-tiered based on national, regional and local laws, and the national process for some of the building attributes is not yet completed. The management system is considered to be appropriate, although significant resources will be needed for the long-term implementation, along with ongoing and effective engagement with residents and local authorities.

ICOMOS recommends that the nomination Ivrea Industrial City of the 20th century of Italy be referred back to the State Party in order to finalise and confirm the national and local protection for the property. ICOMOS also proposes that the property's boundary should exclude the site of the recent housing project facing the so-called red-brick building but included in the buffer zone.

Finally, ICOMOS considers that, in the face of such complex challenges, Ivrea requires a strategic conservation plan. The full text of these reasons is shown on the slide and in the draft decision. ICOMOS has also made a number of further recommendations in order to strengthen the long-term conservation and management of Ivrea.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much, Are there any comments? Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “The delegation of the Kingdom of Spain considers this industrial ensemble and complex with shops, laboratory, factories, etc., a very interesting site. An industrial city, as the ICOMOS representative said, in a very good state of conservation and of great typological interest. This industrial heritage is one of the categories and typologies that are almost absent from the List; this is why we would like to congratulate the State Party for presenting this sort of property, which helps us to make the credibility and the representativeness of the List.

We presented an amendment proposing inscription of the property on the World Heritage List since. As was said by the representative of ICOMOS, there is Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criterion (iv) and integrity and authenticity and has legal protection and it has a proper management plan. I think that it does meet the criteria for being inscribed on the List. The comparative analysis, which at first was not sufficient, has been improved by the State Party in recent months.

Presented with the risk of losing the values, we are convinced that the State Party will take the necessary measures to minimise that risk once it is inscribed on the World Heritage List. Therefore, the delegation of the Kingdom of Spain has tabled an amendment in favour of inscription on the basis of criterion (iv).

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Brazil would like to congratulate the State Party for the presentation of a modern heritage, Ivrea, in the region of the Piedmont. We consider the information presented and the evaluation to be overall positive.

The State Party must clarify whether there has been national recognition of the property. In that case, if that recognition exists, the Brazilian delegation would consider the conditions made by ICOMOS are important and necessary in order to ensure the proper management of the property, keeping in mind that the Outstanding Universal Value is based on criterion (iv).

Brazil considers that the property can be inscribed and it is up to the Committee and this session to ask the State Party the results of the implementation of the recommendations expressed by the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The nominated property, the Industrial City of Ivrea, is an industrial and socio-cultural project of the 20th century that represents a significant example of a 20th century-series of urban development and architecture in response to industrial and social transformations.

We would like to express our warm gratitude to the Advisory Bodies and ICOMOS for the evaluation of the report and the State Party for the nomination dossier. According to the ICOMOS report, the comparative analysis justifies consideration of the property for the World Heritage List. The nominated property meets the condition of the integrity and authenticity and criterion (iv) has been demonstrated; The boundaries of the nominated property and its buffer zone are appreciated with the exception of newly designed buildings in sight of the property area. The management system of the property is appreciated too. The State Party recently adopted legal measures for improving the protection of the visual integrity of the property.

The nominated property meets Outstanding Universal Value integrity and authenticity requirements and therefore we support the inscription of this nomination on the World Heritage List on criterion (iv).

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We would like to thank ICOMOS for the information provided as well as their analysis of the subject, which is important. This has

great potential, as it can bring new themes when inscribing industrial sites of the 20th century. Cuba is in favour of inscription of the property on the basis of criterion (iv).

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“My delegation welcomes the nomination of this modern heritage site which definitely contributes to the awareness of this important type of heritage of human industry. What distinguishes the Industrial City of Ivrea is the ideology presented, which allowed the assertion that the architectural values of the 20th century promoted unity by a cohesive culture as a reforming process for industrial town planning.

Olivetti complained that cities had been expanding; I may quote him, ‘*incoherently for uniquely selfish goals, but realistically, speculative without a real plan coming from a general vision of life*’. His ambition was to experiment with what he called ‘a human industrial city’. This resulted in the creation of an exceptional example of experimentation of social and architectural ideas about industrial processes.

We believe that the value of Ivrea has been demonstrated and we would like the State Party to have the floor to address the points raised by the Advisory Bodies. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I have in front of me seven requests for the floor and it seems that there is a consensus, so please be brief. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie se félicite de cette proposition et félicite l'État partie de proposer pour inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial la cité de Ivrea qui vient renforcer et enrichir une catégorie de patrimoine encore très peu représentée sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Tunisie félicite aussi l'ICOMOS pour son rapport largement positif et appui l'amendement présenté par l'Espagne et propose l'inscription de ce bien selon le critère (iv).

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Zimbabwe supports the recommendation to change the draft decision for Ivrea from referral to inscription. The Industrial City of Ivrea is a unique

industrial architecture and represents the apex of innovation in 20th century production as represented by the transition from mechanical to digitalised industrial technology. Our delegation also notes that the State Party managed to demonstrate the Outstanding Universal Value of the property through criterion (iv), as noted in the evaluation conducted by ICOMOS.

The State Party has managed to demonstrate that the property meets the conditions for authenticity, as the property has retained the original structures developed during the early phases of the development of the city. The delegation of Zimbabwe believes that the protection and management mechanisms that are to be put in place could be addressed as part of the ongoing management of the property while it is already part of the World Heritage List. Madam Chair, we therefore support the amended draft decision proposed by Spain and others.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Norway commends Italy for exposing the legacy of the 20th century through this nomination. We do not have many sites of this kind. The modern industrial and urban architectural and planning history of Europe has many facets, among them, the physical manifestation of theories in the field including the socio-economic aspect. Ivrea is for sure an example.

We do encourage Italy to take on board recommendations in the draft decision. Norway, as a host for an industrial heritage site, would like to wish Italy good luck in their important task of preserving and protecting this property through good management and adapted reuse of these important buildings that are in their care.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous félicitons l'État partie pour la qualité de la proposition qui nous est soumise, également la pertinence de l'évaluation faite par l'ICOMOS. Nous sommes devant un bien d'une grande importance historique comme les autres l'ont dit sur le processus d'industrialisation au XX^e siècle.

L'ICOMOS dans son rapport affirme bien les attributs justifiant la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site à travers l'analyse comparative, les aspects d'intégrité et d'authenticité, le critère (iv), et considère également que les systèmes de protection, de conservation et de gestion sont appropriés bien qu'il existe quelques menaces qui pèsent sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien en ce qui concerne certains projets de construction de nouveaux bâtiments.

Par conséquent, nous soutenons l'inscription de ce site sous les critères (ii) et (iv) et recommandons à l'État partie de travailler en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS pour mettre en œuvre les mesures correctives pouvant préserver les attributs de ce bien.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Hungary commends the State party for the preparation of the nomination of Ivrea, Industrial City of the 20th century. The Hungarian delegation is convinced that the site corresponds to criteria (iv) and to all the necessary requirements. This property is well-preserved, having maintained its original characteristics from the 1930s, including all the essential elements that are making the representation of its value.

The State Party's openness and willingness to dialogue throughout the evaluation process is well appreciated. The endeavours of the State Party in order to answer the requirements stated in the draft decision of the Advisory Bodies concerning the national legal protection of the property are satisfactory. The cooperation of the State Party in the revision of the property boundaries and in the preparation of the strategic conservation plan is appreciated by Hungary.

Based on the Outstanding Universal Value of the site, Hungary joins the proposal of Spain to propose the inscription of the site on the World Heritage List.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. We will spare your time. The United Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of Italy for presenting this interesting nomination. Tanzania thanks the Advisory Bodies for their comprehensive report on Ivrea, which represents a significant example of industrial development and architecture in response to industrial and social transformations. Ivrea is also a testimony to the transition from mechanical to digital industry. Yet, madam Chair, in this time of evolution to digital, to artificial intelligence, the history of Ivrea could also be a mirror of the ideal of the 20th century.

Madam Chair, Ivrea is proposed to be nominated on the basis of cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (vi). ICOMOS agreed partially with the justification of criteria (ii) and (vi); however, it considers that criteria (iv) is fully demonstrated. The boundary of the nominated property and its buffer zone are appropriate. Its management plan was updated in September of 2017 and legal measures have been taken to improve the protection of the visual integrity of the property.

In regard to the above, madam Chair, Tanzania prefers to be active and in the spirit of encouragement, and therefore proposes Ivrea Industrial City of the 20th century to be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Tanzania supports the amendment proposed by Spain and congratulates Italy for this wonderful nomination.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Just to be brief, we will support the amendment of Spain as well. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Bosnia.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Très brièvement, tout d’abord nous pensons que la valeur universelle exceptionnelle a été démontrée, que le critère (iv) est tout à fait justifié, et nous estimons que l’État partie a déjà fait ou rempli une importante partie des recommandations de l’ICOMOS. Par conséquent, la Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient l’inscription.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Guatemala.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I will be very brief and I will not repeat what the previous speakers said. I would like to say that this inscription may send a clear message to the world on the relevance of the 20th century’s industrial heritage, which is undergoing obvious destruction, because it is considered very modern and therefore does not constitute historical monuments as works of art and too new to be an archaeological item and too obsolete to be technologically interesting.

The States Parties must take a careful look at the wealth represented by this sort of heritage which helps us understand our rich history and enrich the World Heritage List. Therefore we support the amendment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. We commend the State Party of Italy for the significant nomination of Ivrea, Industrial City of the 20th century, which shows well-preserved examples of buildings of industry and social services with architectural qualities. In addition to previous speakers, we are also in favour of inscription of the property under criterion (iv) and urge the State Party to implement the recommendations of ICOMOS.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur for the final text with the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As noted during the discussion, we have received an amendment to this draft decision submitted by Spain, Angola, Azerbaijan and Brazil. The original draft decision would have referred the nomination back to the State Party. This proposed amendment would instead inscribe the property on the World Heritage List and we have wide support for this amendment.

As such, the document now contains a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value as well as a notification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed. It has assessment of the conditions of integrity and authenticity, as well as a statement on the protection and management requirements and two additional paragraphs, with some requests and recommendations to the State Party.

Madam Chair, if I may just make one alteration: the amendment would inscribe this property under criterion (iv) but during the intervention of the distinguished delegate of Angola, who is among the co-authors of the amendment, I believe that he has said that he supports the inscription based on criteria (ii) and (iv). I would just like to make clear that the proposed inscription would happen only under criterion (iv). This is the set of amendments we received.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If this is the final text of the decision, are there any objections? I see none. We will adopt it. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.30 as amended adopted.

On your behalf I congratulate the State Party and I give them the floor. Please, Italy.”

Italy:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. First of all, let me make a brief comment on what happened before. We thank all those that supported the Prosecco candidacy, but we wish to express that what happened before should never happen to any other member State in order to have trust and have this organisation be coherent and move forward.

Having said that, I am very proud of the decision that this Committee made on Ivrea. On behalf of the Italian government we want to share our happiness and satisfaction. We wish to thank all members of the World Heritage Committee and ICOMOS for the appreciation of Ivrea Industrial City of the 20th century. Adriano Olivetti realised in Ivrea a social way of life through architecture and transformed the industrial city into the best example of Italian architecture from the '30s until the '70s.

Ivrea represents the synthesis of the new modern industrial culture, where a small family company has become a global phenomenon recognised worldwide for design, high technological value and positive impact towards the local community.

On the one hand, Ivrea combined industrial development together with the social and economic culture. On the other hand, it represents one of the most important experiences from an architectural, urbanistic and technological point of view. Ivrea remains a long-standing example of urban development, sustainable and fair towards the next generations. This nomination recognises the modernity of this value and projects them to the future.

Allow me now to pass the floor to The Chairperson of the Olivetti Foundation for a brief remark.”

Olivetti Foundation:

“Thank you very much. We wish to remember Laura Olivetti’s special and kind perseverance in promoting the nomination ten years ago. Finally, we share with all of you the inspiring world of her father Adriano. We believe in the unlimited power of spiritual forces, love, cause, justice and beauty. Men, ideologies, States that forget only one of these creative forces cannot indicate to anyone the path of civilisation.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The next site is in Spain. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of the Caliphate City of Medina Azahara, Spain. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat. Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Caliphate City of Medina Azahara, which is to be found on page 86 of document INF.8B.4 and on page 41 of the French version of the same document.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am now presenting the evaluation of the Caliphate City of Medina Azahara, Spain. The text of the evaluation can be found on page 113 of the Document INF.8B.1.

The Caliphate City of Medina Azahara is an archaeological site of a city built in the mid-10th century CE by the western Umayyad dynasty as the seat of the Caliphate of Cordoba. Located in the province of Cordoba in the autonomous community of Andalusia, the property is enclosed by the city walls to an area of about 111 hectares. The city flourished for a short while but was then destroyed and its archaeological remains lay hidden for nearly 1000 years, until rediscovered in the 20th century.

To date, about 12 hectares, only 10 per cent of the area, has been excavated and this is mainly limited to the central area of the first five palaces and the Great Mosque. The knowledge of the urban structure is therefore very schematic, but within the wall enclosure the organisation of the city into three parallel streets running from north to south can clearly be seen.

The central street corresponds to the fortified palace situated on one of the highest levels with its building arrangements and terraces down to the mountain side. The eastern fringe constitutes the Medina itself, with two urbanised areas built on different designs and separated by a stream. The smallest western fringe seems to have been occupied mainly by buildings belonging to the Caliphate State along with small areas of workers' houses.

The Medina is an outstanding testimony of a complete urban complex of a city in Europe and from a historical perspective in the whole of western Islamic culture. In its evaluation, ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies inscription of this property on the World Heritage List and the nominated property meets criteria (iii) and (iv) and the conditions of integrity and authenticity.

The boundaries of the nominated property and its buffer zone are adequate and the legal protection is in place and is also adequate. ICOMOS considers that the legal protection is adequate, but the development pressure in the buffer zone requiring careful monitoring and mitigation measures regarding illegal settlements must be implemented.

The main threats to the property are illegal settlement activities in the buffer zone and water damage to the limestone monastery. ICOMOS also considers that the state of conservation of the attributes of this nominated property, while generally good, differs from fair to complex.

Some early interventions on the monument still require mediation work and other conservation works are also necessary. ICOMOS considers that the management is generally adequate; however, appropriate and timely funding must be secured for the property.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that the Caliphate City of Medina Azahara in Spain be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iii) and (iv). ICOMOS further recommends that the State Party gives consideration to the following:

- a) Securing the appropriate and timely funding for the property,
- b) Clarifying of the timeframe for the implementation of the mitigation of the edges of the illegal settlements with hard and soft landscaping,
- c) Carrying out special monitoring on the portion of Las Pintas beyond the Guadalquivir River Canal, where urban plots are still empty, with a view to avoiding development or at least ensuring development has minimal impact,

d) Improving the monitoring by developing indicators which directly measure the state of conservation,

e) Elaborating in detail the evidence of the evolution of conservation doctrines and criteria in the baseline documentation about the site,

f) Updating and approving the Operational Plan for Medina Azahara in order to ensure the preservation of the site;

Moreover, ICOMOS recommends that the name of the property be modified, in order to keep the historical name, to become The Caliphate City of Madīnat al-Zahrā.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, all the congratulations are to be performed out of this conference hall. There is a special place for congratulation outside this room. Thank you very much. Are there any comments for this site as it is proposed for inscription? I presume that there are none. I give Brazil the floor but please be brief.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to start by commending Spain for the notable example presented of continuous dedicated and consistent work in elaborating this dossier, observing the decisions of previous sessions of this Committee and acting in close coordination and collaboration with the Advisory Bodies. This constructive and forward-looking attitude culminated in the positive outcome we have before us now.

The Caliphate City of Medina Azahara archaeological site offers extraordinary knowledge about the material cultural and the development of the western Islamic civilisation of Andalusia, especially the cultural and architectural civilization, illustrating the significant period of the 10th century in the Iberian Peninsula.

The Brazilian delegation would like to highlight the policy of minimal intervention and conservation of the natural environment of the site as pillars of the authenticity of this property. It is also remarkable, the involvement of governmental authorities, including at departmental levels, to ensure the special plan for the protection of Medina Azahara, which reinforces the joint effort in meeting the management and protection requirements.

I would like to congratulate the Spanish delegation and all the State Parties that contributed to this nomination. Thank you very much and congratulations to Spain.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, do you have any objections about the inscription because we want to move quickly?”

Norway:

“Just a short remark. We congratulate Spain with this inscription and we support the State Party in keeping the well-established name of the property Medina Azahara. Congratulations to Spain.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia do you have any objections or we go forward because we do not have time?”

Tunisie :

« Nous n’avons pas d’objection. Je voulais revenir sur la question de l’appellation. Bien évidemment que cette appellation repose sur le dossier tel qu’il est introduit par l’État partie et l’Espagne a déjà inscrit d’autres sites dont l’origine vient bien entendu de la langue arabe, mais qui sont inscrits à l’UNESCO avec leur appellation moderne. Peut-être devrions-nous avoir en tête la cohérence générale de notre système d’inscription ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to France as an Observer. You have two minutes.”

France :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je n’utiliserai pas les deux minutes c’était juste pour féliciter la délégation espagnole pour ce remarquable dossier, la façon dont il a été présenté et tout ce qu’il apporte au patrimoine mondial.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We did not receive any amendments to this Draft Decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.33 adopted. I give the floor to Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Spain would like to thank all the members of the Committee and the Observers for the support they have given to this nomination and to ICOMOS for a fruitful collaboration. This is recognition of joint work between the Ministry, the authorities of Andalusia, the municipality and the efforts made in

terms of conservation. This is a unique example of a caliphate city in Europe and it is part of the Andalusian inheritance of which we are so proud. We are delighted to be able to share it with all of you.

Over one century of archaeology and conservation has led us to obtain this intact urban layout and thanks to this joint work I would also like to mention the adaptation of the Centre which is perfectly integrated in better understanding of the science. Let me give the floor to the representatives of Andalusia and of the Cordoba municipality who have worked so hard for this file and to recognise the work done by the technicians and archaeologists that have worked for many years towards this nomination.”

Representative of Andalusia:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much. On behalf of Andalusia, I thank you for listing our property as World Heritage. This is to us an immense satisfaction. It is a unique site in terms of heritage; it is a symbol of tolerance and bringing together many people and cultures and it has been an example of how communities can defend their heritage.

This nomination received the unanimous support of all people of Cordoba and Andalusia. In Andalusia we defend heritage. We already count 13 sites listed as World Heritage and this one is renewed encouragement to continue working to defend our heritage, because investing in heritage is investing in the future.

Thank you.”

Representative of the City of Cordoba:

“On behalf of the City of Cordoba, I would like to thank the World Heritage Committee of UNESCO for this inscription. This gives great trust to Cordoba and I can assure you we will be worthy of that trust. We will take care of the Medina as we have done for our Mosque, our ancient city and many other sites. Any citizens of the world coming to our city, please know that this will also be your own property, your own heritage.

I am convinced that the listing of sites like the Medina is getting into the greatest category in the World, the only caliphate city left in Europe. This presents many symbols at a time when living together between cultures is more necessary than at any time in the past.

Thank you very much for your trust.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I would like to ask those who would like to congratulate to do this outside the plenary because we have to move on. We do not have time. Thank you very much.

The next site is in Turkey. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Göbekli Tepe, Turkey. But first I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We received a factual error notification for the evaluation of the Göbekli Tepe nomination forwarded by Turkey. This factual error notification was recognised by the Advisory Bodies as there are some errors that implied changes to the state

of the proposed statement of Outstanding Universal Value and these changes have been already integrated into the text that we have. The notification itself can be found on page 87 of Document INF.8B.4 and on page 87 also of the English and French versions.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. Göbekli Tepe displays an ensemble of monumental megalithic structures with numerous examples of T-shaped pillars carved with rich imagery. It is associated with groups of hunter-gatherers in the pre-pottery neolithic period.

The property encompasses the archaeological site and is surrounded by a buffer zone. Göbekli Tepe is a tell, or artificial hill, in upper Mesopotamia between the upper and middle reaches of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, in the foothills of the Taurus Mountains, in a region which saw the emergence of the oldest farming communities in the world. Its topographical position on a plateau makes it a visible land from afar. Its location also affords extensive views of the surrounding plains and may have been deliberately chosen.

Excavations of the site only began in 1995, just a year after it was discovered, when it was a pristine site with no impacts from ploughing or looting. Since then, what has been revealed are extraordinary complexes of round, oval and rectangular monumental megalithic structures within which are pillars that are remarkable due to their sheer size, number and rich carvings. What proved unexpected were the dates determined for these structures, which dated their creation to between 9600 and 8200 BCE.

It appears that these structures were continuously rebuilt, used and perhaps intentionally buried over a span of about 1500 years. Only a few enclosures, eight in all, have been excavated. Geophysical surveys indicate at least 20 others existing within the tell. Each of the enclosures revealed T-shaped limestone monoliths, either standing in the centre or embedded in the walls.

Building D is the largest and best-preserved enclosure so far investigated, with two central pillars surrounded by a circle of wall decorated with depictions of a wide range of animals. The pillars may represent an abstract depiction of the human head; clearly visible are arms on the shaft, with hands brought together above the abdomen.

When first excavated, the imagery of the carved pillars would seem to provide an insight into the belief systems of these prehistoric populations. Clearly, this large site is in the early stages of exploration and further work will almost certainly modify the initial conclusions. T-shaped stones are not unique to Göbekli Tepe and are known from other sites in the wider region. But Göbekli Tepe may be seen to have an elevated position within a wider regional network of these sites.

While excavations initially were understandably focused on these monumental structures, recent excavations also provide evidence of what might be domestic structures of lesser architectural complexity but in close proximity to the monument. The Neolithic structure was set on a limestone plateau which provided the raw material for the stone buildings. Initial surveys of this landscape are beginning to reveal other notable evidence for prehistoric use.

Göbekli Tepe appears to be sited in relation to its visibility around the surrounding plains and to give views of significance distant mountains. ICOMOS considers that the setting is of crucial importance. Excavations in the early stages of the surrounding plains have not yet revealed precisely how much archaeological landscape might be out there, but we do consider though that adequate protection must be given to Göbekli Tepe's dominant position in that landscape.

The nominated area is protected as a great archaeological area, but the buffer zone is only protected at Grade III, a designation that allows for construction of contemporary infrastructure, while the wider management area includes farms and settlements and currently has little protection. A new irrigation canal and a quarry site are visible from the property and a railway is being considered at the edge of the buffer zone and this will also be visible.

Further threats are from electricity pylons and improved roads. We are concerned about the potential impacts of tourism and tourist facilities. Although tourist numbers are currently low due to instability problems in the wider region. Göbekli Tepe could prove to be a major attraction, as is the nearby Nemrut Dağ. Moreover, the site is forecasted to make a substantial contribution to the tourist revenue of the region and currently there is no visitor management plan.

The site was recently closed for 18 months in order to install protective covers over the excavated areas as can be seen here. Visitor facilities were also constructed which are partly within the property and partly outside but highly visible from it. We consider that any further facilities must be sited further away from the property and beyond the buffer zone.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis fully justifies the exceptionality of this ceremonial monument which is several millennia earlier than anything so far on the World Heritage List and for which there are no other similar sites. In terms of Outstanding Universal Value and criteria the State Party initially suggested the justification should include the idea of the site being a kind of temple reflecting belief systems of early communities. In this revision and in the light of more work, it suggests that the first temple of mankind's interpretation should not be pursued. ICOMOS supports this revision and considers that criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) are met.

In terms of authenticity and integrity, ICOMOS considers that, while they are technically met, they are highly vulnerable in terms of the potential threats already outlined. The protection of the buffer zone and the wider setting needs to be considerably strengthened. Overall, we do not consider the protection and development control in place are nearly resilient enough to forestall the enormous pressure that is likely to impact on this property and its setting from infrastructure tourism and rural development.

Heritage conservation and the demands for development must be reconciled through the urgent development of a master plan for the property and its wider setting and implemented to much stronger development control measures.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that Göbekli Tepe be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the bases of criteria (i), (ii) and (iv), but in view of the considerable potential threats to its buffer zone and wider setting that it will be simultaneously be inscribed on the World Heritage List in danger. ICOMOS also recommends that the State Party should invite a mission on the site as soon as possible to agree to a desired state of conservation and we have made other recommendations that are set out in the working document.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? I think we have received amendments. We have ten minutes, your comments and the amendment and we pass to the adoption. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, Australia unreservedly supports the inscription of Göbekli Tepe on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv) being one of the most important archaeological sites in the world that has been excavated over the past 30 years. Its monolithic architecture, engraved images and archaeological evidence brings an extraordinary insight into the lives and society of neolithic people and there is much more for us to learn from the site.

Australia does not consider that the property meets the requirements for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in danger and we support the amendment of Brazil to this effect. We do agree with many of the issues raised by ICOMOS about potential future impacts to the site. With ICOMOS we are concerned about the protection of archaeological deposits that may exist in the buffer zone which is currently a third degree archaeological conservation area as opposed to the first degree in the core area.

For the archaeological research that is taking place in the buffer zone, the State Party provided supplementary information that clarifies that an archaeological research programme funded from 2019 until 2021 will identify and assess the archaeology of the buffer zone to provide the evidence that would warrant a higher, first degree protection order. We are satisfied with the current third degree protection, in the meantime, while the archaeological survey in the buffer zone is carried out.

The additional information provided by the State Party also indicates the threats to the property identified by ICOMOS are in the process of being addressed. We would like to ask the State Party about the progress and the timeframe for completion of the construction of the canal that was identified by ICOMOS as a potential threat to the visual integrity of the site. We continue to be concerned about tourism pressure on the property. We are aware that the State Party will be revising the management plan to include a tourism management plan; we would also like to ask the State Party when the tourism management plan for the site will be completed.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. We welcome with great pleasure this nomination that in our point of view reflects consistent and solid work by the State Party. This is a dossier that clearly demonstrates the authenticity and integrity of an outstanding example of an ensemble of monumental megalithic structures that bring us to the Pre-pottery period of human history. The draft decision proposed to acknowledge the commitment of the State Party regarding management and protection requirements involving authorities of different levels.

We highlight that the draft decision also presents to the State Party a set of recommendations to be duly followed and implemented. The Brazilian delegation understands that it would be premature at this point to inscribe Göbekli Tepe on the List of World Heritage in Danger, as we believe it does not face any of the ascertained or potential dangers defined in Paragraph 179 of the Operational Guidelines.

The Brazilian delegation therefore presents a small amendment to the draft decision and congratulates Turkey for this magnificent nomination of great importance to human history.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I have in front of me about ten requests for the floor. I will start this afternoon at 3:00 pm. Now we will close our session and come back at 3:00 pm. We have a small announcement.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you madam Chair. The side events for the lunch break today: One which will start in room Hawar on Dutch World Heritage sites, protection of Outstanding Universal Value and Solutions for Climate Adaptation, Sustainable Energy and Urban Development. The event is organised by the permanent delegation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to UNESCO and the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science of the Netherlands.

Another side event, starting 1:10 pm in room Manama in the Advisory Bodies’ space concerns Everything you always wanted to know about the Advisory Bodies but were afraid to ask. It starts at 1:10 pm in room Manama. The Dutch event starts at 1:00 pm in Room Hawar.

Thank you very much.”

SEVENTH DAY – Sunday 1 July 2018

THIRTEENTH SESSION

3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“Good afternoon. Dear colleagues, before we resume our session I would like to remind you that Observers’ delegations should refrain from interfering with the work of the Committee during the debate or the voting procedure. I will not accept a repeat of what we witnessed this morning. Thank you.

Furthermore, colleagues, I would like to recall that we still have to examine 11 nominations and that we need to finish with this item tomorrow morning. I call upon your cooperation to respect the time limit of speech, otherwise we will not be able to finish our work. Thank you very much.

We move back to the item of the Turkish site, Göbekli Tepe. We have in front of us ten requests for the floor and I give first the floor to Indonesia.”

Indonesia:

“Indonesia would like to comment on the thorough and detailed work demonstrated by ICOMOS and the State Party which has been clearly reflected in the nomination dossier. We share the view that the criteria under which the property is nominated (i), (ii) and (iv) have all been stated as justified. We note with concern that in addition to this positive recommendation, ICOMOS has also stated that the property is highly vulnerable, due to several items, such as future development projects, the increase of tourism and the limited nature of the documentation on the buffer and management zones. These factors have been foreseen as potential threats to the aspects of integrity and authenticity of the property.

In this regard we share the concern of ICOMOS that the State Party should have serious concerns about the possible threats that may affect the property. However, we are also of the view that the property should not be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to those factors. We would recommend instead that the State Party design a comprehensive plan to conserve the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of the property based on the ICOMOS recommendations. We know that this has been reflected in the amendment of the draft decision.

We support the recommendation to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, we welcome the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and ICOMOS that Göbekli Tepe be inscribed on the World Heritage List. It is a unique site which represents the most momentous transition in human history regarding the way of life of hunter-gatherers and of the first farmers. However, we would like to express our concerns regarding the ICOMOS recommendations to also inscribe the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

After examination of the issues raised by ICOMOS in its final evaluation report and the additional information and relevant documents provided by the State Party, we are convinced that none of the issues raised by ICOMOS is a justification for the property to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Advisory Bodies’ proposal for simultaneous inscription as a World Heritage in Danger is based mainly on the observation of potential danger posed by future infrastructural projects and possible threats from likely increase in cultural tourism. However, at time of inscription, factual evidence of such threats to the authenticity and integrity of the property are non-existent. The issues raised by ICOMOS in its evaluation report include future infrastructure projects and a railway line project which will be implemented outside the property are not even currently at the project phase. The State Party confirms that the Heritage Impact Assessment will be undertaken before the implementation of the project.

As for any potential future increase in tourism, the site was opened to visitation at the beginning of June, 2018, after a two-year closure. The preparation of the visitor management plan is in its initial phase of defining the nature of heritage tourism and carrying capacity. After carrying out the baseline survey, a visitor management plan will be prepared in a year’s time. At present, capacity remains considerably underused.

The last assessment on the level of threat is the definition of the buffer zone. It is stated by the State Party that the buffer zone, which is designed as a third-degree archaeological site by the regional conservation council, can be reassessed based on future research. The German Archaeological Institute will undertake the recording of the entire buffer zone in its next funding phase of the Göbekli Tepe research project.

The State Party is willing to follow the Advisory Bodies’ recommendation, especially on the site management issue. This includes preparation of tourism and risk management plans and expansion of the conservation plan and archaeological research on the buffer zone of the property, in view of upgrading the level of protection measures.

The archaeological site of Göbekli Tepe does not meet the requirements of in Danger listing that are defined in Paragraph 177 of the Operational Guidelines. Thus, Göbekli Tepe meets integrity and authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value and it should be inscribed on the World Heritage List under criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). We do not see any reason to inscribe the property on to the World Heritage List in Danger.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. The nominated site, Göbekli Tepe, represents one of the earliest masterpieces of the human creative genius. The built structure, with its carved, T-shaped stone pillars is dated from the 10th and 9th millennia BC, the Pre-pottery neolithic age. The Outstanding Universal Value of the property nominated on the World Heritage List has been acknowledged by the Advisory Bodies in recommending the site for inscription. The questions raised during the nomination process have been answered satisfactorily by the State Party regarding boundaries, conservation and the possible impact of tourism.

Hungary feels confident that these questions were answered adequately and therefore supports the amendment of Brazil not to place the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger because of some potential future threats, parallel with its inscription on the List, but to take into consideration the Advisory Bodies’ dialogue in monitoring the site in the future.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Zimbabwe congratulates Turkey for the successful nomination of the Göbekli Tepe monuments under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). We believe this site is a major architectural and archaeological site which shows the genius of the Pre-pottery neolithic society.

To save time I would like to state that we have confidence that the State Party has and will put in place different initiatives that it has and will put in motion the protective as well as the necessary management areas to mitigate possible threats. We therefore fully endorse the amended draft decision by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, The United Republic of Tanzania commends the State Party of Turkey for presenting this fascinating nomination and thanks the Advisory Bodies for a comprehensive report on the site. Madam Chair, the State Party acknowledges the presence of construction and building materials for an irrigation channel five kilometres from Göbekli Tepe that will be removed once the construction is completed. Hence, the worries regarding the visual integrity of the site will be addressed.

Madam Chair, Göbekli Tepe is proposed to be inscribed under the basis of criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) and ICOMOS considers that the property meets these criteria. The delegation of Tanzania notes that ICOMOS is concerned about development pressure and urban development around the property. It, however, acknowledges that the State Party has already taken some concrete measures by preparing a comprehensive management plan for a larger management zone which encompasses the nominated property and the buffer zone.

Tanzania congratulates the State Party for taking these measures that will address the concerns raised by ICOMOS. For that reason, Tanzania proposes that Göbekli Tepe be inscribed on the World Heritage List. Tanzania supports the amendment proposed by the distinguished delegations of Brazil and Australia that it does not need to be inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger.

Thank you every much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“Bosnia Herzegovina supports the proposal to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List and not to inscribe on the in Danger List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je souhaite remercier l'État partie de nous permettre d'avoir l'opportunité de parler d'un site qui est irradiant de valeur universelle exceptionnelle. La communauté scientifique de mon pays depuis la découverte de ce site, le suit avec beaucoup d'intérêt. Nous croyons que non seulement le département culture de l'UNESCO est interpellé par ce site, mais aussi le département science, tant cette découverte remet sur la table le sujet de l'anthropologie moderne et des sciences liées à la compréhension du début de nos sociétés humaines et interpellées par cette découverte.

Nous félicitons l'État partie. Pour la Tunisie qui abrite le plus ancien lieu de culte de l'humanité qui remonte à 40 000 A.C., je parle de l'Hermaïon d'El Guettar, nous sommes très heureux de ce dialogue entre les sites à travers la méditerranée. Nous félicitons l'État partie d'avoir présenté un si beau dossier et bien entendu nous rejoignons le Brésil dans la demande de ne pas l'inscrire sur la Liste en péril ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. To save time, we will just say that we agree with the amendment proposed by Brazil not to inscribe the site on the World Heritage List in Danger.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. To save time, we simply wish to express that we join our Brazilian colleagues in their amendment to the resolution. And we also wish to express our congratulations to the State Party of Turkey for this magnificent inscription.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway will warmly welcome the inscription of Göbekli Tepe under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv). The site is outstanding and very important to human kind. Norway is concerned about possible impacts on the property from development, infrastructure and tourism.

We are not convinced that it is really necessary to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger at this meeting. Inscription on the in Danger List should rather be considered when the Committee examines the report of the State Party on the implementation of the recommendations that we, the Committee, decide today. We therefore support the amendment put forth by Brazil which includes several important recommendations.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of Turkey on a well-developed nomination. We recognise the value of this site and the monument and the archaeological evidence exposed that show the domestic dwellings of hunter-gatherers of the Pre-pottery Neolithic period.

Saint Kitts and Nevis further recognises the concerns expressed by ICOMOS, but, as has been stated by others, we believe it is premature to place the property on the World Heritage in Danger List. We congratulate Turkey on this inscription under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Finally, Cuba, the floor is yours.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. My delegation also would like to thank the State of Turkey for this nomination file. We are in favour of the amendment submitted by Brazil because we think it is unnecessary to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As we have heard during the discussion, I have received amendments to the draft decision. The original draft decision called for the site to be inscribed on the World Heritage List and simultaneously to inscribe it on the World Heritage List in Danger. The amendments submitted by Brazil, Azerbaijan, Zimbabwe, China, Bosnia, Hungary and Tanzania would inscribe the site on the World Heritage List but not on the World Heritage List in Danger.

As such, you will notice in the amendments that you have on the screen that we have slight changes to the assessment on the condition of integrity as well as authenticity. We have the proposal to delete paragraph 4 which would have put the site on the World Heritage List in Danger and logically the deletion of paragraph 5 which would have detailed the desired state of conservation and, finally, we have a set of smaller amendments in the new paragraph 4 and the new paragraph 5.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or interventions or shall we adopt the amended draft decision? Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Norway suggests an addition to paragraph 5, the last paragraph, to prolong the sentence with ‘*at which time, the Committee may consider in case of a confirmation of ascertained or potential dangers to the Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the property of the List of the World Heritage in Danger*’.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, over the two days of the Committee we have tried to maintain a spirit of encouragement and to give States Parties our confidence and it is on the basis of this report that we will then start making decision, but we should not be threatening the State Party at this time. I feel that the addition proposed by Norway goes against what the Committee has agreed to do in the past few days.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to make mine the words just said by our distinguished colleague from Zimbabwe and, in relation to the suggestion made by my colleague from Norway, I would call his attention to the fact that every single nomination or every single site inscribed has potential risks for many reasons. I believe that if the country is committed in working towards the preservation of the site, we should give the country this positive sign of encouragement.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Having heard almost each and every committee member it was very clearly stated that at this stage we do not see any threats to the proposed property. I just want to second what was just said by the distinguished delegate of Zimbabwe; it is kind of a prejudice. We do not see any necessity for this addition to this paragraph and the proposal from Norway.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie souhaite que notre décision garde cette intonation positive et confiante à l'endroit de l'État partie et surtout faire confiance à la 44^e session de notre Comité qui aura apprécié la teneur du rapporte présenté à ce moment-là. S'il y a nécessité, c'est à ce Comité-là de le décider, mais restons sur une note positive. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania has the floor”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chairperson, we also support the proposal from Zimbabwe as this Committee is more proactive when encouraging rather than threatening. This has been the exercise since the beginning of this Committee. We support the text of Zimbabwe and we do not see the reason for the addition.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China wishes to add its voice to those of Zimbabwe Brazil, Azerbaijan and Tunisia. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I think that the proposal made by Norway is correct, but at the same time, the way that we have been moving in this Committee over the past couple of days is that we know the risk of being inscribed on the World Heritage List in Danger is always there and I think we need to trust the State, as Cuba has already said. This is why Spain would like to see this wording removed.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, please you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Very briefly, Indonesia would like to align itself with Zimbabwe, Brazil, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Tunisia, China and Spain in proposing the deletion of the amendment suggested by Norway.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, you have the floor. “

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. La Bosnie Herzégovine voudrait aussi se joindre aux autres États qui pensent que cet ajout n'est pas nécessaire. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Can we adopt the decision? Most of the Committee members are in agreement with the text without the proposal of Norway. In that case, we adopt it as it is now in front of you without Norway’s amendment. It is confirmed. Thank you. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.34 adopted. I congratulate Turkey and I give them the floor.”

Turkey:

“Chairperson, members of the Committee, colleagues, I would like first to heartily thank the Bahraini authorities for their effective organisation and magnificent hospitality. This is another remarkable accomplishment for the World Heritage Committee, since you have just inscribed an 11,000-year-old masterpiece of human creative genius. I would like to thank all members of the Committee as well as ICOMOS for their support and acknowledgement of Göbekli Tepe’s unquestionable Outstanding Universal Value.

As you have realised, this site is comprised of the earliest known megalithic stone buildings associated with recently discovered domestic structures, suggesting this site was a major social and domestic hub in the early neolithic period. Furthermore, this unique craftsmanship observed at Göbekli Tepe provides us with an unprecedented insight into the traditions and narrative of a prehistoric population at this crucial time in human history.

We would like to state that the conservation and maintenance of Göbekli Tepe is under the full responsibility and protection of the Turkish authorities. We are aware of our responsibilities and are ready to fulfil all related commitments and to this end we will continue to work with ICOMOS.

Let me also extend my sincere thanks to all Turkish authorities involved in the preparation of the nomination file. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now we move to the next site, in Germany. I now invite ICOMOS to present the nomination of Naumburg Cathedral, Germany. The draft decision concerning this nomination can be found in document 8B.Add. ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much. The presentation of the ICOMOS evaluation of the Naumburg Cathedral in Germany: ICOMOS report can be found in Document INF.8B.Add in page 34 of the English version and page 37 of the French version. You know that Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.35 is found in document 8B.Add.

The World Heritage Committee referred back this nomination at its 41st session in Cracow last year. The decision was in relation to a larger medieval cultural landscape which included the old town of Naumburg and its cathedral. Naumburg Cathedral dates primarily to

the 13th century and is nominated as a testimony to medieval art and architecture, in particular, the workshop organisation of sculptors and stone masons known as the Naumburg masters. The revised material submitted by the State Party has reduced the boundary to the cathedral and its immediate setting.

In addition to the cathedral building, the property includes associated medieval buildings, the cathedral gardens and fortification. The material provides a detailed description of the interior and exterior elements of the cathedral, its floor plan and artistic work. It has a Romanesque structure flanked by two Gothic choirs, demonstrating a transitional style between late Romanesque and the early Gothic.

Notable architectural and artistic features of Naumburg Cathedral include its two Gothic choirs and a series of very important sculptures. In the west choir, pillars supporting the vaults merge with 12 large sculptures of the founders, aristocratic men and women of the Thuringian-Saxon nobility. These are considered to be unique within European medieval sculpture. The west choir screen is also considered to be a significant achievement of the Naumburg masters and is well-known and highly regarded in the history of art.

The State Party has provided a new comparative analysis in relation to European religious architecture from the 13 and 14th centuries. However, ICOMOS does not consider that it supports the case for inclusion of the cathedral on the World Heritage List. In the context of the Global Strategy, ICOMOS also notes that religious architecture of this historical period and geocultural context is relatively well represented in the World Heritage List.

ICOMOS has not identified any issues in relation to the conditions of integrity and authenticity but notes that these are inextricably connected to the ability of the property to fulfil one or more of the criteria and all the requirements of Outstanding Universal Value. For ICOMOS a key question arising from the referred back proposal is whether the Outstanding Universal Value of the cathedral can rest on the artistic element of the Naumburg masters alone, given that the cathedral itself is assessed as otherwise not exceptional or outstanding in its architecture, historical or aesthetic characteristics.

ICOMOS is not aware of examples of inscriptions based on artistic elements alone since the current wording of criterion (i) was adopted in 1995 when the words 'unique artistic achievements' were removed from the criterion text in order to comply with the direction of the Global Strategy.

The State Party has proposed this nomination in relation to criteria (I), (ii) and (iv). ICOMOS does not consider that these criteria are demonstrated. The reasons for each of these judgements are given in the ICOMOS evaluation report.

The boundaries are well delineated, no specific rationale for the delineation of the buffer zone is provided in the material submitted, but ICOMOS has not identified any concerns. There are few threats to this property. It is very well cared for although it has no management plan; ICOMOS has no concerns about the legal protection of the state of conservation or management systems.

The evaluation of this referred back nomination has taken into account Decision 41 COM.8B.29, which indicated three bases for the previous nomination to be referred back to the State Party. The first point asked the State Party to re-centre the nomination by focusing on the Outstanding Universal Value of Naumburg Cathedral.

ICOMOS recalls that according to the Operational Guidelines, the Outstanding Universal Value is not formally recognised when nominations are the subject of referred back decisions by the World Heritage Committee, since this recognition occurs at the time of the inscription. ICOMOS has evaluated the new material submitted by the State Party according

to its usual working methods. As noted already, in the professional judgement of ICOMOS, Naumburg Cathedral does not meet any of the nominating criteria and should not be inscribed, creating an uncomfortable alignment with the World Heritage Committee decision taken at its 41st Session.

The second asked the State Party to adjust the boundaries of the nominated property and a management plan. The State Party has adjusted the boundaries, but no revised management plan has been submitted. However, ICOMOS does not have concerns about the management system and suggests that this does not constitute a critical point for decision.

The final point asked the State Party to review the statement of Outstanding Universal Value at Naumburg Cathedral for final adoption by the Committee within three years. The meaning of this point is not clear to ICOMOS, but it has been understood to mean that the State Party should submit its revised material within the usual time frame, which it has clearly done.

To conclude: ICOMOS considers that Decision 41 COM 8B.29, taken in Cracow in 2017, has pre-empted its ability to fully evaluate the merit of this referred back nomination according to the manner prescribed in the Operational Guidelines and its working methods. With great respect to all, ICOMOS finds that it is just unable to make a recommendation concerning inscription of this property but has provided its advice on each aspect in its evaluation report to assist the Committee.

Based on the material submitted, ICOMOS considers that Naumburg Cathedral does not meet any of the cultural criteria. Thank you very much madam Chair. “

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now to Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“You recall that last year, the Committee, based on expert advice, found that Naumburg Cathedral demonstrated clear potential for Outstanding Universal Value and referred back the nomination to the State Party to address some key issues and ensure that all was in compliance with the requirements. These issues were clearly understood and the State Party has, in our view, directly and comprehensively addressed them. We are therefore well-positioned to complete this process today.

ICOMOS agrees with the State Party that the interior of the Cathedral is outstanding but assesses the architectural whole separately. We know that this assessment is a minority position in the academic world, where a strong majority consensus emerging is that the unity of arts and architecture in Naumburg is unique, inseparable and, importantly, of the highest value. The argument, therefore, is really about the front and the back of the very same stones, which feature artwork on the inside but which also serve as an integral part of the wall on the outside of the Cathedral.

With utmost respect for the commendable work ICOMOS has put into the advice and evaluation of this nomination, we need to make clear the main issue of contention that a stone within a wall is either of outstanding value or it is not; there can be no separate evaluation. However, ICOMOS raises a valid point regarding the Committee’s stand on art work as opposed to architecture and is looking for guidance on this matter.

Saint Kitts and Nevis strongly believes that such guidance should be given as requested by clarifying the draft statement of Outstanding Universal Value for Naumburg Cathedral, pointing to the fact that: assembling intelligence, however named or identified, stood behind the conception and realisation of the western choir as an integral whole, not a mere separate artwork. These sculptures and choir screens are not removable artworks, but are sculpted from the same blocks of stones as the pillar and are in fact invisible from the building. The integrated programme of sculpture, glass, and architecture were conceived, designed and executed together to form a single original masterpiece. That this was executed in a six-year period is also an extraordinary feat, given that such programmes usually take decades or centuries to complete. Its undisputable Outstanding Universal Value deserves global recognition within the context of the World Heritage List.

Saint Kitts and Nevis proposes to amend the draft statement and has submitted a proposal to the Rapporteur in advance for the convenience of editing and reading on screen.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We recall and note Decision 41 COM 8B.29 adopted during the 41st Session in Cracow that the property has been referred back to the State Party and the statement of Outstanding Universal Value should be reviewed for final adoption by the Committee within two years. The State Party has complied with this decision.

After thoroughly studying the nomination dossier, Indonesia is of the opinion that the Naumburg Cathedral nominated by Germany exhibits a high degree of authenticity to the Middle Ages. It bears a truly unique testimony to medieval architecture and sculpture and brilliantly demonstrates the productions of the Naumburg Master’s workshop, which is considered a pioneer of the 13th century architecture and sculpture. In addition, the migration of Naumburg Master’s workshop from northeastern France through the middle and further to southwestern Europe in fact facilitated cultural exchange in European contacts.

We also learn that ICOMOS has not identified an issue in relation to the condition of integrity and authenticity, and that the boundary and buffer zone of the property are appropriate, with effective legal protection. ICOMOS also considers that the cathedral and associated elements demonstrate a good state of conservation.

Considering all the above, we align ourselves with other committee members who have determined this property to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. First of all, we would like to emphasise that the State of Kuwait was a member at the 41st Session. Looking at the presentation made by the Advisory Body, and we thank it for it, it feels like we are going back to square one. I am sure a lot of this discussion occurred during the last Session and it was awarded a nomination as having given Outstanding Universal Value.

I do not understand how we can go back to square one by saying it does not have Outstanding Universal Value. What happened to the Committee? It was not a working group that submitted a draft decision, it was the Committee, and I am quoting the Secretariat on last Tuesday that emphasised respecting the decisions of the Committee, so that we do not have this type of controversial discussion.

I am confused. How is it that at the last Committee the monument was awarded an Outstanding Universal Value and after submitting documents by the State Party it comes back and no longer has it? It does not make sense. I do not think it is the right way for dealing with files that have disagreement in them. There have been a lot of files and disagreements today which respected the majority decision at the end. As was stated in the presentation made by our dear colleagues from the Advisory Bodies, we need clarification on this before we can take a stance.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, Uganda aligns itself with the statement made by the delegations of Saint Kitts and Nevis, Indonesia and Kuwait. We wish to congratulate the State Party of Germany for this concise and well-prepared nomination. My delegation believes that Naumburg Cathedral is a necessary addition to the World Heritage List, as it marks the best work of the European craftsmanship of the 13th century, under the name of the Naumburg Master.

Uganda noted that ICOMOS points to the high number of European cathedrals already inscribed on the World Heritage List. My delegation has reviewed the literature and recent research done on the Naumburg Cathedral and has come to the conclusion that the property is unique in its own right.

The universal significance of the Naumburg Cathedral is invariably recognised by scholars around the world. Although it is true that Gothic cathedrals are well-represented on the World Heritage List, this does not diminish Naumburg’s outstanding qualities in any way. It is also important to note that Naumburg served to address the gap on the World Heritage List according to ICOMOS’ gap analysis of 2004. This analysis found the themes of Protestantism and Evangelism had few occurrences on the World Heritage List. Naumburg Cathedral addresses both. It is today a Protestant church and has been since the Lutheran reformation of 500 years ago. In fact, the Cathedral was a decisive location for Protestantism in its way, as in the year 1542 the first German Protestant Bishop was ordained in the Cathedral.

Also, at the time of the Naumburg Master, the cathedral was a decisive conveyor of the Protestant movement in central and eastern Europe during the 13th century and was built for that very purpose. We therefore wish to express our strongest support for the draft

amendment proposed by Saint Kitts and Nevis to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (I) and (ii).

I thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As a member of the Committee at the 41st and at this session, Zimbabwe is a co-sponsor of the draft amendment. The Committee at the 41st Session decided that Naumburg Cathedral had potential Outstanding Universal Value and then asked the State Party to bring back to the Committee a revised dossier focusing on the Cathedral. This is what the State Party has done.

I think, however, madam Chair, we are dealing with two matters. We would like at this point to state that the Global Strategy for a representative List is at stake. The 18th session of the Committee did note the monumental bias of the World Heritage List. The first meeting of the Global Strategy took place in my country, Zimbabwe. However, since then, we have paid lip service to the issue of the representative List. Unless there is a clear concept of being fully booked, as we heard this morning, we will continue to struggle with properties which meet the criteria, but as long as this site meets the criteria we will exercise the rule of the Operational Guidelines to use the same evaluation. At some points States Parties to the Convention will need to take brave decisions and put limits on certain types of properties on the List, but we cannot penalise this property because of our lack of courage and progress in implementing the Global Strategy.

I therefore fully support the amended draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. À travers la décision du Comité de l'année dernière, et nous étions également présent à cette session, nous avons bien recommandé un renvoi pour ce bien qui était intitulé déjà l'année dernière comme étant la Cathédrale de Naumburg et les sites associés dans le paysage culturel de la Cathédrale de Naumburg et les sites associés dans le paysage culturel de la Saale et de l'Unstrut de l'Allemagne.

Trois recommandations fondamentales ont été faites à l'Etat partie, je les cite : *“redéfinir la proposition d'inscription en la recentrant sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle donnée de la cathédrale de Naumburg ; ajuster les limites et revoir la déclaration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle.”*

L'analyse du rapport qui nous est soumis par l'ICOMOS montre que l'Etat partie a pris en considération ces recommandations, bien que l'ICOMOS est émis des réserves sur l'évaluation des éléments de l'analyse comparative qui ont certainement joué un peu sur les attributs de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle. Nous pensons, à notre avis, qu'une bonne évaluation des éléments présentés par l'Etat partie concernant les critères (i) et (iv) aurait

bien justifié la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. D'ailleurs l'ICOMOS affirme que la justification de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle proposée est potentiellement pertinente. Il souligne le mot "pertinente".

En outre, la révision des limites et les systèmes de protection, de conservation et de gestion sont appropriés. Toutefois nous sommes stupéfaits de voir que le rapport qui nous est présenté soulève deux principes ou questionnements :

1) sûrement l'État partie a travaillé en collaboration avec l'ICOMOS pour réviser son dossier selon les recommandations figurant dans la décision déjà citée, qui était à notre avis une perspective positive. Pourquoi nous retrouvons nous aujourd'hui face à une décision de non-inscription qui fait reculer cette proposition d'inscription ? Cela nous paraît être un cas spécial dans l'histoire de la Convention et du Comité.

2) Le projet de décision qui nous est soumis déclare clairement que l'ICOMOS est dans l'incapacité d'émettre une recommandation concernant l'inscription de ce bien. Par conséquent nous aimerions savoir qui a finalement émis la recommandation de non-inscription.

Au regard des éléments et de notre analyse, nous aimerions que l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'État partie nous apportent des informations et des clarifications afin que nous puissions prendre une décision plus appropriée. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor."

Norway:

"Thank you madam Chair. Nomination processes through World Heritage require substantial resources from the State Party, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and, more than that, nominations create expectations, engagement, pride, commitment and ownership locally, regionally and nationally.

Naumburg Cathedral came onto the Tentative List in 1999 and I have no doubt that the people of Naumburg, Saxony-Anhalt and of the Federal Republic of Germany may be hopeful, confused maybe, even deeply frustrated. More than anything, it is deeply painful to realise that the advice provided by ICOMOS in conjunction with the guidance of previous decisions of the World Heritage Committee have resorted in the highly awkward and difficult situation we find ourselves in now.

The Naumburg Cathedral and its work of architectural art are indeed significant and truly special. Yet, for the third time we have a recommendation proposed in this nomination which began its journey as a large cultural landscape and now in its third evaluation as the Naumburg Cathedral it should not be inscribed.

My first point would be that the recognised Outstanding Universal Value is expressed through one or more of the criteria specified to a World Heritage and in this case ICOMOS considered that none of the cultural criteria have been demonstrated. Further, according to Paragraphs 51 and 154 of the Operational Guidelines, Outstanding Universal Value recognised at the time of inscription are not given in advance. This brings me to my second point.

We have a nomination dossier in front of us revised by the State Party in line with previous decisions and now we are reading in the referral procedures, as outlined in Paragraph 59 of the Operational Guidelines, a nomination coming back after being refereed with a different name and different arguments to justify criteria, entirely new statements of integrity and authenticity and totally altered boundaries, which is in our reading far beyond the scope of this procedure. Finally, and most importantly, criterion (i) was changed in 1995 to accommodate the admission of the Global Strategy adopted in 1994.

We have very carefully reviewed this nomination and all supplementary information and discussed with the State Party, in particular with regard to criterion (i). We do realise that Germany has provided a nomination meeting the highest standard, proving that management and protection are in place, likewise authenticity and integrity, but without a valid argument for the criteria of Outstanding Universal Value, which is yet to be established. More than anything, with half of the properties of the World Heritage List found in Europe, and more than half of this year's nomination coming from Europe, we are challenged by the question: Do we contribute to a more representative, balanced and credible World Heritage List if the Committee inscribes yet another property in this category?

Madam Chair, for these reasons, the Outstanding Universal Value, the credibility of the Convention, the need to review the referral procedure and its application in light of the Naumburg case and in respect of the Global Strategy and our mutual responsibility to adhere to the principles outlined in Paragraph 59 of the Operational Guidelines concerning the establishment of representative balance and credible World Heritage List, Norway has after careful, conflicting and painful consideration, come to support the draft decision.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. The Delegation of Tanzania commends the State Party of Germany for their hard work in preparing the nomination of the Naumburg Cathedral site. Tanzania also thanks and appreciates the work of the Advisory Body for the missions and the arguments made to the analysis and the presentation of this nomination.

The nomination of the property was presented for discussion during the 39th session of the Committee in Bonn, Germany. At this 39th session, the nomination was deferred to the State Party for five things: 1) further exploration of the relationship between Naumburg Cathedral and its surrounding landscape; 2) strengthening the representativeness of the territorial and urban organisation for the period of the High Middle Ages; 3) redefinition of the boundaries of the site; 4) submit – on the basis of the above-mentioned recommendations – a significantly revised nomination, which would require an expert mission to the site and 5) inviting ICOMOS to offer advice and guidance.

I am told these undertakings were successfully completed. This nomination was again presented and discussed during the 41st session. In this session, the nomination was referred to the State Party so as to re-scope the nomination, to adjust the boundaries of the nominated property and the management plan and to review the statement of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. I am informed that these were also accomplished successfully.

The Tanzanian delegation considers that the discussion and the dialogue that take place during the Committee session are generally based on consensus and mutual understanding and therefore they are collective responses coming from all the implemental scope of the Convention.

The Tanzanian delegation understanding is that that the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the Committee should collectively own the decision of the Committee in one way or another, regardless of their differences in their making. This is because the very partner or implementer is normally given an opportunity to add a voice when the decisions are being discussed before the approval of any decisions.

When the delegation of Tanzania went through the Advisory Bodies' analysis and their presentation of this nomination, it found out very significant divergence. This nomination draft decision has moved from referral to non-inscription. The Tanzanian delegation is very surprised by this decision. This is very contrary to the decision of the Committee's prior weighing towards deferral then referral. In the normal process, the delegation of Tanzania had expected to see inscription or, at the worst, the scenario would be referral. What does this mean? Is the Committee being asked for an adjustment to the previous decisions, or what do the Advisory Bodies want to tell us? Is a legal advisor needed in this situation, or guidelines, or the Rules of procedure or commonsense? Can you help us out of this?

The Tanzanian delegation wishes to support the amended draft decision for inscription on the basis of criterion (ii). Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Tunisia, please."

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je voudrais saisir l'occasion de ce dossier pour soulever une question qui est en rapport avec le premier point que l'on avait évoqué dès la première intervention de la Tunisie à ce Comité. Nous sommes tout autant attachés à la lettre qu'à l'esprit de cette convention. Donc la situation dans laquelle l'on se trouve est quelque peu kafkaïenne à nos yeux. Je crois qu'il y a un problème de compétence de ce Comité, quelles que soient les décisions aujourd'hui. Il y a un problème qui se pose *prima facie* et une question de compétence dans le temps.

Je suis heureux que ce site on le discute juste après avoir voté positivement pour le site turc tout à l'heure et j'avais réagi à la proposition de l'honorable représentante de la Norvège que la Tunisie estimait qu'il n'était pas de notre compétence de préjuger à l'avenir de la compétence du 44^e Comité. Comme nous ne pouvons pas préjuger à l'avenir, nous ne pouvons pas déjuger par rapport à ce qui a été décidé quelque soit notre appréciation aujourd'hui. Auquel cas, si nous ne le faisons pas, il n'y a plus aucune cohérence au fonctionnement de ce Comité.

Notre compétence de notre Comité, ainsi que la compétence de l'État partie dans ce dossier et a fortiori des Organes consultatifs est une compétence liée dans les limites de la mission qui lui a été communiquée par la décision de l'ancien Comité. En deçà de cela on serait en pleine contradiction et je répète, quelle que soit notre appréciation aujourd'hui de ce dossier. Il faut bien qu'il y ait une stabilité dans nos décisions, une cohérence dans nos décisions, et quelque part une application par les sessions successives par rapport à nos décisions antérieures.

Si nous ne le faisons pas, nous sommes en train de transformer nos sessions successives en une forme juridictionnelle, comme si la session suivante pouvait se mettre à la place d'une autorité qui pourrait dédire ce qui a été dit à la session principale. Je crois que ce Comité a une limite *ratione temporis*, c'est à dire une limite par rapport à notre compétence dans le temps et on ne peut pas déjuger ce qui a été dit préalablement et nous y attachons, madame la présidente, le plus grand prix et merci de votre attention ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Naumburg Cathedral is nominated as a testimony to medieval art and architecture. The cathedral is known for the skills of its master in combining architectural elements and because of the realistic expressions of the sculptures. The Naumburg Master is one of the most renowned artists of the Middle Ages. Sculptures from the Naumburg Master are also found in other places in Europe as well.

Regarding criterion (i), ICOMOS finds exceptionality in the sculptural work of the Naumburg Cathedral but not in its architecture at all. We do not share this concern because they cannot be any separation between the sculpture and the architecture. The sculptures were designed and created as an integral part of the cathedral walls. The sculptures are inseparable parts of the wall masonry. At the same time, they are load-bearing details, as are other masonry stones. If the sculptures were taken off parts of the walls, the masonry would collapse.

This is the reason why we do not agree with the Advisory Bodies that this nominated property is setting a precedent for changing the use of criterion (i). On the contrary, the Naumburg Cathedral as a whole forms a unique synthesis of architectural construction and fully meets criteria (i) and (ii). The integrity of the nominated property is based on the unchanged layout and architectural elements of mid- 13th century and the lack of adverse effects or pressures. The authenticity of the property is demonstrated by the pristine condition of the materials and the form of the cathedral, which is from the High Middle Ages. Furthermore, we want to emphasise that there were two decisions of the World Heritage Committee on this property and we strongly believe that the World Heritage Committee should be consistent in its decisions.

Last year in Cracow, the Committee adopted a decision on referral and at the same time recognised potential Outstanding Universal Value and came out with recommendations. The State Party complies with the recommendations and now in Bahrain, we are again discussing this issue. Based on this point and the earlier mentioned justification of Outstanding Universal Value, we support the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List and we support the amended draft to the draft decision in this regard.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chairperson, here we are again, working through the sort of situation we should all work hard to avoid. Firstly, let me support the comment from the distinguished representative of Norway in underlining the importance of the Global Strategy and frankly the need for those of us who have many places on the World Heritage List already to stand back and give the possibility for other countries to show us their World Heritage and bask in the glory of this Convention.

I also want to align with the comment of the distinguished representative from Zimbabwe, about the need to differentiate between our consideration of this dossier and the Global Strategy and notes in doing so, that from next year, with our Operational Guideline number 61, we will have for the first time a mechanism that we can apply as a Committee to prioritise the inscription of places on the World Heritage List in conformity with the Global Strategy and this is something we should all welcome.

Australia has concerns with the way this site has been considered by the Committee in previous years. In 2015, the Committee deferred the nomination and requested the State Party to significantly revise the dossier to explore the relationship between the cathedral and its surrounding landscape. In 2017, the Committee referred the nomination back to the State Party while also recognising the Outstanding Universal Value of the cathedral, a most unusual decision, and one we are not convinced was in conformity with the Operational Guidelines. In contrast to the 2015 decision, the State Party was asked to refocus the nomination on the cathedral itself. Back to the future.

We know that the State Party has complied with the Committee’s past decisions, but we know too that given the previous decisions to refer, we are now faced with deciding on a significantly revised decision that has not been reviewed by an evaluation mission.

This case underlines the importance of the Committee thoroughly reviewing the nomination process. Let me now move past Australia’s reflection on the process. We are able to support the proposed amendment to inscribe Naumburg Cathedral on the World Heritage List under criteria (i) and (ii). The splendour of the cathedral is clearly evident; it is a unique testament of the work of the Naumburg Master, in this instance the most exquisite rendering of the groundbreaking innovation in architecture and sculpture that spread across medieval Europe in the second half of the 13th century.

We thank the State Party of Germany for this nomination.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Hungary commends the State Party for its persistence in working in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and respecting the Rules of procedure and the Convention. The results of years-long preparation work are a high quality nomination file corresponding to the criteria and requirements. It fully respects and acknowledges the recommendations of ICOMOS.

In the present case, Hungary does not believe that the evaluation of the Outstanding Universal Value of Naumburg Cathedral was in every respect well-based. Hungary would like to emphasise the significance of Naumburg Cathedral is not the 60th or 70th nominated cathedral waiting for inscription, but the first which western choir is not only a master piece of the later Romanesque architecture, together with these sculptures, but also a master for many other cathedrals in Europe for new artistic designs.

Therefore, Hungary is convinced of the exceptional Outstanding Universal Value of this property and thinks it is justified to be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (i) and (ii) and supports the amended draft decision submitted by Saint Kitts and Nevis.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

“Thank you madam Chair. Spain would also like to point out, as other delegations have, that there is a contradiction between the Global Strategy which has been approved by the States Parties and the decisions of this Committee. These should not be contradictory. The proposal for referral does not mean *per se* that the Outstanding Universal Value has been declared. ICOMOS, in its evaluation report, as was said by other delegations, pointed out the lack of coherence with previous decisions of the Committee.

Spain would like to point out that it is making a great effort to be consistent with the Global Strategy. There are more than 90 cathedrals inscribed, including historical centres (46 properties in that category), so it is more difficult to prove the Outstanding Universal Value in that context. In Spain we made a great effort with our historic centres and cathedrals to explain what it means in terms of geographical representation and properties. We would like to go along with the Advisory Bodies. We have no problem with going along with the consensus. But there is a big internal contradiction. We have been following a very strict policy going along with the Strategy. We would like to point out that the contradictions we make in the Committee must be consistent.

Therefore, we encourage the Committee which studies these properties to take full account of the remarks made by ICOMOS in that respect. I would also like to follow on the comments made by the Norwegian delegation. It is precisely in this Committee that we declare or not the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. According to the ICOMOS report, the Naumburg cathedral lacks exceptional and outstanding historical architectural characteristics when compared to other European cathedrals of the period, which, by the way, are well-represented on the World Heritage List, including a number of extraordinary examples from Germany.

In our view, the over-representation of European creation in monumental architecture on the List and inscribing a property without clarity on the attributes that convey its Outstanding Universal Value would be detrimental to the Global Strategy for representative balance and a credible World Heritage List. We consider that the comparative criteria by the

State Party relying exclusively on the work of the Naumburg Master is possibly too narrow to justify the Outstanding Universal Value, although we strongly echo the importance of the Naumburg Master in the history of art.

Madam Chair, we are faced here with a procedural issue. Last year the Committee took a referral decision to refer the nomination by focusing on the given, and I stress 'given', Outstanding Universal Value of this property and review the Outstanding Universal Value statement for final adoption by this session. This is Brazil's first year at the current mandate; we believe if the Committee found Outstanding Universal Value, it could have perhaps provided sounder guidance on where the basis of Outstanding Universal Value was laid in relation to the World Heritage criteria.

Madam Chair, the State Party has fully complied with last year's Committee decision and submitted for the current session a new nomination dossier focusing on the cathedral alone, rather than on the cultural landscape which was the original orientation of this nomination as we, the Committee, requested. No immovable artwork is outside the scope of this Convention, the work of the Master is an integral component of the cathedral. As put forth by ICOMOS, the key question arising from this proposed nomination is when Outstanding Universal Value can rest exclusively on these artworks. If the Committee would agree that the artistic achievements of the cathedral provide the foundation for its Outstanding Universal Value, Brazil is apprehensive that this might be setting a risky precedent for consideration of properties only grounded on the artistic works for inscription on the World Heritage List to the detriment of the Global Strategy.

In the case the Committee decides for inscription on this basis, as seems the case, Brazil would join the growing consensus and supports inscription and recommends that an expert meeting be convened in order to develop guidance on how integrated artwork can be taken to sustain Outstanding Universal Value in line with the Global Strategy.

Madam Chair, we have some texts on this proposal for an expert meeting and I seek guidance on whether we should present it in the nomination of this draft decision or whether we should include it in a broader decision, since it is a proposal for more general policy guidance.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China fully acknowledges the Outstanding Universal Value of Germany's nomination. Naumburg Cathedral has completely justified criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). China knows that this nomination has been submitted to previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee for examination twice. The State Party has modified its boundaries in order to implement the decisions adopted to meet the inscription criteria. However, it seems that ICOMOS has put the State Party in a very difficult situation, despite all the above efforts that have been undertaken by its newest recommendation not to propose inscription.

China is of the view that some key procedures of the inscription process must be revised and that the Advisory Bodies' recommendations must keep in consistency with those previous, in order for States Parties' nominations with Outstanding Universal Value not to be negatively affected. Therefore, China fully supports the amendment to the draft decision

proposed by Saint Kitts and Nevis, supported by a number of Committee members that this property be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to ICOMOS to clarify and to the Secretariat.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you madam Chair. There was a question asked by Angola referring to the draft decision that is put in front of the Committee and I would like to address that question. As we have already heard from ICOMOS in its presentation, Decision 41 COM 8B.29 taken last year in Cracow pre-empted the ability of the Advisory Bodies to fully evaluate the merit of this referred-back nomination according to the manner prescribed in the Operational Guidelines and working method.

Of course, while the Committee is free to take the decision it wishes, the Secretariat must follow the current procedure and in particular the articles of the Convention and its Operational Guidelines. We note, as has already been said by the delegation of Norway, that in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, the Outstanding Universal Value is recognised at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and that no recognition is foreseen prior to this stage.

It means that under the referral, there is no Outstanding Universal Value. This is why we have to draw the conclusions that are clearly stated in the recommendations included in the evaluation of ICOMOS, where it says that in their professional judgement Naumburg Cathedral does not meet any of the cultural criteria. As we know, cultural criteria are fundamental requirements towards Outstanding Universal Value and inscription on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair and to all the distinguished members of the Committee who have addressed this very difficult matter before us. Let me start by saying very clearly that ICOMOS does respect the decision of the World Heritage Committee and also respects the very diligent work of the State Party in this and other cases.

Kuwait and others have asked why ICOMOS has reviewed the Outstanding Universal Value in the material presented by the State Party given the specific texts that were provided by the 41st session. I think Tanzania also raised the fact that this was also considered by the 39th Session of the World Heritage Committee as well as the 41st Session of the World Heritage Committee. Tanzania also pointed out very well that in fact these two previous discussions, nominations, evaluations and decisions did not evaluate the Outstanding

Universal Value of the Cathedral but rather referred to a nominated Cultural Landscape, a much larger one related to the medieval history and heritage of this part of Germany.

When the 41st Committee Session made this particular decision we looked at carefully today, while Outstanding Universal Value was somehow found or assumed it was not specified, no criteria or particular reasons were mentioned. In the Operational Guidelines and in the Convention and in all the work we do, ICOMOS is asked most of all to be rigorous, scientific and objective in its work. That is what we have truly done in this case.

We were given in February a new comparative analysis, new arguments with relation to criteria for the Cathedral to be considered as demonstrating Outstanding Universal Value. We found that we had no options to evaluate this material. We thought that this was our duty in relation to the World Heritage Convention and we felt it was our duty as a professional organisation.

I want to clarify that we do not necessarily see the World Heritage List as being, if you like, fully booked, as expressed by Zimbabwe; however, as more properties are added to the list within certain thematic, typological and geocultural contexts, the openings for new properties in these areas become narrowed and in this case especially so.

For this reason, we note the comments made by Brazil and the proposal to perhaps initiate an expert study in relation to this particular matter; we welcome these proposals as we welcome the opportunity to be involved. We do not wish to create a major lack of harmony between ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee other than to reassure you that we have endeavoured to serve you as well as we could. We have done our work scientifically, clearly and have tried to be extremely transparent in the report we have provided to you about the situation that we find ourselves in upon submission of the information by the State Party at the start of this year.

I should also just say because various experts in this field have been involved in some of your comments that ICOMOS also consulted many experts in this field, in reaching its conclusion that no criteria are demonstrated by Naumburg Cathedral and that the comparative analysis does not, sadly and regrettably, support inclusion on the World Heritage List in the professional view of ICOMOS.

Thank you for your attention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente. Après avoir entendu l'ICOMOS et après avoir écouté plusieurs déclarations de certains membres du Comité, il y a encore un problème soulevé. Certains ont fait remarquer que dans le cadre de la stratégie globale il y a déjà beaucoup de biens inscrits qui sont des cathédrales sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Entre temps, il y a un amendement qui est proposé et il n'y a pas d'outils pour évaluer ce genre de bien. Là, il y a une contradiction finalement. Est-ce que les outils existent pour évaluer ces biens parce qu'ils ont déjà été inscrits ? On nous présente un autre projet de mettre en place un groupe de travail pour élaborer des outils d'évaluation, donc là nous sommes un peu perturbés nous ne savons plus où aller exactement ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Before I give the floor to Tunisia, I would like the legal advisor to clarify some points.”

Legal advisor:

Thank you, Madam Chair.

A number of important procedural and legal points have been raised by quite a number of delegations. And there is a number of issues that I would like to put forward for the record because I think it is important for the Committee’s deliberations at this Committee meeting, but also to have a better understanding of the Rules of Procedure in the way in which this Committee should operate when it is considering proposals for nomination.

So the first point that I would like to make is a point that was raised by a number of delegations which is that Outstanding Universal Value is determined at the time a property is inscribed. That is very clear when you look at the combined effect of Articles 11.2 and 13.8 of the Convention. What is also very clear, looking at these provisions of the Convention and also the associated provisions of the Operational Guidelines, is that a decision on inscription is made with a two-third majority, which means that a Statement of Universal Value which is adopted at, and only at, the time of inscription of a property is decided upon by this Committee by a two-third majority.

An associated point which I think is important is that there seems to have been an unfortunate tendency, or I am saying the beginnings perhaps of an unfortunate tendency, for the Committee to seek to make a determination at the time of referral or deferral in relation to Outstanding Universal Value. That is not, in fact, within the mandate of the Committee, or the language of the Convention, or the Operational Guidelines, to be able to make a determination as to Outstanding Universal Value upon a referral or deferral decision.

In this context, I think it is also extremely important to note that decisions to referral or deferral are taken by a simple majority. It would be a very dangerous precedence for this Committee and for the integrity and well-being legal and governance of this Convention and its associated instruments, if a decision on Outstanding Universal Value, which is supposed to be made at the time of inscription with a two-third majority, is to be made upon referral or deferral with a simple majority. It completely subverts the intended and very clearly expressed language of the reading, which is provided for in the Convention and the Operational Guidelines and the Rules of Procedure.

Another point which I think is important to raise is the suggestion that a particular Committee is in some fashion bound by a decision that was made by a previous Committee. In the particular case as was mentioned by one or two of the delegations, the supposed OUV determination which was supposedly given at the time of referral was in relation to a quite different nomination. Quite properly, the concerned State has entirely reconfigured its nomination. So even if there had been a legitimate determination of Outstanding Universal Value which, I would re-emphasize, is not the case given that the two-third majority is required upon inscription, any sort of a determination of OUV in relation to a completely differently configured proposal would not, in any fashion, be able to bind the Committee.

I think the last point that I would like to make is that each Committee is, while it is considering any proposal before it, a sovereign body which should look at the considerations before it or proposals before it, the expert’s advice before it, the positions put by Member States before it, and at that time makes the decision incumbent upon the Committee, in light of the information and views expressed at the particular Committee meeting.

Thank you.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Quelle que soit l'issue de ce dossier, je crois que notre état de compréhension et d'intelligence de ce texte sera meilleur à l'issu et c'est déjà une première satisfaction. Avec beaucoup d'intérêt, j'ai suivi les trois interventions techniques de haute facture qui ont été présentées et par rapport auxquelles je souhaiterais apporter au débat la précision suivante.

Il a été dit de manière globale qu'il n'y a de valeur universelle exceptionnelle établie au sens juridique qu'au moment de l'inscription. Je l'aurais bien pris comme tel et le problème serait résolu. Si ce n'est que je suis lecteur, peut être têtue, de l'article 51 de notre texte de référence qui est la Convention qui parle et je le lis : “Lors de l'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial le Comité adopte une déclaration de valeur universelle”. Si l'on s'en était tenu là c'est bon, mais le texte suit : “on fait la déclaration qui constituera la référence principale dans le futur pour la protection et la gestion”. Donc, la déclaration de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle est une chose puisqu'elle supporte le support technique pour la suite, mais pas le constat fait par le Comité. Sinon, on n'en reviendrait à dire que nos réunions sont de la vanité absolue puisqu'on a décidé et on va dire on n'a pas tout à fait décidé.

Je reviens sur le point qui a été soulevé par l'honorable experte juridique qui nous dit, mais c'est la majorité des deux tiers. Certes, mais dans le cas du vote. En l'occurrence c'est une décision qui n'est pas passée par le vote, elle a été adoptée de manière consensuelle, autrement dit avec une majorité plus forte que les deux tiers. Et vous avez vu que je ne parle pas du cas, du site, je parle de la cohérence de l'interprétation de nos textes et la valeur des décisions que l'on a prises.

La Tunisie était membre de ce Comité l'année dernière elle l'est cette année, nous sommes soucieux que nos décisions, qu'elles quel soient, soient cohérentes dans le temps ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I should like to thank you all for the technical explanations we have had, albeit from the legal advisor or from ICOMOS. I do not want to get into legal arguments with the distinguished delegate of Tunisia, but since we are looking at a text, Article 35 about the Global Strategy stipulates that this has been defined, so as to identify and address these gaps.

I think in the case of Nîmes, for example, we took that into consideration. I think it is important to keep this in mind when we are looking at all cases. I do not want to get into a legal argument, but I do want to say with the proposal made by Brazil to establish a working group or an expert meeting would be something that should be done upstream of any

decisions we take, because that would offer us guidance on how we assess this kind of property in the future when they are submitted to us.

Obviously, I do understand the work that has been done by the German authorities, long and thorough work, but on the other hand, we need to understand that there are properties in other countries that would like to see themselves on the List. What we are trying to do is to comply with paragraph 55 of the Operational Guidelines. I am in favour of that expert group being set up so that we can get some guidance on these kinds of nominations because they have an intrinsic value. They are well- presented without to have to get into any argument, although that could be fundamental later as to whether they have Outstanding Universal Value or not, or whether they actually have cultural criteria that are fully justified.

We would like to lend our support to Brazil's suggestion. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to show us the amendments."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. As was noted during this very rich debate, we have received amendments on this proposed draft decision. The draft decision proposed that this property is not to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage and the amendments that we received would instead inscribe the property on the List. The amendments were tabled by Saint Kitts and Nevis, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, China, Cuba, Guatemala, Hungary, Indonesia, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Uganda, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zimbabwe.

Consistent with an inscription, the text you see on the screen right now includes a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value, as well as identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed, an assessment of the conditions of integrity as well as authenticity and we have a statement on the protection and management requirements and, finally, we have a new paragraph 5 with some recommendations to the State Party.

I would also like to point out that this amendment would also delete the original paragraph 5 in which the Committee would have decided to include the review of the referral procedure and its application for examination in the framework of the next revision of the Operational Guidelines at its 43rd session.

These are the amendments that we have received, madam Chair. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Are there any objections to adopting the decision as you see it on the screen? Australia, please."

Australia:

"Just a technical point chairperson. The point about adopting the provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value in the English version does not have the word '*provisional assets*'. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. I think Norway was fairly clear in its concerns. I will not repeat them, but they are still very valid. In the interest of not interrupting this meeting, I am not going to make a point of it, but just to reiterate that all our concerns are still very valid. With the decision in front of us, I would hope that we, one way or another, could try to incorporate what was said in paragraph 5 of the original draft decision; if it could go somewhere, I think the Secretariat could guide us on that.

Also, as expressed by Brazil and our colleague from Spain, we would like to support what was suggested by Brazil. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. We are looking for guidance as to whether we put this decision in our proposal. We suggest having a reflection on this matter; if this is the right place, I would propose the following amendment. It would be a last paragraph that could read:

‘also decides to convene an expert meeting on World Heritage and integrated art to allow for reflection and to develop guidance on whether and how works of art as integral components of nominated properties might be proposed as a basis for conveying Outstanding Universal Value, provided that extra budgetary funding is available and invites State Parties to contribute to this end’.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We have been listening very carefully to the discussion and I should like to refer to Brazil’s proposed amendment. We were just wondering if this could be incorporated into a general decision on item 8, encompassing any concerns, procedural issues that we have identified as we have gone along the inscription process. Because we think it could actually contaminate the decision a little bit. It is almost as if we are looking at something the State Party needs to do. In the English version, you put it as a separate paragraph, but I do not think this is the right place.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We said before that we support the idea of this expert group or meeting and we think it could focus on the Global Strategy and not on something too narrow. We do think this is a bit redundant here, if we bear in mind that we need a broader discussion on the Global Strategy and the Operational Guidelines.

I do not think we should push it here, in this decision. We would rather not have the proposal which we support, put here. We actually wanted the expert meeting to happen upstream of any decisions taken. So maybe we can think of it as an expert meeting on the Global Strategy but certainly not here in this decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. J'ai bien compris maintenant la préoccupation soulevée par le Brésil. Je suis tout à fait d'avis que ce paragraphe ne figure pas sur ce projet de décision. Deuxième chose, ce débat pourrait revenir quand on va parler justement de la stratégie globale, car le ne s'agit pas ici de nous focaliser uniquement sur ce genre de biens, il faudra voir la problématique dans son ensemble c'est à dire des biens qui sont surreprésentés sur la Liste et il y en a toute une série. Je pense que l'on reviendra sur ces débats lors de la stratégie globale, on peut déjà éliminer ce paragraphe de ce projet de décision ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Hungary concurs: It is not important now and we do not support the proposal of Brazil to put this paragraph into this decision. Though the idea is very important and we support the organisation of such an expert meeting or something like this. In this respect, I would like to mention, the existing *ad hoc* group is still working, and maybe the *ad hoc* group could participate in this meeting.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I welcome the observation from the distinguished representative of Cuba, that there would be a great value in having a general discussion in relation to agenda item 8. Colleagues may recall that Australia circulated a draft decision that sought to establish that dialogue exactly. The Bureau decision was taken and Australia was supportive: We would discuss that exactly, having a general discussion on the nomination process or setting up a discussion next year when we discuss agenda item 12A later in the Committee meeting.

On that basis I would like to ask whether the distinguished representative of Brazil would be willing, having heard the discussion, to withdraw the suggestion and bring it forward under agenda item 12A where we can incorporate; if that is fine with the Committee and it would appear that it is.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please”

Brazil:

“Actually, we raised the flag before Australia took the floor. Our intention was to ask through you, madam Chair, and the Secretariat, what would be the best place for our amendment? We would be happy to have it in a general decision on item 8 or as suggested by Australia to have it on 12B. Perhaps the Secretariat could shed light on this.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“Bosnia supports the idea of Brazil, but to be a separate meeting with other questions related with procedures and what Australia suggests should be done in expert meetings before the Committee next year.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Secretariat will answer.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I think to answer the question by Brazil, I believe item 12B would be the best. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Should we adopt the decision as amended or in its original form? As it is amended? The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. If we could just scroll down to the former paragraph 5, because we have a slight contradiction. Norway suggested keeping this original paragraph, but if I understood correctly, the debate that we just had, the Committee would rather have paragraphs of this general nature under a different item, which would be 12B. I imagine that maybe we could request through you, madam Chair, whether the delegation of Norway would be happy to bring that paragraph under that general item.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. I did indeed ask for clarification on where it would be sensible to put that paragraph, as I consider it important. Once again, we ask the advice of the Secretariat on this. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Ms. Rössler, please.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. In our opinion, the most appropriate place would be the new general decision on item 8 which in any case would have to be looked at in conjunction with 12A which it makes reference to. Possibly 8 seems to be the best place for that type of consideration and for paragraph 5 that was proposed in the original draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Just a very quick question: Would the distinguished colleague from Australia be happy to try to incorporate this in the proposal? Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“The answer is yes. Though I must make an observation that when the Bureau asked to make the decision we restricted discussing Australia's original proposal around the nomination process to have a general discussion. The Bureau asked and invited the Committee that would be dealt under agenda item 12A which includes tasking for the *ad hoc* working group to undertake a review of the nomination process.

We, on that basis, were proposing to subdue Draft Decision 8 that we had put forward into Draft Decision 12A. I am comfortable with it being incorporated into the wider amendments that we are suggesting for 12A and then we will see how we go.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. It is my understanding in this sense that we can delete Norway’s proposal to keep paragraph 5. In this case, we have in front of us, as I have already proceeded to the presentation, an amendment to inscribe this property on the List of World Heritage. Madam Chair, I request through you, the Committee to deliberate whether they agree with this inscription or prefer the original draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I ask whether we agree on this amendment or the original draft decision. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, you already have two thirds of the members of the Committee who are proposing the amended draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The amended draft decision will be adopted as it is in front of you on the screen. Do you agree? I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.35 adopted as amended. Congratulations Germany and please you have the floor.”

Germany:

“Madam Chair, dear colleagues, first of all, we are very grateful to ICOMOS, the World Heritage Centre and especially the World Heritage Committee for your openness and your patience in looking at this nomination for the third time. Let me express our gratitude for

the Committee's decision to inscribe Naumburg Cathedral. We are humbled by the support expressed by the esteemed delegates towards this site. We would also like to thank ICOMOS for its very thorough evaluation of this site.

Today, a nomination process that has matured for the better part of two decades is coming to an end. We are very grateful to all those involved in this very productive journey.

The workshop of the Naumburg Master is an unparalleled tale of cultural exchange and cooperation in architecture and art throughout the European Continent before the 14th century. With this decision the Committee honours this truly international achievement, which is in the best spirit of the Convention.

I would like to pass the floor to the district president of Naumburg who would also like to address the members of the Committee. Thank you madam Chair."

District president of Naumburg:

"Highly esteemed members of the Committee, madam Chair, I echo the Ambassador in the gratitude for the support we have received through all these years. Naumburg marks a turning point in the history of art and architecture. We are certain that it is an important addition to the World Heritage List and we cordially invite all the delegations to come to Naumburg to experience this milestone of architecture with their own eyes.

Thank you very, very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now invite ICOMOS and IUCN to present the nomination of Pimachiowin Aki, Canada. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor."

Mr. Balsamo:

"Thank you madam Chair. We receive a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of Pimachiowin Aki, which is to be found on page 9 of both the English and French versions of document INF.8B.4.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. IUCN please and ICOMOS you have the floor. Could you please do the congratulations outside the plenary please? There is a room for this."

ICOMOS:

"Thank you madam Chair. At the 40th Session of the Committee a mixed nomination for Pimachiowin Aki was referred back to the State Party to allow it to consider issues related to its management and effective governance. Subsequently, a new nomination was submitted which includes a smaller area than the earlier nomination and the participation of four First Nations rather than five.

Pimachiowin Aki encompasses the Anishinaabe ancestral lands at the headwaters of the Berens, Bloodvein, Pigeon and Poplar rivers. This forest landscape, dissected by free-flowing rivers, lakes and wetlands, includes portions of the lands of four First Nations: Bloodvein River First Nation, Little Grand Rapids First Nation, Pauingassi First Nation, and Poplar River First Nation.

Today, Anishinaabe communities in the nominated property are based in four small permanent settlements and harvest animals, plants and fish, consistent with their traditional practices and Treaty rights. This large property encompasses 2.9 million hectares and is surrounded by a substantial buffer zone. The Anishinaabe are a highly mobile indigenous hunting-gathering-fishing people, who say that they and their indigenous ancestors have made use of this and adjacent landscapes for over 7,000 years. Over time they have been able to maintain their traditional culture, including knowledge of and respect for the landscape and the tangible and intangible resources it provides. The Anishinaabe cultural tradition of keeping the land involves honouring the creator's gift, observing respectful behaviours towards life and maintaining harmonious relations with other people.

The nominated area provides a clear representation of how the living traditions of keeping the land guide Anishinaabeg perception and use of the Pimachiowin Aki. The waterways that cut through the forest are their lifeblood; it involves fishing, hunting, trapping and also some cultivation along the banks. Mnemonic narratives connected with travel routes have continued and are now beginning to be documented. Along the shores, wild rice has been intentionally managed to increase its productivity and archaeological evidence reveals that this practice has persisted for some 1200 years.

The forest is the wider canvass of the Anishinaabeg activities, its resources are used judiciously for medicine and food while tree bark was used historically as covering for tents and canoes. Hunting and trapping as well as fishing are at the heart of the Anishinaabeg relationship with the land, but in a way that ensures continuity. The forest is nurtured through wild fires to encourage new grass for ducks that are hunted for food.

Collaborative research between the community and archaeologists since 2003 has helped document hunting sites used in living memory, for temporary habitation and harvesting activities. This documentation covers sites both used and unused; some of the abandoned sites have been dated to 1200 years BC.

The Anishinaabeg world view of a symbiotic relationship between people and nature attributes animacy to objects in the natural world, giving meaning to peoples' existence in this environment over time and through the seasons. The Creator, Manitou, has a central place. Two kinds of spirit beings are repeatedly referred to: the Thunderbirds and the Little Rock People, powerful helpers and carers for the land. The thunderbirds are said to nest in rock formations created at a time when plants still did not exist, and their stone nests are respected. Pictured grasses are seen to be closely related to these sacred sites. All the maps of different aspects of the land are being drawn together with the Anishinaabeg view of their landscape.

Elders and others with land-based knowledge are especially esteemed for their role in guiding decision-making in personal, family and community matters related to the use of the land and for their role in ensuring the continuity of Keeping the Land.

ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies this property being inscribed for the water-based traditional practices of the Anishinaabeg. This nomination should not be considered as representing the cultural landscape of the wider American sub-Arctic region.

Outstanding Universal Value is satisfied as are criteria (iii) and (vi). The conditions of integrity and authenticity are also satisfied but will need to be actively maintained. The boundaries are adequate; protection needs to be strengthened in our view to ensure

hydroelectric lines do not cross the property. Conservation is satisfactory, though there needs to be further development of the Management Plan's specific overarching themes, such as socio-economic development, visitor management and interpretation.

In conclusion, madam Chair, ICOMOS recommends that Pimachiowin Aki be inscribed on the World Heritage List as a cultural landscape on the basis of criteria (iii) and (vi). We have additional recommendations that are set out in the working document.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. IUCN's evaluation of Pimachiowin Aki is on page 65 on the English version of the evaluation report of IUCN and 67 of the French version.

Pimachiowin Aki was nominated as a mixed site under criteria (v) and (ix) in 2012. The World Heritage Committee deferred the nomination in 2013 to allow the State Party to address issues concerning boundaries and the conceptual framing of the property's Outstanding Universal Value. A joint ICOMOS and IUCN advisory mission to the property took place in October of 2013. The property was renominated in 2015 under natural criterion (ix), however, with changed cultural criteria (iii) and (vi).

Both Advisory Bodies recommended in 2016 to inscribe to property. The State Party, however, advised of concerns regarding governance and relationships within the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation and the Committee referred the nomination in Decision 40.COM 8B.18 to allow more time to address these concerns. The State Party submitted a new full nomination for Pimachiowin Aki, which is now in front of this Committee.

Pimachiowin Aki means the Land that Gives Life and encompasses just over 2900 million hectares in the Canadian boreal shield and includes the ancestral lands of four First nations: Bloodvein River, Little Grand Rapids First Nation, Pauingassi, and Poplar River as well as plus three provincial protected areas, namely Woodland Caribou and Atikaki Provincial Parks, along with Eagle-Snowshoe Conservation Reserve. A buffer zone of 3,592,000 ha has been defined. Changes to the property's boundaries have reduced the originally nominated area by 436,000 ha (13%) and the buffer zone by 448,000 ha (12%).

However, the nominated property continues to support a vast landscape which not only has very rich ecological integrity, but which has never been subject to industrial development, a combination which is becoming rare globally. Indeed, Pimachiowin Aki is the most complete and largest example of a North America boreal shield which constitutes the largest network of contiguous boreal shield protected areas. If inscribed, it would become one of the 20 largest World Heritage sites by area.

Pimachiowin Aki protects an exceptional diversity of terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems, including needle-leaf forest, wetlands, rockland, and mixed wetland-rockland as well as many lakes and free-flowing rivers. As a result of its ecological integrity, the nominated property fully supports key ecological processes of the boreal forest, including fire regimes, nutrient flows, species' movements, predator-prey relationships, hydrological dynamics and evolutionary processes.

Pimachiowin Aki's remarkable size, integrity and ecosystem diversity also ensure that the full range of characteristic boreal species, including indicated species for primary forest health are present, including Woodland Caribou, Moose, Wolf, Wolverine, Loon, Leopard Frog, Lake Sturgeon and Canada Warbler.

Pimachiowin Aki also retains its full floral diversity. Traditional use by Anishinaabeg, including sustainable fishing, hunting and trapping, is also an integral part of the boreal ecosystems in Pimachiowin Aki. The landscape reflects its 6000-year history of the relationship between people and landscape. The Anishinaabeg first nation considers their culture to be inseparable from nature and the land, a cultural outlook that has fundamentally shaped their belief systems and which underpins the nomination.

First nations have played the leading role in defining the approach to protection and management of Pimachiowin Aki. Protection and management of the property are achieved through Anishinaabeg customary governance, contemporary provincial government law on policy and cooperation among the four First Nations and two provincial government partners via the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation.

The nominated property is governed through an accord signed by the four nominated first nations, which reinforces the long-standing stewardship approach for care for the land for future generations. A Memorandum of Understanding between the provincial government and Manitoba, Ontario, provides insurance for protection and management of the property and establishes a strong partnership. The Pimachiowin Aki partners share a commitment to safeguarding the Outstanding Universal Value of the Pimachiowin Aki.

IUCN considers that this nomination is a landmark for properties nominated through the leadership and commitment of indigenous peoples and a model for future nominations which seek to capture the indissoluble links between nature and culture and in particular between cultural integrity and ecological integrity in large landscapes.

In summary, IUCN recommends inscription of Pimachiowin Aki under criterion (ix) on the basis of the property's large intact landscape, the clear commitment of all involved partners for the long-term protection of this exemplary property and the effective protective and governance framework which is in place.

The draft decision is on page 9 of the English and French version of working document 8B. Thank you madam Chairperson."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Since this property is for inscription, please could you shorten your speech as we still have 7 or 8 sites in front of us? Australia, please."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. We are very pleased to go first in speaking about this one. We greatly welcome the inscription of the ancestral land of the Anishinaabeg under criteria (iii), (vi) and (ix). This has been a long journey since the referral of this nomination in 2013 and we commend the Anishinaabeg communities and the State Party of Canada in finalising the nomination and bringing it back to us.

The detailed, comprehensive and very beautiful nomination dossier framed by the knowledge and the language of the Anishinaabeg and the keeping of their land through traditional land resource management is exemplary and is a further milestone in recognition of the Outstanding Universal Value of first nation communities. These values underpin the

connection of first nations to their territory and sustain the protection and management of the extraordinary and natural values of this very large landscape and they support the ecosystems recognised under criterion (ix). Congratulations to all who have worked so hard on this nomination.

Today is also Canada's day. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is to Spain".

Spain:

[English interpretation] "Thank you madam Chair. My delegation could not but intervene. This a file that has been given high evaluation by all our experts, perhaps the most highly valued. We would like to attest to the exceptional nature of this site because of its content which was valued by IUCN and ICOMOS and also the form, the sort of attitude by Canada where they withdrew when they received a report that they needed to improve governance with the local communities. This is something that we absolutely have to acknowledge. That comfort really legitimizes for our Convention and Community that sort of attitude, which should always prevail. This should become the norm rather than the exception."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Hungary, please."

Hungary:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. For Hungary and, as site manager for cultural landscapes, to me it is a great pleasure to congratulate on the success of this property where people live and work and in hand. It is the synergy of natural and social processes that constitutes the Outstanding Universal Value. Pimachiowin Aki is an outstanding example of the long-lasting bond between culture and nature it therefore entails that the integrity of customary governance be maintained in order to ensure continuity of cultural traditions across generations and the continuation of the common stewardship which are evident in the property.

The Hungarian delegation warmly congratulates the State Party of Canada for the preparation of the excellent nomination file as well as for the effective protection and integrated management of Pimachiowin Aki and fully supports the inscription of the mixed property on the basis of criteria (iii), (vi) and (ix) on the World Heritage List.

Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is to Kyrgyzstan."

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We congratulate Canada for this exceptional work and just a small correction; in the English version it says criteria (x); it should be (ix).”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie voudrait féliciter l'État partie d'avoir présenté un si beau dossier relatif à un paysage culturel tout aussi remarquable. Nous voudrions aussi souligner l'exemplarité morale dans laquelle cette inscription a été faite.

Alors qu'une inscription antérieure aurait été possible, son retrait pour associer davantage les populations locales a été pour nous la plus belle des réactions ce qui fait qu'aujourd'hui le dossier est complet de tous points de vue. Nous voudrions saluer et encourager l'État partie à protéger et à promouvoir ce site et nous en sommes dès à présent certains. Encore une fois, félicitations ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe also congratulates Canada for this wonderful inscription of the Pimachiowin Aki ancestral lands. This property shows the interaction between indigenous people and their environment and how this relationship is dated over 7000 years and still continues today. It is an important reminder to us to respect traditional knowledge and traditional governance systems, as they are able to sustain the environment. Well done Canada and congratulations.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. My delegation also joins others in commending the Advisory Bodies for their very comprehensive evaluation of the proposed nomination of this property which is within the North American Boreal shield. This shows that it has very clear Outstanding Universal Value under natural criterion (ix).

The property has an exceptional diversity of both terrestrial and freshwater ecosystems. The cultural component of the nomination is justified under criterion (vi). The conditions of integrity protection and management are also strongly reflected in the analysis for both cultural and natural components.

We do appreciate the efforts made by the State Party and the Advisory Bodies for the nomination of this important property. We fully support it. Thank you madam Chair”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Comme tous les autres membres du Comité, La Bosnie-Herzégovine voudrait féliciter le Canada pour cet excellent dossier et souhaiter à ce magnifique site la bienvenue sur le la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. As a country where the native people are undeniably protagonists in nature conservancy through their cultural-traditional ways of life, Brazil is very happy to see the nomination of the Pimachiowin Aki site in the List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur has the floor now, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We have not received any amendments to this draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.11 adopted. On your behalf I congratulate Canada and give them the floor.”

Canada :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme c’est la première fois que le Canada prend la parole à cette session, je voudrais remercier le Royaume du Bahreïn pour son hospitalité. C’est un immense plaisir pour le Canada de partager ce moment mémorable, l’inscription de Pimachiowin Aki sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Il s’agit de la reconnaissance internationale d’un site qui illustre le lien indissociable unissant la culture et la nature pour les peuples autochtones ainsi que l’intendance indéfectible de leur territoire traditionnel.

I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies who worked so closely with Canada and the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation to help advanced this complex nomination as part of our shared nature, culture journey within the World Heritage context. I will now turn the floor to our Pimachiowin Aki colleagues to say a few words.”

Pimachiowin Aki representative:

Thank you madam Chair. Members of the Committee, Ladies and Gentlemen,

My name is Hudson. I am a director with the Pimachiowin Aki Corporation and a member of the Poplar River First Nation. On behalf of the first nations of Pauingassi, Bloodvein River, Little Grand Rapids and Poplar River and the government of Ontario, I want to say that we are thrilled to join the family of places that help to recognise and protect the world's precious heritage. Our journey to World Heritage site has been rather long. If the Pimachiowin Aki contributes in some way to greater use of the World Heritage Convention for indigenous people we would feel gratified. I now call upon my friend and colleague to say a few words.

Thank you again”

Pimachiowin Aki representative (New speaker):

“ First, I would like to thank you for allowing us to speak. I want to acknowledge all of our elders for their wisdom, knowledge, guidance and direction. Our people have lived and cared for this land for thousands of years. Today, we are still trying to fulfil the responsibility given to us by the creator to look after this area, to ensure life for our children and grandchildren. We strongly believe that nature and culture are inseparable.

This nomination describes the cultural tradition of Ji-ganawendamang Gidakiiminaan, keeping the land, which is our sacred responsibility and our spiritual connection through the boreal forest of Pimachiowin Aki, the land that gives life. It also describes the responsibility that each generation has to ensure life continues for generations to come. As Anishinaabe people, we want to leave a lasting legacy to protect and preserve this area for the benefit of Pimachiowin Aki,

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Our next site is in Columbia. I now invite ICOMOS and IUCN to present the nomination of Chiribiquete National Park – ‘The Maloca of the Jaguar’, Colombia. ICOMOS you have the floor. First, let me ask people to present their congratulations outside the plenary hall.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you Chairperson. I am now presenting the ICOMOS evaluation of Chiribiquete National Park ‘The Maloca of the Jaguar’ in Columbia. The text of the evaluation can be found on page 36 of the document INF.8B.1

Located in northwestern Colombian Amazon, Chiribiquete National Park is the largest protected zone in Colombia. The nominated property covers a surface area of 2.7 million hectares, to which the State Party added, in 2013, a buffer zone of almost 4 million hectares, giving the nominated property a total surface of more than 6 million hectares.

The natural environment of the park is typically Amazonian and extremely rich in terms of biodiversity. One of the most significant characteristics of this property, perhaps

more than its fauna and flora, is the presence of *tepuis*. A word of indigenous American origin, it signifies mountain. *Tepuis* are limestone table top mountains which vertical and sharply slopping faces dominate the Amazonian forest. At the foot of the *tepuis* there are more than 75,234 pictographs identified on the walls of 60 rock shelters of different sizes, dating from 20,000 BC to the present day. The rock art is of artistic, technical and cosmological value and bears witness to the indigenous communities that have occupied the Amazon for millennia.

The rock art is interpreted as scenes of hunting, battles, dances and ceremonies, all of which are linked to the cult of the Jaguar, seen as a symbol of power and fertility. The practices are said to reflect coherent systems of ancient secret beliefs forming the basis and the explanations of relations between the cosmos, nature and man. The property represents one of the rare cases in which nomadic indigenous communities still live, voluntarily isolated and without contact with the modern world who make rock paintings reflecting ancient rituals with profound cosmological implications.

In its evaluation ICOMOS considers that the comparative analysis justifies inscription of this property on the World Heritage List. That the nominated property meets criterion (iii) and the conditions of integrity and authenticity.

ICOMOS considers that the boundaries of the nominated property and the buffer zone are adequate and that the state of conservation of the property is satisfactory. The management system of the property is adequate but measures are necessary to consolidate and reinforce research and development of projects to enhance natural and cultural heritage in the buffer zone, as proposed in the Management Plan.

In conclusion, ICOMOS recommends that Chiribiquete National Park be inscribed on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (iii) and ICOMOS also makes additional recommendations, as displayed.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. IUCN, please.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN’s evaluation of Chiribiquete National Park ‘the Maloca of the Jaguar’ is on page 75 of the English version of the IUCN evaluation report and page 77 of the French version.

Chiribiquete National Park, ‘the Maloca of the Jaguar’, or CNP, is the largest national Park in Columbia and very large by global standards, with over 2.7 million hectares. Chiribiquete National Park is located in the central Colombian Amazon and its protection is reinforced by the establishment of an extensive buffer zone of almost 4 million hectares.

The presence of *Tepuis* is one of the most impressive defining features of Chiribiquete National Park. *Tepuis* are tabletop mountains found only in the Guiana Shield, notable for their striking reliefs and high levels of endemism. The *Tepuis* found in Chiribiquete National Park, whilst smaller when compared to others in the Guiana Shield, result nonetheless in dramatic scenery that is reinforced by their remoteness and inaccessibility. A particularly significant value of the property is its high degree of naturalness, which makes it one of the most important wilderness areas in the world.

The fauna of Chiribiquete National Park is particularly rich in terms of mammals and the area is considered a key site for the conservation of a healthy population of charismatic and endangered species, including the Jaguar, the pink dolphin, the lowland tapir, the brown woolly monkey and the giant anteater.

Despite the fact that limited scientific research has been undertaken in the nominated property, available data shows that over 2900 species have been recorded. These include globally impressive levels of species richness for vascular plants, mammals, including high numbers of bats species, birds, reptiles, amphibians, fish and butterflies. The number of species, including endemic species, of which 21 have been reported, would most certainly rise as more scientific expeditions are undertaken in the future.

The case made in the nomination for justifying the application of the geological criterion (viii) is based on the argument that Chiribiquete National Park has a noteworthy geological history. However, the geology and geomorphological processes occurring in Chiribiquete National Park are similar to that existing in the whole of the Guiana Shield and in other locations and thus considered to be of national significance in this context.

The nominated property is exceptionally large, well-preserved and is in excellent condition, thus providing adequate refuge for many species and habitats. Chiribiquete National Park is listed among the most irreplaceable areas in the world for the conservation of mammals, birds and amphibian species and is located in a unique biogeographical context where evolutionary processes have mammals and a high diversity of flora and fauna.

Voluntarily isolated and uncontacted indigenous peoples live inside the nominated property. The cultural and ethnic integrity of local communities and their rights are protected under Columbia's constitution and related legislation. The buffer zone of the Park is made up entirely of 22 indigenous reserves and the Amazon forest reserve. These indigenous reserves are under traditional ownership, which centres on protecting cultural and natural values and are similarly covered by Colombian law.

The nominated property is owned and managed by the Ministry of the Environment through the *Unidad Administrativa Especial del Sistema de Parques Nacionales* guided by the 2016-2020 Management Plan. Overall the management of the property is well-organized, with good capacity for building and operations. Patrolling and protection activities are also actively supported by the army, which has played a key role for many years in the location through the eradication of illegal coca plantations inside the property and in the buffer zone.

The funding supporting the management of the property results from a combination of financial and human resources provided by the State Party and also supported by international projects. IUCN notes that additional financial resources will be needed to cope with future management challenges, for example linked with tourism development.

In summary, IUCN recommends the World Heritage Committee inscribes Chiribiquete National Park, 'the Maloca of the Jaguar', on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (ix) and (x) in light of its remarkable levels of biodiversity and ecosystem integrity and the effective protection regime which is in place.

The draft decision is set out on page 12 of both the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Norway, please."

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway applauds the State Party of Columbia for this stimulating nomination, fulfilling a combination of natural and cultural criteria. The State Party has been instrumental in its efforts to protect biodiversity and its valuable forest even through the critical status of the country’s transition to peace. As the State Party has highlighted on several occasions, the earth’s most valuable treasures are not oil or gold, but its biodiversity and tropical forest.

Stopping deforestation is essential to meeting both the Paris agreement climate change goals and sustainable development goals. The State Party sends an important signal that forest protection is decisive for reaching the climate targets. Norway is proud to support Columbia in building a prosperous and sustainable future to safeguard its natural treasures through the Norwegian climate and Forest Initiative. We strongly encourage other States Parties to consider the protection of the Amazon forest.

Norway also commends the State Party’s high political commitment towards protecting indigenous rights, including implementing legal frameworks and strengthening indigenous self-governance of the indigenous territories. Indigenous peoples are critical in protecting natural and cultural heritage and have historically been the forest’s best guardians.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I am taking the floor again on the same note as what I said with the previous nomination. Here, we are in front of an absolutely outstanding nomination, as you see in the file itself. Pictures speak better than words; we all had the chance to observe the breathtaking beauty of this place.

We want to congratulate the State Party, as said by Norway, for all its efforts to protect biodiversity and also, as was the case with Canada, the excellent attitude of the State Party when it received a referral decision, so that it could be later discussed in the Committee, to improve the nomination before it comes to the Committee. That way it came in a perfect format before the Committee.

Congratulations to the State Party for submitting such an exceptional file. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary would like to congratulate the State Party for nominating Chiribiquete National Park to the World Heritage List, on the basis of cultural and natural criteria. The property contains all the elements that set its expression of Outstanding Universal Value and its appropriate size is satisfactory for the preservation of the conditions of integrity. The nominated property is extremely large and provides space for natural

processes and ecosystems. The rock art sites are authentic in terms of situation and setting for intangible cultural spirit and impression, material forms and conceptions.

The Hungarian delegation fully supports the inscription of Chiribiquete National Park as a mixed site on the World Heritage List. We wish the State Party great success with the management of the property in the long term. In addition the Hungarian delegation wishes all the best for the football team of Columbia during the upcoming days and weeks.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“I wish I could say the same about Mexico, madam Chair. Brazil believes the Chiribiquete National Park is one of the best examples of what one can call a site with Outstanding Universal Value. Under criteria (ii) and (iii), the park is one of the best existing examples of pre-Columbian rock inscription in South America and arguably the best of such sites in the whole Amazon basin, with pictographs as old as 20,000 years.

Under criteria (ix) and (x), Chiribiquete National Park is one of the most complete and diverse ecosystems in the northern portion of our continent, which harbours a unique and vast endemism with very few other parks than can be on par. The property is well-preserved and has its own natural and cultural integrity.

Brazil commends the Columbian government for the protective policies in place and the safeguarding of the site’s attributes. Therefore, Brazil is of the opinion that the proposed site is more than fit to be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie souhaite féliciter l’État partie d’avoir présenté un dossier d’une si grande qualité et d’une très grande beauté. Nous avons lors de l’étude du dossier énormément apprécié toutes ces composantes. Sa valeur universelle exceptionnelle est évidente et épatante et son étendue géographique est impressionnante, ce qui certainement fera l’objet de mesures attentionnées de l’État partie pour sa préservation et sa protection. En tout les cas on les félicite et on se félicite aussi de son entrée sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I think it is very easy to fall in love with this amazing site and its clear Outstanding Universal Value. Just like the previous speakers, we wanted to congratulate the State Party and encourage them to give due consideration to the recommendations and we look forward to its inscription.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, the last speaker, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, Tanzania commends the State Party for its effort in nominating this property. Not often do you see a cultural location associated with extremely high endemism which is of extreme importance within South America and the Guiana Shield. The property is also clearly endowed with cultural values and criterion (iii).

Madam Chair, while both cultural and natural components of the nomination of this property are strongly justified, we take note of the potential threats related to the cultural rights and livelihoods of the voluntarily isolated indigenous people which could potentially impact the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. In this regard, we encourage the State Party to strengthen the management conditions of the property with respective tourism concerns.

We support the draft decision to inscribe the property in the World Heritage List. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Did the Rapporteur receive any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. No, I did not receive any amendments for this property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.12 adopted. I congratulate Columbia and I give them the floor.”

Columbia:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam chairperson. We are happy. On behalf of the government of Columbia we want to extend our thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain for its hospitality and congratulate all of you for all the work that you are doing to preserve the memory and identity of the World Heritage. We want to extend our thanks to the Secretariat, ICOMOS and IUCN for having offered us so much support in preparing our nomination. We had very frank, open, constructive and enriching dialogue. Our thanks also to the Committee for backing this inscription.

We know that as a State Party of the Convention we do face major challenges, but the Chiribiquete National Park is right at the heart of the Amazon forest and it is the largest National Park in the country. Chiribiquete National Park is the first mixed property for Columbia and we know all of the challenges involved. For that reason the Ministry of the Environment and that of Culture have both worked very hard together to prepare for this moment. Nearly 15 years have gone by since the indigenous people, academics, representatives of the government and local community representatives have worked on this.

We wanted to extend a special recognition to Jose Manuel Santos, our president, who right from the outset of his tenure in office has done so much to advance protective measures for this site, which we think is of such importance for the peace process in Columbia. These two public institutions have been doing so much to continue that work. I would also like to mention the institution of Anthropology. Thank you very much.

I just wanted to say that Chiribiquete National Park is now everybody's heritage. It is right in the heart of the Amazon and a striking example of nature and ancestral knowledge. We wanted to extend our thanks to all member states of UNESCO and we wanted to launch a global call for the protection of the Amazon and the affirmation of guarantees for the survival of the local indigenous communities. Many other communities have enabled us to save the *Haguar*, the Anaconda spirits that live on and need preserving.

Thank you from Columbia and thank you from the Latin America region. Please, remember that you have the assurance that everybody working on Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage will do their utmost to maintain the property. We have a Road Map to guide protection management of the site. We will apply all recommendations as consistently as possible as our duty to having it inscribed on the List. When it comes to research and social dialogue, this is all in the name of peace. Now, we have the chance to rise to the challenge of ensuring Chiribiquete National Park as a World Heritage site can really rise to the challenge of living up to its historical and ancestral importance.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Our next site will be in Mexico. I now invite ICOMOS and IUCN to present the nomination of Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley: originary habitat of Mesoamerica, Mexico. The draft decision concerning this nomination can be found in document 8B.Add. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We received a factual error notification concerning the evaluation of this nomination. It is to be found on page 10 of the English and French versions of document INF.8B.4. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS, Please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley originary habitat of Mesoamerica is a previously referred back nomination which was first discussed by the World Heritage Committee in 2017, when the Committee suggested re-conceptualisation of the nomination towards a more diversified approach in terms of cultural criteria. It further recommended augmenting the comparative analysis in relationship to water management systems, to strengthen management and protection of archaeological remains, to develop a visitor management strategy and to develop a more inclusive governance model.

Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley hosted early settled and later settled communities over the past 14,000 years. The property is composed of three components: Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán, San Juan Raya and Purrón. All are located in the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley. Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley is presented towards 624 archaeological sites that bear witness to the conversion of nomadic hunter-gatherers to a sedentary lifestyle based on the opportunity of irrigation over the course of 12,000 years. Only 22 of these 624 archaeological sites are presented in the nomination dossier.

These 22 sites can be split into three areas which reflect the beginning of agriculture, plant domestication and the development of human settlements. The beliefs and rituals and the intricate water management system infrastructure which facilitated complex irrigation systems, irrigation channels which can be divided into five larger irrigation systems contribute to the most diversified water management system known on the American continent, with ten types of sites, including wells, dams, canals, rock aqueducts and filtration galleries, most of them dating between 800 and 700 BC.

The *Purrón Dam Complex* is the largest water control site in Mesoamerica. It was built in four subsequent stages between 750 BCE and 200 CE and was in use for over nine hundred years and now remains as a topographic and archaeological reference. The dam was part of the water management system which reflects aspects of the early evolution of man's relationship to this arid environment over a period of more than 10,000 years and illustrates the process of early plant domestication.

ICOMOS considers that it is unfortunate that so little is documented on the many features of the many archaeological sites which present these processes in the Valley. While the selection of sites highlights the nomination, those presently selected provide a peek into a much larger and broader evidence existing. ICOMOS therefore considers that the justification is likely relevant in theory, but the numbering of documents and sites presented does not constitute the critical mass required to underline and illustrate these very important historic phenomena.

Therefore, while acknowledging that the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley presents a complex system of early irrigation and presents evidence of human advancement towards agriculturalist communities in illustrating one of the earliest examples of plant domestication, ICOMOS continues to recommend better definition and representation of the property, in particular by means of extensive cultural heritage-focused surveys in the valley, both in and outside the boundaries. ICOMOS hopes that such surveys will allow for the full recognition of all the attributes of these Mesoamerican agriculturalist communities.

As a result, ICOMOS considers that bar for the present selection of sites none of the criteria have been justified, they need to be further substantiated, the landscape approach might provide the basis for the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley or part of it to be seen as an outstanding reflection of the emergence of irrigation-based agriculture in Mesoamerica. Once a set of attributes is justified by means of survey and documentation, a protection and management approach would need to be expanded and strengthened.

In conclusion, therefore, ICOMOS recommends that the nomination should be deferred to allow the State Party to consider revised nomination based on further research and documentation to ensure the full legal protection of cultural heritage elements in the

property and finalise management and monitoring arrangements as well as strengthened human and financial resources in relation to Cultural Heritage.

I now pass the floor to IUCN for their report in relation to natural criteria.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN, please.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN’s evaluation of Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley is on page 25 of both language versions of the Add IUCN evaluation report. IUCN recalls that this property was originally nominated and referred back to the State Party by the Committee in 2017 to address a range of issues. One of the principal concerns related to natural values was to confirm the attributes of the argued Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (ix) were located inside the boundaries as designed.

Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley originary habitat of Mesoamerica is nominated as a mixed site with a serial configuration of three component parts. The property is located in central southern Mexico, within the country’s southernmost arid and semi-arid region. As known through the factual error processes, the areas of the property have now been clarified. IUCN provided a detailed outline of natural values in its 2017 evaluation. In summary, Tehuacán-Cuicatlán includes a diverse array of xeric shrublands, tropical deciduous forests, oak and pine forests as well as vegetation types of smaller extent, such as palm groves or gallery forests.

The region is reported as an arid or semi-arid zone, with one of the highest levels of biodiversity in North America. The valley is noted as a global biodiversity hotspot. Tehuacán-Cuicatlán stands out as remarkable for its species richness and levels of endemism as well as for the protection of threatened species and its contribution to global agrobiodiversity.

An astonishing 70 per cent of worldwide floral families are represented in the valley by at least one specie and the area is one of the main centres of diversification for the cacti family, which is highly threatened worldwide. Despite human presence, this region reportedly has the highest colony of columnar cacti on the planet and presents a unique landscape.

Tehuacán-Cuicatlán also exhibits particularly high biodiversity among other plant types, mainly the agaves, bromeliads, bursaceae and oaks. Worldwide it also hosts one of the highest animal biodiversity levels on dry land and encompasses over ten per cent of the global distribution of four amphibian species, and is ranked in the top 0.2 per cent of the most irreplaceable areas in the world for the survival of threatened species.

In 2017, IUCN concluded positively on the overall biodiversity richness of this region and the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Biosphere Reserve. The resubmitted nomination has confirmed that the property includes a significant portion of this biodiversity. For example, some 44 per cent of flora within the wider valley and 50 per cent of species of the biosphere reserve as well as some 99 endemic vertebrae species are found inside the property as nominated.

Whilst there are gaps in the knowledge base and it appears clear that other areas outside the nominated areas likely contain high areas of conservation value, the State Party has provided convincing evidence that Tehuacán-Cuicatlán includes impressive and globally significant biodiversity values.

IUCN again reiterates the potential for this property to meet criterion (ix) on the basis of globally important ecosystem values. A general, effective and well-established management system is in place for the natural values of the biosphere through the National Commission of Natural Protected Areas. Initiatives are being progressively introduced to better integrate natural and cultural heritage management. Various new positive developments are also documented with respect to the Committee request encouraging improved participatory governance and regional economic development.

More detailed maps provided by the State Party clarified the overlay between the zoning system of the biosphere reserve and the nominated property. This remains complex and potentially confusing. However, it appears to represent an adequate management regime for the mixed property.

In summary, IUCN considers that the nominated property meets criterion (x) on the basis of confirmed biodiversity values within the site and a range of improvements to participatory governance and the institutional coordination for the management of Natural and Cultural Heritage. As reflected in the draft decision before the Committee, IUCN encourages the State Party to consider in some future time renominating the property also under criterion (ix).

Madam Chair, the draft decision is set out on page 2 on both the English and French versions of working document 8B.Add. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The file presented by Mexico is an example of natural and cultural values joined together, which we seldom have opportunity to analyse. It is a clear response to the Global Strategy mentioned. It recognises an integrated approach expressed in mixed properties. Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley an ordinary habitat of Mesoamerica is testimony to human adaptation to particular conditions.

This is also seen in the high biodiversity and of species. Different civilisations have flourished and given rise to cultures that have lasted for long periods of time which showed the management of agriculture and in particular of corn, which is fundamental in the Mesoamerican period, as well as the storage of crops and the use of water. This has been clearly studied and documented and shows that we have a series of exceptional elements that bear witness to fundamental stages in human history enriched with a high degree of authenticity in a very important natural context. Cuba would like to congratulate the State Party on this important file and inscription on the basis of criteria (iv) and (x) as recognised by the amendments presented by the Kingdom of Spain.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I have in front of me seven requests for the floor. The list is closed and we will complete this file today before we stop. Spain now.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chairperson. Indeed, we think that the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley originary habitat in Mesoamerica is an area with the greatest biodiversity in northern America that fulfils criterion (x). As for the cultural aspect, we think that the natural aspect cannot exist without the cultural aspect in this context and vice versa. The area condition of the site promoted innovation in man, giving rise to great technological advances in human history. The domestication of plants, wells, terraces, dams as well as innovations that brought about the industry of ceramics.

This is a cultural aspect that exists in that natural environment. Both of these aspects go hand in hand, so we have to be coherent with our encouragement to the State Party to present the property. We think it is a great example. The State Party has taken stock of the observation made last year by providing additional information. We think that information fully meets criterion (iv); therefore, this property can be inscribed as a mixed property on the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you. First of all, I would like to thank ICOMOS for the report and the State Party, Mexico, for presenting this nomination from our region of Latin America and the Caribbean. As President of the Institute of Historical and Artistic Heritage of Brazil, I would simply like to focus on the cultural aspect.

The Valley of Tehuacán-Cuicatlán is in Mesoamerica, a place in which interaction between man and nature brought about the creation of extensive and early hydraulic systems which supported the development of agriculture and the communities living there. Brazil believes that the water wells, the canals, dams, aqueducts, etc. amount to exceptionally early evidence of a pre-Mesoamerican water management system which is a significant prerequisite for the cultivation of crops and the survival of human settlements. That system of water management represents a prime example of a technology that illustrates an important stage in the human settlement of our continent and therefore justifies its inscription under criterion (iv). Brazil, madam Chair, supports the amendments tabled by Spain.

Finally, I would like to wish good luck to Mexico in their game against Brazil tomorrow.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. It seems that we have a consensus in the room. I have 8 requests for the floor. Would you like me to go the Rapporteur or shall we wait and listen to the speakers and adopt tomorrow? You are happy to adopt today. Thanks. Rapporteur please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As we have heard, I received an amendment presented by Spain and Guatemala and we have heard support for this amendment by the previous speakers. The original draft decision contained two sets of proposals. One inscription based on criterion (x) and another one that would have deferred the examination of the nomination as this is a mixed site and the evaluation was conducted by two Advisory Bodies.

The amendment received would now inscribe the property on the World Heritage List on the basis of criteria (iv) and (x) and as such we have the revised text with a new identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed, as well as a statement of integrity and a new statement on the condition of authenticity. Finally, we can see slight amendments in paragraph 5 and the proposal to delete parts of paragraphs 8 and 9.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? I now give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Sorry for taking the floor. I am not fully convinced that we had a proper discussion on the cultural criterion to make this decision on the spot so fast; we do not want to interrupt the proceedings but we do find it difficult.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections to that criterion proposed? Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. After the word of the delegation of Norway, the decision is taken too quickly; we would like it to be postponed and to have more discussion. This is what I understood from the comment of the delegation of Norway and if this is the case we agree with them.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We adjourn until tomorrow and will continue the list of speakers. We have an announcement before closing. Thank you.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you madam Chair. There are two side events here tonight. At 6:00 pm Canada’s Indigenous Heritage organised by Park Canada in the main lobby of the UNESCO village. Also at 6:00 pm, it is now 6:10 pm but they will probably start right now, the African Liberation Heritage and the World Heritage followed by the Nelson Mandela Centenary Celebration cocktail party and concert. This takes place at the Ritz Carton Hotel. It is organised by the National Heritage Council of Africa.

We have one more special announcement. For the States Parties of the Arab region, there will be a technical meeting on the third cycle of reporting exercise for the Arab region held in the premises of the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage. This concerns only Arab State delegations. Please note that transportation will be provided from the venue at the front and buses will depart at 6:30 pm and there will be transportation back to your hotels. That only concerns the Arab State delegations.

Thank you all and have a nice evening.”

EIGHTH DAY – Monday 2 July 2018

FOURTEENTH SESSION

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“After we have finished examining item 8B we will proceed with the examination of items 8D and 8E. We will also have to examine 10A as it was impossible to do so last week. I recall that we also have a lot of items to deal with this morning. Namely Items 12B, 11 and 8C, as well as general decision on item 7 which is still open. I would like to recall that item 7B is also still open, on the state of conservation of Socotra in Yemen.

We will continue our discussion of yesterday on the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, Mexico. I have requests for the floor from Norway, Azerbaijan, Tunisia, Guatemala, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Saint Kitts and Nevis and Australia. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Thank you for your patience and for the opportunity we have been given to analyse this item and to talk with our colleagues from the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. This has proven important in understanding the draft decision.

The delegation of Norway would like to commend the State Party for submitting the nomination of the amazing Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, a rich territory habitat of Mesoamerica and highly appreciates the great efforts of the State Party of Mexico to nominate a property on both natural and cultural criteria.

As for natural criterion (x) we fully support the inscription of this property on the World Heritage List as containing one of the highest levels of biological diversity in an arid or semi-arid zone in North America and including a high number of threatened species.

Although the nomination could benefit from more time to elaborate on the cultural criteria and also to demonstrate intrinsic bonds between nature and culture more explicitly, we do support the amendment from Spain and Guatemala. In particular, requests 6 and 8 are very important.

Finally, we would like to encourage the State Party to make use of all the legal frameworks, such as the 2003 Convention, as tools in the overall management of the property. We would be pleased if Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley is inscribed on the World Heritage List as a mixed property.

Felicitaciones Mexico. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The property demonstrates exceptional levels of biological diversity in an arid and semi-arid zone in North America. A remarkable 70 per cent of the worldwide fauna are represented in the Valley. It is a sanctuary of diversity of floral and fauna, amphibians, birds. This property includes in particular a high diversity of plants and is one of the most important protected places in the world for the conservation of fish, with ten per cent of the distribution area and counts for ten per cent of four amphibian species and bird species.

Also, the property is a global sanctuary of biodiversity and includes numerous groups of plants. This area is rich in biodiversity elements with a high level of ecosystem services. Archaeological excavations shown the early domestication of plants, water management and subsequent developments such as salt production and the development of pottery, also the understanding of scientific, cultural, ecological and historical dimensions for the development of the region.

Taking into account all that was said above, the Azerbaijani delegation would like to recommend the Committee to inscribe this site on the World Heritage List under criteria (x) and (iv).

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie voudrait féliciter l'État partie d'avoir présenté un dossier si bien ficelé sur un site, la vallée du Tehuacán-Cuicatlán, qui nous offre une diversité biologique extraordinaire, mais aussi culturelle puisque c'est le berceau de la civilisation mésoaméricaine. La Tunisie qui soutient l'amendement proposé par l'Espagne recommande à ce Comité de l'inscrire sur les critères (iv) et (x) ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Guatemala, please”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We would like to once again thank the Advisory Bodies for the presentation and the evaluation made regarding the nomination. This nomination is mixed to ensure that it will better-protect the site and its values. The natural and cultural landscape is of great importance for the history of mankind. We think that these sort of mixed sites are very few on the World Heritage List, as is the case with sites in Latin America and the Caribbean in general.

We think that the site presented by Mexico is fully justified both for culture and nature under criteria (iv) and (x). This inscription has the necessary potential to promote research in the region in order to make more thorough studies in Mesoamerican knowledge. Therefore, it would promote a transborder, serial inscription that can show the early human settlements in the region.

Given the quality and the efforts made by the State Party, we are convinced it is necessary to promote this site for future thematic research that might deepen our knowledge on the possible links between the material evidence and human settlements and the Mesoamerican myth on the creation of the universe.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Uganda, having reviewed the analysis of the Advisory Bodies, and additionally the submission of the State Party, expresses its satisfaction to the Advisory Bodies for the informative analysis of the document that is presented before us. We further extend our appreciation and sincerely thank the State Party for all the work they have done in an effort to articulate the Outstanding Universal Values of Tehuacán-Cuicatlán.

Madam Chair, we take note of the fact that the attributes related to nature are not in question and IUCN clearly confirms it with its draft decision under criterion (x). Madam Chair, regarding the cultural aspects that ICOMOS seems not be satisfied with, it is about time for this criterion to note that the State Party has already provided substantial information in the nomination dossier.

Using the same information, ICOMOS did confirm the presence of 22 archaeological sites with evidence that reveals the process of technical evolution that reflects early domestication, a salt industry, pottery, irrigation, agriculture. The Tehuacán-Cuicatlán archaeological sites and Salinas Las Grandes located in the Zapotitlán-Cuicatlán component of the site show traces of political, religious and residential features reflecting people’s lifestyle of the time. They portray interesting developments. Other cultural heritage sites hold vestiges that relate to the beliefs and traditions of the valley.

Furthermore, the State Party, on the 28th, provided more information that relates to the technologies of water supply, irrigation and management of archaeological sites. The nomination document also indicates the property is composed of buffer zones with three components that refer to earlier documentation of the property’s attributes. These properties have already been taken in consideration.

Madam Chair, the information captured in the dossier is undoubtedly adequate to qualify the property for a mixed site. With the enhanced expert capacity, we expect more information will continue to trickle in. Madam Chair, it may not be possible for everything to be done at the moment and we expect that the site will give us more information as time goes on.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very madam Chair. Zimbabwe congratulates Mexico for this property and agrees with the natural values that have been stated for this property as confirmed by IUCN. We are concerned that the cultural value of this property which is very important and shaped the property and its relationship with its people has not been fully recognised.

The Zimbabwean delegation supports the inscription of the property as a mixed site. According to the State Party, the area has over 600 archaeological sites, which demonstrates the development of the transition from nomadic hunter-gatherer communities to sedentary farming communities. The interaction of mankind in the environment is demonstrated in the water irrigation system that has been dated to as early as 800 BCE.

Zimbabwe therefore supports the amended draft decision as proposed by Spain to inscribe this property as a mixed site under criteria (iv) and (x) and congratulates Mexico for this property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, we commend the extensive and in-depth analysis by the Advisory Bodies on the serial mixed nomination dossier of the property, which has been ongoing since 2016. This property is justified for inscription, as it has Outstanding Universal Value in the global diversity in tandem with criterion (x). The natural component of the nomination also confirms that apart from demonstrating the Outstanding Universal Value, the integrity, management and protection requirements are also adequate and the local community was sufficiently involved during the nomination process.

Madam Chair, apart from this positive consideration from the natural component perspective, most of the key issues with regard to the cultural and archaeological dimension, including the Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (iv) are fully met, as required by the Operational Guidelines, thus justifying the inscription of this property under criterion (iv). Therefore Tanzania supports the amended draft decision to inscribe this property under criteria (x) and (iv).

I thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis you have the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of Mexico for the submission of this extraordinary site. The property exhibits not only significant biodiversity of endemic flora and fauna, but has also shown cultural uniqueness in the long human interaction with the area, as reflected in the evidence of water management technology, plant domestication, salt industry and pottery as part of human adaptation for over 13,000 years.

We believe that the property meets the requirements of criteria (iv) and (x) and Saint Kitts and Nevis support the draft decision as amended and congratulates the State Party on the inscription of this mixed property.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Madam Chair. Australia supports the listing of this property as a natural property under criterion (x) and congratulates the State Party on the work with the Advisory Bodies in addressing the issues relevant to the natural heritage of the site and the work done on integrating the archaeological features of the site with its natural values.

Australia encourages the State Party to consider a renomination under criterion (ix), given the property’s potential ecological significance as a dry land site of exceptional biodiversity and the potential to extend the property guided by a more systematic inventory of the flora and fauna.

If we are moving to inscribe this property, also, under criterion (iv), Australia would like to ask ICOMOS which of their recommendations they would consider should be included in the draft decision for implementation and reporting back to the Committee.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please, you have the floor.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. Thank you for giving us more time to go over this submission. The State of Kuwait would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for the great work they have done for this submission. We would also like to thank the State Party for the continuous dialogue with the Advisory Bodies and the submission done.

We believe regarding criterion (iv) that this is another site we see with a water system that played a major role and how it has been developed. This is the second site we see where the water system is so important and the continuation of that management and evolution has developed, producing much economy on that site and helped the sustainability of the inhabitant of the site.

We agree and are comfortable with the draft amendment submitted by the delegation of Spain. We are supporting it and congratulate the State Party for the great work they have been doing.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor to reply to Australia.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you, madam Chair. The delegation from Australia asked specifically for ICOMOS’ concerns and comments with regard to the recommendation that should be given to the State Party. Under this context, ICOMOS considers recommendation number 8 essential, in particular the first point in the recommendation to continue to undertake further surveys, research and documentation of cultural heritage sites in the Valley.

Perhaps it would be even further helpful if it was clarified as to what the objectives of these surveys, research and documentation should be. In ICOMOS’s view, they should be to identify the attributes that reflect Outstanding Universal Value in cultural terms, as well as to ensure that these attributes are completely located, identify the boundary of the properties, and in case not, to consider future boundary modification to ensure that all attributes are located within the property.

The other recommendation solicited under paragraph 8 seems equally valuable. ICOMOS appreciated the suggestion. Thank you very much madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur has the floor to show us the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good morning to all. As you have heard this morning, I have received amendments submitted by Spain and Guatemala. We have heard support for these amendments by Brazil, Cuba, Norway, Kuwait, Azerbaijan, Tunisia, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Zimbabwe and Tanzania. While the original draft decision acknowledged the relevance of criterion (x) for the inscription of this mixed site, the proposed amendment would list the site under criterion (iv).

Logically, we have an augmented provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value with the adding of the identification of criterion (iv) and this is a cultural criterion. We also have a new assessment of the condition of authenticity and we have a set of recommendations to the State Party under paragraph 8.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would just propose an amendment to the amended text as suggested by ICOMOS in terms of recommendation 8. We can do that now or shortly.

8.a *‘Continue to undertake further surveys, research and documentation of cultural heritage sites in the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, including in areas currently located outside*

the property boundaries, related to irrigation systems and settlements to identify the attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to identify whether these are in the property’.

Perhaps a new sentence: *‘If these are located out of the property, to consider a minor boundary modification to include these,’*

This was done quickly, so it can be better- worded.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair. I seek clarification from the legal advisor. If we have inscribed a site on the basis of Outstanding Universal Value, do we then carry out further studies to find Outstanding Universal Value?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The legal advisor, please.”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you madam Chair. The question is on the implementation of the Convention and on the criteria and is better to be addressed to the Secretariat to answer this. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I do believe there are two different levels here. One is the notion that Outstanding Universal Value has been recognized, which the Committee seems to agree on. The second aspect is the question of what physical attributes representing that Outstanding Universal Values within the properties there are. I believe the suggestion by the delegation of Australia was to identify the attributes which represent the attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value and not the Outstanding Universal Value as such.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you Madam Chair, Perhaps, to make things clearer and easier for the State Party, we suggest with Australia’s lead to change ‘to identify the attributes’ to ‘further clarify the attributes’: I think that would make things clear. I can see ICOMOS nodding.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“We very much agree. I was going to give an indication to do exactly the same.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur could read the final text, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. The text will now read:

‘Continue to undertake further surveys, research and documentation of cultural heritage sites in the Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley, including in areas currently located outside the property boundaries, related to irrigation systems and settlements to further clarify the attributes that contribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to identify whether these are in the property. If these are located out of the property, to consider a minor boundary modification to include these.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you all agree with this? Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.13 adopted. I congratulate Mexico and I give them the floor.”

Mexico:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. At the outset, we should like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for its outstanding hospitality. On behalf of the government of Mexico, we would like to extend our thanks to the members of the World Heritage Committee for backing the inscription of this property, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre for their professional undertakings in assessing this property.

This nomination is the result of a joint decision by cultural and environmental institutions and of the political nature in our country, thanks to environmental bodies as well as advisory services, also the State of Puebla and other communities that paved the way for the success of the file and I thank them again.”

Additional speaker from Mexico:

[English interpretation] “The Tehuacán-Cuicatlán Valley originary habitat of Mesoamerica is an outstanding testament to irrigation and water management and also harbours several important families of plants such as agaves, yucca, bromeliads and more. As a mixed site we think it really pays testimony to the very earliest inhabitants and their ingenuity in adapting to the climate by using diversified techniques for water management and survival in these conditions. The outstandingly high level of biodiversity in the region is also highly implicated with the early agricultural endeavours in the region. The indigenous communities are also the direct stewards of this property.

By way of conclusion, dear colleagues and friends, at this highly important moment for our country, we also would like to share with you that the nomination of this mixed property responds not only to the Global Strategy but also more broadly to the orientations, guidelines and thematic studies published by UNESCO.

The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies have guided our Committee by these kinds of initiatives and that is why we wanted to underscore that heritage sites of this nature are not only inscribed for their natural and cultural attributes taken in isolation, but rather because they dovetail and interconnect and comprise of the relationships between culture, the environment and the communities living there.

The inscription of this mixed property from Mexico also responds to the Strategic Action Plan for Heritage in our region. We feel that it also bolsters the credibility of the List and we entrust that through this inscription, we will be even better placed to ensure that the role of local communities and the conservation and safeguarding of the site will be stronger than ever.

For Mexico and as well as similar inscriptions in other countries, like Columbia and Canada, these inscriptions point to a paradigm shift and perspectives for assessment of sites with Outstanding Universal Value.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much and congratulations again. We will now continue with the examination of natural sites. I now invite IUCN to present the site of Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains in South Africa and I give them the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN’s evaluation of this property is on pages 3 and 4 of the English and French versions of the IUCN evaluation report. IUCN had the opportunity at the Committee here to meet with the State Party of South Africa and has been provided with clarifications and information on a range of issues concerning legal protection, staff capacity and integrated management planning.

The nominated property, Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains, covers 113,137 ha of land located in northeastern South Africa, and joining the Swaziland border on its eastern boundary. The nominated property comprises 40 per cent of the Barberton Greenstone Belt, one of the oldest geological features on our planet. As you can see on the map, around two

thirds of the nominated property is protected by a nature reserve, shown in light green, with one third lying outside, shown in pink.

Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains represent the best-preserved thick and diverse succession of volcanic and sedimentary rocks, dating back 3.6 to 3.25 billion years to the early part of the Archaean Eon, when the first continents were starting to form on the primitive earth: features of the early Earth that are especially well-preserved. Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains include meteorite-impacts dating to just after the end of the Great Bombardment (4.6 to 3.8 billion years ago), tidal bedding that formed when the newly formed Moon was less than half as far away from Earth as it is today, and komatiites that represent the hottest lavas to have ever flowed on Earth.

Those areas in the nominated property corresponding to nature reserve host a range of wildlife that is considered typical to South Africa. Land use in the remainder of the property is mostly distributed between timber plantation and areas used for low-impact herding and subsistence farming. The unique geology of the Barberton Greenstone Belt has also created distinctive soils that host a diversity of plant species.

The five reserves that collectively constitute 67 per cent of the nominated property are effectively protected by the National Environmental Management, Protected Areas Act, and the Mpumalanga Tourism and Parks Agency Act. The State Party has advised that should the property be inscribed, it would trigger additional protection under South Africa's World Heritage Convention Act. However, at the time of the nomination, a significant one-third of the nominated property lay outside the formal protected areas, requiring different approaches to protection and management.

IUCN acknowledges the important geo-sites within these areas which differ from those in the protected area and these make an essential contribution to Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains' case for Outstanding Universal Value. Establishing effective protection of these areas was at the time of the evaluation being actively addressed by the South African Resources Agencies. No more heritage buffer zone is proposed on the basis that the State Party considers the buffer zone is unnecessary. However, IUCN believes that the need for a buffer zone for protection is most critical for geosites outside the reserve as critical reinforcement of their protection.

The Mpumalanga Tourism and Parks Agency (MTPA) is expected to extend its role to act as overall management authority of Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains. The MTPA has long-standing experience managing protected areas within the nominated property. However, should the property nominated be inscribed, MTPA will need to diversify its current biodiversity forecast to build capacity in geological management. High level geological expertise will be necessary to manage the increased attention, pressures and opportunities that World Heritage would entail.

The landscape of Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains is rugged and sparsely populated, with fewer than 500 inhabitants and no medium or large-scale settlements nor industries in the nominated properties. The land owners within the nominated property have signed a resolution committing themselves and the property to support the World Heritage site on condition that they are afforded formal representation in all decision-making, structures and their land ownership rights are protected. The level of threat of the nominated property is not high by comparison with others worldwide. However, IUCN considers again at the time of the evaluation that the protection level across the property as a whole did not yet meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.

In summary, IUCN considers that the nominated property meets criterion (viii) and the integrity requirements. However, the legal framework and adequate buffer zone, recruitment of enhanced geological expertise and integrated management system need to be finalised, as to meet the requirements for protection and management. IUCN, therefore, recommends

that the World Heritage Committee refer the nomination of Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains back to the State Party to address these issues.

Madam Chair, the draft decision is set out on page 6 of both English and French versions of working document INF. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any comments or should we just proceed with the nomination? Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We would like, first of all, to thank South Africa for the nomination of this geological World Heritage site. We understand that in UNESCO we have seen even broader recognition and acknowledgement of the need to safeguard this type of heritage. We have been listening very carefully and we read in detail the IUCN report and we concur with much of the analysis as concerns the Outstanding Universal Value and the need for protection and management to be clarified.

That is why the proposed decision for referral seemed very important because it would indeed ensure that more work would be done on the protection and management of the property. We have heard that South Africa has been looking at this issue. I was wondering if we could hear directly from the State Party to hear their side before making a decision.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now the floor is to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe congratulates the State Party of South Africa for submitting this property. In this regard, we also congratulate Kenya. These are the only two nominations from Africa that the Committee is discussing at this setting. We therefore, as a preamble, would like to again remind the Committee of the under- representation of African sites on the World Heritage List, in particular natural sites. We do appreciate the efforts of the State Party as well as the work of the Africa World Heritage Fund in ensuring that this under-representation is dealt with. We do hope that in the future we will discuss a clear plan of action that the Centre is taking to ensure that Africa is being represented on the World Heritage List.

I would like to support Cuba in asking that the State Party be given the opportunity to clarify the recent developments that have taken place in order to address some of the concerns that have been listed by IUCN, particularly in relation to protection of the site recently and legal changes that took place to address this, as well as issues of recruitment. If the State Party is given an opportunity, this would be clarified.

Zimbabwe is one of the sponsors of the amended draft decision related to this particular property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. Uganda, please, you have the floor.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Uganda thanks IUCN for the analysis and also congratulates the State Party for this in-depth submission. The delegation of Uganda feels that the proposed property meets the provisions of criterion (viii) and should therefore be considered for inscription.

The property represents the best-preserved thick and diverse succession of volcanic sedimentary rocks dating back to 3.6 and 3.2 million years ago, to the early Archaean, when the first continents were beginning to form on the primitive earth. Our delegation takes note of the concerns raised by the Advisory Bodies with regard to the partial inclusion of attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value and the inadequate staff capacity in the field of geology.

Madam Chair, the proposed property has a good representation of the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value which are allocated inside its boundaries. The Committee may appreciate that in a landscape where some of the land is settled and owned by the community it is undoubtedly very difficult to have all their land inscribed to incorporate all the attributes associated with the Outstanding Universal Value. IUCN too acknowledged this fact in their analysis.

Madam Chair, the good news is that the proposed property, with coverage of 113,137 ha, is large enough to hold components of the geosites and most of the geosites are actually included within the property. With regard to staff capacity, we need to appreciate that capacity-building and recruitment is a continuous process and this cannot really be one of the reasons why an inscription of a property onto the World Heritage List should not be considered.

Madam Chair, in the view of the above, our delegation joins other delegations in support of the amendment of the draft decision from referral to inscription.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous félicitons l'État partie pour le dossier d'inscription du site des Montagnes de Barberton Makhonjwa, site naturel d'une valeur exceptionnelle représentant, je cite le rapport : *“la succession de roches volcaniques et sédimentaires, la mieux préservée, la plus épaisse et la plus diverse datant de 3,6 à 3,25 milliards d'années et remontant au début de l'éon archéen lorsque le premier continent a formé sur la terre primitive”*.

Nous félicitons également l'UICN pour le rapport d'évaluation objectif qui nous a été soumis. Nous avons bien pris note que l'UICN a conclu que l'analyse comparative démontre que les montagnes de Barberton remplissent bien les critères (viii) et que les conditions d'intégrités sont également remplies. Toutefois, l'UICN a émis des réserves sur le

mécanisme de protection juridique des géosites situés en dehors des aires protégées nationales, y compris une vaste zone de protection adéquate autour de chacun des géosites.

Nous avons également prêté attention lors de la présentation de ce rapport par l'UICN et des consultations ont été réalisées en marge de cette session avec l'État partie, mais toutefois, nous souhaiterions que l'État partie puisse fournir à notre Comité des informations complémentaires pour nous permettre de prendre une décision appropriée pour l'inscription de ce bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Just to remind you that we only have 90 minutes and we have five sites and we take the risk that at the end of the day we will not be finished. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary has understood information provided by the State Party about the elimination of the shortcomings identified by the Advisory Bodies in the nomination file related to the legislative framework and the management of the property. Therefore, Hungary supports the amendment proposed by Angola and other committee members to inscribe Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains on the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, you have the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of South Africa for the work done on this site. The Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains are the best-preserved example of the oldest and most diverse sequence of volcanic and sedimentary rocks on earth. The site has met criterion (viii) and based on information of the State Party, it has addressed concerns raised by IUCN in completing the process of legal protection, engaging required processes for recruitment and the implementation of the management plan.

Saint Kitts and Nevis, in view of the work done by the State Party, supports the inscription of Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains and commends South Africa for their commitment to the protection of this site. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to China.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to be very brief, we co-sponsor this amendment and we congratulate the State Party of South Africa. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Burkina Faso.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous félicitons l'État partie pour la proposition du site des Montagnes de Barberton Makhonjwa sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Le rapport d'évaluation de l'UICN dit que : *“Le bien proposé nécessite une expertise géologique de haut niveau pour gérer l'attention, les pressions et les possibilités accrues qui vont de pair avec le statut de patrimoine mondial”*.

Nous voulons féliciter l'État partie pour son engagement à garantir des capacités supplémentaires et pour avoir alloué des ressources financières à hauteur de 20 millions de rands pour la gestion du site des Montagnes de Barberton Makhonjwa. À cet égard madame la présidente, il est important de noter qu'il s'agit d'un exemple d'un versement énorme consenti par un État partie en développement pour un programme de conservation.

À l'instar de Cuba, le Zimbabwe, l'Angola et d'autres, nous souhaiterions demander par votre intermédiaire, madame la présidente, que l'État partie précise davantage comment il entend traiter l'expertise identifiée requise pour la protection et la gestion efficace des géosites.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway would like to congratulate South Africa with the nomination of an impressive property and IUCN for its report as well. The evaluation clearly confirms that Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains have potential to meet criterion (viii). We are also intrigued by the idea that this nomination might open the possibility for the future transboundary extension, which might result in Swaziland's first inscription on the World Heritage List. However, IUCN recommends the nomination be referred back to the State Party to allow South Africa to complete the remaining issues concerning protection and management.

As mentioned by others during this meeting, the State Party has indicated to us that there have been some further developments considering the implementation of recommendations proposed by IUCN in the original draft decision for referral. We would like to hear directly from the State Party on this matter.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. My delegation also commends the State Party of South Africa for the submission of this extraordinary property in the eyes of the World Heritage Committee. The property proposed for inscription under criterion (viii) is clearly unique in offering the rare opportunity for protecting a prehistoric geological setting of the formation of continents of the primitive earth.

To us madam Chair, the analysis by IUCN is adequately robust and balanced in content and scope and the Outstanding Universal Value is, in particular, clearly visible. We note that IUCN proposed a referral of this nomination, compelled by the main issue of lack of legal protection of the geosites outside the core national protected zone. Given the pending clarification by the State Party on this issue and that the status is now changed by way that it is legally in place, we support the inscription of the property.

Thank you madam Chair,”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to congratulate the State Party on the file for two reasons. First of all, it is a file that in terms of natural heritage and geographical situation aims to strike a balance in the World Heritage List. We thank IUCN for the work they carried out in their report and their opinions.

The delegation of the Kingdom of Spain supports the amendment for the fact that the State Party has already adopted a series of measures to protect this site. I think that solves the problems of management and protection referred to. I believe it is solved. Secondly, the draft amendment that we agree with invites the State Party to develop an integrated management plan along with Swaziland, which would be more than desirable.

Therefore, we encourage IUCN and South Africa to work together along these lines. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. As the first country in South America to have established a geopark, Brazil understands that the protection of nature extends beyond the conservation of fauna, flora and scenery. Brazil holds the position that it is important for the Convention to bring into it more examples of outstanding geological sites such as that of the Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains.

Brazil takes note of IUCN concerns, but considers that the South African clarifications regarding the legal protection of the nominated area, the hiring of specialised staff and the site management plan are satisfactory. Brazil is of the position that the Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains meet criterion (viii) of the Convention.

Madam Chair, we therefore fully support the amended draft decision to inscribe the site. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The nominated property comprises 40 per cent of the Barberton Greenstone Belt, one of the oldest geological features on our planet. This ancient geology is core to the proposed Outstanding Universal Value of this nominated property. This site represents the best-preserved, thick and diverse succession of volcanic and sedimentary rocks, dating back 3.6 to 3.25 billion years, to the early part of the Archaean Eon.

According to the report and other documents, it is of importance that this area is included on the World Heritage List. At the same time, madam Chair, we would like to recommend to the State Party to finish work to conclude the legal status which is directly relevant to the protection of the South African State and to increase capacity-building and the recruitment of specialist staff.

In conclusion, madam Chair, we would like to join our distinguished Committee members on the inscription of this site on the World Heritage List. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie félicite l'État partie pour cette nomination et félicite l'UICN pour son évaluation très précise qui atteste de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle de ce site. Compte tenu des informations complémentaires apportées par l'État Partie, La Tunisie soutient le projet d'amendement qui entend l'inscription de ce bien.

Merci madame ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Bosnia.”

Bosnie Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Tout d'abord, nous pensons que le critère (viii) est tout à fait justifié concernant la proposition d'inscription de ce bien. Aussi, la Bosnie-

Herzégovine, après avoir entendu les clarifications de l'État partie, estime que l'État partie est en train de mettre en œuvre la plupart des suggestions de l'Organisme consultatif et qu'il n'y a plus d'obstacles que le Comité puisse aller vers une inscription. Par conséquent nous soutenons l'amendement.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, can you tell us about the amendment and the text?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As we have heard, I received amendments to the draft decision submitted by Angola, Burkina Faso, Tanzania, Uganda and Zimbabwe and we heard wide support for these amendments. The original draft decision would have referred the nomination back to the State Party; however, the amendments would inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

In line with this we have a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value as well as the identification of criterion to which the property should be inscribed and an assessment of integrity as well as a statement and management required. In the last few paragraphs we have some recommendations for the State Party.

These are the amendments received. Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections related to the amendments?”

Angola :

« Je m'excuse, madame la présidente, de demander la parole. Je pense qu'il y a un groupe de pays qui a demandé à l'Afrique du Sud de parler pour confirmer les informations ».

The Chairperson:

“Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you very much Chair. One question on the wording of paragraph 4, as we are dealing with important issues like the implementation of management plans in this paragraph, we suppose that we should go back to 'requests' as in the original draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Any other objections on the amendments? Shall we adopt it and give the State Party the floor to give all the information? Yes. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.5 adopted. On your behalf I congratulate the State Party and I give them the floor.”

South Africa:

“Thank you madam Chair for offering us an opportunity to clarify issues relating to Barberton Makhonjwa Mountains. Three issues have been raised as reasons for a referral of the site and these are protection, capacity for management of geological sites and the implementation of the integrated management plan. However, in our view, only one of these issues, the protection, could be considered as valid for a referral. The others could not be considered restrictions as part of the recommendations.

On the issue of protection, the IUCN evaluation found that the boundaries of the buffer zone arrangements of the property meet the required needs of the Operational Guidelines, provided that a complete, wider protection is provided to the geosites of the nature zones.

On the issue of legal protection, IUCN indicated one third of the site comprising of geosites outside the legally protected area had limited or no legal protection. Furthermore, they acknowledged that these challenges are being actively addressed. We would like to confirm that these sites have now been declared under national legislation, on the 15th of June this year. Evidence of this has been subsequently submitted to IUCN.

Furthermore, protection of these sites include appropriate buffer zones around each one of the 51 geosites, collectively declared the buffer zone around the geosites and the ongoing land, use zoning mechanisms provided in the State Party’s domestic Land Use Planning Zoning legislation, combined to offer adequate protection to the nominated property. This means that 100 per cent of the nominated site now has domestic protection.

By implication the State Party has now fully met the outstanding requirements. On the issue of geological capacity, while the State Party understands that this element is not a prerequisite for inscription, the human resources structure of the management authority has been expanded to include a new unit led by a senior geologist and the total number of staff is eight. On the issue of the integrated management plan, we have already submitted a final management plan and we understand that we have now fully complied with the requirements of UNESCO.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now. Let us move on to the next site. I now invite IUCN to present the nomination of Fanjingshan, China. IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. The IUCN evaluation of this property is on page 15 of both the French and English versions of the IUCN evaluation report.

IUCN had the opportunity to meet with the State Party of China both before the Committee again and once more here at this 42nd session. Updates and clarifications have

been provided on policies and practices regarding relocation of residents within the boundary, tourism management and several other issues raised within the evaluation.

The nominated property, Fanjingshan, is located within the Wuling Mountain Range, near Tongren City in North-East Guizhou province, South-West China. It covers a total area of 40,275 ha. The nominated property overlaps, but does not fully coincide with, Fanjingshan National Nature Reserve, Yinjiang Yangxi Provincial Nature Reserve (Chayuan area) and a small area of National Non-Commercial Forest. Fanjingshan National Nature Reserve is also a UNESCO Biosphere Reserve. A buffer zone of 37,239 ha fully surrounds the property.

The resulting vertical stratification of vegetation is common in mountain systems across the globe. Fanjingshan is characterised by three major altitudinal vegetation zone areas: Evergreen broadleaf forest, mixed evergreen, and deciduous broadleaf forest to mixed deciduous broadleaf and conifer and scrub forest at higher elevations. Fanjingshan National Nature Reserve is noted in the literature as one of the best-preserved subtropical ecosystems in China.

The nominated property's isolation and changing climatic conditions have led to a high degree of endemism, with a total of 46 locally endemic plant species, four endemic vertebrate species and 245 endemic invertebrate species. The most prominent endemic species are the Fanjingshan Fir and Guizhou Snub-nosed Monkey, both of which are entirely restricted to the nominated property.

A total of 3,724 plant species have been recorded in the nominated property, an impressive 13 per cent of China's total flora. The diversity of vertebrates (2,317 species) is also very high. A total of 450 vertebrate species are found inside the nominated property, as many as 64 plants and 38 animal species that are listed as vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered on the IUCN Red List are also found here, including the *Bretschneidera sinensis* tree, the Chinese Giant Salamander, the Forest Musk Deer, *Moschus berezovskii*, Reeves's Pheasant and the Asiatic Black Bear.

IUCN does not consider the nomination has made a compelling case for the Outstanding Universal Value in regard to criterion (vii), as many mountain ecosystems in China and in the world feature the same elevation gradients. The metrological phenomena are common among mountain landscapes with similar climatic conditions and claims for wildlife spectacles at the scale of those recognised on the World Heritage List.

Although the nominated property covers many local floristic elements and is of sufficient size to encompass the entire known home range of the Guizhou Snub-nosed Monkey, IUCN does not consider it is sufficient to sustain the full range of ecological functions necessary to meet criterion (ix).

The nominated property has adequate legal protection with a realistic regime of protection in place. However, better coordination would be desirable to streamline management across the three agencies responsible for the management of the three component areas of the property and to ensure consistent implementation of the property-wide Management Plan that has recently been developed for the site.

IUCN, in dialogue with the State Party, has been informed of changes to the Management of Protected Areas in China, transferring, as of March, 2018, responsibility to the Ministry of Natural Resources. This recent change of governance and its implication on the site needs to be further clarified.

There are several villages within the nominated property, five with 718 households, and in the buffer zone. IUCN sought additional information from the State Party on proposals for relocation of people from within the nominated property and received several assurances in that regard. However, at the time of finalising the evaluation, some ambiguities continued

to exist and IUCN considers that prior to an inscription of the nominated property, the State Party further clarifies the process and measures taken concerning the relocation of residents to ensure this process is fully voluntary and in line with the policies of the Convention and relevant international laws. Further clarification on these issues has been provided in meetings between IUCN and the State Party here in Bahrain.

Tourism in the nominated property is at manageable levels but has been steadily rising and may increase sharply should the property be inscribed, as has been seen in some other World Heritage properties in China. The main potential threats to the property would be a further increase in infrastructure to accommodate increasing tourism demands, potentially creating further fragmentation of habitat and disturbance to the species of importance. IUCN recommends that greater precision be provided on tourism infrastructure and access planning and management action to cope with any such future increase in tourism demand.

IUCN also noted a number of other issues to be further clarified for the nominated property, such as wildlife taming, salamander farming for human consumption and improved harmonisation of management zoning.

In summary, IUCN considers that while the nominated property meets criterion (x) and the requirements for integrity, protection and management requirements are not fully met, pending the finalisation of new governance arrangements, clarification of safeguards related to tourism development and control and clear assurance on plans to relocate residents from the property.

Madam Chair, the draft decision recommending referral of this nominated property to the State Party is set out on page 6 of both the English and French versions of working document 8B.

Thank you Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would like to thank the State Party of China and IUCN for giving us a chance to discover this outstanding site, congratulations for this high quality dossier. With more than 6,000 species of fauna and flora distributed within 402 km² the nominated property contains 64 plant and 38 animal species that are listed on the IUCN Red List; as the only habitat of the Guizhou Snub-nosed Monkey, it is a refuge of vital importance for many ancient relics, rare, endangered endemic species. It is of great importance to biodiversity conservation.

Moreover, IUCN has confirmed that the boundaries of the property and its buffer zone are of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features which convey significance. We commend the State Party for being in close consultation with IUCN for the clarification follow-ups and for putting great effort into further improving the management system according to the suggestions of IUCN. This is a great example of strong dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and a State Party that we would like to encourage in the Committee.

The exceptional richness and biodiversity and ecological integrity of the property justify the proposed criterion (x). The IUCN report has also confirmed that the nominated property includes all key components required to express the claimed Outstanding Universal Value. We therefore propose to inscribe the property to the World Heritage List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia would like the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie salue l'État partie pour nous avoir soumis un très beau site. La Tunisie soutient le projet d'amendement qui vous a été soumis, souligne avec satisfaction l'évolution de la soumission de ce dossier et, comme nous venons de l'entendre dans le cadre du rapport de l'UICN, la concertation entre l'État partie et les instances consultatives a duré jusqu'à ces derniers jours et on s'en félicite, ce qui nous conforte dans l'idée que le critère (x) est bien vérifié et que donc nous proposons ce site à l'inscription.

Nous continuons à encourager l'État partie à rester de concert avec les Instances consultatives à développer son programme de conservation et de protection. La Tunisie renouvelle ses félicitations à l'État partie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, the delegation of Uganda thanks the Advisory Bodies for their comprehensive analysis given to the nomination document for the property. Our delegation takes note of the fact that the property's boundaries, protection status, monitoring frameworks and community relations suffice on provisions for inscription of the property.

For purposes of emphasis we take note of the state of the art monitoring frameworks in place and the huge budget allocation of over \$US15 million for the protection of the property. The property is also a hotspot for biodiversity conservation that clearly meets the provisions of criterion (x).

Madam Chair, Uganda further takes note of the high number of visitors to the site which presents a big management challenge. This seems to be the only issue on site which we believe the State Party has the capacity to adequately handle considering the budget available for site management.

In this regard, the delegation of Uganda wishes to support the draft amendment to Decision 42 COM 8B.2 from referral to inscription while maintaining the remaining sections as information gaps for the State Party to attend to.

I thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I will be brief. Cuba considers that this is a site that meets the prerequisites to be on the World Heritage List and also recognises what the Advisory Bodies said in its concerns, which is why it proposes referral. However, the State Party as provided detailed information on the recommendations, therefore we support the draft amendments. Yet, we would like to make a slight modification to the amendment once it is put up on the screen.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Zimbabwe supports the amendments for inscription of this site. This is a site which hosts more than 6,000 species of fauna and flora, distributed in Fanjingshan within an area of less than 500 km², which demonstrates the high value of diversity in the nominated property.

Furthermore, this is the last habitat of the snub-nosed Monkey, which is a threatened species and on the IUCN Red List. In this sense the property well meets criterion (x), by containing threatened species of Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of science and conservation.

In the spirit of safeguarding the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Zimbabwe supports the draft amendments to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List. We are satisfied by the management and protection measures that the State Party has put in place and therefore, we are confident that this site will be protected within necessary resources allocated, as outlined by the distinguished delegate of Uganda.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you Chair. Hungary would like to congratulate the State Party and the Advisory Bodies for excellent work, continuous communication and cooperation in the nomination of Fanjingshan. The Hungarian delegation has been convinced by the information provided by the State Party in relation to the relocation of residents within the property as well as the legislative agreements and arrangements with restrictions of development for sustainable visitor management.

According to our view, the conservation system established works adequately and ensures the success of the conservation of the outstanding natural heritage of the site in the long term. In conclusion, Hungary fully supports the inscription of the nominated property on the World Heritage List on the basis of criterion (x) and supports the amendment to the draft decision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway supports the amendments from Australia, paragraphs 4, 5 and 6, including the mission. Thank you, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia would like to say something? No. In that case I give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Chair. In the name of consistency, I believe that the additional recommendations put forth by Australia in this amendment do indeed contribute to strengthening this draft decision, so we support them.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, please.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. We commend the State Party of China on the extensive work done on this nomination file. We recognise that this property has met the conditions under criterion (x) and has adequate protection and management.

Saint Kitts and Nevis supports the inscription of the site and we encourage the State Party to implement the recommendations of IUCN especially in the area of visitor management. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you Madam Chair. The Azerbaijani delegation read the dossier and the evaluation report of IUCN. According to the IUCN report more than 6,000 species have been counted in the nominated property; an impressive one per cent of the world’s fauna and thirteen per cent of China’s fauna. It is a very important area for endemic species distributed inside the property, with 46 species of endemic plants and 250 species of animals located in the property. It contains the most important and scientific natural habitat for the in situ conservation of biological diversity.

Azerbaijan agrees that this area meets criterion (x). Azerbaijan appreciates that the State Party held productive meetings with IUCN and that the recommendations of IUCN in the technical report have been addressed with updated information. Therefore, we would like to join Kuwait and other distinguished members of the Committee and suggest this site be inscribed on the World Heritage List by the Committee this year.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Bosnia, you have the floor.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup. La Bosnie Herzégovine comme les autres collègues considèrent que le critère (x) est justifié pour l'inscription de ce site. Nous pensons aussi que devant nous, nous avons un très bel exemple d'une synergie établie entre l'État partie et l'Organe consultatif afin de résoudre certaines réserves que l'Organe consultatif avait adressées dans son rapport. Par conséquent, nous pensons qu'il n'y a plus d'obstacles pour l'inscription de ce beau site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. La Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient donc l'amendement proposé par certains de nos collègues.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. I now give the floor to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway can also agree with the inscription of the biodiversity hotspot under criterion (x) and we congratulate China. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chairperson, my delegation notes that there are more than 6,000 species of plants and animals distributed in the property within less than 500 km² which demonstrates the high value of biodiversity in the nominated property. Furthermore, the nominated property is the last habitat for the Guizhou Snub-nosed Monkey and the Fanjingshan Fir, both of which are threatened species in the IUCN Red List.

In this sense, the property well meets criterion (x) containing certain dispositions pertaining to Outstanding Universal Value from the point of view of science or conservation. In the spirit of safeguarding the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Tanzania supports the amendment of the draft decision to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List as already put forward by Kuwait, Tunisia, Uganda and the other States Parties.

I thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. After carefully studying the dossier, the Indonesian delegation is fully convinced that the property has fulfilled criterion (x) of the Outstanding Universal Value. In this regard, we would like to commend the State Party and IUCN for the excellent work in analysing and endorsing this nomination. The State Party of China has also drawn a clear plan to conserving the property based on the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies, as reflected in the amended draft decision.

Therefore, we see no reason to postpone the inscription of this property as a World Heritage and we support the amended draft decision. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Brazil wishes to commend the government of China for its nature protection activities. Brazil is of the opinion that the property meets criterion (x) and should be inscribed in the World Heritage List.

Brazil, however, would like to ask IUCN to clarify paragraphs 3.b of the amended draft decision. It is not clear to us whether the recommendations are not to increase levels of visitation or to prepare for increased levels of visitation.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Last speaker; Spain, please, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We just wanted to thank the State Party and the Kingdom of Spain would like to support the draft amendments as received. We have absolutely no doubt as to the fulfilment of criterion (x) and boundaries and buffer zone. Yet, we would like to hear directly from the State Party, China, for further information on the issue of relocation and compensation of inhabitants of the property. We are sure that China would be aware that inscription of this site would entail an increase in tourism and just wondering whether the State Party has foreseen anything to that matter.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. In response to the question from the distinguished delegate of Brazil concerning paragraph 3.b on tourism. It is really our view that tourism impacts come from two different sources. One is the internal impact of tourism development surrounding the property; it is a small and fragile property in very good condition. We are concerned about surrounding tourism pressure.

We are also concerned about the number of visitors to the property. At the moment the visitors are confined to a very small area of the property and ceilings or caps are placed on the total number of visitors per day to the property and we would support continuing that approach. We also think that it is important to anticipate growing tourism demand for site managers to engage more broadly in regional scale tourism development and planning, so that we do not see large levels of infrastructure and pressure continuing to exert impacts on the property.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to China to answer the question.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would like to thank IUCN for the high quality technical report of the property. We fully recognise the Outstanding Universal Value based on criterion (x) and the entirety of the nominated property. We would also like to extend our appreciation to Committee members for your generous support.

I would like to clarify some issues raised in the IUCN report and by some of the distinguished Committee members. The relocation of the residents has been part of the national policy relocation programme since 2001. It is based on volunteering and is for the benefit of local people.

Concerning the possible increase in tourism pressure upon inscription, we have revised the Protection and Management Plan of the site according to IUCN recommendations. I would like to take this opportunity to confirm we have no plan to develop western access to the nominated property. The different common agencies managing the property will be streamlined into one office for more focus and efficient management.

We paid a visit to IUCN on May the 31st in order to clarify misunderstandings and provide updated information. On June 27th the State Party had a formal meeting here again with IUCN and provided a report responding to IUCN’s concerns point by point. All concerns of IUCN have been well addressed. We strongly believe, the inscription of Fanjingshan by the Committee will add value to the List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to the Rapporteur to give us the final text with amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As you heard during the debate, I have received amendments to the draft decision submitted by Kuwait, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Hungary, Tunisia, Uganda and Zimbabwe. We have heard wide support for these amendments. While the original draft decision would have referred the nomination back to the State Party, the amendments propose to instead inscribe the property on the World Heritage List.

In line with this, the amended decision has a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value with the identification of criteria under which the property should be inscribed and an assessment of the condition of integrity. We also have a statement on protection management requirements as well as a new paragraph 4 that has requests to the State Party and these were previously located under former paragraph 2.

Madam Chair, during the debate we have heard from the distinguished delegate of Cuba that they might have some amendments. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “It has already been included in the draft. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. As everybody seems to agree. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.6 adopted. On your behalf I congratulate China and I give them the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. May I use this opportunity once again to extend our deepest heartfelt thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain for hosting and managing this magnificent conference; thank you. I also wish to use the opportunity to thank the World Heritage Committee, IUCN, the World Heritage Centre and the States Parties involved for your most valuable support and confidence.

We fully understand and appreciate that this encouragement also entails heavy responsibility of conservation. We can assure you that the State Party of China will live up to your expectations and will take measures to address all the concerns raised. I thank you very much and now I would like to invite the Mayor who has jurisdiction over this particular property to address you.

Thank you.”

Mayor of Tongren:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Fanjingshan is located in Tongren City district in North-East Guizhou province; its name means the place of divine beauty. On behalf of the 4.3 million citizens and friends abroad and at home who care for the Mountain, we would like to express our gratitude.

The local people have cherished the mountains as they would their own eyes so that the Outstanding Universal Value has been kept. After inscription, we will strictly abide by the Convention and adopt measures to protect and manage the mountain and to demonstrate its Outstanding Universal Values, so that this site could be passed on to future generations.

We would like to thank the Centre and IUCN. We look forward to their further guidance and we would cooperate with other countries in terms of research. I will be waiting for you to pay us a visit in Tongren City.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Let us continue with the next site, in the Islamic Republic of Iran. I now invite IUCN to present the nomination of Arasbaran Protected Area, the Islamic Republic of Iran. But before I give the floor to the Secretariat, Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. We received the factual error notification concerning the evaluation of the Arasbaran Protected Area. This notification is to be found on page 2 of both the English and French versions of document INF. 8B.4.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to IUCN.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. The IUCN evaluation of this property is on page 27 of both the English and French versions of the IUCN evaluation report. IUCN has taken the opportunity to meet the State Party here during the Committee session to clarify its evaluation.

The Arasbaran Protected Area is located in the north of Iran, near the border with Armenia and Azerbaijan. The nominated property covers nearly 58,000 ha, with a buffer zone covering 105,601 ha. As can be seen on the map the nominated property includes five strictly protected areas which cover around 12.4 per cent of the total sites; here in light green, inside the dark green nominated area. The rest of the property comprises areas of mixed land use including areas of farmland, in association with the 47 seven villages which are in the nominated properties.

The changing social demographics are resulting in the abandonment of farmlands, which are regenerating. The nomination reports more than 42,000 nomadic people using the property for traditional animal husbandry.

The nominated property is located at the junction of the Caspian, Caucasian, and Mediterranean climates, and is characterised by high mountains, alpine meadows, semi-desert plains, pastures, and forests. The nomination advances arguments for global significance based on the diversity of its flora, including ten endemic plant species in a very small area. The property does indeed have an impressive flora in the regional context, with 785 species of flowering plants and three notable tree species; Caucasian or Persian Oak, Georgian Oak, and European Hornbeam. However, IUCN concludes the significance is at the national and in some cases regional scale, but not global.

Over 360 vertebrate species are reported at the properties, including numbers of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians and fish, which represent a high percentage of Iran's fauna. The nomination also notes important habitat for several significant mammal species and the diversity of important bird species.

The property and its surroundings have significance in the wider regional ecological context as it lies within the more extensive Arasbaran ecological corridor, which was identified as one of ten priority corridors for conservation outcomes in the Caucasus. However, IUCN considers there are other corridors considered as higher priority for conservation.

The nomination places much emphasis on its hosting of the Persian Leopard. However, the status and trend of this charismatic mammal within the nominated property cannot be presently confirmed. IUCN, based on reference literature and the views of the IUCN Species Survival Commission of Cats' specialist crew concludes it is unlikely the species exists within the property. It is nonetheless an important corridor habitat and potential reintroduction area for this species.

IUCN's evaluation recognises the key part of the biodiversity values within the nominated property with a demonstrability of importance at the national level in terms of high percentages of Iran's fauna and flora. In some cases, the values are clearly of regional significance, but were not considered globally exceptional based on the special analysis and literature review carried out both with regards to criteria (ix) and (x).

IUCN has concluded that the integrity of requirements of the Operational Guidelines in this case has not been met. Only 12.4 per cent of the overall property that lies within the strictly protected areas can be considered to exhibit an adequate level of naturalness and intactness. Despite the encouraging regeneration of abandoned farmland areas, numerous plots of ploughed land remain dispersed among the villages located within the property. The small size of intact lands which are restricted to the protected areas embedded to this overall fragmented and somewhat disturbed landscape did not, in IUCN's opinion, provide adequate integrity.

IUCN also concludes that protection and management requirements are not met. While the protected areas have secured legal protection under the national Act of Conservation and Optimisation of Environment, the vast majority of the nominated property lacks adequate legal protection in relation to species and ecosystems. The nominated property has a complex, multi-agency governance system and adequate management capacity, but lacks an acceptable integrated management plan which would ensure a cohesive approach across the whole property. IUCN also notes the severe financial resource limitations in some aspects of the property's management.

In conclusion, IUCN recommends that the Committee does not inscribe the Arasbaran Protected Area on the World Heritage List. The nominated property's values are highly

significant on the national scale and in some case regionally, but the case has not been made that they are international. Furthermore, and significantly, integrity requirements were not met and significant concerns relate to protection and management.

The draft decision, madam Chair, is set out on page 7 of the English and French versions of working document 8B. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any comments or we move on to the Rapporteur? I now give the floor to Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much Chair. Australia considers the biodiversity of Arasbaran Protected Area of very high regional significance and home to a significant level of plant and animal diversity. We noted the property was also included in UNESCO’s Biosphere Reserve. However, as pointed out by UCN, only 12 per cent of the overall nominated areas remain fully in a substantial natural condition. The nominated property does not overlap with any protective areas considered to be the most irreplaceable in the world for the conservation of birds, mammals and reptiles. Also, while there is important regional plant diversity, the property is relatively low in threatened and endemic species.

We encourage the State Party to continue to enhance the effective management of the area within the global network of UNESCO Biosphere Reserves. We consider that this is the appropriate mechanism for the international recognition of this protected area. Australia supports the draft decision not to inscribe the property on the World Heritage List. We consider the property supports ecological processes, biodiversity and endemism of regional rather than global significance. Australia does not support the proposed amendment to refer the property.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Bahrain.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. To follow up on the comments made by Australia, we second what was said. We commend Iran for presenting a natural site and we commend them for their effort and bringing it to the attention of the Committee. As said by IUCN and Australia, this site is of regional significance and fell short in demonstrating its global significance.

If I may refer to the draft decision and the amendment circulated to us, there has been a call for a referral to focus on a couple of different elements. The first is to restrict the discussion on criterion (x) and I call on the members of the Committee to actually focus on the criteria of the discussion. I think it is one of the easiest criteria to justify when it comes to natural sites because there are many tools that can assess the contribution to the Outstanding Universal Value. The nomination dossier has mentioned the IUCN Red List on numerous occasions and it has said that some of these species are of least concern on the global scale. We believe that the nomination, if referred, would limit the opportunity for the State Party to demonstrate that there are certain species within the boundaries of their property.

There are other elements related to the percentage of endemic species in the property. We believe that has not been demonstrated. Certainly, some of the species are endemic at the national or regional level, but they are not consistent with the boundary of the site and I hope that the Committee will take into account this critical element.

With regard to the Persian leopard mentioned in the amendments, I think we should be cautious when mentioning flagship species, because we often see that IUCN expressed uncertain confirmation with regard to its availability and presence in the property boundaries as well. Just to keep this in mind, as we go through the amendments tabled. We are in support of Australia's proposal to maintain the draft decision in its original format.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, first of all, we wish to welcome the constructive dialogue between the State Party and IUCN regarding this nomination file. The whole concept of the World Heritage is supposed to come in a spirit of dialogue. Arasbaran Protected Area is indeed one of the unique natural sites in the world, within which a number of endemic and threatened species thrive. According to the report of IUCN, some doubts exist about the Outstanding Universal Value and the criteria proposed by the State Party of Iran.

Madam Chair, however, according to the additional information as well as the clarifications made by the State Party, the nominated property is characterised by considerable biological richness, containing 1,071 plant taxa, 10 endemic plant species, and 47 almost unique syntaxa in terms of their floristic composition. The migration routes of million of birds, a total of 15 globally threatened animal species, among which is the charismatic and globally known Persian leopard, ensures one of the highest bird diversity values in the world, as clarified in the comparative analysis.

It also shows the occurrence of the broadest *Juniperadacima* woodland as well as the southernmost distribution of this tree within the northern hemisphere, represents the last refuge of Caucasian Black Grouse in the northern hemisphere and provides occurrence of 61 plants species originating from Caucasian, Turkish and European areas that grow within the property.

We are fast convinced that based on the above-mentioned biological features the nominated property has the potential to meet the requirements to be placed under criterion (x). As for the need for an integrated management plan, including a farmland relocation programme, the third party has provided sufficient information about the commencement of the relocation.

The wish and the decision of the relevant authorities to continue with this relocation programme will ultimately clear the property from this issue in supporting the integrity of the property.

Madam Chair, Zimbabwe submitted an amendment to the Secretariat proposing the referral of the nomination, so that the State Party is able to continue the relocation programme so that all farmlands are abandoned while the stakeholders are encouraged to contribute to the conservation process and to continue monitoring and transformation of the

areas of the relocated farmlands, to take inter-naturally functioning ecosystems and the foreseen positive impacts on the area's biodiversity and finally to continue monitoring threatened animal species and in particular the Persian Leopard.

I submit madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary would like to congratulate the State Party of Iran for its efforts to protect and enhance the natural values of the Arasbaran Biosphere Reserve. However, the Hungarian delegation takes this opportunity to draw the attention of the distinguished Committee to Paragraph 23 of the Operational Guidelines, according to which the Committee decisions should be based on objective and scientific considerations.

Based on the detailed assessment and evaluation made by the Advisory Bodies, and considering the supplementary information provided by the State Party, Hungary is not fully convinced of the potential of the nominated property to meet criterion (x). Furthermore, as it was presented by the Advisory Bodies, there are several shortcomings identified in relation to the integrity and management of the nominated property. Therefore, Hungary suggests that the nominated property is deferred to the State Party for substantial revision.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Chair, my delegation takes notes of the critical issues highlighted by IUCN that may not favour the survival of the site and its biodiversity. However, we recognise the commitment of the State Party in freeing it from encroachment to a greater extent; an indicator that the State Party is willing to implement the recommendations of the decision of this Committee. We need to note that this area is the last refuge for the survival of some biodiversity and also has an improved management plan.

Considering this analysis, we prefer the view that this property is not inscribed but referred, as proposed by Zimbabwe. We submit.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Madam Chair. We recognise and appreciate the efforts made by the State Party to protect the Arasbaran Protected Area, which also is internationally recognised as a

Biosphere Reserve. However, as pointed out by IUCN in their presentation, the comparative analysis does not support inscription on criteria (ix) or (x) and the integrity and the protection management of the nominated property do not meet the requirements of the Operational Guidelines.

Therefore, the delegation of Norway seconds the view expressed by Australia and Bahrain. We also support the original draft decision. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Dear members of the Committee, Arasbaran Protected Area, despite the conditions of its Outstanding Universal Value, is an area where are found endemic, rare and threatened species with several unique taxa and the most extensive juniper woodlands in the world and is also a place on the migratory route of birds. This biodiversity represents a strong element which makes the nominated property eligible for *in-situ* conservation.

China is convinced that this property fully justifies the criteria and therefore supports the draft amendment proposed by Zimbabwe to refer this property back to the State Party for further study.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. We have a slight problem. We recognised the detailed analysis made by the State Party, but the information provided and I am referring to the document INF8. B.2 English version on page 31 says: *'the analysis of the Advisory Bodies confirms the greatest diversity of plants and animals than other sites inscribed on the World Heritage List'*. This is an open door for the State Party to base the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. Therefore we support the amendment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam chair. We congratulate the work of the State Party for the preparation of the Arasbaran Protected Area nomination in the spirit of collaboration with IUCN. The result of this process has been considered by IUCN as insufficient justification for

nomination. The nominated property is located at the junction of the Caspian, Caucasian, and Mediterranean climates, and is characterised by high mountains, alpine meadows and other ecosystems.

The nominated property and its surroundings have significance in the wider region's ecological context within the wider Arasbaran ecological corridor, which was identified by the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund as one of ten priority corridors for conservation outcomes in the Caucasus. These corridors were defined on the basis of the presence of globally threatened species and intact habitats.

The Arasbaran Corridor includes the nominated property and is described as comprising important mountain habitats for the Persian Leopard which are closely relevant with other forests which are on the tentative List of World Heritage. This fact also opens transboundary cooperation for the future in context of collaboration with a UNESCO label.

Madam Chair, on the point of concerns, the need for an integrated management plan and the information provided by the State Party shows that a process of relocation of all agricultural activities in the premises of the protected area has already started.

Azerbaijan supports the amendment proposed by Zimbabwe for the referral of this nomination, which will help the State Party fulfil the requirements pointed out by IUCN.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis commends the State Party of Iran for the effort made to protect the natural value of the Arasbaran Protected Area. The great biodiversity, which includes several endemic species and which vegetation has survived from the ice age period deserves continuing protection and conservation.

Based on the additional information from the State Party, Saint Kitts and Nevis supports the draft decision to refer the property back to the State Party and to address concerns raised by IUCN regarding the management of the site. Thank you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I would like to speak to the consistency that we spoke on several times in this Committee. Spain, in light of the report of the Advisory Bodies and also in light of our own report and having taken a close look at this proposal, despite the great landscape diversity, it is not clear how this project complies with the criteria. There might be some doubt about criterion (x) but it has not been proven for its Outstanding Universal Value. Moreover, the integrity has not been proven either, because it is a fragmented site. The state of conservation has also shown that there is no management plan, which is fundamental for conservation.

Therefore, we would like to stick to the initial draft decision. We think we have to be fully aware that we are not in a bubble; all the decisions we take on a site, cultural or natural, must be consistent with the others. Therefore, Spain, in light of the documentation presented and the comments made, would prefer the initial proposal of non- inscription to be adopted. That will not prevent the State from continuing to work on the site. We are in favour of non-inscription.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie félicite l'État partie et les Organisations consultatives. À la lecture du dossier et à partir des informations complémentaires, la Tunisie est convaincue que ce site possède une valeur universelle exceptionnelle potentielle et qu'une révision du dossier permettrait d'appuyer cette valeur universelle exceptionnelle. C'est pourquoi la Tunisie se joint et appuie la proposition d'amendement présentée par le Zimbabwe et demande le renvoi.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur to explain the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. As you heard, I received amendments on the draft decision submitted by Zimbabwe, Guatemala, Azerbaijan, China and Uganda. While the original draft decision would not inscribe the site on the World Heritage List, the amendment would instead refer the nomination back to the State Party.

Madam Chair, during the debate we have heard conflicting views, with some Committee members supporting the original draft decision, others supporting the amendment and one intervention would ask for deferral of this nomination. Before we proceed to the substance of the amendment, I wish to ask the Committee, through you, which way we go with these options?”

The Chairperson:

“So, how would you like to proceed? I am asking the Committee.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Let me just repeat. To prove the Outstanding Universal Value, the timeframe would not be sufficient with a referral. Therefore, we think more work is needed for the dossier. If there is potential based on criterion (x) then, they can come back. There are

several possibilities; some countries have withdrawn their dossier or have come back and presented again.

We have to be very clear. The decision that we take here implies a series of obligations on the part of the States Parties and Members of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies, but above all the State Party must prepare very extensive and painstaking documentation. I mentioned Article 23 a few days ago in this respect.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. The question at hand here is not whether the property warrants or needs continuing protection, as has been mentioned, because a place does not need to be inscribed on the World Heritage List to be protected. The question is whether the property has Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and required management. Assessment from IUCN said none of this has been demonstrated and we must agree with their assessment.

We would like to know from IUCN whether they see any glimmer of hope that Outstanding Universal Value might be able to be demonstrated for the nominated property. It would need to be a strong glimmer indeed to agree to defer this property for the Committee, let alone to agree on the proposed amendment for referral. We must be careful in making decisions that hold out false hope for the State Party of Iran, the sincerity and integrity of which is in no way under question and I must emphasise that.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN, please.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. I have to first respond to the distinguished delegate of Cuba, who raised an issue in relation to our report. I am not sure whether it was a question. In the interests of clarification, the full context of that point is that around the analysis which confirms that Arasbaran Protected Area is home to plants and animal diversity compared to other sites already on the list, but in overall terms it has a relatively low level of threats and endemic species and the nominated property was not noted to overlap with highly irreplaceable areas. Just by way of clarification, to put that in context.

IUCN has very carefully analysed this property, a normal working method we undertake with the cooperation of the World Conservation Monitoring Centre with special analysis and also very thorough literature analysis. We have been provided with information here and had discussions which we had not had the opportunity to evaluate; we would make that point.

I think IUCN would like to reiterate that its recommendation to the Committee not to inscribe the property is based on the property not meeting the three pillars of Outstanding Universal Value, recalling that if any of these is not in place, Outstanding Universal Value

cannot be found. In this case, we strongly contend that none of those three pillars are met. This is a heavily modified cultural landscape within which a number of core protected areas exist and we think that it is appropriately recognised as a biosphere reserve.

I think, if I may, the Committee is of the potential that this property has a chance to meet one of the biodiversity criteria it would be (x). IUCN would strongly counsel against using referral to do this, for the reason that deferral would be the appropriate mechanism if the Committee was of the mind to undertake the quite substantive revision that would be needed for this property to identify and understand in more depth the values and really to consider boundary design changes which might reconfigure the property.

We concluded quite clearly in our evaluation of the property that it has high biodiversity values within Iran and in some cases regionally. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to thank the Advisory Body of IUCN for this clarification as well as for their advice on this matter. I also listened very carefully to what the distinguished delegate of Spain said in terms of the amount of time required to draw out the potential in this property. I would like to ask at this stage if you would give the State Party an opportunity to give this information that we keep hearing about, the additional data provided, but not to all members of the Committee.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, you have the floor.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. We thank the State Party and the Advisory Bodies. The State Party of Kuwait, after hearing the response from IUCN on the question asked by the delegation of Australia, thinks it is appropriate to go to the option of deferral, like the State of Hungary mentioned.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, you have the floor.”

Bosnia- Herzegovina:

“Thank you very much madam President. Bosnia-Herzegovina thinks that there is a basis for the development of that dossier. We think that maybe the most realistic approach

would be the approach which has just been suggested by our colleagues from Kuwait and Hungary; that the Committee adopt a decision that would be in favour of deferral.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the State Party to clarify.”

Iran:

“Thank you very much, madam Chair. Arasbaran Protected Area, although it is comparatively a small region, it has one of the richest flora, several unique syntaxa as well as endemic plants and animals and the most expansive juniper woodland in the world. Moreover, the property represents the last refuge of Caucasian Black Grouse and others. These are the specific features that give the Arasbaran Protected Area global significance and thus Outstanding Universal Value.

Furthermore, the existence of 15 threatened animal species, some of the them critically endangered, endemic plant species, as well as being one of the most suitable habitats for the Persian Leopard, make it much more significant and worthy of World Heritage status.

We firmly believe that it fully meets the requirements for criterion (x). The State Party would like to strongly commend IUCN for its meticulous and detailed examination of the nomination file. We would also like to thank IUCN for their willingness and dialogue with the State Party during the entire evaluation process. We have indeed had several communications with IUCN, including a Skype meeting and a face-to-face dialogue later here in Bahrain.

However, we still have differences of opinion. One issue is the question of integrity, maybe due to the farm lands within the property. However, as explained in the additional information document, the State Party is determined to relocate these farmlands and has already started this process. Major parts of this process have already been done. There are 42 villages within the property with 2,000 inhabitants, 3,400 ha out of which 1,340 ha are remaining.

We believe that the nominated site, having met the requirements of integrity and management and therefore criterion (x) is worthy of referral, so that the State Party will be able to adjust the minor modifications and changes needed in close collaboration with IUCN and bring the file back to the attention of the World Heritage Committee for inscription. This will certainly empower the process of protection of this important site.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, do you want to have the floor?”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, in the interest of consensus and to move forward on this matter, I would like to support the proposal by Kuwait and Hungary for deferral of this property. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Chair, when you look at the issues that are highlighted and the amount of work that Iran has to do on site, we think a deferral is actually very appropriate.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. We also support the final version of deferral.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, please.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We also support the proposal for deferral. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Although China thinks that this nomination justifies the Outstanding Universal Value and after listening to the statement of the parties concerned and especially Iran, China also joins members like Zimbabwe to give a deferral.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Guatemala, please.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. For the sake of consensus, Guatemala agrees with deferral as well. Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, après avoir écouté l’UICN et l’État partie nous sommes d’avis qu’il y a des défis importants que l’État partie doit relever, notamment en ce qui concerne la gestion de ce bien. Nous sommes d’avis que le dossier soit différé ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Pour aller vers le consensus, la Tunisie se joint à la proposition du Koweït et demande un différé. Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Having heard the Committee and the comment of the State Party of Iran, Saint Kitts and Nevis also supports the deferral.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think that there is a consensus. The Rapporteur, please”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. After having heard the floor it seems that there is a strong support for the deferral of this nomination. Accordingly, you will see on the screen that we will put up an option for that. I would also like to suggest adding a final paragraph for this draft decision. The usual sentence we have in deferred nominations:

‘Considers that any revised nomination would need to be considered by an expert mission to the site’.

Thank you very much. You now have on the screen the draft decision with the amendments that would defer instead of refer and then for the rest we have left the modification that was submitted with the original amendment of referral.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair. Just to assess the citation of this matter by the Committee and noting the significant grounds towards deferral of the property, Australia would be able to support that proposition, but we would like to see as part of that a deferral point added into the decision. It would be a new ‘a’. It would state simply: *‘Provide clear technical justification for Outstanding Universal Value and integrity.’*”

If the Committee was happy to accept that addition to this draft text then Australia would be happy to support in kind the deferral.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? There are none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.7 adopted as amended. I give the floor to the State Party of Iran.”

Iran:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Although it was not our favourite result, with respect to the decision of the Committee and the time spent on it, we firmly believe that this natural site has Outstanding Universal Value; we are determined to continue our efforts to make it so that we can bring it back to the Committee for its real unique values.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Let us move on to the next site, in the Russian Federation. I now invite IUCN to present the extension of the Central Sikhote-Alin, Russian Federation, to include the Bikin River Valley. IUCN you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN’s evaluation of Bikin River Valley is on page 51 of the English version of the IUCN report and 53 of the French. The Bikin River Valley National Park is nominated under criterion (x) as a serial extension of the existing Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage, which is a serial site. The nominated extension covers 1,160,469 ha.

The Bikin River Valley National Park is located approximately 80 to 100 km to the north of the Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage site. The nominated extension is almost three times larger than the existing Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage site, which was inscribed as a serial property under criterion (x) in 2001, and has a total area of 406,349 ha, comprised of two components,

The Sikhote-Alin Mountains are located in the South-East of the Russian Far East, northeast of Vladivostok. The nominated extension is on the western slope of the Sikhote-Alin Mountain, which is distinct from the existing property in terms of relief, climate, vegetation, landscape and also more biodiversity. It includes a vast area of practically undisturbed mountain taiga landscapes, almost completely forested with traces of ancient glaciations and volcanism. In particular, it contains one of the largest and best-preserved broadleaf and pine-broadleaf far-eastern forests, the Ussuriyskaya Taiga.

The fauna, in the proposed extension, combines species from the taiga, found among the Okhotsk-Kamchatka flora, with representatives of southern Manchurian species. Faunal diversity comprises 52 mammals, 241 birds, 7 amphibians, 10 reptiles and 48 inland water fish species, including a full range of mammalian and avian apex predators. Threatened animal species present include mammals such as the Amur tiger, Musk deer and Himalayan black bear. The nominated property is considered one of the last reliable shelters of the Amur tiger. Over 90 per cent of the remaining population of Amur tigers are reported to be found in the Sikhote-Alin Mountain region. In addition, the national park has a very unusual bird species composition and ecological structure, with 241 bird species belonging to 17 families. IUCN is therefore clear that the nominated extension holds globally significant biodiversity values which complement those within the existing Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage site.

The property enjoys strong protection as a result of its status as a national park. The boundaries follow the watershed boundaries of the middle and upper Bikin River and the nominated property falls entirely within the administrative boundaries of the Pozharsky District, an administrative unit of the Primorsky Krai. The buffer zone has not yet been fully configured, a significant issue due to land use pressure from industrial areas and from industrial logging. Buffer zone delineation is also important for facilitating coordination with and connectivity to nearby protected areas which will likely have to be integrated to planning for key wild activities for species, including the Amur tiger.

The nomination also lacks the detailed analysis of the threat to the essential ecological connections and functional linkages between the extension and the existing site. There are also other protected areas nearby adjacent to the existing property and the proposed extension that arguably deserve to be examined as future components.

In addition, at present there is no complete and adopted management plan for the nominated extension. An outline of the management plan was proposed in the nomination but was not yet complete at the time of the evaluation. IUCN has been advised by the Russian coordinator for the nomination in a meeting, here in Bahrain, that the draft management plan has been completed. A fully developed management plan should consider existing inscribed components and the proposed extension and should be based on adequate levels of ecological and land use baselines, as well as clearly- defined access and resources use prescription, especially for local people. In addition, there is currently no vision for an integrated approach to manage the separate components of the serial property or for linkages to nearby protected areas.

Finally, although management capacity on the ground appears to be scaling up since the creation of the national park, there are also indications that staffing and funding are not yet sufficient for such a large area.

In summary, while the nominated extension holds significant globally biodiverse values in a large area of exceptional ecological integrity, IUCN recommends the World

Heritage Committee refers the Bikin River Valley National Park to the World Heritage List under criterion (x) pending the configuration of the buffer zone and the completion of the fully integrated Management Plan.

The draft decision is set out on page of 8 of the French and English versions of working document 8B. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary, before this morning’s session, submitted an amendment to the draft decision which has not been distributed to the Committee members. First, I would like, if you can allow me, to briefly introduce this amendment to the Committee members.

The World Heritage Committee inscribed the Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage site back in 2001 and now it has a more stable, significant boundary modification to this site, the Bikin River Valley. The State Party established the national park on the area of the nominated extension in 2015. The nominated extension is extremely large, covering almost 1.2 million ha and coincides with the boundary of the Bikin national park. It covers substantial areas of intact forest and represents a significant increase in both scale and ecological representativeness of the protected areas, in addition to the already-inscribed property. The property holds globally significant values both in terms of fauna and flora. The nominated extension enjoys a high level of protection, as was described in detail by the Advisory Bodies.

It is evident that significant efforts and important steps have been taken to communicate and negotiate with stakeholders in preparation for the establishment of the Bikin national park, harvesting and use rights were negotiated and granted to indigenous groups well before the establishment of the National Park. As a result, a Committee for indigenous issues has been set out within the National Park’s administration and it seems to be functional.

At present, there is no complete and adopted Management Plan for the nominated extension, thus the requirements for inclusion on the World Heritage are not properly in place. However, there is a draft available of the foreseen Management Plan which is an important basis for an effective Management Plan.

Also encouraging are the efforts and achievements made by the National Park administration in terms of the engagement of local people, law enforcement and management of capacity-building. The Hungarian delegation appreciates the efforts made by the State Party to set out a Management Plan for the nominated extension. Based on these arguments, Hungary has submitted an amendment to Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.9, in order to approve the significant boundary modification of the Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage site of the Russian Federation to include the Bikin River Valley in the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China thanks IUCN for the high quality summary report on the nomination of Bikin River Valley. As stated by IUCN, the biodiversity of the proposed extension is evidently of global significance and this extension would be an important addition to the natural values of the existing World Heritage site of Central Sikhote-Alin.

Therefore China would like to join Hungary in approving the extension of the Central Sikhote-Alin World Heritage site to include the Bikin River Valley on the World Heritage List.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Azerbaijan would like to thank the Advisory Bodies, IUCN, the World Heritage Centre and the State Party for their efforts during the nomination file’s preparation and assessment.

The area holds significant biodiversity values. A wide spectrum of altitudinal belts are well-developed in the nominated property, including a mountain tundra belt, a forest belt of dwarf Siberian Pines, a forest belt of Erman birch, a fir-spruce forest belt, a spruce-pine forest belt, and a pine-broadleaf forest belt. The fauna of Bikin River Valley combines species from the taiga, found among the Okhotsk-Kamchatka flora, with representatives of southern Manchurian species.

A good example of adequate management of the extension of the property is clear. According to these facts, Azerbaijan would like to support the amendments proposed by Hungary.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, please.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. We recognise the fact that this property is a very specific area of over 1 million ha, one of the most intact and...”

The Chairperson:

“I am sorry, there is a point of order. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I am very sorry and I apologise to the distinguished delegate for interrupting the floor. It is very difficult for us to hear a proposition for a change in a decision to inscribe the property when we do not have the possibility to see the text. It has not been circulated electronically to Committee members through the website. It would be good to actually see it. It is on the screen now.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, go ahead Uganda and apologies.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair. The biodiversity of the area is very high and diverse. Uganda recognises it and we agree that it satisfies criterion (x). With regard to management, protection and integrity, the property enjoys a high level of legal protection, dedicated staffing offers opportunities for community employment and economic benefits. The financial capabilities are very high, with an annual budget of \$US 780,000.

Madam Chair, the Park has acquired a buffer zone of 129,509 ha. I think this can be considered a good beginning. The local people and the indigenous community are also fully involved. Madam Chair, the gaps linked to connect with the already-inscribed property is a long-time programme which has already commenced through buffer zone establishment.

Madam Chair, the delegation of Uganda is of the view that the site is to be inscribed together with an already approved site so that the boundaries are changed, helping the protection of endemic areas threatened and relict biodiversity. The issues pointed out by IUCN can be considered as additional information that the State Party will require to provide in subsequent reports.

The delegation of Uganda therefore invites the State Party to take note of the issues outlined by IUCN and put in place strategies to implement them. I submit Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente. La Tunisie considère que ce Comité connaît bien ce site, puisque c’est un site déjà classé et que la demande de l’État partie de l’étendre à la Vallée de la rivière Bikin se justifie aux yeux des éléments qui ont été présentés tant dans le rapport technique que dans les précisions des autres États parties.

Nous considérons qu’il y a de fortes présomptions, vu l’État actuel du site, que l’État partie est à même de répondre aux problèmes soulevés dans le rapport d’évaluation. La Tunisie pour cette raison appuie le projet d’amendement de la Hongrie et souligne à l’État partie notre souci que celui-ci prenne toutes les mesures pour garantir la connectivité des espaces de vie du tigre de l’Amour.

Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Kyrgyzstan delegation commends the State Party for the extension of Central Sikhote-Alin in order to include the Bikin Valley River and we support the amendment from Hungary.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, the delegation of Zimbabwe would like to commend the State Party of Russia for the proposal to extend the boundaries of its property, Central Sikhote-Alin, to encompass the Bikin River Valley. The serial nomination is said to be the most important intact and effectively protected forest on the western slope of the Sikhote-Alin Mountains and increases the inscribed property in terms of size and richness of biodiversity.

The site has clearly demonstrated its qualification for inscription under criterion (x). This extension of the property would ensure an increase in spatial conservation, which is key to encouraging the persistence of wide-ranging species such as the Amur tiger, which is under threat of extinction.

The Advisory Bodies noted that the buffer zone configuration was not satisfactory. Engagement with the Advisory Bodies in this aspect is encouraged. It is our hope that they can conclude with this to ensure the conservation of the biodiversity and its elements.

Madam Chair, we are pleased to note that efforts have been put to engage communities in the structure of governance at the local level. The State Party is being encouraged to continue with this approach and we wish success in the finalisation of the integrated management plan.

Zimbabwe therefore supports the amended Draft Decision by Hungary. I submit madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Brazil recognises the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and the management efforts made by the Russian government. Furthermore, Brazil welcomes the increasing number of natural sites in the World Heritage List.

However, Brazil would be more comfortable if the site had already presented its integrated Management Plan. According to Brazilian law, a national park is not yet ready for any activities without an integrated Management Plan. In accordance to our own law, it is very hard to approve anything of any property before we know what integrated Management Plan is set forth for that property. Therefore, we would prefer to see that document done, before we can finish this discussion.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Cuba would like to congratulate the State Party for the additional information that really facilitated discussion and also when it comes to protection and management of the property, we would like to take due note of the information provided by IUCN, which also facilitated our assessment. We do not want to repeat what was said previously, but we do want to reiterate that we can support the Hungarian proposal.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, I would like to apologise, because we did receive these amendments, but they were not distributed in a timely fashion. I do understand how important it is for the Committee to be able to take a look at these amendments, especially when they are of a substantial nature. Again, I wish to apologise.

Hungary has submitted amendments and we heard general support for this from the speakers. The general draft decision would have referred the significant boundary modification of this site back to the State Party. The proposed amendments would instead approve this significant boundary modification.

Logically now, in paragraph 3, we have a provisional statement of Outstanding Universal Value as well as an assessment of the conditions of integrity. We also have new paragraph 4 with recommendations that were formerly under paragraph 2 and we have two new paragraphs at the end of the decision. One of them would request the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre the integrated Management Plan by 1st of February, 2019, and the last paragraph requests an updated report on the state of conservation of the property to be examined by the World Heritage Committee at its 44th session in 2020. These are the amendments that we have received.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? Tanzania, please”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair. My delegation supports the amendments as proposed by Hungary. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.9 adopted as amended. Our last site is in France.

I now invite IUCN to present the nomination of the Chaîne des Puys – Limagne fault tectonic arena, France. The draft decision concerning this nomination can be found in document 8B.Add. IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN’s evaluation of Chaîne des Puys – Limagne fault tectonic arena is on page 3 of the French and English versions of the Add IUCN report. The nominated property has been under consideration by the Committee through two referral processes over the course of a five-year period. The Property before the Committee has undergone several substantive changes from the original nomination in 2013 and was considered by the 38th Committee session in 2014. We will offer several observations on this later.

The Chaîne des Puys – Limagne fault tectonic arena, France, is nominated essentially in the same configuration as previously; however, two active quarries have now been excised from the nominated area and included within two small internal buffer zones. As a result, the nominated area has been slightly reduced to some 27 ha and the buffer zone has consequently increased.

The property is nominated with a new name and amended criteria, now only advanced under criterion (viii). The attributes of the site advanced in support of criterion (viii) are Plateau des Dômes, remnant of the ancient Hercynian mountain chain; the 30-km-long Limagne fault escarpment as the expression of continental break-up, subsidence and sedimentation which took place between 37 and 25 Ma (million years ago) and the inverted relief of the Montagne de la Serre, an important expression of the uplift phase. These elements have been reinterpreted in the new information to present a different approach to the site’s claimed Outstanding Universal Value.

Following the Committee’s 2016 referral decision, IUCN did do a process of dialogue with the State Party to clarify the previously unfavourable evaluation, including issues related to a confused foundation for Outstanding Universal Value and the nomination, the perceived weaknesses in the previous comparative analysis methodologies and the diverging views clearly evident within the scientific community on the global significance of the nominated property.

While not prejudging the case for Outstanding Universal Value, IUCN provided advice on the principle considerations, which the State Party needed to account for in reframing the case. Lastly, advice was provided on the issue of related principles of criteria, criterion-specific integrity and aspects of protection and management.

The State Party has undertaken a fundamental revision of the framing of the property's global geological value to focus less on the assembly of individual features of continental rifting to one where the Outstanding Universal Value is expressed as a simpler and more cohesive story of how these elements together express the continual break up process. To textualise this, the State Party developed a convincing conceptual narrative to understand how the planetary scale phenomenon of continental drifting could be represented on the World Heritage List.

The list was backed by peer reviews, comparative analysis methodology which was new, to justify why the property represents a global example of this phenomena, illustrating the complete sequence of this process that gives rise to continental break-up.

In the evaluation, IUCN drew upon a significant number of fresh reviews from experts in this field of geology. Some reviewers had previously experienced with this nomination and revised their views while others considered this property for the first time. As we elaborated in the evaluation report, the nominated property continues to generate diverse scientific views within the specialist geological community. The IUCN recommendation reflects the majority of views within the majority, but it should be noted that the property continues to create polarised scientific opinion.

IUCN notes that the removal of criterion (vii) from the nomination changes the integrity parameters of this site, as the values are now restricted to the large scale geological features as the expression of the continental drifting processes. Such landscape scale features a robust and resilience to impact; however, care would be needed to prevent any impact from extractive industry. In this regard, IUCN welcomes assurances by the State Party that no new quarrying permits will be issued and that active quarrying in the two excised areas will be progressively phased out by 2030 at the latest. IUCN also notes care will be required to maintain the legibility of the geological landscape, which is central to the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The State Party has clarified a number of protection and management issues and provided an update on welcome measures to raise awareness among private land owners of the property and to strengthen the protection regime. IUCN is satisfied that the requirements of the Operational Guidelines have been met with respect to the property being inscribed under criterion (viii). IUCN recommends the World Heritage Centre inscribe the property on the World Heritage List under criterion (viii).

In closing, madam Chair, IUCN would bring to this Committee's attention, its deepest concern regarding the misuse of the referral mechanism, in this case on two occasions. The nominated property before this session of the Committee has a new name, new boundaries, changed criteria and a conceptually recast framework of Outstanding Universal Value supported by new comparative analysis. In IUCN's view, the deferral mechanism would have been a far more appropriate way to provide the time and dialogue needed to address the fundamental revision to the nominated property. The consequence has been the disproportion of resources applied in this contracted timeframe to this protracted evaluation. A practice that, should it continue, risks diverting attention from other priorities with a view to achieving a balanced World Heritage List, consistent with the 1994 Global Strategy.

The draft decision is set out on page 1 of both English and French working documents 8B. Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Unless you have any objections, we will adopt the decision and we give the floor to France to speak. There are amendments. Do you have any objections? Tunisia, please."

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, on aurait aimé que la parole soit donnée à la Russie à la fin de la dernière décision comme cela a été fait pour les autres délégations ».

The Chairperson:

“I will give the floor to Russia after the adoption of this decision in order not to mix the items. Thank you. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.10 adopted.

Je donne la parole à la France et après la Fédération de Russie. Merci ».

France :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. La France voudrait d'abord remercier les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial pour leur décision. C'est en effet l'un des sites les plus importants qui illustre les grands processus tectoniques de la terre qui vient d'être inscrit. Je voudrais ajouter que ce site est à d'un point de vue un exemple et un modèle sur le fond et dans la méthode. C'est par un dialogue exigeant et bienveillant avec l'UICN parrainé par le Centre du patrimoine mondial que nous avons obtenu ce remarquable résultat.

Je veux maintenant donner la parole au président du département du Puy-de-Dôme ».

Président du département du Puy-de-Dôme :

« Merci madame la présidente, mesdames et messieurs les membres du Comité, merci chacun d'entre vous pour l'adoption de la résolution que vous venez de faire voter ou adopter plus exactement. Je m'exprime au nom de tous les acteurs de ce lieu emblématique la Chaîne des Puys - faille de Limagne qui se sont engagés au quotidien dans sa préservation et sa valorisation. Je sais qu'ils sont nombreux à suivre ce Comité, je tiens à les remercier chaleureusement, car ils se sont mobilisés pour bâtir cette candidature.

Cette candidature a connu de nombreux encouragements de personnalités scientifiques et aussi politiques et je voudrais souligner l'encouragement que nous a apporté le président de la République, Emmanuel Macron, qui nous a donné véritablement le coup de pouce nécessaire pour poursuivre cette action.

Votre assemblée a décidé d'inscrire aujourd'hui un nouveau site tectonique. C'est une catégorie peu présente sur la Liste, car difficile à appréhender. Il s'agit pourtant de phénomène qui façonne cette planète. Nous sommes évidemment conscients du devoir qui nous est fait maintenant pour pouvoir continuer, comme nous l'avons fait avec le plan de gestion que nous avons à engager, à assurer l'intégrité de ce bien.

Merci à tous et à toutes. »

The Chairperson:

“Félicitations pour la France. Now, I give the floor to the Russian Federation.”

Fédération de Russie :

« Merci madame la présidente de ne pas discriminer notre délégation. Puisque je prends la parole pour la première et la dernière fois, j'aimerais tout d'abord exprimer nos vifs remerciements au Royaume de Bahreïn pour son hospitalité et l'excellente organisation de ce Comité. Je remercie également les membres du Comité pour la décision d'inclure la vallée de la rivière Bikine sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Je pense que c'est l'aboutissement logique et tout à fait justifié d'un long processus commencé en 2001 lorsque le Sikhote-Alin central a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. À ce moment-là, il n'y avait aucun doute sur la richesse et la biodiversité extraordinaires de cette région. L'État partie a suivi fidèlement les recommandations de l'UNESCO pour préparer l'élargissement de ce site.

Actuellement toutes ces recommandations fondamentales sont remplies. En même temps, nous partageons pleinement les recommandations exprimées par l'UNESCO en ce qui concerne la création de la zone tampon et aussi l'amélioration du plan de gestion existant.

Je pense que la décision qui a été prise aujourd'hui va encourager les autorités locales et l'administration du parc national de la Vallée de la rivière Bikine pour faire le travail qui reste au plus vite.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Before we close dear colleagues, as you know item 7 is still up for examination, as well as the state of conservation of Socotra under 7A. I would propose to deal with these matters at the beginning of our afternoon session, immediately after completion of item 8 for which we still have to examine one nomination, several boundary modifications, as well as statements of Outstanding Universal Value and sub- items 8D and 8E. Do you agree with this?

Thank you very much, see you this afternoon, but an announcement first.”

Secretariat:

“Thank you madam Chair. A very short announcement and the last announcement for a side event. It will take place in room Hawar from 1:00 pm, Life beyond Tourism, the promotion of World Heritage by the Training for Dialogue Among Cultures in World Heritage Sites organised by the Fondazione Romualdo del Bianco.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

End of the July 2, 2018, morning session

EIGHTH DAY – Monday 2 July 2018

FIFTEENTH SESSION

3 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“As agreed this morning, we will now examine the nomination of several boundary modifications, as well as statements of Outstanding Universal Value and sub- items 8D and 8E. We will then examine the state of conservation of Socotra, Yemen and the general decision on item 7. Following this, I propose to examine item 11 concerning the draft policy compendium, item 12B on governance and then 10A on periodic reporting. Finally, we will examine item 8C which concerns the update of the World Heritage List and World Heritage List in Danger. Thank you.

We will deal now with the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania. Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to inform the Committee that on the 28th of June, we received a letter from Romania where it is stated that the Romanian government requests the nomination file to be examined during the current session to be referred. As you know, Roşia Montană Mining Landscape is currently recommended for inscription. However, article 11.3 of the Convention mentions that the inclusion of a property on the World Heritage List requires the consent of the State concerned.

Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. As the information provided by the Secretariat before the presentation of the evaluation of this nomination is very relevant for the conduct of this debate, with the permission of the Committee, before opening the debate, I would like to invite the concerned State Party to provide us with more in-depth information about their request. Is there any objection? We have four requests for the floor. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Firstly, I should indicate that Australia has no objection at all to hearing from the State Party of Romania and indeed I think the Committee’s consideration would be quietly facilitated by hearing from the State Party. While it would not be in alignment with the usual practice, I think given the sensitivity of the issues at hand, it would be hopeful for the Committee to hear from the State Party by the way of explanation as to their request for the referral at the outset of their consideration.

The second thing I would like to flag is that we will have a question for the legal advisor about the framing of the current draft amendment and I will pose the question now; perhaps the legal advisor can then contemplate it and come back once we have heard from the State Party.

The question is: is it within the scope of the Committee to make a decision to refer on the basis of a request that referral be made due to the fact that there is an arbitration under way, or is the Committee really only able to make a decision that sits within the scope of the Operational Guidelines and the Convention itself? Just to clarify whether we can take a decision that references the arbitration or whether we should really be adhering very clearly to the bounds of the Operational Guidelines.

Thank you”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chair. I appreciate the input from my colleague from Australia so I postpone my comment to after hearing from the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please”

Hungary:

“Madam Chair, I will comment on the case. I do not know whether we are able to read it now or to wait after the State Party’s statement. If you allow me, I will read it.”

The Chairperson:

“Yes, you can read it.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Waiting for the long discussion preceding the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, the Hungarian delegation welcomes the nomination of this exceptional site. The region provided the richest golden mines in the Carpathian basin in Europe for millennia. The utmost significance compares the city in the Roman era as a special mining community for the high level extortion of this metal. The archaeological remains testify to this activity in the second and third centuries CE and the wooden tablets found in the mines provided extraordinarily important source material for the research of this community and for legal practice in the Roman Empire and a solid basis for the World Heritage nomination.

The plan of the Canada mining company of the Roşia Montană Gold Corporation intended to extract 300,000 thousand tons of gold and some 15,000 tons of silver in the region and to explore more. The archaeological excavations surely have more galleries to

explore. Cyanide was used to extract gold after building a more than 180-metre-high dam in the nearby valley and then artificially containing this highly polluting atmospheric liquid.

The decision of the Romanian government to submit for the long-desired nomination of the site in the World Heritage List would have put a full stop on this fierce fight between investors and groups and activists and scientists of natural and cultural heritage all over the world. The quality of the decision of the Committee recommended by the Advisory Bodies is of great importance for enhancing and preserving a site deserving better conservation and deserving the value of a World Heritage site.

However, there is an ongoing international arbitration case and the State Party requested a referral for the nomination. Hungary can support such a decision of the Committee but underlines that Hungary is convinced that there is no direct connection between the World Heritage site of Roşia Montană and the ongoing arbitration, since according to present legislation no mining activity may be executed in the region of Roşia Montană.

For the sake of acknowledging the site, the Outstanding Universal Value has clearly been stated in the draft decision in order to further encourage the State Party in its endeavour to protect the site. Hungary respects the State Party's requests, supports the proposal of Azerbaijan and therefore can agree with a referral underlining that according to the Advisory Bodies and further expert opinion, the site is already ready for inscription; the rightful extension of the site's non-inscription is not fully justified.

Hungary truly hopes that the State Party, may the Committee decide to refer the nomination back to the State Party, can use this gesture of the Committee and will return with the nomination for the 43rd session of the Committee in order to foster the state of conservation of the property. Hungary strongly commends the State Party by assuring the overall legal protection of the site to go further on the rehabilitation of its monuments. Hungary further urges the State Party to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and the Committee and to continue reporting on its efforts.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. Azerbaijan would like to thank the Advisory Bodies for its report and we take note of the Advisory Bodies' evaluation whereby the nominated property justifies Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv).

However, having this new information from the State Party, we believe the best decision at this stage would be a referral of the nomination back to the State Party, considering the ongoing international arbitration case and at the same time to make recommendations in the draft decision as well.

With this in mind, Azerbaijan has proposed certain amendments to the original draft decision and, of course, will support the proposal to create opportunities for the State Party to present their arguments. Thank you Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you very much Chair. Tanzania takes note of the presentation made by the World Heritage Committee, but Tanzania also wants to align with the words Australia said. One would wish for the State Party to be given the floor so as to clarify this issue, but secondly we would want to get guidance from the legal advisor on whether this decision needs the approval of this Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. This is a rare moment in our session that has called some very different cases during the past few days where the State Parties are asking for changing referral to inscription, while this one is the opposite.

China is in a position of supporting these amendments, proposed by colleagues from Azerbaijan, because this has precedent. Chair, if you allow, I would remind our colleagues here that in the 40th Session, we had exactly the same case from Canada and the Committee gave the State Party more time to think about management issues and the State Party went home happily.

Thank you Chair for your patience.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Cuba would also like to refer to some arguments that have been made by the delegations, that is the importance of taking into account what the State Party says but also the Convention and its Operational Guidelines provide that any inscription can only be pursued on the basis of the requests of the State Party.

I am not sure what Hungary said and according to what the legal advisor said yesterday, it is impossible to define the Outstanding Universal Value until the Committee has made a declaration. We have to be careful with that. At the time being, we are referring and postponing a decision and not taking a decision on its Outstanding Universal Value. We would like to hear the State Party for the information but we are waiting for the decision and the amendment. I think we have to be consistent with the argument provided yesterday by our legal advisor.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, please, you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. According to the nomination dossier of Roşia Montană Mining landscape, the property nominated by Romania is recommended for inscription. The Advisory Bodies said that both criteria under which the property is nominated in this case (ii) and (iv) are justified and well-demonstrated and all aspects of integrity, authenticity and management and protection of the property are declared adequate.

Despite this positive recommendation, the State Party has interestingly proposed the nomination be referred to the State Party, taking into account an ongoing international arbitration related to this property. After carefully studying the draft amendment and other supplementary documents in which this admirable yet rather unusual request is reflected, Indonesia is of the view to honour the request of the State Party concerned and does recommend to endorse the status of referral for the property.

We would also like to commend the State Party on this respectful gesture that shows a willingness to compromise with local and domestic authorities that led to the decision to forego the opportunity for inscription of the property. An act that is clearly along the line with the spirit of consensus that we all try to enforce in UNESCO. We are, however, looking forward to welcoming the inscription of the property in the near future.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« La Tunisie veut saluer l'esprit de responsabilité de l'État partie qui a choisi de partager avec nous des difficultés juridiques qui risquent demain de rendre compliquer peut être notre décision d'aujourd'hui et encore plus la préservation et la protection de ce site à inscrire. Nous saluons cet esprit et nous nous joignons à la demande de renvoi. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The legal advisor has the floor to answer the question.”

Legal Advisor:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. In relation to the question posed by the Australian delegation on which a number of other delegations have made related questions or remarks: Whether the Committee has the power to refer a matter to back a State Party consequent to a request that referral be made by the State Party because an arbitration is under way.

On a simple reading of the language of Paragraph 159 of the Operational Guidelines, I see no legal impediment to this. It does not state that the additional information which is requested in the case of a referral needs to be only additional information further in support of the nomination.

I would note, however, that in line with the practice in relation with referral this information would need to come to the Committee within the three years otherwise the matter would be considered as a new nomination.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Excuse me for taking floor a second time. It is just for a clarification. The citation from the draft decision of the Advisory Body of ICOMOS quoted the Outstanding Universal Value. I would like to propose it as was mentioned by the distinguished delegate of Cuba.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The State Party, you have the floor to clarify.”

Romania:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Esteemed members of the Committee and Secretariat, distinguished observers,

First of all, and on behalf of Romania, we would like to recall that my country is fully committed to the protection and conservation of the nominated property. Unfortunately, as you have heard already, the property is linked to an ongoing arbitration proceeding at the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, an entity of the World Bank Group. Therefore, and in order to protect both the national heritage and the economic rights of the submitting State Party, the government of Romania requested the nomination be referred.

At this point in time, any other decision of the Committee would negatively impact my country from an economic, judicial and social point of view. It would affect Romania's capacity to defend its position in the arbitration and would be used by the mining company to beef up its accusation and to exercise additional pressure on my government.

My government is not willing to pay a huge amount of financial damages claimed by the mining company, about 4.37 billion US\$. Money which in the end would have to be supported by each Romanian citizen, including the local community. The Romanian authorities also consider that an inscription decision of Roşia Montană property should be taken only if the site is not subject to any litigation.

As ICOMOS rightly underlined in its evaluation, the ongoing arbitration limits the actions of the State Party. A hasty and forced inscription against the will and the official position of the government of Romania would not have helped further protection and conservation measures or with the enhancement or the promotion of the property. I would

also like to underline that there are no ascertained threats towards the integrity of the property in the case of a referral decision by the Committee, as the subject of the arbitration file is obtaining damages and not reopening mining exploitation. I stop there.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I think we have had several discussions as to the powers of this Committee when it comes to recognising the Outstanding Universal Value. We see no problems with going for a referral in this case. Especially if, from a legal perspective, that is going to be the best outcome. We see no reason not to refer this and we also take note of this assessment undertaken by the Advisory Bodies.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. After hearing from the State Party and especially from the legal advisor, the State of Kuwait supports the draft amendment submitted by Azerbaijan for a referral.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Madam Chair. After hearing from the State Party, Zimbabwe accepts and supports the proposal by Azerbaijan, which respects the wishes of the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Firstly, I would like to say that after having carefully examined the nomination file and the evaluation from the Advisory Bodies, it is Norway’s

primary stand to support the draft decision to inscribe the Roman Gold Mines of Rosa Montana on the World Heritage List and at the same time on the World Heritage List in Danger.

Anyway, after hearing the request from the State Party to the Committee to refer the nomination, we are ready to discuss which decision is the best to serve the property in the best way. Thank you Madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Having listened to the State Party and the clarifications by the legal advisor, Tanzania supports referral.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam chair. I think we will first say that we are very pleased to have heard directly from the State Party the reason for the referral. I think it is incredibly helpful to the Committee and thank you Romania for that. It was also helpful to hear the legal advice on what is reasonably within the scope of consideration by the Committee and Article 159 of the Operational Guidelines. I think that is a great clarification for us to have.

Australia is able to support the draft amendment as put forward by Azerbaijan. We would be more comfortable with a formulation that put the primary rationale for referring the property back to the State Party being based on the need to improve the management arrangement for the property, which to our reading would be a more substantive basis in the Operational Guidelines for the Committee to do so. We would also be comfortable in noting that the basis on which the State Party had sought referral is because there is international arbitration under way. We would be happy to put forward some amendments if the Committee would wish to see them.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give NGOs the floor.”

NGO:

“Thank you madam Chair. Distinguished members of the World Heritage Committee, I represent Europa Nostra, the voice of cultural heritage in Europe. Roşia Montană needs your firm and immediate support. Nominated for inscription on the World Heritage List, the site is recommended by ICOMOS for the World Heritage List and the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The sense of urgency that results from such a clear recommendation has been endangered by a recent disturbing piece of news, indicating a potential request from the State Party to UNESCO to delay the decision of the World Heritage Committee on this case now to be referred back to the State Party.

After many years of relentless struggle by rights activists and active segments of civil society, including Europa Nostra, to save this site from the proposed, highly destructive mining project, we are of the opinion that the recommendation from ICOMOS provides adequate response to the protective needs of Roşia Montană. The inscription of the site will ensure its urgent protection and would mark the beginning of a new era of sustainable development for the local communities concerned, which have for too long been neglected and also negatively impacted by the many years of resistance to the State caused by the proposed mining project.

We are hopeful that the World Heritage Committee will reach during this very session in Bahrain a positive decision to inscribe Roşia Montană site on both Lists. We urge you to carefully examine all recommendations made by ICOMOS and also to duly take into account the concerned voices of civil society acting at local, national and European levels.

Yesterday, the honourable delegates of Kuwait stated: *'it is always the Committee that has the power to decide'*. Please decide to inscribe this site today. The inscription is a great chance to conserve the site for future generations.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now that we have heard the comments of Azerbaijan and Australia, the Rapporteur, could you please show us the amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As we heard, I have received amendments on this draft decision submitted by Azerbaijan. The original draft decision would have inscribed this property on the List of World Heritage and simultaneously on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This amendment proposes instead to refer the nomination back to the State Party. As such the original draft decision is heavily modified.

If I just may, madam Chair, draw the attention of the Committee, especially after hearing the discussions on paragraph 4, which now would be the paragraph referring the nomination back to the State Party. If I understood correctly, we might have comments regarding the formulation of these paragraphs. As for the rest of the decision, it was already introduced by the author and we have had sufficient time to study it as it was distributed beforehand.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. Australia, please, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am going to make a couple of suggestions for amendments for the consideration of the Committee. The first suggested amendment is to paragraph 3 on the screen at the moment, and it would be to change it to say:

3. *‘Acknowledges the official request for referral made by the submitting State Party until the ongoing international arbitration is resolved.’*

Then we have paragraph 4 which would be amended by deleting the text saying *‘until’* and substituting instead the words *‘to finalise the measures required to ensure the protection and management of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property as identified by ICOMOS.’* That, to Australia’s mind, would put the decision more clearly in the framing of the Operational Guidelines and the core reasons why we would in the normal courses of events refer the proposal back to the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We agree with the suggestion made by Australia. In this way we are more aligned with the Operational Guidelines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Hungary supports the amendments given and put forth by Australia. The second point is that within the recommendations Hungary would like to add one more point to the recommendations. The following one: Hungary further *‘urges the State Party to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and the Committee and to continue reporting on its efforts.’* If we could add this to the recommendations?

Do you want me to re-read it?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. I apologise for taking the floor. I would like to ask the distinguished delegate from Hungary where he would like to put this proposed this new paragraph.”

Hungary:

“It is a not a new paragraph, it sits with the recommendations. Hungary thinks it would be very important if contact and dialogue could be kept between the Advisory Bodies and the State Party during the next couple of years or the time it takes to be able to make a very good nomination without any issues.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. My question was where exactly in the text? Following your answer, I would suggest that this could be the final paragraph of this recommendation, if the distinguished delegate of Hungary agrees, then we would put it on the screen.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much. It can be given as a new paragraph. It could become paragraph 5. I read it again: ‘*urges the State Party should work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies and the Committee and to continue reporting on its efforts to be able to submit the final nomination of the property.*’”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I am a little lost. I had an amendment for paragraph 3; right now we are on paragraph 6. We are having trouble following. Could you please scroll up? What we could maybe do is to go paragraph by paragraph and I wanted to say something on paragraph 3. We are still a little concerned. We understand why Australian made the amendment. Are we not undermining the sovereignty of a State Party? I think we have to use language in both of these where we need to kind of use language for a state of conservation report and not for the inscription of a property.

I think we need to be very careful with the actual words we use in the decision. Currently, it actually looks as if it is obligatory for them to resubmit a file. It says until the ongoing arbitration is resolved. It makes it look as if they would have to resubmit at that point in time and I think this is of some concern. We think it would be better to come back to the original wording of Azerbaijan. Finally, the recommendation in paragraph 6 also seems to be about monitoring and follow-up of an already inscribed site and it looks as if we are referring back to the State Party.

In fact, we remember that States want to protect their heritage and I think we work on the basis of trust and encouragement then we should make it transparent so we explain the situation the State Party is in. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Most of my ideas have been expressed by my distinguished colleague from Cuba. Regarding the amendment proposed by Australia on paragraph 3: I see no problem referring to the international arbitration. But I do not see the reason to delete from paragraph 4 for the same reason after we heard from the legal advisor as there are no legal impediments to explaining the official reason presented by the State Party concerned, which is the arbitration case. That is my first point.

My second point is about the newly-proposed paragraph 6. I think, like Cuba said, it feels that it is already inscribed and we already invite the State Party to report. That is the first impression, and the second is '*continuing reporting*' which is of concern. We would rather prefer to put something about cooperation but not like '*continuing reporting*'; how to define it is my concern."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Norway."

Norway:

"Thank you madam Chair. Firstly, Norway supports the proposals from Australia in paragraphs 3 and 4. We think it is better to put reference to the ongoing international arbitration in paragraph 3. We have a few more proposals for paragraph 5.

Firstly, we would propose in the first sentence to put in '*give urgent consideration*' and in the end add a new sentence. That is: '*further recommends that the State Party implement a monitoring programme for the property*'.

Thank you madam Chair,"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor."

Australia:

"Thank you very much Chair. I was reflecting on the intervention of the distinguished delegate of Cuba and I do find myself agreeing with the first part of her observation about the timing and coming back to the resolution of the arbitration. I would suggest a slight change of the wording of our amendment in 3. Instead of saying: '*until ongoing (...)*' it would say '*due to the ongoing international arbitration*' and remove '*is resolved*'. I think that may satisfy the point made by the delegate of Cuba".

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is now to Spain."

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] "Thank you very much madam Chair. I beg to differ with the delegate of Cuba. I do think it is a State prerogative that when submitting they could actually have withdrawn their nomination. Here, it is a referral we are looking at. So, I do think that cooperation with the Advisory Bodies is to be advised.

I think that the suggestion made by Norway concerning paragraph 6 and supported by Australia does actually talk about the best interests of the site. I think if the State Party of Romania wishes for this to be referred and not withdrawn or even deferred that is the State's prerogative. Just like any of the decisions that we have made. When we make decisions we

often make a series of recommendations at the end of our decisions and this in some way is no different.

Maybe we could have a minor follow-up or a dating mechanism. We could make mention of the need to continue monitoring the situation or improving the management and protection of the property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je crois que le cas qui est devant nous est relativement simple. L'État partie ne souhaite pas que le Comité inscrive et nous semblons accéder à sa demande. Le deuxième point, le renvoie, alors que les Organes consultatifs nous recommandent d'inscrire, n'est pas une garantie d'inscription automatique le jour où ce dossier va revenir devant le Comité. Ce jour-là on regardera l'État du site. C'est la deuxième idée que de reconforter notre résolution.

Le troisième : en attendant cela, on formule le vœu à l'adresse de l'État partie de prendre le meilleur soin possible de ce site. Je rejoins dans sa finalité et dans une partie de son analyse l'honorable représentante de Cuba, dans le sens que nous ne pouvons pas aller au-delà de la volonté de l'État. Mais le fait que l'État nous demande de ne pas inscrire, mais de renvoyer, n'est pas une garantie le jour où ce dossier sera devant le Comité qui va statuer ce jour-là ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I want to thank the distinguished delegate of Australia for changing the first paragraph. I think it was one the major points of contention. I am happy with the paragraph with the addition proposed by Norway on paragraph 5. I wonder, given that we have this, whether we really need paragraph 6?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Thanks to the distinguished delegation of Australia for its flexibility in mentioning this, which we believe makes it clearer as to why we are referring this nomination and naturally we can go along with that request. We are happy with that.

As for paragraph 6, apart from the suggestion of Norway for paragraph 5, we are calling for greater cooperation on the part of the State Party and to establish some kind of communication with the Advisory Bodies so that there is a cordial working relationship. I do not think it should be seen as if we are asking for a state of conservation report of an inscribed site.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur has the floor now.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. It seems to me that the Committee seems to be in agreement about the referral, but we have heard a number of quite complex amendments on the text as a whole and we also had a request from the distinguished delegate of Cuba, I believe, to go paragraph by paragraph due to the complexity of the comments received on different paragraphs. May I request to you Madam Chair whether we should move in this fashion or not?”

The Chairperson:

“Yes please, go paragraph by paragraph.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 1 would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 2 would now read:

‘2. Taking note of the Advisory Bodies evaluation whereby the nominated property justifies Outstanding Universal Value on the basis of criteria (ii) and (iv), and meets the conditions of integrity and authenticity.’”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Then we have the proposal to delete paragraph 3 which would have had the statement of Outstanding Universal Value.”

The Chairperson:

“As adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Then, we have new paragraph 3, formerly paragraph 4, which would now read:

‘3. Acknowledges the official request for referral made by the submitting State Party due to ongoing international arbitration’.”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Then we have the former paragraph 5 for deletion.”

The Chairperson:

“Adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Then we have the new paragraph 4, which would read: *‘In compliance with article 159 of the Operational Guidelines, refers the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania, back to the State Party, to finalise the measures required to ensure the protection and management of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property as identified by ICOMOS’.*

Madam Chair, if I may, earlier I have already mentioned this paragraph because it is important as it refers to the nomination. This paragraph looks different from the usual refer back nomination. Article 159 of the Operational Guidelines, as it was already expressed by the legal advisor, set the timeframe for referral nomination, which means that it needs to come within three years.

The wording as it stood originally to which it was proposed to be deleted and some delegates suggested keeping it which is the part about *‘until the matter with the international arbitration is solved’*, in my view it might create some kind of misunderstanding because an ongoing arbitration might go longer than 3 years. We start the paragraph by saying *‘in compliance with article 159’* which sets three years.

I just wish to bring this to the attention of the distinguished Committee that in my view the paragraph that was proposed to be deleted would indeed create some kind of inconsistency with article 159.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is now to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Having also heard the comment by our distinguished colleague the Rapporteur, I would like to clarify the reason why we came up with this draft amendment, the part which is now deleted from our screen. We would like to mention in the referral the main reason as proposed by the State Party; this is the reason why we put it there, as it has certain implications on future actions of the State Party as well.

As for the issue of timing, again in order to address this issue we have put at the beginning of the paragraph the clear reference to article 159, which sets a timing of three years in terms of referral. This is how we could combine these two issues as resolved.

Having said that, we do not see any problems with the new measures required to ensure the potential, as regards the part proposed by the distinguished colleague from Australia. If all Committee members agree with the new proposal, we are not going against it, of course. Again, I just want to remind you of what was said by the legal advisor; putting a certain reasoning as proposed by the State Party does not have any legal impediment. So we could have two options: one opens in terms of legal protection and management and second the reasoning proposed by the State Party to the Committee members.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. We are looking at the consistency of this paragraph with regard to what we said earlier on explaining the reasons for the referral of this nomination. As written in the new paragraph 4, it seems that the reasons are to ensure the protection measures related to the Outstanding Universal Value. I think that the amendment from Azerbaijan deals with both concerns, as expressed in the amendment made by Norway, which could also be preceded with the issue of international arbitration on the way and which is the reason we are referring this file back to the State Party.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“The part of the draft decision already adopted by the Committee is very clear in acknowledging the reason the State Party has sought referral and that is because of the unresolved international arbitration. I think the earlier part of the draft decision has already addressed that matter, and I do express the view that it is better that the part of the operative paragraph around application of Article 159 refers only to the reasons for developing the

management and protection arrangements for the property. I think that is a clearer and simpler construction, having already identified the primary reasons the State Party has sought referral earlier in the text.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I have to say, I am not sure at this point whether we agree with putting back parts of that deleted paragraph or not. If I may put forward a suggestion maybe, the paragraph could read:

‘4. In compliance with article 159 of the Operational Guidelines, refers the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania, back to the State Party, due to the ongoing international arbitration, and to finalise the measures required to ensure(...)’ and so on, maybe the two positions could be reached through this wording.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“What I am suggesting is that in that paragraph there is no point in talking about the ongoing international arbitration at all because it has been addressed before in the draft decision. I would want to see any reference to the ongoing international arbitration deleted from this paragraph. That is the proposal that Australia is making and we would like it to be considered by the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to say that we are in agreement with what was proposed by the Rapporteur. Again, back to what I said: If a majority of Committee members think that there is no necessity again to put it here, of course, we are not going against this position, but we have already expressed our view as to why we put it here initially.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. En analysant les deux paragraphes, 3 et 4, nous pensons que les deux paragraphes peuvent être fusionnés pour faire un seul paragraphe. C'est à dire, il faudra dans un premier temps justifié pourquoi l'État partie fait la demande, c'est la première partie du paragraphe et, ensuite, conformément aux Orientations le Comité décide.

Je n'ai pas la formulation, je vois ça comme cela. En deux temps, pourquoi l'État partie demande la non-inscription actuellement et, ensuite, le Comité prend la décision en fonction de cela en citant donc les Orientations. Voilà ma suggestion ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Hungary, please. Cuba rather, you have the floor."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you. We would also be more favourable to the proposal made by the Rapporteur but we would not stand against the concerns. I think what this paragraph 4 is really questioning is finalising measures. We all agree as to the need for protection and management of the property, but the idea of finalising seems to be indicating that there has been a process started for a listing.

In response to the colleague from Angola, I do not know whether we can blend a preambular paragraph with an operative paragraph, but to help the decision we would go along with the consensus. It is just the word '*finalised*' that we think is problematic."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you. I now give the floor to Zimbabwe."

Zimbabwe:

"Thank you madam Chair. I just wanted to ask if we can live with both references in two paragraphs. Does it do us any harm?"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Australia, please."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. Actually, we can essentialise now, and what I would like to suggest is that Australia accepts the inclusion of the words '*due to ongoing international arbitration*' and in respond to the observation from the distinguished delegate from Cuba rather than to say '*finalise*', we could say, '*implement the measures required*'. If that is acceptable to the Committee, I think we have the basis for moving on."

The Chairperson:

“The Rapporteur, you have the floor.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will proceed to read the paragraph as it is now:

'4. In compliance with paragraph 159 of the Operational Guidelines, refers the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania, back to the State Party, due to the ongoing international arbitration, and to implement the measures required to ensure the protection and management of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property as identified by ICOMOS. '

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“No objections I presume? Thank you very much. Adopted. The Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We proceed to paragraph 5 which would read:

5. 'Recommends the State Party to give urgent consideration to continuing the development of the management plan of the property through measures that ensure the protection and conservation of the property including to tourism management strategy as well as to the involvement of the stakeholders and engagement of local communities into the management of the property. Further recommends that the State Party implement a monitoring programme for the property.'

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I have no problem with the first addition suggested by Norway, but the other part I am not sure about. First of all, the monitoring: Which and when and is it common practice when you have a referred decision that you have to implement a monitoring programme?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. The question also would refer to the issue of the urgency, particularly on the paragraph mentioning a monitoring mechanism. We have further mentioned a management plan, is this not perhaps a little redundant here?”

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Would the Committee like to remove this part? Can you read it please?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will read the paragraph again:

5. ‘Recommends the State Party to give urgent consideration to continuing the development of the management plan of the property through measures that ensure the protection and conservation of the property including to tourism management strategy as well as to the involvement of the stakeholders and engagement of local communities into the management of the property. Further recommends that the State Party implement a monitoring programme for the property.’

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Just to this point connecting with paragraph 6, the last recommendation should be as follows: ‘according to all proposals, further recommends that the State Party implement monitoring programme for the property in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies’. This would be at the end of the fifth paragraph. It means that paragraph 6 should be taken out of the recommendations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Peut-on remonter sur le paragraphe antérieur, le 4 ? Nous sommes un peu gênés ici. Ceux qui ont proposé les amendements au paragraphe 5 j’ai une question pour eux. Quand on dit : “mettre en œuvre les mesures veillant à assurer la protection des mesures de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle”, est-ce qu’il y a des différences par rapport au paragraphe 5 ? C’est une question. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are very attracted to Cuban efficiency on this proposal. We made a recommendation or accepted a proposition that we should implement the measures required to ensure the protection and management of the potential Outstanding Universal Value as identified by ICOMOS and this is the same point that Angola is making. All those measures were set out in the original decision there are readily available to the State Party and kept in all the documents of the Committee.

I actually believe that now because of the amendments already made, this paragraph becomes redundant except the bit about cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. I would propose that we delete paragraph 5 as Cuba suggested and we focus on how on we want to characterise our expectations of the State Party working in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. Delete 5 and move on please.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to the removal of paragraph 5? No objections. The floor is to Spain. Spain does not want the floor, it is for Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We do not have any objections. Just to say that we support what was proposed by Kuwait from Hungary. Initially, we were not against the deleted part 6 where there was a statement about cooperation with the Advisory Bodies. We also, just once again what was said by colleagues from Australia, want to have a cooperation element in this draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. No one has any objections? Can you read the final version of this paragraph, please?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. If I am to understand correctly. We would delete paragraph 5 and we would just keep the part that says: ‘*further recommends that the State Party implement a monitoring programme for the property in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies*’. Maybe should we also delete that and maybe have a new formulation further down below? This is a question I ask the distinguished delegate from Australia through you Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Yes, the suggestion is to delete 5 in its entirety and to assist the Committee we would have something that goes along the lines of: ‘*recommends the State Party progress this nomination and the recommended measures in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies*’. That would replace what was there and would replace 6 also if that was agreeable to the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. Now, what we do not have in this paragraph is the management plan. A monitoring programme is not the same thing as a management plan and I see that a number of things have been deleted from this text. If this is the new proposal, it is consistent; I would want to draw your attention to the fact that we need a monitoring programme and a management plan if we could see to that.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnia-Herzegovina:

“Thank you very much. We would like to support Australia’s proposal.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you. Now what we have on screen is something slightly different. Progressing the nomination is not the same thing as a management plan or a monitoring programme. I know that we are in a hurry, but I think we need to stick to what we have in paragraph 3.

To recommend the State Party progress the nomination. This nomination, what is it exactly that are we referring to? I am not sure that this is reflecting our debate. I think the management plan is good and monitoring programme is also good but progresses nomination? Are we talking about a new nomination?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, nous devons simplifier les choses. J'avais posé une question j'ai reçu la réponse. Le paragraphe 5 ne faisait que répéter la petite phrase que nous avons dans le paragraphe 4 qui dit mettre en œuvre les mesures. Toutes ces mesures sur le plan de gestion, etc. Tout ce que nous sommes en train de lister est dans cette petite phrase "*mettre en œuvre les mesures*". Nous devons juste rajouter la dernière partie qui propose "*de travailler en étroite collaboration avec l'Organisation consultative*" c'est ce qui devrait être rajouté à la fin du paragraphe 4 et on règle le problème. Ce serait plus simple et on éviterait de parler de dossiers et autres choses.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

"Hungary, please."

Hungary:

"Thank you very much. To compromise, Hungary would like to create a short extension to the proposal of Australia. The question is on the management plan, conservation and protection of the property and tourism should be mentioned or not. I suppose Hungary would like to make a proposal to involve these words into a new paragraph 5:

5. 'Recommends the State Party progress on this nomination and the recommended measures regarding management planning, conservation and protection of the property and tourism management strategy and in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies'.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Shall we adopt it according to this final wording proposed by Australia? Could you please read it?"

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. Paragraph 5 would now read: '*encourages the State Party to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies*'."

The Chairperson:

"Angola".

Angola :

« La phrase est incomplète : "*travailler en collaboration avec les Organes consultatifs*", pour faire quoi ? C'est la question ».

The Chairperson:

“Do you have any amendment or wording to put in? We cannot just wait and raise a question without giving the wording that you would propose. So that the Member States understand exactly what you want.”

Angola :

« J'avais déjà fait la proposition, je crois. Cette phrase ne peut qu'être rajoutée à la dernière partie du paragraphe 4 ».

The Chairperson:

“We have already adopted paragraph 4. Please, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Je m'excuse madame la présidente. Mais on va être redondant. Le 5 va répéter le 4. On a demandé à l'État partie de mettre en œuvre des mesures en collaboration avec les Organes consultatifs. C'est la suite du 4. »

The Chairperson:

“Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you. I suppose we should close this debate. For Hungary both solutions are paragraph 5 and the second third from Bosnia, Australia or Cuba could be acceptable. It is better and more concrete than the first variation, also supported by Hungary. If it is possible and agreeable, we should return to this one instead of the second, which is too general.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair. Just bear with me for a moment, because I think the formulation I agreed with Cuba and Angola's suggestion that it is directly linked with paragraph 4 is right. What Angola is asking that simply we take these words and put them at the end of paragraph 4: *'encourages the State Party to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies'* and I would add the words *'to this end'*.

That would I think meet almost all the expectations from Committee members.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you want to amend paragraph 4? Do you all agree? China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. We agree with what is there now for paragraph 5. However, it is your decision whether you want to make a separate paragraph 5 or add it to the end of paragraph 4 as described. It is up to you.”

The Chairperson:

“No, it is up to you, up to the Member States. We have to make a decision. This is a matter of precedent. If we come back to a paragraph adopted, we will not see the end. We have to be practical. Can you read the final draft, please, paragraphs 4 and 5?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will first proceed to read paragraph 4:

‘4. In compliance with article 159 of the Operational Guidelines, refers the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania, back to the State Party, due to the ongoing international arbitration, and to implement the measures required to ensure the protection and management of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property as identified by ICOMOS.’

And then for paragraph 5, after the discussion, we have a suggestion put forward by Australia and also earlier by Angola: *‘encourages the State Party to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies to this end’*. Their suggestion is to put this at the end of paragraph 4.

The distinguished delegate of Hungary instead suggested keeping a version of paragraph 5 that was earlier to be deleted, which would read: *‘recommends the State Party progress this nomination, the recommended measures regarding management plan, conservation and protection of the property and tourism management strategy in close consultation with the Advisory Bodies.’*

I believe that the question is whether the Committee may agree with the shorter formulation or the Committee requires specific references to management plan, conservation and such.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, we are losing time and it seems that we all agree. Tanzania takes in the proposal from Angola, to merge 5 into 4 and that we just add the sentence from Australia. I do not think we need to repeat 5 and to combine to shorten.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you all agree with this proposal? Are there any objections? The Rapporteur will give us the final wording.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Paragraph 4 would be the final paragraph of this draft decision and would read:

4. *‘In compliance with article 159 of the Operational Guidelines, refers the nomination of Roşia Montană Mining Landscape, Romania, back to the State Party, due to the ongoing international arbitration, and to implement the measures required to ensure the protection and management of the potential Outstanding Universal Value of the property as identified by ICOMOS and encourages the State Party to work in close cooperation with the Advisory Bodies to this end.’*

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Should we adopt it? Adopted. Therefore I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.32 as amended adopted. Thank you very much.

As we have now finished with the examination of the nomination; we will now examine the minor modification of boundaries of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. Mr. Balsamo, you have the floor.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. For this session of the Committee we received eight minor modifications of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List. If there are no objections, the Advisory Bodies will not present the boundary modifications of five of the properties proposed for approval and the Advisory Bodies will only present at the end of this brief presentation three minor boundary modifications, namely those of Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes, Republic of Korea, Venetian Works of Defence between 16th and 17th Centuries: Stato da Terra – Western Stato da Mar, Croatia, Italy and Montenegro and Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra, Ukraine.

The draft decisions concerning the final boundary modification recommended for approval are on pages 8-9 of the English version of document 8B.Add, pages 9-10 of the French version of the same document.

Madam Chair, you may wish to ask the Committee if we can proceed with the adoptions of Draft Decision 8B.37 relating to Croatia, Old City of Dubrovnik; 8B.39, relating to the Jewish Quarter and St Procopius’ Basilica in Třebíč, Czechia; 8B.40, Jelling Mounds, Runic Stones and Church, Denmark; 8B.41, Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay, France and 8B.42 Archaeological Area and the Patriarchal Basilica of Aquileia, Italy.

Madam Chair you may ask the Committee if they agree to adopt these five draft decisions.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections to adopt these five draft decisions together? There are no objections, they are adopted. I now invite IUCN to present the proposed minor modifications of the Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes, Republic of Korea.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. IUCN’s evaluation of the minor boundary modification of Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes, Republic of Korea is on page 17 of both English and French versions of the Add IUCN evaluation report.

IUCN notes that this minor boundary modification request entails five new monuments to be added to the existing Jeju Volcanic Island and Lava Tubes World Heritage property. IUCN is recommending a partial approval of this minor boundary modification request through the approval to add the new Upper Geomunoreum Lava Tube System component parts of the property. The recommendations of the French version of the working document requests the State Party to provide to the World Heritage Centre, by the 1st of December, 2018, a new large-scale map of the whole of the revised Geomunoreum component, including all of the relevant component parts, and the buffer zone, and also to provide separate measurements for the area of each of the component parts, as well as the buffer zone.

IUCN, however, does not approve the addition of the other three proposed new component parts, Suwolbong Tuff Ring, Chagwido Tuff Cone Complex and Socheongul Lava Tube, the reason behind the fact is that these are three discontinuous components with different attributes that require more thorough evaluation in terms of the overall serial values of the existing property. It is also not possible to evaluate the contributions made to criteria (vii) and/or (viii) and/or to verify integrity protection and management.

In principle IUCN considers that it is problematic to add completely new components to a serial World Heritage site which are not immediately linked to areas already included in the inscribed property. We therefore recommend that they resubmit these three component parts in the format of a new nomination for an extension of the property, with revisions to clarify the boundaries of the nominated components and their buffer zones, in order that a full evaluation of these proposals can be undertaken by IUCN.

The draft decision is on page 8 of the English version and page 9 of the French version of document 8B.Add. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.36 adopted.

We will now continue with the minor boundary modifications of cultural properties. I now invite ICOMOS to present the proposed minor boundary modification of the Old City of Dubrovnik. ICOMOS you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you for your patience madam Chair. This transnational serial property of the Venetian Works of Defence between the 16th and 17th Centuries: Stato da Terra–Western Stato da Ma was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 2017 in Cracow on the bases of

criteria (iii) and (iv). The property was inscribed as a series of six components which represent the defensive works of the Venetian Republic in the 16th and 17th centuries, demonstrating the designs, adaptations and operations of *alla moderna* defences. The three States Parties had originally proposed a larger series.

The proposed minor boundary modification concerned proposed changes to the boundary and the buffer zone of one component in Montenegro, the Fortified City of Kotor. It is expected to include a new component, the Forte Mare in Herceg Novi. Each component will retain its own boundary with a greater, enlarged buffer zone encompassing both of them shown in the darker yellow.

The State Party proposes that the two components' names be changed to reflect these changes. The World Heritage Committee will recall that there is another World Heritage property which overlaps with the boundary of this component, the Natural and Culturo-Historical Region of Kotor, inscribed in 1979 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv). This property is much larger, 14,600 ha, and recognises the role of this region in spreading Mediterranean culture in the Balkans, which is a very different Outstanding Universal Value than the one we are considering here, which relates to Venetian works of defence between the 16th and 17th centuries.

The site of Forte Mare in Herceg Novi was originally nominated as part of the serial transnational property of Venetian Works of Defence, but was not included by the World Heritage Committee in the inscribed property in Cracow in 2017. It experienced severe earthquake damage in 1976 and today has significant levels of tourist pressure. ICOMOS recommended that this site could possibly be considered as an extension, but that issues affecting the authenticity are arising from intrusive and poorly-thought out tourism facility problems with the state of conservation, visitor pressure and problems from dense vegetation growth and buildings. ICOMOS also raised issues regarding the boundary of this component.

While the State Party has started to address these issues referred to in the World Heritage Committee's 2017 Decision, ICOMOS considers that these are significant and longer-term challenges. According to the Committee's decision and previously that of ICOMOS, the inclusion of this component in a serial World Heritage property should only occur following the completion of the improvements to the conservation of the site, and with the benefit of a mission at that future time. These are not possible for minor boundary modification processes.

In submitting the proposal, the State Party has not necessarily adhered to the World Heritage Decision to present this minor boundary modification rather than extension or major boundary modification. ICOMOS would encourage the State Party to continue its important work and to present this at a later stage as a major boundary modification or extension.

Thank you very much madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments, questions or objections? I see none. I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.38 adopted.

I now invite ICOMOS to present the proposed minor modification of St Sophia Cathedral in Kiev and related monastic buildings in Ukraine. ICOMOS you have the floor."

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much. The three components of the serial property of Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1990 on the basis of criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv). At the time of inscription, no buffer zone was defined.

The property has been the subject of many state of conservation reports since inscription, regarding protection and management issues, and sometimes including boundary and buffer zone issues. In March 2017, a joint World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring mission was undertaken, the conclusions and recommendations of which were reported and approved to the Committee in its 41st session in 2017. As a result, a further state of conservation report has been requested from the State Party by the 1st of December, 2018.

In response, the State Party proposed the extension of two buffer zones which include the three components of the property. The overall buffer zone increased from 220.15 ha to 356.93 ha. The major reason for extension is to better-protect the components contributing to the Outstanding Universal Value by including additional landscapes in some urban areas or features which currently provide an historical context which are important to control to ensure a future sympathetic context.

ICOMOS considers that while the proposed buffer zone is an improvement it is not fully satisfactory. Therefore, further suggestions are made to reduce the boundaries, by running behind the first row of buildings and other recommendations. The results of substantial extension to the east, south and west, ICOMOS considers that while the proposed buffer zone for the second component, the Kiev-Pechersk Lavra, is considered an improvement it is also not fully satisfactory.

ICOMOS recommends that the examination of the proposed buffer zone for Saint-Sophia Cathedral and Related Monastic Buildings, Kiev-Pechersk Lavra, Ukraine, be referred back to the State Party in order to allow a series of five other recommendations that are outlined in the texts of this evaluation that can be consulted on page 56 of document INF.8B.1.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this draft decision? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.43 adopted.

We have now finished the examination of minor boundary modifications. We will now continue with our Agenda item 8B and proceed with adoption of the 7 statements of Outstanding Universal Value of properties inscribed at previous sessions of the Committee. You will find the 7 statements in document 8B.Add. I now invite Mr Balsamo to present this point.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We are dealing with 7 statements of Outstanding Universal Value that were provisionally adopted by the Committee. The seven statements concern the following properties: Denmark, Kujataa Greenland: Norse and Inuit Farming at the Edge of the Ice Cap; India, Archaeological Site of Nalanda Mahavihara (Nalanda University) at Nalanda, Bihar; India, Historic City of Ahmadabad; Islamic Republic of Iran, Historic City of Yazd; Japan, Sacred Island of Okinoshima and Associated Sites in the

Munakata Region; Poland, Tarnowskie Góry Lead-Silver-Zinc Mine and its Underground Water Management System; South Africa, Khomani Cultural Landscape.

The statements have been refined with the cooperation of the Advisory Bodies and the concerned State Party and they are now ready for adoption. Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.44 is in document 8B.Add page 11 of the English version and page 12 of the French version.

Thank you madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8B.44 adopted.

We now move to our item devoted to the clarification of property boundaries and areas by States Parties. Please refer to document 8D. I now invite Ms. Petya Totcharova to present this item.”

Ms. Petya Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. The document World Heritage Committee 42 COM 8D concerns the adoption of nine boundary clarifications. That is clarifications of the delimitation of properties at the time of their inscription on the World Heritage List by their respective countries. The boundary clarifications here are nine and have been prepared in the framework of the retrospective inventory of nomination dossiers of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List in the period of 1978 -1998 as well as for properties inscribed after 1998 in the framework of the Periodic Reporting.

Madam Chair, there is a draft decision proposing to the Committee these nine boundary clarifications. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8D adopted.

We now move to agenda item 8E, adoption of retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Please refer to documents 8E and 8E.Add. I now invite Ms. Petya Totcharova to present the item.”

Ms. Petya Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. These documents, 8E and 8E.Add, concern the adoption of 21 retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value. Twenty are included in document 8E and one in document 8E.Add. They have been finalised between the 40th and 41st sessions of the World Heritage Committee.

The regional distribution of the retrospective statements of Outstanding Universal Value presented is as follows: one in Asia and the Pacific, 20 from Europe and North America. There is a draft decision on page 1 of the document in both English and French

copies which concerns the adoption by the Committee of these statements of retrospective Outstanding Universal Value.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I see none. Therefore, I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 8E adopted. Thank you very much.

I now refer to our meeting this morning when it was decided to discuss the issue of Socotra at the end of this meeting. I am pleased to inform you that following information submitted by the State Party during the first day of the Committee and in consultation with the State Party a joint Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.100 was agreed upon between the World Heritage Centre and IUCN and circulated to you on a blue form a few days ago. If you need extra copies, the Secretariat stands ready to distribute extra copies now.

If you agree, due to the time constraints, I would like to suggest that we adopt this draft decision without further debate. Are there any comments? I see none. Thank you very much. I therefore declare the revised Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.100 adopted.

I now invite Ms. Nada Al-Hassan, Chief of the Arab State Unit of the World Heritage Centre, to read the list of the natural properties on the World Heritage List located in the Arab State for which reports are proposed for adoption without discussion.”

Mme. Nada Al-Hassan :

« Merci madame la présidente. Il y a deux sites qui vous sont proposés sans discussion. Le 42 COM 8B.98, le parc national du Banc d’Arguin en Mauritanie et B.99 parc national marin de Sanganeb et parc national marin de la baie de Dungonab, île de mukkawar, au Soudan.

Merci madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. If there are no objections from the Committee on these states of conservation reports, I declare them adopted. So, do you have any objections or comments? I see none. I declare the decisions read out adopted.

Before we conclude agenda item 7B we still have to adopt the omnibus decision regarding the state of conservation for properties for which all issues have been successfully addressed by the State Party and which do not require any decisions by the Committee. I therefore invite Ms. Petya Totcharova to read the list of the properties, which form the omnibus this year. You have the floor.”

Ms. Petya Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. The properties that are included in the omnibus this year are The Grand Canal (China); Carolingian Westwork and Civitas Corvey (Germany) and the Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslavl (Russian Federation). Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or comments? I see none. I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7B.101 adopted. I would now like to ask whether any observer delegations would like to express themselves. I see none. Thank you very much. Actually, Switzerland you have the floor.”

Confédération suisse :

« Merci madame la présidente. La délégation souhaite tout d’abord remercier l’État du Bahreïn pour la grande hospitalité et la parfaite organisation de cette réunion du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Nous remercions et félicitons également les États parties qui ont fait de grands efforts en collaborant avec le Comité du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pour arriver à des inscriptions fortes et convaincantes. Nous pensons par exemple à Pimachiowin Aki et d’autres sites magnifiques.

De même, nos remerciements vont aux États parties qui ont tout mis en œuvre pour renforcer la gestion et la protection de leur bien par exemple le Belize qui a réussi à retrouver l’État de conservation souhaité du récif de la barrière du Belize. Cela montre que le respect des processus et des règles définies par cette Convention amène à des résultats réjouissants et importants pour la conservation du patrimoine de l’humanité.

Nous sommes par contre déçus par certaines autres décisions prises par le Comité. Pour la première fois, un Comité a décidé d’inscrire des biens qui étaient recommandés pour non-inscription. Plusieurs autres décisions sur l’état de conservation ont été vidées de leurs substances. Les membres du Comité qui ont essayé de rappeler les principes de la Convention ont été mis en minorité.

Madame la présidente, les États parties ici présents travaillent d’arrache-pied pour la protection et la reconnaissance des biens en engageant des discussions basées sur le respect de la Convention au niveau national et en travaillant avec les autorités locales et les populations. Ces efforts entrepris pendant de nombreuses années par nous tous risquent d’être minés par des décisions prises sans respects des règles et des processus définis et sont dommageables pour la crédibilité de la Liste et la Convention du patrimoine mondial.

Nous sommes préoccupés de cette tendance et nous savons que cette préoccupation est partagée par beaucoup d’autres. Il est primordial maintenant de réfléchir comment revenir à des décisions basées sur des expertises et non pas sur des intérêts particuliers.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“I now give the floor to Sweden.”

Sweden:

“Thank you madam Chair. Sweden would like to add its voice to the speaker expressing concerns on the Committee’s decisions on nominations and state of conservation reports. We made an intervention on the first day of the session regarding this. I will not repeat our arguments on the consequences for the credibility of the Convention, the Committee and the World Heritage List.

The ad hoc working group has begun to work on these matters and I would strongly encourage continuing dialogue between the Committee, States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre to come up with solutions, including revised working methods and procedures.

We would like to underscore that inscription of sites that lack adequate protection and management is problematic, since many of these sites will result in state of conservation reports shortly after their inscription. Many problems would have been avoided if they had been addressed in the nomination process. Moreover, hasty inscriptions have financial consequences. This is important ahead of future sessions, especially since the Committee has decided to prioritise conservation over nominations.

Lastly, we, all States Parties, should respect and take into account the Global Strategy for a balance and credible World Heritage List when preparing Tentative Lists and nominations. The Global Strategy is a tool for credible implementation of the Convention. We encourage the State Party to see it as a tool for how to enrich the List, to see it as an opportunity and a means to this end.

The credibility of the World Heritage Convention and its sustainable future have many facets; all facets need to be taken into account and dealt with in a holistic perspective.

Thank you madam chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Slovenia, you have the floor.”

Slovenia:

“Thank you very much for the floor Chairperson. Allow me to start by expressing our gratitude to the Kingdom of Bahrain for their generous welcome and organisation of this event, attended by delegations from all around the world and watched online. Slovenia’s delegation would like to join the group of observer States Parties that are following this year’s Committee session attentively and with great interest. Therefore, we feel compelled to speak.

As our colleagues from Sweden and Switzerland have before us, we would like to warmly congratulate all States Parties that have presented their nominations and commend them for their endeavours, considerate expertise and technical work, invested collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies.

We are particularly pleased with the well-grounded advanced nomination project that resulted in a straightforward inscription to the World Heritage List, or, just the same, removal from the World Heritage List in Danger. On the other hand, we feel discomfort with a number of cases, regardless of a particular region or where States Parties are from. Where the well-defined processes and rules under the Convention and Operational Guidelines were not observed, in our opinion, this put the very spirit of the Convention as well as the professional practices implemented by our experts respected by local and national authorities and engaged communities under question.

Drawing from our own experience, I can confirm that the established mechanisms in question do work and that all implications of the Advisory Bodies for recommendations or even unfavourable Committee decisions can give an impetus to further deliberation and consideration during the development of a convincing, conceptually strong nomination. We highly respect the expertise of the Advisory Bodies and their openness for dialogue with the States Parties. We seek their advice and benefit from it. The same goes for the World

Heritage Centre and their competent collaborators. It is such a rewarding experience for us when a property is inscribed on the basis of clearly-laid out, recognised values.

I should conclude with the well-known fact that the real work only starts after the inscription, with a strong focus on management and presentation of the World Heritage properties' Outstanding Universal Value to the public. When it is burdened with issues that should be resolved prior to inscription, this complicates and adds to the pressure of the complex and responsible task that it already is. I believe this clearly shows that the general respect of the process cannot be emphasised enough.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. New Zealand, you have the floor.”

New Zealand:

“*Mihi whakatau*, greetings from Aotearoa, New Zealand. Thank you madam Chair for your leadership of this session and this opportunity to speak. Thank you Bahrain for such warm and generous hospitality. We would like to add our weight to those of the observer States Parties that just spoke.

As a State Party of the World Heritage Convention, New Zealand considers that maintaining the integrity and the credibility of the World Heritage List is of the utmost importance. During this meeting we have observed a number of decisions that have softened or departed from the Advisory Bodies. We would be most concerned if this was to have future implications for the credibility of the World Heritage List. We consider that the provisions and the Convention in the Operational Guidelines for the advice of the Advisory Bodies and the scientific and objective decision-making are seen as true to maintaining the integrity of the List.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Canada.”

Canada:

“Thank you madam Chair for giving Canada the floor. This session of the World Heritage Committee has seen some very positive developments; one example is the concerted efforts by the UNESCO Secretariat in Bahrain as host country to defuse issues ahead of this session. This is most welcome and Canada would like to congratulate all concerns.

Several sites of an exemplary nature have been inscribed and a site has been removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. These are tremendous achievements. At the same time, there have also been more recent developments, notably a widening gap between the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies and the decisions of the Committee.

Canada respects the work of the Advisory Bodies even when we do not necessarily agree with some of the conclusions. It is for this reason that Canada withdrew one of its

nominations for consideration at this session. This will allow us to fundamentally rethink our approach for this nomination in light with the Advisory Bodies' recommendations.

The proper functioning of the Convention requires not only the States Parties serving in the Committee to give due respect to the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies but also the State Parties presenting nominations. This being said, we also recognise the expertise required to assess increasingly complex nomination dossiers requiring the Advisory Bodies to draw upon increasingly diverse and specialised expertise. Canada encourages the Committee and the Advisory Bodies to discuss these issues and to propose solutions.

As a strong supporter of the World Heritage Committee, Canada hopes that these comments will be received in the constructive spirit in which they are intended.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Denmark, you have the floor."

Denmark:

"Thank you madam Chair. The State Party of Denmark would like to address our concern over the Committee's increasing tendency to deviate from the expert bodies' advice in the decisions and the impact it might have on the World Heritage List. As we have just heard, other delegations share this concern and we feel strongly enough about it to address this worrying trend.

In order to maintain the credibility of the World Heritage Convention, we would underline that this deviation between expert advice and Committee decisions causes problems for us as Observers and States Parties representatives. What are we to report to our colleagues at home and to the people who are working hard to prepare Tentative List nominations and protecting and managing our World Heritage properties?

How can we continue to insist on their obligations to fulfil the entire requirement that goes with the preparation of a nomination file or a property inscribed on the World Heritage List? What we have experienced as observers over the last days make our work difficult.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Colombia, you have the floor."

Columbia:

[English interpretation] "Thank you madam Chair. Thank you again for your hospitality and thank you to everyone working in Bahraini heritage for their welcome.

We saw the inscription of Chiribiquete on this List and we celebrate this with one and all of you. In addition to the previous statement made, previous reiterations have been working for years of waiting, of travelling, of researching, of documenting; it was a very long and hard process. Many stakeholders were involved in reaching this culminating point of the inscription. Madam Chair, we also had the opportunity of working with the Advisory Bodies.

We had panels of experts, we had very difficult moments, but we managed to come up with a robust nomination that did go through.

What we wanted to say, madam Chair is, as has been pointed out, that we have to understand with concern and with some trepidation the tendency here. The aim now is to move forward. Now, what is going on with this Convention is also going on with the 2003 Convention.

We are going to leave Bahrain with a feeling of gratitude to your country Madam Chair, but also with absolute certainty that this must change for the good of all Member States.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We are moving to the next item. You will recall that it was decided to examine the General Decision 42 COM 7 on the state of conservation of World Heritage properties at the end of our debate on Items 7A and 7B. The agenda item was introduced on Tuesday morning last week by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Therefore, we move to the draft decision.

I would like to know whether there are any comments on this matter. Zimbabwe, please, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Madam Chairperson, I seek the floor to raise a matter that is of concern to us. This is relating to the decisions and the processes involved in opening sites for discussion at the Committee. If you look at the list of sites that were open for discussion either on the World Heritage List in Danger or on the state of conservation reports, there is a predominance of African sites. This is despite the fact that Africa is the least represented continent on the World Heritage List. Also, it contains 30 per cent of the properties on the World Heritage List in Danger.

In fact, among those that were open, one would have thought that there was discussion to be had. These decisions were approved without discussion. So, you wonder why they were opened. This is the same in terms of state of conservation reports where we had the situation where, for example, there was one from Latin America, none from Europe; it was actually at the request of the State Party that the property discussion be opened.

Madam Chairperson, this gives us an impression of an unfair targeting of Africa and Arab States and given them the impression that we are the ones in trouble. If it were not for the NGOs that raise problems of properties in Europe and other places, we would never know that they face the challenges that we do. Therefore, we make a proposal in addition to the draft decision which really asks that the opening of sites for discussion by the Committee be a process that is more rational, that is representative of the properties that are due to report and also representative of the World Heritage List.

This does not preclude States Parties from additionally requesting that their properties be open for discussion because they have specific issues to raise.

We are really concerned by this targeting that is happening and we think it is very negative to a region that is least represented on the List, but which is targeted for exposure,

even when it is not necessary. We had requested a case where a site was opened and the State Party did not bring the expert to answer any questions that had been raised.

Madam Chairperson, we have proposed an amendment to the draft decision and we are happy for others to contribute to the text, to make sure that it does not preclude States Parties for asking a site to be opened.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Ms. Rössler to answer this query.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Thank you to the delegate of Zimbabwe for the intervention and we have seen the amendment. I would like to recall where this comes from.

In 2003, the Committee decided that a report be presented to this World Heritage Committee according to two categories. Reports with recommended decisions which in the judgement of the Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies require discussions by the World Heritage Committee and second, category reports, which in the judgement of the Centre in consultation with the Advisory Bodies can be noted without discussion. The reasoning is that when you add more sites to the World Heritage List, you have more reports coming and the Committee does not have enough time to look into everything. That was the reasoning as it was in 2003.

Now, we are 15 years later. Since the adoption of this Decision, we have a very clear process in our discussions with the Advisory Bodies. We have two meetings in April where we look into all of this. We have agreed that the following state of conservation report will be brought to the Committee discussion based on scientific evidence and threats on the ground for the following points: if a deletion of the site from the World Heritage List is proposed because you need to take this decision; if inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger; if removal from the World Heritage List in Danger; if a property presents serious conservation issues of utmost urgency and if significant new information regarding the property has been received after the document was issued. You sometimes heard that colleagues from the regional desk and from our nature team presented such new information.

Of course, Committee members can still decide any other state of conservation in detail provided a request is made to the Chairperson. I am afraid it is not a mathematical approach but one based on the decision which needs to be taken by the Committee.

I hope this clarifies. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. I do appreciate the question that was raised by the distinguished delegates from Zimbabwe, because it is a valid thing to want to understand the basis on which properties are put forward for discussion around the state of conservation. My one observation is that we need to be careful about stepping into using a representative bias by doing that because I would not want us to see ourselves in circumstances where we spend a

lot of time talking about properties that do not warrant discussion because the circumstances are not urgent.

Australia proposes one amendment to Decision 7, just to introduce more of a sense of urgency around the finalisation of the climate change policy and we are asking that the policy comes back to the committee for a decision next year and that it goes through a process of development to involve consultation with States Parties and with civil society. I hand the floor to my colleague who also wants to make comments we have related to state of conservation processes.”

Australia new speaker:

“I would like to refer to the two additional clauses that Australia proposes under the Active Reactive Monitoring evaluation; in the draft decision these are numbered 8 and 9. I just would like to give you some rationale for these.

Australia notes with concern, as has been reflected in the remarks of the distinguished delegates from Zimbabwe, that the Committee has considered the state of conservation of many cultural and natural sites on the in Danger List for which the States Parties’ capacities to respond to the threats to these properties are compounded by natural disasters or civil unrest. In addition to these burdens, the managers of all these sites are experiencing overwhelming challenges in responding to the multiple and complex annual reporting requirements associated with an in Danger listing.

Australia notes that in conformity with article 11.4 of the World Heritage Convention, the Committee decided, and this is Decision 41 COM 14, paragraph 36 that, as a priority, States Parties concerned with working with the World Heritage Centre- related Advisory Bodies should develop cost action plans for sites on the in Danger List. I will not read the full clause because of time. As part of this approach, Australia suggests that a funding proposal is developed on the World Heritage market place to fund a workshop to assist States Parties with World Heritage properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger to implement and stage action plans.

These Action plans could be then clearly linked to international assistance, that is our clause number 9, and clause number 8 is asking how the Committee’s decisions could require States Parties with properties in Danger to document the progress they made against these staged and cost action plans rather to require them to report each year against all the items of the mentioned requirement to meet the desired state of conservation of their properties. We suggest that the aspects of this matter might be hopefully considered during the review of Reactive Monitoring currently being undertaken and this refers to our clause suggested, additional clause number 8.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Lors de nos débats de mardi dernier, nous avons posé la question au Centre par rapport aux biens qui sont inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril pendant plus de dix ans. La réponse que nous avons reçue est qu’il y a un processus qui est mis en place pour essayer de répondre à cette préoccupation.

Nous avons été informés qu'il y avait un terme de référence d'une équipe d'experts qui travaillait sur la question. Nous avons pris connaissance de ce terme de référence sur l'évaluation des missions de suivi et, finalement, nous nous sommes rendu compte que ce terme de référence n'aborde pas la question que nous avons soulevée. Donc, les termes de référence sont plutôt orientés sur les mécanismes pour évaluer l'efficacité des missions de suivi réactif et non d'évaluer la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du site qui est inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial pendant plus de dix ans.

Par conséquent, nous avons soumis un amendement à ce sujet sur ces cas spécifiques des sites qui sont inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril pendant plus de dix ans.

Pour continuer un peu mon propos. J'ai une question à poser à la conseillère juridique. En suivant un peu les débats tout au long de la session, surtout concernant les biens qui sont retirés définitivement de la Liste en péril ou à être inscrit dans cette même Liste, nous avons des débats qui étaient assez durs et parfois contradictoires. Au point où je suis allé voir ce qu'il y a dans les orientations dans le paragraphe 176, alinéa E.

Ma question est la suivante, pour faciliter un peu le Comité dans ce processus de prise de décision, comme nous avons toujours souligné le renforcement des dialogues et, etc., est-ce que les missions consultatives sur le terrain, qui sont recommandés dans ce paragraphe, peuvent être réalisés au sein de l'équipe qui fait la mission avec le membre du Comité ? La question est : est-ce que le membre du Comité peut accompagner un peu ces missions sur le terrain ?

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The legal advisor, can you answer the question?"

Legal Advisor:

"Thank you madam Chair. I do not think that this is a legal matter, this is much more linked with practical financial and other considerations that would need to be considered by the Centre and the Member State. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please."

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous souhaitons faire une appréciation en ce qui concerne le rapport de l'UICN sur le changement climatique. Madame la présidente, nous notons avec passion les conclusions du rapport de l'UICN et la résolution de l'ICOMOS 19 GA qui indiquent que le changement climatique est la menace qui pèse le plus lourdement sur les peuples et sur le patrimoine mondial culturel et naturel. C'est pourquoi nous réitérons notre demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial et aux Organisations consultatives en collaboration avec les partenaires externes d'étudier davantage les impacts actuels et potentiels du changement climatique sur la valeur universelle exceptionnelle des biens du patrimoine mondial.

Nous demandons aussi au Centre du patrimoine mondial que le document du rapport de la première évaluation scientifique des impacts du changement climatique sur les barrières de coraux publiés en 2017 soit mis à jour dans les meilleurs délais afin de permettre d'inclure les projections en ligne avec les informations relatives de l'Accord de Paris en s'assurant que les conclusions soient communiquées efficacement.

Enfin, nous notons avec satisfaction l'engagement de la société civile dans ce processus et réitérons notre demande au Centre du patrimoine mondial et aux Organisations consultatives à présenter au Comité du patrimoine mondial à sa 43^e session en 2019, un rapport d'activité portant sur le programme concernant les actions en lien avec le patrimoine mondial, le changement climatique et d'autre part la mise à jour du document d'orientation relatif aux impacts du changement climatique sur les biens du patrimoine mondial.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now I give the floor to Ms. Rössler to answer Angola's question.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Thank you to Angola for the question concerning the Reactive Monitoring. The process is actually explained in Paragraph 169 and following. Reactive monitoring is the reporting by the Secretariat that means the World Heritage Centre and other parts of UNESCO together with the Advisory Bodies through the Committee. It is not the Committee going on Reactive Monitoring missions.

However, I would like to inform you that in the 27 years I have observed, they were maybe two or three cases of very complex issues. In such cases, the Committee requested the Chairperson to go on a specific field mission together with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. Personally, I remember three cases. I hope this answers your question.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Before we continue, I just want to inform you that because of the huge number of matters to discuss today we have managed to stay up to 7:00 pm tonight. Spain you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. It needs to be said that this is one of the decisions with the most complex additional obligations for the Centre as well. Despite the lack of time, I think that we need to discuss what it is that we are going to request from the Committee and the Centre as well and the Advisory Bodies.

We can support the proposals made by Australia and I simply add a comment to the proposal from Zimbabwe. I fully understand the rationale behind this concern, having heard the director of the Centre. I believe that it is a very complex issue with the number of state of conservation reports that we have to deal every year; achieving mathematical proportionality is complex and we really need to have sufficient flexibility to ensure that the criteria can

enable us to deal in the Committee with those cases that are necessary for which we need a discussion. Also, to have a margin for those states that may wish to give their opinion to the Committee.

When we reach that point we will have some suggestions for modifications to Zimbabwe's proposal which I believe may perhaps limit us in our ability to deal with state of conservation reports either for properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger or the World Heritage List itself.

I must say that I am a little at a loss as to the proposal tabled by Angola and I may perhaps request the Centre to take a look again concerning what it is we are dealing with and understanding the concern with regard to the number of properties on the in Danger List and the funds that we have to ensure that we can provide any necessary assistance. I think we need to find the best possible mechanism to ensure protection and to make sure that those properties can be taken off the in Danger List.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please."

Zimbabwe:

"Thank you madam Chair. Two things; firstly, I am grateful for the explanation of the Director on the process they follow to identify sites for discussion. I am, however, not satisfied with quite a number of sites from Africa which then passed without discussion. I do not want to question the gentleman from the group of this site or another. I am still left with a sense that there is something that needs to be done to try and provide a fair picture of the World Heritage List and the state of conservation report and the World Heritage List in Danger. I think that can be achieved.

I am grateful to Spain for the proposal that they would also put forth some texts to ensure that it does not appear, if you want, to now discuss 100 reports. But it is to say that if we are going to discuss ten reports, those ten reports should just not be African reports, they should cover the globe and represent everybody.

Secondly, I want to thank Australia for the proposals that have been made to further support the countries on the World Heritage List in Danger and also to make it more meaningful in terms of capacity-building in terms of technical as well as financial assistance for maintaining these sites. This would ensure that we are in fact doing something to change the status of the properties that are on the List in Danger.

Thank you madam chairperson."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Cuba, please."

Cuba:

[English interpretation] "Thank you very much madam Chairperson. What we have here is a rather complex decision and we, perhaps, also need to remember that references have been

made to climate change and other issues. Let me clarify that for the moment we are only dealing with the List of World Heritage in Danger or can we also touch upon other issues such as climate change? For the moment, I will only deal with that issue.

This is something I believe that we have been getting back to constantly, the need for and importance of greater dialogue between the Advisory Bodies, the States Parties concerned and the Secretariat, particularly with regard to Reactive Monitoring and the state of conservation for the sites that are on the List of World Heritage in Danger or for those that may potentially be put on that List. I think it is important if we want to maintain this harmony and balance that we are all advocating in this Committee. I think we had some examples during this very session.

There has been a meeting with the Advisory Bodies, is this a strategy throughout the year that constitutes a possibility of meetings and dialogues? We have other issues concerning climate change, but if we have not got that far yet, we will reserve those comments for later.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, please.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. Saint Kitts and Nevis generally supports the content of Draft Decision 42 COM 7. However, we note that the wording outlining the amended paragraph 23 on the subject of climate change was extensively discussed at the 41st session of the World Heritage Committee and as such we would like to maintain the wording of that portion of that decision. Particularly, in light of the recent extreme weather events experienced by Small Island Developing States in the Caribbean. A draft amendment to this effect has therefore been submitted regarding paragraph 23.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Can we go back to the draft amendment submitted by Australia please? Yes, thank you. I truly appreciate what has been submitted by the Australian delegation to ensure funding. We have monitoring missions and they have some recommendations and with their suggestions we want to make sure those suggestions be implemented.

What is worrying us is that these link to implement those suggestions by raising funds for the capacity-building and workshops. What is worrying us is that as we always hear about the lack of funds and those funds that are not available; we are shifting the responsibilities from the States Parties regarding their sites to the lack of funds availability. I want to just put towards the Committee that this might elicit the responsibilities of the States Parties regarding their in Danger List.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Allow me to recall at this point the statement of the Brazilian delegation during the examination of the state of conservation of the Kathmandu Valley. We stressed the need for more emphasis on international assistance for the recovery in post-natural disaster situations. We are well aware of the efforts undertaken by the World Heritage Centre in light of this strategy for reducing risk from disasters at World Heritage properties. But we consider that more emphasis should be given to the destruction of heritage resulting from natural disasters.

However important, the destruction of properties caused by conflicts should deserve our special attention, but they cannot overshadow the significant and involuntary losses of lives and World Heritage properties caused by natural disasters. Therefore, I would like to propose an amendment to include a new item at the end of paragraph 18 addressing specifically emerging situations resulting from natural disasters. I do not know if it would be the case of presenting this amendment or if we wait until we reach this paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“As you would like, because we will adopt paragraph by paragraph. Thank you very much. Australia you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just responding to the comments from the distinguished delegate from Kuwait. I do understand well what he is saying, so when we come to paragraph 11, I can perhaps make the suggested change now and at the end of the paragraphs where it says instead *‘and notes that these plans can be linked to requests for international assistance and shared in the Market Place’*; capital ‘M’ and capital ‘P’. I think it is clearer than *‘prerogative of the State Party to being used those plans to seek international assistance or to share them in the Market Place’*.

I think that the suggested change to climate change from the distinguished representative from Saint Kitts and Nevis is sensible and is a clear restating of the decision that was taken by the Committee last year.”

The Chairperson:

‘Thank you very much. Norway, please’

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. It is indeed a long and complex decision, this one. I will try to be brief and make a few remarks. We fully sympathise with the emotions expressed by the distinguished ambassador from Zimbabwe. Yet, I do wish to reiterate what I understood from

the Centre: this must be an exercise that depends on the site itself and not on arithmetics. Maybe we could find a way to express this in paragraph 12 by suggesting, for example, that properties open for discussion reflect proportionality and representativeness of the World Heritage List; something like that, I have yet to think of a sentence. But this is what I could suggest: *'From the 43rd session, state of conservation open for discussion should reflect or should be proportional...'*, something like this.

Secondly, we talked about paragraph 28 earlier. I would like to ask the World Heritage Centre whether this is a realistic timetable. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor."

Spain:

[English interpretation] "Could you show the paragraph on screen again? I would need to see it again so that we can draft it. Very much along the lines of Norway, we suggest that the state of conservation should represent the proportionality and representativeness of the List or something along these lines."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor, "

Zimbabwe:

"We thank Norway and Spain for these suggestions. While I am in general agreement with them, I am wondering why we changed from the 43rd session to the 44th session, because the list of state of conservation reports does not change, it is just the meeting where they would decide which one to open: I think it is one meeting that decides this and they do not need time to figure out how to do this. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Brazil, please."

Brazil:

"Thank you madam Chair. I understand the concerns of the representative of Zimbabwe and I am grateful to her for bringing up this topic. We are also grateful for the suggestions made by Spain and Norway.

However, I believe that what should guide our topics here is not to include sites only to make a proportional list. I think what we have to do is to address the situations that really require attention. With this paragraph, we will be targeting countries in order to make a proportional list which I do not think should be the purpose of our work.

Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, please.”

Hungary:

“Thank you chairperson. Hungary agrees in principle with the proposal of Zimbabwe. However, Hungary thinks that the form and the expression provided in the recommendation is not exactly what we would like to have. In the main points and main sentence Hungary agrees with Spain in this respect.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chairperson. I will be very brief. We agree with the Ambassador of Brazil. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Australia agrees with the Ambassador from Brazil, but I think the formulation may need some assistance. If I may read it out and then it can be put up on the screen to assist the Committee, it builds on the intent of both Norway and Zimbabwe and it would say: *‘suggests that the Centre considers geographical distribution as an additional criterion when deciding which properties it recommends for discussion regarding their state of conservation’*.”

That would, I think, enable the Centre to give some serious thought as to how we make sure that we are looking at those properties that are of concern around their state of conservation and we do so with a sort of broad sweep across the whole of the planet. Because it is the case that sometimes with developed countries such as Australia, while we have the view that we are managing our properties very well, there are nonetheless issues that do bear further examination by the Committee and while that can be uncomfortable for us, it is nonetheless the case that in examining those properties, there are lessons that can be learnt through such examination with the wider World Heritage community. I see the point that Zimbabwe is making, hence this suggested formulation.’

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. It is always good to have the assistance of a native language speaker when it is getting late in the evening. I think we will support the Australian proposal and withdraw our own. I was also thinking along these lines not just geographically, but also thematically; it could be relevant to look into this to make sure we have a thematic representation of the state of conservation as well.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would still not be very happy, I am sorry, with adopting as a priority the geographical distribution. I think that the main reason for addressing one site should be its state of conservation. I think that the priority should be the most, let’s say, urgent cases regarding the state of conservation. I think that the Centre should consider primarily the state of conservation in different regions of the world.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I appreciate very much the suggestion by Australia and I think this will go a long way in resolving the problems. I still want to make sure that it says 43rd session and not 44th session, because that is something that is very doable for the Centre.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. I think we are still struggling with the formulation here. It is not supposed to be an arithmetical distribution of how we deal with the problem, but rather perhaps to capture exactly what is happening in all regions. Perhaps, as put forward by the distinguished delegate of Norway, maybe the native speakers can help here. I have a feeling that we have not struck the right wording yet.

What I am saying is the way to depict our work is disproportional on the Africa region, giving an impression that troubles are only in Africa. As has been said by other delegates here, in some regions there also issues that should be brought forward for discussion. I think we still have to, maybe, look forward and compose this paragraph to come up with the right wording.

Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. La première observation sur ce paragraphe concerne le verbe, le premier, “*suggérer*” le Comité ne suggère pas. Si vous suggérer, quand je fais une suggestion, le Centre peut l’accepter ou non, donc c’est optionnel, on accepte ou on n’accepte pas. Donc, on ne suggère pas et je propose que l’on mette :

“Recommande que le Centre du patrimoine mondial, en dehors des principaux problèmes de conservation auxquels sont confrontés les sites, prenne également en compte la répartition géographique et thématique”, pour répondre à la préoccupation de la Norvège, “*comme critère supplémentaire*”.

Voilà la proposition je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Going back to the suggestion from Australia regarding the geographical distribution, and I also understand Brazil’s concern regarding meeting the criteria that some countries might feel targeted. It should be from the statistical point of view, before the word ‘*distribution*’ ‘*normalised count distribution*’; this way it would take perspective. ‘*Normalised count*’ would be fair statistically to each region and would eliminate the targeted point as addressed by Brazil. If you add, ‘*normalised count of the geographical distribution*’.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous avons des propositions qui sont très proches les unes des autres. Tout d’abord, je relève que la traduction anglaise dans la proposition espagnole c’est “suggère” en anglais et “décide” sur la version française. Je vais rester sur la version française du coup. Sensible à l’argument de l’honorable représentant de l’Angola, le Comité ne “suggère” pas il “décide”, d’ailleurs c’est une décision qui se prépare.

Il me semble que le souci soulevait par les honorables représentants du Brésil et du Mozambique nous mènent plutôt vers des sites qu’à partir de sa 43^e session les biens proposés à la discussion devraient tendre à refléter la représentativité. Beaucoup l’ont dit, ce

ne peut être une représentation arithmétique et il peut y avoir des situations d'urgence qui font qu'une région est plus représentée que d'autres. "Tendre à refléter" cela veut dire que l'on ajoute un paramètre supplémentaire cela quelque part me paraît équilibrer les tendances ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Now, with your permission, I will give the NGO the floor before you adopt the decision."

NGO:

"Thank you madam Chair for giving us the floor. I am speaking on behalf of the Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF. We wish to congratulate her Excellency Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa for her election as Chair and thank her for ensuring that all States Parties and approved Observers had the possibility to intervene and provide relevant information in this Committee session prior to adoption of decisions.

We also highly appreciate the support of the World Heritage Centre along with the States Parties to open the working of the Convention to members of civil society, including NGOs, and the opportunity to comment on the draft policy compendium.

We encourage the World Heritage Centre to extend this consultation to Phase 2 to provide suggestions on which policies to develop and refine. We welcome the recent no-go commitments made by Barclays and Standard Charters and the growing interest of the insurance industry and strongly encourage the World Heritage Centre to pursue dialogue along voluntary no-go commitments with other relevant public sector and private entities.

We note with concern that illegal activities threaten 25 per cent of the sites under review at 42.COM and 55 per cent of natural sites. Criminal networks behind such illegal activities have been responsible for the deaths of our colleagues working in and around protected areas. We express our condolences to the families and friends of those killed while protecting World Heritage sites.

We urge States Parties to put in place and implement strong legal frameworks to combat wildlife crime and related corruption, ensure adequate resources for law enforcement at all levels, prioritise anti-poaching and counter wildlife trafficking efforts, including the successful prosecution and increased domestic and international cooperation.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Canada, please."

Canada:

"Thank you madam Chairperson. Distinguished delegates and guests, listening to the discussion throughout the session on item 7, Canada would like to take this opportunity to share recent news in relation to the state of conservation of the Wood Buffalo National Park World Heritage site.

As a result of the 2014 petition by the Mikisew Cree First Nation, a Reactive Monitoring mission was undertaken to Wood Buffalo National Park World Heritage site by the World Heritage Centre and IUCN. In July of 2017 a decision was adopted by the World Heritage Committee requesting the development of an action plan informed by a Strategic Environmental Assessment to assess the cumulative impact of development on the Outstanding Universal Value.

Canada respects the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee, supported by the expertise of IUCN and considers the decision of the World Heritage Committee to be a call to action. We are pleased to report the recent completion and publication of the Strategic Environmental Assessment. As a next step, the Minister responsible for Parks Canada recently announced CAD 27.5 million over five years to support the development and implementation of the action plan to secure the future of the Wood Buffalo National Park World Heritage site.

This substantial new long-term funding is part of Canada's recent historic investment of CAD 1.3 billion to protect and grow Canada's network of protected areas as we work towards the 2020 Aichi Biodiversity Target. This represents one of the largest investments in nature and conservation in Canada's history.

Le Canada souhaite réitérer son engagement à développer un plan d'action robuste en réponse aux recommandations du Comité. Pour se faire le gouvernement du Canada entend continuer à travailler avec ses partenaires des provinces et territoires ainsi qu'avec les communautés autochtones concernées afin d'assurer le futur du parc national Wood Buffalo site du patrimoine mondial pour les générations à venir.

J'aimerais conclure en remerciant les membres de ce Comité, les collègues du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN pour leur collaboration continue sur cet important dossier.

Merci beaucoup ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is to the Rapporteur to read the decision paragraph by paragraph. Thank you."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. After this rich debate there are several amendments to this draft decision. I am going to start from the top. Paragraphs 1 and 2 would remain unchanged."

The Chairperson:

"Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraphs 1 and 2? I see none. As adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much. New paragraph 3 would read:

3. *'Thanks the State Party of Bahrain for having organized a World Heritage Site Managers Forum (Manama, 2018), as a capacity-building exercise aiming at increasing the understanding of the World Heritage decision-making process among site managers, in order to achieve a more effective protection of the OUV (Outstanding Universal Value); acknowledges the importance and benefit of this Forum and considers that it should be convened in conjunction with all future sessions of the World Heritage Committee;'*

The Chairperson:

"Are there any objections to the adoption of paragraph 3? I see none. As adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"New paragraph 4 would read:

4. *'Takes note of the Statement of Participants which calls for transparent, informed and responsible decision-making to emphasize the importance of heritage above short term political and diplomatic interests and encourages States Parties to support the participation of their respective site managers to future fora and other capacity-building opportunities as they will be able to offer informed insights which could lead to more effective and efficient management.'*

The Chairperson:

"Kuwait, please."

Kuwait:

"Thank you madam Chairperson. After reading this paragraph, Kuwait and colleagues of the Arab group truly believe we are involved in UNESCO in our care for education, culture and science regardless of our political point of view. We strongly value the cultural content of our work. We also strongly trust that members are working with a clear and responsible agenda and all the files in front of us are not political files, they are cultural-based files.

We also strongly value and respect the Director General's clear recommendations on not mixing politics in any file discussions as we hear in so many occasions and meetings. We also strongly believe that any disagreement or discontent that happens here is based on different cultural backgrounds and technical understanding of the topics and not political content. Therefore, we do not think that this amendment is necessary for any values since we believe that there is no need to reiterate or repeat what is already practised.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Angola, please."

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Juste un petit rajout sur la première phrase : “*on prend note de la participation des participants au forum*”. Vers la fin du paragraphe, j’aimerais suggérer que l’on simplifie un peu la formulation, elle est assez lourde à digérer.

Je relie la phrase “*encourage les États parties à soutenir les gestionnaires de site aux forums futurs et aux autres opportunités de renforcement des capacités afin de leur permettre de fournir des informations éclairées en ce qui concerne la gestion de leurs sites respectifs*” ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. When it comes to this paragraph, first of all, at the creation of this managers’ forum, which was organised in Cracow, we agreed that we should take notes of the participation of the participants, but to make a specific reference to that alone, to transparent decisions, the importance of heritage, political and diplomatic issues, I think there are other aspects that were also raised at the forum.

Therefore, I think it would be simpler to say, ‘*takes note of the participation and encourages the member States to support the participation in future editions*’. We also agree on the substance of what Kuwait said.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you madam Chair. I see that Cuba has already spoken of what I had to say, so I have nothing to add.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. Very briefly, just to support these proposals made by the Cuban delegation. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie soutient les propositions du Koweït et de Cuba ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, this was a joint proposal between Australia and Norway; from an Australian perspective, having heard the discussion and noting that the statement from participants in the forum be indeed incorporated into the record of this meeting, Australia would be happy to support the amendment proposed by Cuba.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much. I would just like very briefly to express our agreement with the proposal made by Cuba, especially because we cannot prejudge the results from those fora. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, please.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We support what was said by Kuwait and also we support Cuba’s amendment because it takes both amendments made by Kuwait and Australia.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think there is an agreement of the Member States. Could you please read the paragraph?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. I will now read out the paragraph which would read:

4. ‘Takes note of the Statement of Participants to the Forum and encourages States Parties to support the participation of their respective site managers to future fora and other capacity-building opportunities in order to enable them to provide appropriate information with regard to the management of their respective sites as they will be able to offer informed insights which could lead to more effective and efficient management.’

I am afraid we have not gotten to that part of the paragraph. The bigger discussion is more on removing this part. This is now reflected on the screen; the proposal of Angola to remove the last part.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you agree about the decision’s wording? In that case it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Now, paragraph 5 would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“As adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“We have a proposal from Angola for paragraph 6 which would read:

6. ‘Notes with concern that some properties have remained on the List of World Heritage in Danger for more than ten years; this raises questions on whether the Outstanding Universal Value has been maintained and requests the World Heritage Centre to establish an inclusive working mechanism for assessing the Outstanding Universal Value of these sites, and to present a report during the 44th session;’

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections? I see none. As adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Paragraphs 7 to 9 would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“As adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“We have new paragraph 10 which would read:

'10. Requests that the Reactive Monitoring Evaluation includes options for process improvements for sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger, in particular how actions recommended by Reactive Monitoring missions to assist States Parties to meet their desired state of conservation should be incorporated into the costed Action Plans decided by the World Heritage Committee in its Decision 41 COM 14;'

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? I see none. As adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"Paragraph 11 would read:

11. 'Further requests the World Heritage Centre develop a proposal, for sharing in the World Heritage Market Place, for funds to support a workshop to assist States Parties with sites on the List of World Heritage in Danger to develop and implement prioritised, staged and costed action plans, and notes that these plans can be linked to requests for international assistance and shared in the Market Place;'

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Are there any comments or objections? I see none. As adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. We have reached paragraph 12, where we have several proposals for discussion as was noted earlier. The meaning of all these proposals is the same, but the wording is slightly different. May I request through you madam Chair if I should read out the four proposals, or should the Committee go into consideration of the four proposals?"

The Chairperson:

"Do you need time to consider it until tomorrow? Or we discuss now and adopt. Today, we do not have much time. Can you discuss it tonight and tomorrow we will finalise the matter? Angola, would you like to say something?"

Angola:

« Pour aider dans la réflexion. Cet amendement est en trois parties sur lesquels on doit se mettre d'accord. D'abord la limite du temps, la 43^e session, sommes-nous d'accord ? Le premier problème. Le deuxième est le libellé des représentativités géographiques et thématiques. Le troisième volet est celui soulevé par le Brésil. Il faut prendre en compte les problèmes de conservation en priorité. Voilà, les trois grands problèmes pour que l'on arrive à une meilleure formulation pour cette recommandation ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. With your permission, we will keep these paragraphs between brackets and I do not know what you would rather do. Think about it and discuss among yourselves and we talk about it tomorrow, unless you have another suggestion. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I was trying to listen to your proposal. I think it would be good to work on the general agreement. As Angola said, it is just to agree on the three key principles; maybe you give us tonight and we come back tomorrow with some paragraphs for consideration.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please”

Brazil:

“Just to request madam if you could circulate the text we have now. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The Rapporteur, please continue the remaining paragraphs. Thank you.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. After bracketing paragraph 12, paragraphs 13 to 25 would remain unchanged.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you want to adopt these paragraphs now or tomorrow as there might be a link between them? Hungary, please, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. An addition should be given on paragraph 21, otherwise there is no problem with the paragraphs for Hungary. I do not know whether it is the original or not. It appeals to all the Member States of UNESCO. Something is missing at the end: *‘on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import and Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property;’*

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, I think you asked the question whether we would be happy with the whole block of paragraphs with no changes. The answer of Australia is yes, absolutely.”

The Chairperson:

“We adopt it now without any changes. You wanted to add something?”

Hungary:

“It is written already so I am happy with it.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we adopt as it is now? Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I am sorry, if I am a little bit lost, but I proposed some amendments right after the item ‘*emerging situations resulting from conflicts*’. I would like to introduce two paragraphs at the end of this whole paragraph. Could I propose it now, or should I send it to the Secretariat?”

The Chairperson:

“I think you can send it and you come back tomorrow with the full amendments for the rest of the decision.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, with your permission we move to item 11. It concerns the report on a draft policy compendium. The relevant document is document 11. I would like to invite Ms. Petya Totcharova, of the World Heritage Centre, to briefly present this item.

Ms. Petya Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. Actually we are passing from the state of conservation to a more general document that we have been requested to produce. I have to present the

progress report on the draft policy compendium, which is included in document 11 of this session.

Just very, very briefly on my side before I request to give the floor to the two experts from the working group who are going to present the process, the content and the outcomes of the working group. Let me just give you a bit of background.

You may remember that at the 35th session in Paris, the Committee adopted a decision saying that new policy guidance document should be developed as a means to capture the range of policies that the General Assembly adopts. This was a big undertaking for which we needed extra budgetary funding. Thanks to the government of Australia, which pledged its support for the preparation and finalisation of the policy guideline documents in 2015, the work could start. It started with a scoping study which the Committee examined at its 40th session and requested us to undertake further work along the lines of the recommendations of the scoping study.

Further background on this; this decision approved the scoping study and the two-phase approach that was recommended by the study. It remained, and this is important to remember, because the initial decision was for policy guidelines, but at the 40th session the Committee decided to rename it as a compendium of policies of the World Heritage Convention in order to avoid confusion with the Operational Guidelines between policy guidelines and Operational Guidelines. Then it requested that the draft policy compendium which has been developed and readied by an expert working group be examined at this session.

At this session, you have in document 11, a progress report which contains this draft policy compendium, a two-phased approach, as mentioned in the scoping study. Phase one is the current one. Actually, what you see in front of you in Word format is a collection of existing policies which we are presenting to you, as we were requested by the Committee at its 40th session. And we have phase 2, which will follow this one, where the policy compendium will be reviewed for consistency between individual policy and the streamlined final text will be presented for approval to you at the next Committee session.

It is very important to highlight that this is a collection of existing policies for presentation to the World Heritage Committee. The scope of work actually produced a draft policy compendium for further development and the methodology was identified in organising existing policies and not policy drafting. It is very important to highlight there has been no new policy drafted or suggestions about policy to be drafted. Possibly at the next stage, the group can present to you a set of topics on which no policy stance has been identified. One important element: The future and real format of the policy compendium should be an online one. It needs to be a reference tool, so that all users can easily identify the policy they are looking for.

How did we work? We did a study, an extensive research of World Heritage policy documents, Committee decisions, hundreds and hundreds of decisions on state of conservation, on nominations and other related documents. We had a case law approach because you do adopt in the end of the day; you do establish policies through your decisions. This ensured a holistic approach with a case law analysis of World Heritage Committee decisions and state of conservation nominations. We identified an appropriate thematic structure or we actually debated on an appropriate thematic structure which was finally agreed between us and presented to you.

We had a working group, as we said, and we have two representatives of the working group with us today to actually present the results of their work. The policy compendium expert group included experts working both in the cultural and natural fields of heritage from the different regions of the world and also we ensured gender balance.

We have a regional, gender, cultural and nature group of experts. Here to represent this working group, one from the European region and the other from the Asia-Pacific region, and as you can see they are very well gender-balanced. It is like this, we try to have the gender balance follow the priority of UNESCO. Work was carried out online and also during two meetings organised at the UNESCO headquarters in Paris and that was very, very intensive, especially during the face to face examining of paragraphs. You will learn more about that.

Just one last point that I wanted to make. You will all remember that we did an online consultation which was very inclusive, very participative. It was for the first time an online consultation which included not only States Parties Committee members, but it included a larger set of stakeholders, if I can call it this. It included Category 2 Centres, UNESCO chairs and very importantly the civil society. This is really a first experience in this regard and we do believe that it provided us with a very, very good feedback from a large number of stakeholders.

This is the time where I should finish my introduction and pass the floor to our experts, Dr Terril from Australia and Ms. Marana from Spain, to present the work of the working group and the document. Thank you very much madam Chair; with your permission I pass the floor to Mr. Terril.”

Mr. Greg Terril:

“Thank you very much indeed.

I have about eight slides to outline some of the choices that the working group faced in developing a draft of the policy compendium. Perhaps the first choice was over the thousands of decisions that have been made over 45 years. How to select out those key policy-related decisions?

Our frame of thinking was the simple proposition of a user wanting to find out policy on key items such as local communities or factors affecting properties, transport, development, buildings and so forth. To answer that, our first challenge was to have a broad operating definition of what policy was. We did not spend time on this, but we understood that policy is in effect an agreed approach on how to approach something, by contrast with operational issues which is a process of the timelines to go about following a particular process.

Policies and operational issues can exist on something of a continuum, but we were very keen to have a fairly clear distinction between what is in the Operational Guidelines, how to go about matters and what might be in the policy compendium, the basic approaches to be consistent in thinking about a class of activities.

A critical question we phased was the audience. For whom should this compendium be developed? As you see on the screen, we came up with three audiences: the primary audience, the Committee, secondary audiences or major audiences including experts and other observers who attend Committee meetings, for those beyond them, those that are involved in managing sites around the world, many thousand of people in effect and beyond them a broader group of interested parties.

In some ways, the aim of what we were trying to do was to provide an easy access guide, so that across the whole system, across all those audiences, people could readily understand what policy decisions have been taken over the past 45 years.

Our next choice, our next decision was where to look for the policies. As already mentioned, a primary documentary source was the Convention itself and the decisions taken

by the World Heritage Committee and by the World Heritage General Assembly, which is a vast body of work, a vast number of decisions. We were also concerned to look more broadly in the UNESCO context and in the United Nations system context to make sure that all critical policy areas were covered and that there were no very strong gaps in what was left. I am happy to report that what we found and what you will see in the draft in front of you is that through the Committee's decisions and the General Assembly's decisions all main policy areas are covered and there is very little in the UNESCO system, in the United Nations system that stands as a gap.

The many thousand of policies contained within Committee and General Assembly decisions recognised, the next question that arose was how to quote those policies. Not all policies are identified themselves, as such. Some are implicit statements that apply through a general category of activity, some are very directly characterised as policies. What we tried to do was to lift out all of those policies and to quote as much as was needed, but as little as was needed to be clear so as to keep the length of all of those policies manageable.

Our critical guiding line was always to keep the original wording. We did not change any wording from the originals. In a couple of instances we inserted in square brackets references to the World Heritage Committee or the World Heritage Centre or perhaps States Parties just to be clear to whom a particular policy may apply. That is in square brackets; it has always been identified and in no other instance did we have to track or change from the wording.

Having sorted through and found the key policies that we thought were relevant, the next question was what structure to adopt. To list them alphabetically, analogically, by the type of document that they are included in or some other order. What we found was, there is no option that avoids overlap. In many cases policies are relevant to several categories of activity. We made the choice rather than repeat; often we would place policies in the categories they were most relevant to. We also made a very deliberate decision in choosing the heading of categories. We would only pursue terminology that is relevant in other processes of World Heritage related to the Operational Guidelines periodic reporting and so forth.

After much discussion, we decided that the most familiar and therefore the best structure to order the policies in for this paper-based version in front of view was the five 'Cs'. They are very familiar, align well with Convention's objectives, and they have a structure that does enable the creation of subheadings under each objective that follows procedural and other categories. In addition, we have created a general chapter and some long annexes showing where we have drawn our policies from.

A further challenge that we faced, a further choice that we faced, was whether in effect some policies are more important than others. In this respect we made the decision that in our view policies that come directly from the Convention are the most important. The next most important are strategies and policies adopted directly by the World Heritage Committee or the General Assembly. The third category was the Operational Guidelines, also other UNESCO recommendations and decisions and finally what we have called case law, which are really decisions that are adopted consistently over time, particularly under items 7 and 8 on our agenda.

We faced a situation and you will see from the footnotes in the policy compendium where we referenced many, many decisions where they were often similar policies on the same topic with slightly different wording. In this case, we chose to follow the most consistently used wording and with a preference for wording from more recent decisions rather than older ones. We thought we might face a challenge of policies that would be different from each other that were diverging. We were not sure if that situation would arise or how to respond.

As it turned out, that situation was more theoretical than real. And if I may give an example, in relation, for example, for the consultation with local communities: in a space of five years, consultation with local communities at one stage was recommended not to take place before a nomination was inscribed, to avoid the possibility of disappointing the communities; within five years that position had reversed, and consultation was urged with local communities. That is an illustration to show that policies evolve, they do not necessarily diverge.

Clearly the Convention had been elaborating its thinking and eventually, of course, that approach was captured in one of the five 'Cs'. Finally, in relation to some of the challenges on how to organise a policy, many of the policies, as I mentioned, crosscut; they relate to different elements. That is a feature that is quite prominent in the paper version that you have in front of you. But the Secretariat has already mentioned our aim is to eventually put this online where it would become relevant.

Final slide, the online consultation, that the Secretariat has already mentioned, sent out or invited comments on a draft structure, tables of contents and contexts for the policy compendium. It asked three questions. The first, which is on your top left: was the proposed content the key issue that it was covering suitable to the task? 97 per cent of respondents answered yes. The second question: was the structure a good framework to follow? We are pleased to report that 99 per cent of respondents answered yes. The third question was on the format: was it suitable, an appropriate, useful way to present? 97 per cent have responded and said yes. That was very heartening for our work and enabled us to bring forward the structure that we have in front of the document with you today.

With that, madam Chair, I finish my presentation and hand over to my colleague. Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much."

Ms. Maider Marana:

"As was already said, we created a research process to identify some case law decisions that were key for particular items. We based our research on the already existing tools from the Convention. The main source of information was the state of conservation database which is accessible online and which was useful to identify decisions of different categories like themes or threats.

In this regard, more than 400 decisions relating to state of conservation were also reviewed; more than 200 decisions to nominations. In fact a high number of decisions were reviewed, but taking into account that Committee decisions refer to specific challenges to a particular property, they do not provide a text that could be recorded in a policy compendium. The exercise of the case law tried to identify common responses to similar issues by compiling at least three comparable decisions for similar problems affecting the site. We also tried to ensure that the decision did not relate to one single property, but at least to three different properties or more from different regions.

As we mentioned, the draft policy compendium compiled already existing policies and we kept the original wording. For those paragraphs related to the case law the content of the paragraph is not linked to one single decision, but to different decisions which have taken a similar approach to a specific subject. In some cases the wording could be similar to some particular decisions on the state of conservation of a property. However the text aims to highlight common approaches to general issues.

During the drafting of the policy compendium, the expert group was aware of the differences among categories and even on the possible gaps concerning specific topics. Looking to different chapters, we would see that there is a clearly different number of references among categories. It is not the same number of references under conservation or under communication, for example. Furthermore, the expert group also identified some key areas for the Convention which, however, were not reflected in any specific decisions where we could take quotes from texts.

This is the case for example for a key item like youth where the World Heritage Committee has promoted actions to engage young people in the protection of heritage, but it has not had such approach in a specific decision. Therefore, it is important to remember that a higher number of references in one or another category does not mean any type of hierarchy or consideration over the importance of the theme. It is related to the existing references in the consulted documents. In basis, all categories should be considered for future phases of the work.

Once analysed the methodology; we would like just to present the results. The experts consider that the current document is a holistic draft policy compendium including general procedures and key issues. It also gives us a general overview of the Committee's work and decisions. In addition to all the above, we firmly believe that the document we are presenting today provides us with a basic framework for any next steps.

The draft policy compendium document currently has more than 100 pages, and as was already presented, all these materials structure around the five 'Cs'. However, it is a structure which is also tailored to adapt to the specific needs of the exercise. In addition to the introduction of the document, the expert group considers that our first chapter on general policies regarding the Convention should be included. This new chapter is then followed by the mentioned five 'Cs' chapter.

As was already mentioned, it was also noted that there were a range of policies on a strategy document that could be relevant to the work of the World Heritage Committee and they have been listed under Annex 1. The final result is a document composed by introduction with a methodological approach, six chapters and one annex of all the sentences in a text. The first chapter is dedicated to general policies and focuses on four items: fundamental policies, synergy with the Convention, shared responsibilities and the implementation of the convention at the national level.

After this general chapter, we have the five 'Cs' chapter. It is dedicated to the credibility of the World Heritage List which is a long chapter with key items like nominations and the concept of Outstanding Universal Value, the Global Strategy for a representative balance and credible World Heritage List or reactive processes, among others.

The third chapter relates to conservation, where many policies were identified. We must highlight some chapters like conservation, protection, management of properties, monitoring of the state of conservation, impact assessment, disaster risk management or the sustainable development policy and tourism. In order to have a holistic approach to conservation, a chapter on factors affecting properties was also included. The list of factors then refers to the really long list established for the exercise of the state of conservation and which was also considered for the questionnaire of the third cycle of the reporting exercise. Some sub-chapters of these factors affecting properties could be pollution, development, infrastructure, etc.

The fourth chapter incorporates capacity-building, including general policies on the topic and the key tool of the capacity-building strategy. The following chapter is dedicated to communication, including education and awareness-raising and interpretation. Last but not least, Chapter 6 relates to communities and focuses on some key items for the Convention,

like the participation of local communities and other stakeholders, human rights, gender equality, youth and the fostering of peace and security.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I will be very quick. Australia offers its commendations to the expert working group and the World Heritage Centre for the excellent policy compendium. For us here, as Committee members, this policy compendium, including personally, has already been very helpful and we are sure it will assist the World Heritage system in more consistent decision-making. We are pleased that we were able to support the first phase of the compendium and we look forward to Stage 2 and especially the online tool, which will improve accessibility and usability.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. The policy compendium is an important document for a more coherent and systematic implementation of the Convention. Developing it has been an enormous and challenging task. Norway would also like to thank the experts and the Centre for its extensive, comprehensive and immense effort. We would also like to thank Australia for sponsoring this important work. Norway supports this holistic approach, including not only policy decisions but also the Convention itself, the Operational Guidelines, recommendations and key thoughts emerging from decisions adopted by the committee.

Norway also supports the broad target group. We believe that everyone directly involved in the implementation of the Convention and the management of the World Heritage properties will benefit from having such a guiding document. Nevertheless, since this broad target group not only includes the Committee members, the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies, it also includes local authorities, site managers and owners and targets local communities.

We are a bit worried that the document as it appears today is not as user-friendly as it could be. As a tool, a policy document gives very good guidance. Still, Norway believes it is possible to improve the readability of the document with policy adjustment, namely to include introductory presentations under each major topic. Norway has proposed an amendment to the draft decision to accommodate this. We would like to hear the Centre’s view on this proposal.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Very briefly, the Brazilian delegation commends the group of experts for the work carried out so far, especially by noting the very solid methodology adopted. We are looking forward to seeing the results of the second phase of the work next year.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie félicite le groupe d'experts pour l'excellent travail déjà réalisé et relève avec beaucoup d'intérêt et de satisfaction l'état d'avancement et attend avec beaucoup d'intérêts et d'impatience le travail final.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. The United Republic of Tanzania’s delegation commends the expert working group, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the progress made with the policy compendium. The delegation wishes to thank Australia for the extra budgetary contribution that enabled this important work to be undertaken to this level of implementation.

Your Excellency Chair, the United Republic’s delegation notes with satisfaction the level of involved stakeholders in the preparation of such an important document, including the civil society and organisations with conservation missions. Tanzania also noted during the presentation of the item that the compendium is being finalised for its adoption in 2019.

The United Republic of Tanzania is of the opinion that before its adoption, time and fora should be allowed for giving government organs, civil society and other stakeholders time to digest this very important document within sessions to utilise it for its effective implementation.

Thank you chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICCROM, please”

ICCROM:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. As some of you will remember, it was ICCROM that carried out the scoping studies for these policy guidelines and we are very pleased to see the progress that has gone since the time we presented them at the 40th session of the World Heritage Committee. All three Advisory Bodies, ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN would like to take this opportunity, first to thank the government of Australia for funding the continued work on the policy guidelines and also to thank the World Heritage Centre and the working group which undertook Phase 1 of the works on the policy compendium.

As you can see, the amount of work that was needed to collect the various policies and in particular to collect and analyse the various Committee decisions was a very difficult task to undertake in a relatively short amount of time and the working group should be congratulated on that work. We have noted the Committee's discussion of this item just now and we hope that it will give a better understanding of how this draft can meet the needs as foreseen by the Committee, and we will work on what improvements may be necessary when we get into Phase 2 of the work.

The Advisory Bodies, however, would like to make the following two points with regard to the first draft. We do feel that there is still a need to better understand the relationship between this compendium and the Operational Guidelines. This is especially important given that paragraphs of the Operational Guidelines which pertain to policy are found within the compendium. There will obviously be a need for very clear procedures to ensure that the compendium is updated at the same time as the Operational Guidelines are changed. This is one of the reasons why the Advisory Bodies strongly support the suggestion of the working group that this compendium be developed into an online platform rather than a static document.

Furthermore, in keeping with the spirit of the original scoping study, we think that the compendium should contain at the beginning of the document a specific list with web links to the full policy and strategy document being collected. For example, a link to the policy for sustainable development, a link to the strategy for reducing damage from disaster to World Heritage property. We know that there is already an annex at the end of the document with all sourced material, but we feel that policies and strategies should be pulled out and highlighted at the beginning of the document.

As this is foreseen to be an online platform, such a list with links would allow the user to easily find and access policies and strategies in their entirety to allow them to better understand the context and the content of each of the strategy or policy documents. We think it would be very easy to achieve at the technical level and would provide an even more valuable product when it is finalised.

To conclude, we would again congratulate the World Heritage Centre and the working group and we look forward to hearing any other comments that the Committee may have this afternoon.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Angola, please"

Angola :

« Madame la présidente, nous félicitons également le groupe d'experts qui a travaillé sur cette ébauche ainsi que pour la consultation qui a été faite pour leur permettre justement de nous présenter ce rapport de qualité. Il y a quelques éléments qui ont été repris par la Tanzanie par rapport au temps dont nous aurons peut-être besoin pour pouvoir digérer un peu ces documents.

J'imagine le nombre de politiques ou de sous chapitres que comporte ce document en termes de volume même s'il va être mis en ligne, je pense qu'il y a quand même un aspect que les experts devraient prendre en compte. C'est justement le format final pour que le document soit lui-même facilement digéré par ses utilisateurs et malgré cette mise en ligne il y a toujours des gens qui reviendront dire que l'on a du mal à s'y retrouver. Il faut donc toujours penser également à une alternative. S'il y a des difficultés d'accès en ligne, qu'est ce que nous allons proposer pour que tout le monde puisse avoir accès à ce document qui est important et va nous aider évidemment à avancer dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention.

Deux choses, le format final pour qu'il soit facilement digéré et également donné du temps aux États parties pour pouvoir aller en profondeur et voir s'il y a tous les éléments qui ont été listés et s'il y a une cohérence dans ce qui a été présenté. Nous avons bien pris note, et c'est fondamental, que ce compendium est une compilation des politiques existantes et qu'il n'y aura pas de nouvelles politiques élaborées qui en feront partie. Déjà avec cette note, cela exigera qu'un examen plus fin du contenu du compendium soit fait. Voilà pourquoi nous sommes d'accord avec la Tanzanie que l'on est plus de temps pour filtrer un peu cet élément souligné dans la présentation.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, the delegation of Zimbabwe would like to add its voice to the other States Parties in thanking the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for contributing to the assemblage of the various relevant policies that came out with the draft compendium. We would also like to thank the State Party of Australia for the much-needed funds to carry out the work. We strongly feel this is the right step in guiding decisions as we implement the World Heritage Convention.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Secretariat to answer the questions and then our Rapporteur to read it as final.”

Ms. Petya Totcharova:

“Many thanks madam Chair for giving us the floor to respond very quickly as we are running out of time. First, I would like to thank you very much for thanking the work of the expert working group and overall for the work done. Norway had a proposal to make the

document digestible by the general audience and you have proposed an amendment in this regard which we will see on the screen immediately. We fully agree that this is a very good exercise. It is a doable option and it is fully acceptable.

There were comments made by a number of you about the digestion of such a complex document. Certainly, and this is why we inserted both the Centre and the experts, the online format is supposed to provide a much easier access and more user-friendly one for this exercise, which now seems a little bit complex. We hear your concerns about the digestion; they have already been taken on board and we will be working in this regard. How far before the Committee can we provide the document? That is not easy to say today, but certainly some kind of consultation will be organised.

Thank you very much for the comments of the Advisory Bodies as well and of ICCROM more specifically. We have noted the comments by you, but let me clarify one thing. The Advisory Bodies were members of the working group; they have representatives in the World Heritage Centre and we have worked together and they have made an excellent contribution to the work of the group. Of course, there are these general comments. I appreciate them on behalf of the Centre and the group and as was rightly noted, the online platform is a must and the distinction between Operational Guidelines and policy compendium is certainly something that has been addressed by the group and also the next stage.

As for specific web links at the beginning of the compendium instead of the annex at the end, probably, we should have a much clearer idea what it will look like once we have moved on with the online format which is called Reference Manager for that type of database. These were all the issues raised.

Thank you very much madam Chair for giving us the floor and allowing us to clarify our response.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. As you have heard during the discussion, I have received an amendment on this draft decision. It was sent in by Norway and was also presented by them, a small request to be taken into account during Phase 2 of elaboration of the policy compendium.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments before we adopt the decision, or any objections? I see none. Therefore I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 11 adopted.

We come to the end of our meeting today. We will convene tomorrow at 10:00 am as usual and I hope that we will complete everything by the afternoon.

Thank you very much.”

NINETH DAY – Tuesday 3 July 2018
SIXTEENTH SESSION
10 a.m. – 1 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“We are starting today’s session. We are rather behind schedule, therefore I proposed to the Bureau that we meet in the afternoon, from 3:00 until 5:00 pm; interpretation will be only available during this time.

I propose the following schedule for today’s session: we will begin with item 12B. Item 8C is the update of the World Heritage List and List in Danger. We will then proceed with the examination for item 13 concerning international assistance and item 14 of the budget, item 9A on the Upstream Process as well as 12A regarding the *ad hoc* working group. As you know, we will also have to continue the adoption of Decision 7 on state of conservation.

We will afterwards have to examine items on any other business and item 17 which is the agenda of the 43rd session. Dear colleagues, regarding item 16 on the next election of the next chairperson as well as the designation of the next Bureau, I would like to inform you that consultations are still ongoing and that we will inform you on the results of these negotiations as soon as possible.

Dear colleagues, Items 13, 14 and 9A and 12A are related. As they contain elements that have been discussed by the *ad hoc* group, it is proposed that respective decisions are examined, each with their respective item. However, the adoption is to be done once all decisions have been agreed in order to ensure consistency between them. Bahrain as chair of the *ad hoc* group will provide an explanation of the proposed approach.

Finally, with regard to item 17 concerning the provisional agenda of the 43rd Session of the World Heritage Committee, please note that a document has been prepared and will be distributed to you this morning.

Dear friends, I call upon your cooperation once again to help me to facilitate the debate and the intervention to avoid any delay in our schedule today. Let us now examine item 12B of our Agenda regarding the follow-up and implementation of the recommendations of the working group on Governance, as endorsed by the General Conference. Document 12B contains all the relevant information on this matter.

Allow me to invite Ms. Rössler, Director of the World Heritage Centre, to briefly present this item.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. Good morning to all of you. You will all remember that in 2016, the General Conference of UNESCO established an open-ended working group to review the governance, procedures and working methods of UNESCO’s International and Intergovernmental Bodies.

The General Conference, at its last session in 2017, endorsed the recommendations of the open-ended working group on governance as amended. Our dear Rapporteur was the Co-chair of this working group. These recommendations are divided into general recommendations for all international and intergovernmental bodies and specific recommendations for the UNESCO Conventions.

The General Conference also invited the governing bodies of the different organs examined by the working group, to implement, as appropriate, the above-mentioned recommendations.

As you know, the Committee and the General Assembly have already undertaken work with a view to assessing and improving their working methods, notably in the framework of the intercessional *ad hoc* working group established in 2014, with the task of improving and streamlining the working methods of the governing bodies.

Hence, document 12B presents in annex the implementation status of the general recommendations of the General Conference working group for all international and intergovernmental bodies and the implementation status of the specific recommendation for the UNESCO Conventions including the implementation status of the specific recommendation for the World Heritage Convention.

The Draft Decision 42 COM 12B is in the document in front of you. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or enquiries? I see none. The floor is to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I wish good morning to all colleagues. We have not received any amendments on the draft decision.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Therefore, I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 12B adopted. Now, item 12 is closed.

Our next item is 10A. As you will remember, we could not proceed with the examination of item 10A regarding Periodic Reporting last week; I would therefore propose we examine it now. Thank you.

We will now listen to the presentation of the progress report on the preparation of the third cycle of Periodic Reporting, which is contained in Document 10A. I would like to give the floor to Ms. Totcharova, from the World Heritage Centre, who will introduce this item.”

Ms. Totcharova:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The document is presented further to Decision 41 COM 10A, when the Committee endorsed the outcomes of the reflection period and launched the third cycle of Periodic Reporting, postponing its initiation or its start to 2018.

The document presents the timeline and the work that has been done by the Centre, the timeline of the periodic exercise that you see in the slide. As you all know, the exercise of the third cycle starts in the Arab region in 2018 with submission of the report in 2019; a report which would have processed the results of the Periodic Reporting cycle presented in 2020. You can see the timeline: The Arab region will be followed by Africa, then the Asia-Pacific followed by Latin America and the Caribbean and finally by Europe and North America.

You would remember that the report of the working group that worked on the reflection made a number of recommendations, one of the most important of which was the fact that it should become a much more State Party-driven exercise, the decision that you took last year in Cracow at the last Committee Session. You endorsed the view of the expert group and requested the Secretariat to ensure a holistic approach across the regions to provide overall coordination to develop guidance, tools and analysis and to facilitate the State Party-driven approach to this exercise.

The Secretariat has taken this on board and has produced a number of training and guiding materials, lots of guidance has been or is in the process of being produced, so that we can help you as States Parties and all stakeholders in this exercise to implement it in the best possible way and have the results that would guide the work which concerns protection and management and conservation of the World Heritage properties in the countries in the different regions of the world.

This set of training materials will facilitate an autonomous and successful Periodic Reporting exercise. This is the purpose of developing this set of materials, to support the capacity-building and be adaptable for a different range of contexts. It can be used with broad and different types of audiences. Finally, we have tried to design them as very user-friendly.

One of the training materials include the guidance and there is a glossary embedded in the questionnaire itself. Together, they provide clarification on a number of specific questions, provide contexts and background. We will soon have a glossary that supplements this guidance and provide definitions to key terms so that all stakeholders can work autonomously on the questions.

Two animation videos have also been produced. They explain the Periodic Reporting process and its two sections refer to section 1 being addressed to the State Party involved, let us say national government authorities, and section 2 is addressed to site managers, as each site has to report on its state of conservation. This second video is aimed primarily at site managers. It offers an overview of the exercise and the questions in plain language with engaging visuals. It is available for the time being in English and French and is being adapted in Arabic and will be produced in all the six languages of the United Nations. Adapted Spanish, Chinese and Russian versions are currently under development.

We have also produced a handbook for site managers actually available as a PDF document on the website of the World Heritage Centre. We have just printed a few copies which have been distributed at the Site Managers' Forum and we had some copies outside. I think this has stirred great interest because the copies disappeared in a few minutes. It is another very user-friendly tool with very clear explanations, both with regard to the content and the process.

We are also preparing a curriculum, a set of training materials which help fill the Periodic Report. It is a capacity-building tool adapted to be basically ready-made and developed to facilitate training for all of those involved in Periodic Reporting, be it at the site level or at the level of national government or sub-regional levels. It draws from a large number of World Heritage resources which already exist. It will be accessible in a basic and more advanced modern version depending on the type of training initiative you would like to develop. Its comprehensive nature will make it adaptable to many World Heritage contexts.

Typically, we have plans to have the curriculum available in September when the exercise starts in the Arab Region.

Of course, we have updated the World Heritage Centre webpage and we have developed a platform for Cycle 3. The webpage has been updated for clarity and friendliness and the platform will host the questionnaire and have available all training materials. These pages will be updated as the materials come in.

You would remember that at the last Committee Session you approved an analytical framework for Periodic Reporting. That is the framework that should be and will be used for processing information received from the periodic reports in a given region. Of course, more information is available on our website.

What has the World Heritage Centre been doing to facilitate the States Parties and to help all the different regions get ready? Measures that we have undertaken include facilitation of the process through updating all the records that we have, so that we can fill in with the most valid information available. We have communicated with the States Parties on the key dates and deadlines and availability of training materials. We have been updating our database of site managers, ensuring it helps the scope over the reporting that has been prepared and supporting the States Parties' in-depth analyses.

As you know, this was mentioned previously, the next cycle will be started in the Arab region. Some of the material has already been translated into Arabic and others will follow suit. The regional desk for the Arab States is active, and the Centre as a whole is actively working with the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage which has planned a lot of activities focused specifically on supporting the States Parties from the Arab region in this exercise, which is to start technically from September with access to the questionnaire.

I am very pleased to inform you that the first meeting in this regard took place two days ago, on the 1st of July, in the premises of the Arab Regional Centre for World Heritage. It has shown the great interest and commitment on the one side of the States Parties to participate in this exercise and to use this exercise as capacity-building. Because, while preparing for the Periodic Reporting all different components of the World Heritage 'landscapes', if I may use this term, are to be revealed. It is a very good opportunity to strengthen capacity-building. Of course, the commitment of the Arab World Centre for World Heritage has been demonstrated very strongly.

I wanted to share this, so that all our colleagues from the different regions are following up on the regional action plan from the second cycle and I have been asked from our colleagues from the Latin America and Caribbean Region to make a brief mention of the very, very recent work that was done in the region at the end of April.

Seven States Parties, including Mexico and Central American sub-region, met in Zacatecas to discuss and adopt the sub-regional Action Plan for Mexico and Central America, PAMAC, which has a five-year duration, from 2018 until 2023. This plan includes a capacity-building strategy and a pilot project programme and it has defined six objectives that have been agreed upon by the participating States Parties. The important role of Mexico, as organiser of the meeting, is to be highlighted and the commitment of all States Parties in the region is to be commended.

Thank you very much madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Guatemala. Please"

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its presentation. At the same time, we would like to reiterate the sub-regional Action plan for Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. It is a strategic process that will be very useful to guide the coming steps in connection with implementation. The State of Guatemala and others have actively committed to implementing the plan in a collaborative way as part of the sub-region.

We would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for its assistance in this important process, as well as the regional Institute for World Heritage in Zacatecas Category 2 Centre. We would like to reiterate our thanks to the government of Mexico for their open mind, and their ability to share their worthy experience with other States of the sub-region. It is certain that in the coming years there will be qualitative progress of the Convention in Central America and the Caribbean, including the implementation of the Periodic Reports that the sub-region will present in 2021.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. We wish to commend the World Heritage Centre for ensuring that the reflection period indeed led to changes and improvement of considerable importance to the framework of Periodic Reporting, both in process and actual format.

Most importantly we wish to emphasise the integration of synergies with other Conventions and the 2030 agenda for sustainable development. We strongly support the more uniform and holistic approach which ensures relevance for this important monitoring mechanism across regions and time. We also wish to commend the World Heritage Centre for having produced comprehensive guidance and training materials. Further, for deciding approaches for implementation which should facilitate even further periodic reporting as a process which is and certainly should be States Parties-driven.

The mention of the necessity to develop new and integrated methods for analysis is most welcome and would allow for an even more State Party-driven exercise. The results could be made instantly available to the States Parties and site managers, which will increase the relevance and applicability of the scientific and significant database that the Periodic Reporting actually constitutes, on a more permanent basis as a monitoring and management tool.

Norway finally wishes to commend the commitment of the Arab Region Centre for World Heritage for assisting the World Heritage Centre in facilitating the exercise in the region in which we are now guests.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie se félicite du démarrage de ce troisième cycle des rapports périodiques. La Tunisie félicite le Centre du patrimoine mondial d'avoir fait un excellent et énorme travail de préparation et de soutien et de formation. La Tunisie remercie également le Centre régional arabe pour le patrimoine mondial de Bahreïn d'avoir accepté de fournir son assistance et son expertise aux États de la région pour réussir cet exercice.

La Tunisie espère que cet exercice donnera l'occasion de nous fournir une image réelle et non retouchée de l'état de conservation de nos sites et de leur valorisation et de nous permettre aussi de connaître le degré effectif d'implication des communautés locales dans la gestion et le processus de conservation des biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial de la région.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chair:

“Thank you very much. Mexico, you have the floor.”

Mexico:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I would like to thank the World Heritage Centre for this important and distinguished report. I would also like to thank the delegate of Guatemala for his kind words. As was just said, in cooperation with the Unit for Latin America and Caribbean of the World Heritage Centre in Zacatecas, there was a sub-regional meeting for the induction of the Action Plan for World Heritage in Mexico and Central America, 2018-2023.

At first, we had in September of 2017 the earthquake that we suffered, so we had to postpone and we convened this year. The meeting was an opportunity to identify activities and projects that would allow for better levels of conservation and management of World Heritage properties in the region in the light of the results of the second Periodic Reporting cycle for Mexico and Latin America.

The main object of the Action Plan is to have a practical tool to support and to guide the efforts and actions in technical training conservation management and sustainable development of World Heritage pursuant to the priorities set by the sub-region. As a result of this, enriched by the enthusiastic and positive participation of the States Parties, 16 other projects were presented and will be implemented over the coming years regarding various properties in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama and Mexico. Among them are archaeological projects, historical centres, national parks, biosphere reserves and modern heritage sites.

Thirty-seven experts attended from the seven countries of the sub-region and three Advisory Bodies, as well as two distinguished experts from Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

We would like to thank you for your valuable support. We would like to thank the Unit in Central America, The World Heritage Centre and the States Parties for their cooperation and presence at that meeting. In the light of the dialogue yesterday around the Global Strategy, we would like to emphasise the fact that in Latin America the Global Strategy is

enforced. This can be seen in the most recent files presented by Brazil last year and this year by Columbia and Mexico as well as our country's encouragement to the joint implementation, as Norway is doing for Europe, of the UNESCO Cultural Conventions and Agenda of 2030.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICCROM, you have the floor.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you madam Chair. I make this intervention on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN. First, we would like to join the congratulations already made to the World Heritage Centre for the excellent work that has been done in preparing the third cycle of Periodic Reporting and in particular the attention to sustainable development and also the capacity-building materials that have been developed for this cycle.

The Advisory Bodies feel that one of the most important benefits of the Periodic Reporting process is not necessarily the report itself, although these are very important and useful, but also the regional networking opportunities that Periodic Reporting process affords for national focal point, sometimes site managers and sometimes Category 2 Centres in the concerned regions.

We would therefore like to encourage States Parties to continue to strengthen this networking of national focal points and in particular to utilise site managers much more effectively, wherever that is possible within the process. Also, where applicable, Category 2 Centres will be very useful and can be tasked not just with helping out with the Periodic Reporting process, but can also be utilised to develop capacity-building strategies based on the results of the Periodic Reporting process.

We have seen Category 2 Centres do this for the Asia-Pacific region in the second periodic cycle and you have just heard in the intervention of Mexico that the Zacatecas centre has just carried out a workshop to this effect. We have also heard that ARC-WH will be working with this region, which is the first region to go for the third cycle on Periodic Reporting. We would like to encourage the Category 2 Centre of the regions not only to work on the Periodic Reporting process themselves, but in the aftermath develop capacity-building strategies.

Of course, to conclude I would like to say that the Advisory Bodies will be happy to collaborate with the States Parties in carrying out this task. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. I will be very brief. We would like to congratulate you on the new cycle for the countries as it will be an important milestone. It has been done to observe the development of climate change, especially for Small Island

Developing States (SIDS). These are States that are hard-hit by hurricanes and other natural disasters. We will attend, as participants of the programme of UNESCO for the 2019-2020 workshops for Latin America and the Caribbean, in order to discuss two basic subjects; the impact of climate change on World Heritage sites and the impacts of tourism. These are threats that both affect SIDS and the effective management and preservation of heritage.

To that effect, we look for harmonisation with the sustainable Agenda 2030 in order to create synergies between the Convention and that new agenda. We hope to have UNESCO's cooperation and the participation of all the experts and members of this Committee.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Madam Chair. I have not received any amendments. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I go to the adoption. I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 10A adopted.

The next item is 8C. I now invite Mr. Alessandro Balsamo from the World Heritage Centre to give us the updated List of World Heritage in Danger, taking into account the decisions taken during the examination of the state of conservation reports, as well as the nominations of properties on the World Heritage List. The update of the List will be presented orally by Mr. Balsamo.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. The Committee at its 42nd Session in Manama inscribed 19 new properties on the World Heritage List, 13 Cultural, 3 mixed and natural and approved the extension of one property already inscribed on the List. Among the newly-inscribed properties there are three cultural landscapes and with this addition, we have now 105 properties officially recognised as such on the World Heritage List, which represents 9.6 per cent of the List.

The new figures of the World Heritage List are 1,092 properties of which 845 are cultural, 209 natural and 38 mixed. The breakdown by region of the 19 new properties inscribed at this session is: 2 from the Africa region, 3 properties from Arab States Regions, 4 properties from Asia-Pacific, 8 properties from Europe and North America and 2 properties from Latin America and the Caribbean.

Out of the 19 successfully inscribed nominations, two of them, that is ten per cent, are situated on the territory of the current Committee members. Following the debate on item 8B, four nominations were deferred and two referred. At this session, in 14 cases the Committee did not follow the Advisory Bodies' recommendations which were presented in draft decisions. For the first time in the history of the World Heritage Convention we registered two

nominations recommended for non-inscriptions which were inscribed. We also took note of two non-inscriptions that became referrals and one non-inscription that became deferral.

Another recurring phenomenon is the inscription of nominations recommended for referral. At this session all of the referrals presented were inscribed, in particular, four referrals became inscriptions and one referral for an extension became an approval.

In addition, we also took note of one deferral that became a referral, two deferrals that became inscriptions and one postponement that became an adjournment. The Committee allocated approximately 18 hours of discussion to examining 28 nominations which result in an average of 38 minutes for the discussion of each nomination.

As the results of the decisions related to the state of conservation of properties inscribed in the World Heritage List and the decisions on the nominations of properties to the World Heritage List at this session, the Committee decided to inscribe one property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, Lake Turkana National Park in Kenya, and at the same time one property was removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Belize Barrier Reef Reserve Systems. According to these decisions, there are now 54 properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Draft Decisions 42 COM 8C.1 8C.2 and 8C.3 are on pages 1, 2 and 3 of both the English and French versions of document 8C.Rev which was distributed this morning.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Mr. Balsamo. Now I give the floor to Ms. Rössler for additional information.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. It is my duty to inform you also of some other consequences of the decisions taken as a follow- up to your decisions.

Here, in Bahrain the Committee examined 157 state of conservation reports, including 54 sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Out of the 70 state of conservation reports, 22 were requested from previous session of the Committee in Cracow in 2017, 15 were requested from previous nomination decisions adopted at the 40th and 41st sessions, the two previous sessions.

In the next year, as of today, the Committee will examine at least 149 state of conservation including 54 sites inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Out of the 95, item 7B state of conservation reports foreseen for next year so far, 69 are requested from previous sessions of the Committee, 25 are requested from this 42nd session and three are requested from nomination decisions adopted at several sessions, including the past three sessions. I also want to let you know for the 44th session in 2020, 65 item 7B state of conservation reports are already in the pipeline, including two request for nomination decisions adopted here at this session.

Let me also make a brief comment emerging from your discussion and decisions. The consequences of decisions under item 8 are not only an increase in terms of state of conservation reports, but also statements of Outstanding Universal Value that you need to adopt, as many are only draft statements as well as finalisation of management plans, boundaries or buffer zones. This may require reflections on streamlining the workload of the

Committee, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies. We will, however, I can assure you, not prolong the Committee Sessions in the future. At least we hope not.

It is exactly 40 years ago today that the Committee inscribed the first World Heritage sites, very iconic places on the World Heritage List, including the Galapagos island in Ecuador, Lalibela in Ethiopia, the historic centre of Cracow and the first national park on earth, Yellowstone National Park. Today, we have 1,092 sites, making up a very diverse World Heritage List and many aspirations from authorities and local communities to get more inscriptions. Inscription is a critical moment in time, but a small part of a long-term conservation process.

In this regard we would like to very much encourage all of the States Parties to take the recommendations by the Committee concerning the inscriptions seriously. We often send Reactive Monitoring missions a couple of years afterwards and discover they are not implemented. As you all know, we strongly believe in this powerful legal instrument which is the World Heritage Convention. I trust you do as well.

However, I would like to kindly ask all of you to help in this dramatic situation, with an increasing List and more state of conservation problems, and to please assist the countries in need for effective management plans, visitor use plans, policies and legal provisions to protect World Heritage. We also need to support the overloaded system management.

We are in the same boat here and the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies wish to effectively serve this Committee and the 1972 Convention, so that the sites we all cherish can survive and can be enjoyed by generations to come.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much Ms. Rössler. Norway would like the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Thank you to the Secretariat for substantial food for thought. What makes World Heritage unique among many of the very important and significant Convention mechanisms is the Outstanding Universal Value. We, the Committee, have been elected among 198 States Parties sitting around us to this Convention to be the guardians of that Outstanding Universal Value of the 1,092 properties now on this List.

All three pillars constituting Outstanding Universal Value must be present for its justification. This must guide our decision-making. Integrity is crucial in this regard, as unclear borders and buffer zones may create large challenges for protection and management, creating difficulties for local communities and potential for conflict between conservation and development.

Our decisions in the Committee must be based on objective and scientific considerations. We are dependent on carefully prepared nominations, consistent procedures in line with the Operational Guidelines and evaluation by the most recognised and qualified experts.

Consequently, we, as a Committee, should not aim to push nominations from a recommended non-inscription towards an inscription. We should aim to do constructive work together and contribute towards consensus decisions. We should never compromise on Outstanding Universal Value and high scientific standards. We should not bend scientifically-based mechanisms of referral and deferral. These are not expressions of distrust or discouragement. We should not bend the Operational Guidelines. And why am I saying this?

To ensure that our shared world heritage can be enjoyed and appreciated by our children and all future generations.

The strength of this Convention is its credibility. Where does this credibility come from? The sound, professional and objective decisions made by the Committee of the previous 41 years. We are elected to protect and uphold this precious legacy. The reason we are sitting here with this powerful mechanism for protection and conservation of the World's natural and cultural heritage is the credibility built, brick by brick, from the decisions made by our predecessors from this Committee. In that sense, we are standing on the shoulders of giants. But Norway worries that we may not see far enough and comprehend the full consequences of our decisions.

Of the many important decisions we have made over the past nine days, there is one which we need to discuss a bit further, concerning the Sites of Memory. There are more nominations of this typology in the pipeline and I would suggest that we follow the example of the First World War cemeteries and the way to resolve the reflection concerning such sites before these nominations are evaluated.

Norway has proposed an amendment in this regard, but we would wish to ask the distinguished colleagues and the Secretariat for advice as to where this decision should be. We would suggest the amendment to be included on the decision for item 8, which was prepared by Australia, but we will ask for your guidance on this matter.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie voudrait commencer par remercier la directrice du patrimoine mondial non seulement pour ce rapport édifiant qui nous renvoie à nos responsabilités d'États parties membres du Comité, mais plus généralement d'États parties à la Convention.

Je souhaite, au nom de la Tunisie, louer la qualité du travail qui est mené dans le Centre et la sensibilité croissante des missions qui lui sont dévolues. Je crois que la présentation de madame Rössler nous met devant la responsabilité historique et le tournant que connaît à la fois la compréhension, la mise en œuvre, mais aussi l'attachement à la Convention.

À la fois, la réussite du système de la Convention de 1972 porte en lui-même les fragilités et peut être les menaces de sa mise en œuvre. L'attachement de plus en plus grand des États à inscrire des sites, fait de telle sorte que la compréhension et l'application sereine de ses règles peuvent parfois être soumises à rude épreuve. Nous l'avons vécu lors de plusieurs sessions passées y compris celle-ci.

Je comprends parfaitement l'attitude des États observateurs qui hier avec exprimé leurs craintes et également peut être leur doute quant à une évolution sereine de l'application et la compréhension de notre Convention. Je comprends d'autant moins que cela soit dit par des États membres du Comité siégeant au Comité qui au moment de ces dossiers, où ils estiment que la compréhension n'est pas parfaite, n'avaient pas pris la parole au moment où la question se posait. Je crois que je vais commencer par dire que c'est une question de responsabilité et chacun de nous doit assumer sa responsabilité pleine.

Je crois que notre système si vertueux et si généreux nous appelle à davantage de solidarité. La question a été posée hier dans le contexte de la présentation des sites en péril, mais je crois que cela va plus généralement. Madame Rössler a fait un appel à la solidarité entre les États aux capacités différenciées à accompagner ce système, je crois qu'il faudra l'appuyer.

Il nous faut travailler en direction de solidarité en lieu et place de toutes compétitions. Il nous faut aussi travailler à la logique d'accompagnement des États qui viennent de classer de nouveaux sites. Surtout, elle a raison de parler de générations futures. Je crois que la question est amplement de transmission et aussi de pédagogie. Je crois que c'est une responsabilité morale qui nous incombe à tous plus que juridique et politique.

La Tunisie qui a présidé au printemps 1972 le Comité d'action de la Convention demeure tout aussi attachée à la cohérence de sa lecture, à l'intelligence de sa mise en œuvre et sa portée historique ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Firstly, I want to lend Australia's strong voice of support to the intervention of the distinguished delegate of Norway expressing concern that we must always as a Committee have very serious regard to the obligations which we have been entrusted as members of the Committee. I would say that having sort of participated over the past days in the discussions of the Committee, which on my assessment have been on many dossiers deep and constructive discussions, I think we have laid the foundations for a very long relationship among Committee members in this session.

I do, however, note the essentiality of us always working to take full account of the technical advice that we receive and to be very careful when we are seeking to move away from the considered advice of the Advisory Bodies. In relation to the nomination process, we have circulated some amendments that we will seek to discuss under item 12A.

I would also now like to thank Dr Rössler for her very important comments about the work that we have been undertaking this past week or so and, also, concur with the distinguished delegate of Tunisia about the importance of us all working as a World Heritage family to ensure the good health and well-being of our World Heritage properties.

We must always engage with an understanding of the seriousness of our obligations as States Parties to implement the recommendations of the Committee which are formed after very serious considerations on really strong advice from the Advisory Bodies. Moreover, we all must be mindful as individual States Parties of our obligations under the Convention which compel us to take the actions necessary to avoid finding ourselves in the position where the Committee is reviewing the state of conservation of our World Heritage properties and in some instances take the difficult decision to place the property on the in Danger List.

Having said that, we should work to avoid that in danger List whenever we can; we must also recognise at the same time that the purpose of in Danger listing is not only to signal a concern about the management of a property or threat to it, but to mobilise global support for a State Party in need, to help it ensure the Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity of a site can be maintained.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I would like to join one point on the reflection of the distinguished delegation of the State Party of Norway mentioning the possibilities of discussion about the Sites of Memory. Let me reiterate my previous contribution.

Supporting this contribution of the Norwegian delegation, we, Hungary, think that further elaboration is needed on how nominated sites with such specific concepts could have their right place on the World Heritage List and how the Committee supports their rightful importance by different means, among others, by creating another category or subcategory for memorial places. We believe that setting up an expert group consisting of members of the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat and the Committee could clear confusion during discussion.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I should also like to thank the Director of the Centre and in fact all the team at the Centre for the work they have done in preparing the documents for the evaluation of sites, and also for all the valuable information about the state of conservation reports which, as we know, take an increasing amount of time. This is not only in terms of the number and quality of documents that we have received and keep receiving, but also when it comes to all of the inscription processes, and the follow-up, which collectively we have to work on. Their input is valuable and thanks to the hand in hand work with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre this work is possible.

I should like to add my voice to what was stated by the delegate of Norway. I also wanted to underscore our collective responsibilities when it comes to these decisions, which are not only of a moral nature, but also, for example, in the case of all of our decisions, multifaceted. We have also seen the need for additional support to respond to that crying need for technical assistance and capacity-building which we know needs to be done. Really, it is going to make a decisive difference into the future development of the Convention.

When we analyse the proposed amendment put forward by Australia, I think we can look back with pride at the process over the last 40 years, at the time when the first site was inscribed. Now, it is time to see which way we can develop and, given the new context, how we can keep looking back at the work that we do at the Committee for this Convention.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We would like to thank the Centre and Ms. Rössler for all the information provided. In this session of the Committee, we have taken consensual decisions and I should like to express our thanks for the constructive nature of our discussions. Even when we have diverging opinions, under your able stewardship, Chair, we have been able in one way or another to feel that our voices have been heard and that we are involved in the decision-making process. No one has been left out, no one has felt the need to express dissent.

I think yesterday it was the ambassador of Canada who raised a very important point saying that it is not only Committee members but all States Parties that are part of the reflection process, if we really want to honour the principles of the Convention.

We said it from the onset: dialogue is key. Dialogue with States Parties and not only at the Committee session, but upstream as well, because that is when we are going to ensure that we have the States Parties included in the decision-making process. Dialogue needs bolstering between the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the Centre. That is why in a varying context, we think that the Committee is really working towards a more equitable geographical representation on the List and for a more balanced list.

Now, there is more work that needs to be done in terms of understanding, promoting and developing our processes. When it comes to follow-up, you can see in the Latin America and Caribbean Region, we have had lot of support for our region and that is why, thanks to that support, we have seen fewer discrepancies when it comes to assessment and follow-up of the sites. I think that all stemmed from that very close connection and support network that serves that region very well.

Once more, I think that we can feel very comfortable in the constructive manner in which this session has been proceeding and we are delighted to take part in a reflection process when it comes to ways we can enhance the Operational Guidelines, the ways it can work. We also want to thank the Secretariat for its support and also all the input from the Advisory Bodies from the technical point of view.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. First of all, I would like to thank the Centre for their report and I also share the concerns of my colleague and delegation from Norway after hearing the statistics from the Centre on the gap between the decisions that have been taken by this Committee and the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. As a Committee member I always like to look at the overall picture.

A lot of our colleagues aimed towards the Committee decision, but I feel as a Committee member we should look at the evaluation procedure and the qualification of the Advisory Bodies. Not in the sense of undermining their qualifications, but I think any qualification system and any organisation should be monitored for their evaluation systems, there should be indicators, there should be the qualification with the capacity-building for the improvement of those technical experts. From hearing over the last few days, most of the

issues concerning the States Parties which discussed the files are miscommunications and a lack of understanding of some of the files.

To us as a Committee member, we do not rely on my opinion or my decision, we have a huge team behind us. On top of that, we use an international advisory board support, and experts, and, unfortunately, the current advisory board does not take their advice into consideration. One of the files we study in deep detail; we looked at three different opinions from different experts from three different regions of the world and they made a positive evaluation. Yet, the Advisory Bodies gave negative feedback and without any argued justification.

On top of that, the State of Kuwait and the Arab group: For the past several years, we have had, prior to this Convention, a meeting every year where all the Arab group experts meet to discuss all the files and these experts come from different countries and backgrounds. They give us as Committee members their own recommendations. We do our homework. We feel the gap is increasing.

It is time to look at the evaluation procedures and take it from the professional point of view to see that they need improvement. I think they do. If help is needed, we are happy to do so, financially or through expertise. At the end, we do not want to harm the credibility of this Committee, but we want to give the States Parties and their files a fair evaluation. Some Committee members feel the evaluator was disappointed. At the same time the States Parties, when their file does not get a fair chance, also feel disappointed and it is also our responsibility to have their voices heard.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. At the outset, we would like to commend the work of the Secretariat and the report provided. We have a few concerns I would like to share. First, regarding the holistic organisation of the in Danger List: we believe it is our collective duty to put this instrument as it was intended to be, a way to promote cooperation among States Parties and other stakeholders for the conservation of properties. This should be done in a constructive dialogue with the States Parties concerned. We know that every time we have a proposal for in Danger listing we are punishing the State Party, when actually the instrument was foreseen the other way around.

Another concern I would like to share is the high number of referred back decisions that, perhaps, in the willingness to help, give a positive sign to the nominating States Parties. We are often putting them in a very delicate situation. The refer-back mechanism was conceived for additional information; we refer back nominations and then we request in the substance a completely new nomination. In being willing to help, we are actually doing something detrimental to the nominating State Party. For those who have already been in the process of submitting a nomination, they will understand what I am saying. If you are trying to re-scope the whole thing and provide it in a short time frame, perhaps the referred decision is not the best instrument.

One last concern is the coming nominations that we saw in the document INF.3, regarding nominations that will be examined next year. We have already seen properties associated with recent conflict. The Committee took a decision to adjourn one property in

that typology. We believe that we should provide at this stage very clear guidance to the Centre and to the Advisory Bodies, how to deal with these cases. We believe that the expert meeting will provide important guidance. Until then, our understanding is that we should not continue with the evaluation of these properties by the Advisory Bodies and not examine them at the Committee until we have clear guidance on how to proceed with these nominations.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Bosnia.”

Bosnie–Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. La Bosnie-Herzégovine voudrait aussi dire quelques mots concernant ce sujet que nous trouvons très, très important. Surtout, que cette session a été notre première session et on a essayé, si je puis dire, d’analyser un petit peu de l’intérieur le travail du Comité.

Tout d’abord, on aimerait remercier le Secrétariat et, personnellement, madame la directrice du Centre du patrimoine mondial pour leur excellent travail ; pour tous les documents que nous avons eu le plaisir de consulter pendant ces presque dix jours ici à Manama.

Sur un plan général, la Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient la position qui vient d’être exprimée par la délégation de nos amis norvégiens. Nous pensons qu’avant tout, il faut faire attention et il faut faire de notre mieux pour garder la crédibilité de notre Convention. Nous pensons que la Convention est devenue une sorte de victime de son propre succès et de sa très, très grande visibilité sur la scène internationale. La Convention est devenue l’un des instruments les plus importants du système des Nations unies et pour cette raison il est tout à fait logique et naturel de voir de plus en plus d’États parties exprimer leurs souhaits légitimes de voir leurs sites inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

En même temps, il y a des voix qui disent qu’il ne faut pas avoir trop de sites, parce qu’en ayant trop de sites, en continuant l’inscription, on pourrait contribuer à l’inflation de l’importance de la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Nous pensons qu’il faut essayer de chercher un équilibre et cet équilibre on peut le chercher à travers un dialogue d’un côté entre les États parties de la Convention et les membres du Comité, le Secrétariat de l’UNESCO et du Centre du patrimoine mondial et bien sûr avec les Organisations consultatives.

On a entendu des collègues qui, dans certains cas, ont exprimé certaines réserves en ce qui concerne l’évaluation de certains dossiers. Nous pouvons aussi les comprendre, mais nous pensons aussi que la meilleure façon de procéder, d’avancer et de garder la crédibilité de la Convention est d’établir un dialogue avec les Organisations consultatives. Pour ces raisons la Bosnie-Herzégovine soutient et essaiera de participer au groupe *ad hoc* sur les questions de nomination et de l’évolution.

Je voudrais terminer cette intervention en citant madame Rössler qui nous a dit que nous sommes tous sur même bateau. Nous pensons aussi cela et si jamais il y a un problème où que ce soit sur le bateau tout le monde pourrait couler, ce qui serait dans l’intérêt de personne.

Merci beaucoup. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. Uganda would like to add its voice to the discussion. Many delegations have raised concerns on a number of issues concerning the credibility of this Committee. We would like to stick to objectivity and scientific standards for evaluation and not necessarily deviate from the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies. We have to find a way of enhancing discussion and dialogue with the Advisory Bodies, because many times the work of the Committee seems to be taking the direction that has been observed because of the unfairness in the recommendations of the Advisory Bodies.

A case in point is, for example, the National Park of Uganda, the decision that we just adopted referring to mines. The mines closed 40 years ago. The Advisory Bodies came and saw that the mines are no longer functional, but you can imagine the decision that has been adopted still refers to that mining activity in the protected property. This unfairness must be addressed in a holistic manner, so that we can determine these decisions are wrong because, in the backs of our minds, there is this observation that it is not fair and this must be done in a different way.

We are going to keep on discussing, taking the same direction until I do not know when. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. Angola, please you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. L'Angola aimerait faire quelques commentaires par rapport à la discussion que nous accompagnons en ce moment. Premièrement, de dire que nous aimerions féliciter le Centre. J'imagine que ce n'est pas facile pour le Secrétariat de mettre en œuvre les recommandations qui émanent de nos travaux. Ils ont un défi à relever et ils le font avec l'accompagnement des Organisations consultatives. Nous devons reconnaître le travail du Centre et celui de toutes ces organisations qui nous accompagnent.

Nous devons également reconnaître que nous avons eu une 42^e session productive malgré certains points de vue contradictoires. Nous avons fait de notre mieux pour arriver quand même à prendre des décisions assez cohérentes qui permettent à ce que la Convention puisse continuer à être mise en œuvre. Nous avons réussi à trouver des consensus grâce à la coordination de madame la présidente. Nous devons également reconnaître que là où il y a travail il ne manque jamais d'imperfections. Il nous faut donc nous féliciter nous-mêmes du travail que nous venons de faire.

Entre temps, cela fait 46 ans que la Convention a été adoptée. La capacité aujourd'hui de la compréhension, de l'interprétation de la Convention face aux problématiques de développement n'est plus la même. Nous devons être prêts, les États parties, le Comité, les Organisations consultatives, le Secrétariat et toutes les parties intéressées par la Convention. Nous devons être prêts, c'est à dire disponibles, disposés pour pouvoir accepter de faire avancer des réflexions dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention.

La nature humaine a horreur du changement, mais nous devons l'assumer. Les dynamiques ne sont plus les mêmes. Nous devons être préparés à accepter des réformes qui pourront être intégrées dans la mise en œuvre de la Convention. Préparons-nous dans cette perspective du dialogue ouvert que demain les choses pourraient changer dans d'autres directions. Nous devons être prêts à les assumer.

Je vous remercie madame. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China thanks the Secretariat for having provided us with this very important information on the update on the List and of World Heritage and World Heritage in Danger. China also appreciates your excellent leadership, madam Chairperson, in conducting the work when we faced some very delicate conservation nomination cases and for guiding us through all the difficulties.

China is of the view that there is an urgent need for both nomination and evolution processes to be reformed. The transparency and objectiveness of the evaluation process must be guaranteed. In the meantime, China also observes that the Committee follows the same approach to studying the dossier very carefully and to recognise Outstanding Universal Value of nominations before making decisions to inscribe nominations on the List.

Therefore, China thinks that the Outstanding Universal Value should be given only by decision of the Committee. The divergence between the recommendations by the Advisory Bodies and the decision made by the Committee should not be on the basis of political interest or other reasons. A dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat must be enhanced.

Thank you very much, madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Maintenant, je donne la parole à la France ».

France :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Je voulais livrer les réflexions de la délégation française sur ce sujet très important. D'abord, je voudrais dire un grand merci à madame Rössler la directrice du patrimoine mondial y compris pour son intervention récente. Je vois bien ses préoccupations, nous comprenons son souci et nous espérons qu'elle va continuer à très bien diriger l'ensemble de ce bateau sur lequel nous sommes en commun avec les Organes d'évaluations, IUCN, ICOMOS et ICCROM.

Je voudrais dire, ensuite, que la France attache une grande importance à ce système du patrimoine mondial. Pour nous, c'est non seulement un outil international, mais aussi un outil interne français. C'est pour cela qu'aucun des dossiers qui sont présentés dans l'espérance qu'ils soient inscrits sur les listes ne nous sont indifférents. Non seulement pour aider à la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel, mais aussi aux dimensions sociales.

Si on reprend par exemple le dossier de Nîmes. C'est autant un dossier monumental de protection du patrimoine qu'un dossier, la municipalité me l'a redit plusieurs fois, de fierté pour une population qui comme dans toutes les grandes villes du monde contemporain est mélangée dans ses origines, a oublié son passé et ne voit plus le sens des monuments. C'est pour cela que ce que vous faites et ce que nous faisons est extrêmement suivi localement et extrêmement suivi aussi par les communautés.

Je voulais dire aussi que sur les sites mémoriels et funéraires nous avons bien compris qu'il y a là un sujet sensible. Je réitère notre disponibilité au Comité et au Centre du patrimoine mondial pour aider à la réflexion dans les mois qui viennent.

Enfin un dernier mot pour la présidence bahreïnienne, chère Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, je suis là depuis quelques jours quatre, cinq jours et je peux mesurer à quel point vous avez tous mis en œuvre pour que la réunion se passe très bien et nous vous en sommes très reconnaissants.

Merci à vous. »

The Chairperson:

“Je vous remercie. The floor is to our Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We have not received amendments to Draft Decision 8C.1, 2 and 3. However, as was acknowledged during the debate, we received one proposition of modification that would fall under general item 8. With your agreement, what I would like to propose is that we proceed to the adoption of 8C.1, 2 and 3 and come back to the amendment sent in by Norway.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? I see none. I therefore declare Draft Decisions 42 COM 8C.1, 8C.2 and 8C.3 adopted. Let us come back to the amendment proposed by Norway which has been distributed and will be put on the screen. This is for general item 8. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. You can now see on the screen the amendment that we have received from Norway. You will see that this amendment would introduce a new decision which is comprised of four paragraphs and the delegation of Norway has already partly introduced it during the previous discussion.

If I may, madam Chair, just make a small comment regarding paragraph 2. Since paragraph 2 is recalling Decision 42 COM 8B.24, which is about Sites of Memory, it would perhaps be appropriate to also recall Decision 42 COM 5A where we have a decision to convene an expert group for this meeting, should this be agreeable with the other text. Maybe, put in paragraph 2: recalling Decisions 42 COM 8B.24 and 42 COM 5A.

The third paragraph, you might recognise, as it was moved from decision 42 COM 8B.35 which was for the inscription of Naumburg on the World Heritage List. Then, we have the final paragraph about the evaluation of sites associated with recent conflicts. This is the amendment we have received from Norway.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia

“Thank you madam Chair. Firstly, I think that the suggested addition by the Rapporteur is sensible. The question I have though is for the legal advisor. It relates to proposed paragraph 4, which seeks essentially to put on the back-burner the evaluation of dossiers that are associated with recent conflicts and places of memory while the expert meeting is held and guidance is developed.

I acknowledge that the Committee made the decision to adjourn discussion in relation to the Western Front dossier. It was a decision of the Committee and this draft decision seeks to extend that approach to other dossiers that have similar considerations. What I would like to understand is whether it is really within the ability of the Committee to make a general decision that evaluates dossiers that are put forward by States Parties individually, in accordance with the Operational Guidelines, or whether in fact it is necessary for us to consider at the Committee each of those, on a dossier by dossier basis.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Our delegation favours the draft decision; we can go along with that. Yet, the decision we took on item 5A was specifically related to Sites Associated with Memories of Recent Conflicts. So, we would suggest with your lead to strike from paragraph 4 where it says ‘*Sites Associated with Recent Conflicts*’ and strike out ‘*other negative and divisive memories*’ as this is not in line with what we agreed when discussing this specific topic. I would like to take this opportunity to recall that last year we inscribed a property related to slavery. This could be considered as a negative memory and we believe it was a very important decision that was taken.

On another note, when we were discussing Naumburg cathedral, we proposed that an expert meeting should be convened to discuss integrated art. I would like to know, with your lead madam Chair and the Secretariat, if this would be the place to put that recommendation or should we put it in another agenda item.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Tanzania.”

Tanzania:

“Thank you Chair. Tanzania goes a long way with what Brazil has to say on Sites Associated with Recent Conflicts; ‘recent’ to me does not give a time frame, if you want to understand what is recent. I thought if the Committee members could agree we could take out the word ‘recent’ and then allow the experts that will be working on this subject to define what would be ‘recent’ and probably that would be given terms of references so that we are sure about what we want to say about ‘recent’.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, you have the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. We agree in principle with the amendment presented by the delegation of Norway. However, we wish to associate ourselves with the comments of Brazil. We also want the phrase ‘*associated with negative memories*’ removed, because we believe it would impact on sites of particular importance, such as sites of enslavement.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We also share Brazil’s concern. We asked for the floor as we were thinking of the Route of Slavery which was a UNESCO project that recognised that negative memory. We also have another concern following Australia’s comment. With respect, this would be a general framework that would have an impact in the future. I am not sure in paragraph 3 that we should not say that this will be presented at the assembly of the States Parties in 2019. During the 43rd session it could be examined, but presented at the States Parties assembly? We could add this to the third paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. We are in general agreement with the proposal by Norway as well as the proposed amendment by Brazil and Tanzania. I also welcome the suggestion by Cuba that our results will go to the Assembly. I would like to ask the Centre something, as in the documentation they circulated a list of nominations that would be discussed at the 43rd

session and among them is a site from Rwanda which is a Site of Memory. What does this mean from now?"

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor."

Azerbaijan:

"Thank you very much Ms. Chairperson. Azerbaijan is also in agreement with the proposed draft amendment. However, I would just like to mention that regarding the second part of paragraph 3, we had a discussion where we had some components from initial proposed draft amendments on chapeau decision 8 which was presented by the colleague from Australia and incorporated them into 12A, as far as I understand. Here, I want to mention that the reform on nomination processes is also at this stage included in the draft decision of 12A. Just to recall that we need a point of referral here, because we have an overall reform on nomination in 12A.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is now to Kuwait."

Kuwait:

"Thank you madam Chairperson. We also agree with the draft amendment submitted by Norway on Paragraph 3, as my colleagues asked, if there is no legal issue, it is a good suggestion that will help the Committee's work in the future.

Regarding paragraph 4, as I heard from the delegation of Brazil, the reason they are deleting it is because it is already present at another place. I do not see if that is the reason, so I think leaving it, as has been submitted by Norway, we have no problem with.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Angola, please."

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous sommes d'accord de manière générale sur la proposition de la Norvège. Par contre, nous aimerions que la dernière partie du paragraphe 3 soit un peu expliqué. Je n'arrive pas à comprendre, "*Décide d'inclure l'examen de la procédure de renvoi et de son application*". De quel renvoi ? Cela paraît un peu ambigu, j'aimerais avoir des clarifications sur la dernière partie de la décision.

Deuxième chose. Par rapport au terme "récent" que la Tanzanie a demandé de supprimer. Je pense qu'il faut qu'on le garde, car c'est le libellé actuel, tel qu'il est présenté dans la réflexion de l'ICOMOS. La réflexion avance, quand nous aurons un document

définitif, là nous saurons si le mot récent devrait être supprimé ou pas. À ce stade on peut le garder, je pense.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary agrees with the proposal of Norway on paragraphs 3 and 4 almost entirely. I would like to emphasise that we are speaking of not only conflicts in general, but, of course, the ‘recent’ is to be specified and clarified as to what it means exactly; at the present time or the near past, or maybe some 100 years ago. It should be clarified.

The other thing is that ‘negative and divisive’ reflection is another question because, in my opinion, it is the most important statement in this paragraph, as the goal of World Heritage is mostly for positive sites and so on. We have discussed what kinds of places, what classification can have such place with negative or divisive memories on the World Heritage List. Let me mention that on this problematic, not only has the World Heritage Committee taken decision on or statement, but they are other conventions or places or possibilities to give memory for them. I would like to propose a perspective not only from the point of view of the World Heritage Convention, but also from other similar Convention or possibilities for Europe or the world.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much Chair. I will be brief. We support Norway’s proposal. With respect to what Angola said, that is to keep the word ‘recent’ in, we also think we have to be consistent with the work carried out and that requested. Although we respect what Hungary just said, I think that this is not the framework in which we should request that exactly, so we should keep the text as clean as possible. Thank you for adding the group of States that support the amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Having heard the different Committee members, China also thanks the Norwegian delegation for putting forward such a substantial amendment to the item. Taking into consideration the concerns, I think that it would be appropriate to put this from paragraph 3 under item 12A since we will have to examine the

next paragraph concerning the decision process and under Item 12A it would better reflect the content of paragraph 3.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Angola, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je voyais déjà le point 4. C’est l’Angola qui a proposé de garder le point 4 non l’Ouganda. On a demandé de garder tout simplement pour soucis de cohérence, sinon on va changer également cette terminologie qui va être prise au 5A. Donc, pour éviter de revenir sur le 5 A autant garder le libellé tel qu’il a été présenté par l’ICOMOS qui travaille sur le sujet.

C’est l’étude qui va déterminer quelles sont les différentes thématiques que l’on va traiter sous ce que l’on appelle jusqu’à présent les sites associés à des conflits. On a demandé à l’ICOMOS de faire une étude inclusive avec les experts afin de revenir sur des thèmes clairs après avoir consulté toutes les parties qui sont intéressées par cette thématique.

Nous avons demandé un éclaircissement pour la dernière partie du paragraphe 3. Pour nous ce n’est pas très clair pour que nous puissions donner notre avis là-dessus ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. I wish to thank all the distinguished members of the Committee for this substantial discussion. I did indeed ask for guidance and advice and I think a lot of very good input has been provided. With regard to the question from the distinguished delegate from Angola, whether or not the referral mechanism is the challenge or if it is the process or the timing: I am not sure of this.

Still, I think it is important that we have the discussion, that we have the possibility to work with the Operational Guidelines next year and to do this in conjunction with the discussions that would be in the nomination process, whether that be something on the timing of the cycles or the application of the mechanism itself. I do not have the answer, but I think it is a very important debate that we have. Thank you very much for raising the point, Ambassador from Angola.

I would also kindly ask the Secretariat for a clarification on the actual decision taken that was in 8B.24. My mind is getting a little bit slow and sluggish after nine days. I might have been lacking precision, therefore I would kindly ask for clarification.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. First, we give the floor to the legal advisor, then Mr. Balsamo then Ms. Rössler to reply to your question. The legal advisor, please.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. In response to the question from Australia. I would first like to specify that under the Convention, the States Parties have the right to have the nomination reviewed by the Committee, provided that they are on the Tentative List and subject to criteria and procedures foreseen in the Operational Guidelines.

Now, Paragraph 140 of the Operational Guidelines foresees that *‘On receipt of nominations from States Parties, the Secretariat will acknowledge receipt, check for completeness and register nominations.’*

It would mean that from the moment a nomination has been completed, the Secretariat would have the obligation to register the nomination. However, I understand that this paragraph concerns only evaluations, and evaluations would need to be undertaken in conformity with the decisions of the Committee and again criteria proposals from the Committee.

Essentially, you are in a way postponing the evaluations of certain files; you cannot restrict the registration by the Secretariat of nomination files from the moment they are complete, but obviously the evaluation, you are kind of postponing it until further reflection is undertaken on this theme. In no way are you limiting with this paragraph the rights of member States to have their nominations reviewed. I would also suppose that in submitting nominations the States Parties will also bear in mind the future decision as you decide to take such a decision.

Thank you madam Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Mr. Balsamo please.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, there was a question I think from the delegation of Tanzania concerning the presence of the file of Rwanda in Document 8B.3 that presents nomination for the next session. I wish to note that the document presents all the nominations that are being received and the file from Rwanda was considered incomplete so it is actually schedule on the agenda for the next session.

There were a lot of interventions concerning the words ‘recent conflict’ and ‘negative and divisive memories’. I would like to remind you that only three days ago, the Committee put this wording into decision 8B.24, which is that recalled in the amendment proposed by Norway. This is actually, basically, the aim of the reflection that is needed to clarify, the reflection that has been requested. This is what has been put into Decision 8B.24.

There was also a question from Angola concerning the review of the referral process and, if I may and you allow me Chair, I will try to address this by saying that this wording is actually coming from the draft decision that was put forward in the case of Naumburg. At the moment of adoption, of course, it was not kept on that decision, but through the floor, Committee members, I do not remember exactly which delegation, asked to keep that part of the draft decision and put it somewhere else, and this is how I remember it.

Just to give more thoughts about this request. As we have also stated in our brief presentation of item 8C today, we have this recurring phenomenon on which, on one side, all the referrals presented to the Committee last year are automatically basically inscribed and, on the other side, there is this effect, as was mentioned earlier by Brazil, of what we call the poisoned apple. The referral has been used as a nice gift to the States Parties, but it is not because they find themselves with requests that they cannot achieve in the framework of referral, redoing boundaries, redoing nominations and revised justification. We know that statistically, when nominations come back, there is another negative recommendation. Basically, it is to review all this process and to avoid further problems that some reflections are needed on the process of the referral.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICOMOS, you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Our intervention concerns the deletion of the word ‘recent’. If this word were to be deleted, the decision would read ‘Sites Associated with Conflicts’ and this word would cover many archaeological sites, most of the castles, 100 per cent of fortresses and many historical walls. It would not limit the scope of the work. We would advise not to delete this word.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to talk about the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. First of all, we apologise that the English text is not on the screen. We seem to be having a technical problem. We can proceed with the French version. I will sum up the discussions that we have had. It seems to me that the Committee is in agreement with the scope of the paragraph. However there were a few comments received and amendments proposed.

Regarding paragraph 3, we had a suggestion from China that this paragraph should be moved under Item 12A; this is not shown on the screen. After having listened to the Secretariat, as there were some questions regarding the exact scope and wording, this is directly lifted from a previous decision. In the previous decision, it was drafted by the Secretariat because it is a general trend on the referral mechanism.

In paragraph 4, we heard suggestions on the one side to delete the word ‘recent’. We heard some opinions saying it should instead be retained and ICOMOS also intervened to say why it should be retained. We had some comments about whether we should rethink the part about ‘negative and divisive memory’. If I understand the Secretariat, this is language directly lifted from Decision 42 COM 8B.24, paragraph 2 of that decision.

I do not want to add to the confusion, but if we are to have a general item 8, we are now moving to put what was supposed to go in 12A under general item 8. I do believe that we received an amendment for a final paragraph on 12A from Australia and Norway which actually could be better-placed here. Unfortunately, I only have the English version which reads out:

'Also decides to include in the draft agenda of its 43rd session, a general item 8 to allow discussion on the nominations and evaluation cycle.'

We will reflect this proposal on the screen. This is how I would summarise the status of discussion right now.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, please."

Azerbaijan:

"Thank you Chair. I just want to repeat our point on the second part of paragraph 3, in other words second what was proposed by China. Change the place or if we do not, think about the second part, the broader nomination process, which is already covered by draft decision under 12A. That is my first point.

My second point is, if now we agree to have already a general chapeau decision under item 8. We would like to come up with a proposal, a new paragraph 3, I believe. If I can read it out, with your permission.

3. *'Also recalls that all its decisions including the laws on nominations should be consistent with the Convention, the Operational Guidelines and previous decisions of the Committee'*.

I think the rationale behind this is very clear. We are speaking about consistency of our decisions and compliance with the language of the Convention and the Operational Guidelines.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor."

Brazil:

"Thank you madam Chair. A quick response to some concerns and questions about the debate. We would like for the sake of consistency to keep the word 'recent' since we already took Decision 5A that specifically mentions sites associated with recent conflicts. In line with consistency, we would like to keep the word 'recent' in this decision.

We are not sure our question was answered regarding the expert meeting on integrated art. We sent an amendment during the discussion on Naumburg Cathedral and we

would like to know if this would be the right place to have this amendment or should be it put in another agenda item. We ask the Secretariat.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Spain.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “I wanted to speak concerning Azerbaijan’s new paragraph 3. I think in terms of substance, this is something that is very important, just looking at international laws such as the Convention. The interpretation of this is in the Operational Guidelines; in previous decisions they always have an obligation to apply the Convention, obviously.

There is actually no legally binding obligation to recall previous decisions, which is why I would prefer that it would be in the Convention and the Operational Guidelines; that would suffice.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Ms. Rössler, please, answer.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to answer the question from Brazil. Yes, you can put part of the decision under this text, I think it is the most suitable. My understanding is that there is also a general text proposed by Norway or Australia which is now under item 12 which could be moved here. This is up to you; the Rapporteur could maybe clarify.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. In fact the proposal we received from Azerbaijan for this new paragraph 3 is almost exactly the same proposal that we received from Australia and Norway under 12A, which would be paragraph 14 in 12A. Except for the part where the distinguished delegate from Spain proposes to delete the second part related to previous decisions from the Committee. As I said earlier when it was not on the screen, we could have certain parts moved here. We could have a final paragraph proposed by Australia and Norway for 12A put here. It would go:

‘Also decides to include in the agenda of its 43rd session, a general item 8 to allow discussion on the nomination and the evaluation cycle’.

We have also heard the intervention from the distinguished delegate of Brazil who has already tabled a text for a previous decision. We have the text and it will be on the screen maybe as a new paragraph 6. Then what I have just suggested could become paragraph 7. We are going to have the proposal for the new expert group also reflected here at the end.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. If I recall correctly from the legal advisor’s statement yesterday or the day before concerning new paragraph 3: we do agree with Spain that the Committee is convening each time for a new time, so in that sense I think Spain’s argument is very valid. Possibly the legal advisor could provide clarification on that.

Concerning the proposal from the Rapporteur: If I remember correctly, we were discussing the nomination process, so that was the term used. That would be enough.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to run through the various amendments. First, the clause 3 amendment from Azerbaijan: Australia was the original author of that text and it was proposed to be incorporated in our amendment to item 12A. Having heard the intervention from Spain and Norway, I do actually understand the point that has been made and, subject to the advice of the legal advisor, we would support the proposal from Spain that this last element be deleted.

In relation to point 4 and Azerbaijan’s suggestion regarding the text relating to the second part of the text about the referral procedure: I do agree that this is appropriately placed in 12A, but indeed it could just be deleted because the referral procedure would be part of what is looked at under 12A. So it would be more efficient to just delete it. If it is to be moved, this is perfectly alright with us.

As to the last point that Norway raised on the last element, seven, I guess: I think we have nomination and evaluation of sites and Norway said that it should just say ‘the nomination process’ and we would be happy with that modification.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je pense que la chose devient de plus en plus compliquée. On n'a pas passé le nœud du problème qui est le paragraphe 4. Les autres questions viennent juste renforcer. On doit prendre une décision sur le processus du renvoi. Il faut régler cela et les autres questions seront vues.

À mon avis les questions que le Brésil soulève, si je me base au début, les problèmes étaient qu'il y a une surreprésentation de certains biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, entre autres la question des cathédrales. Le débat, est qu'il y a besoin d'un groupe de travail pour raffiner, disons, les outils d'évaluation pour voir comment ces biens surreprésentés pourraient être gérés dans le processus d'inscription. Nous ne limitons pas la réflexion uniquement aux arts. Cela va au-delà des arts. Prenons la question dans sa dimension intégrale.

Je ne vois pas comment on va insérer ce paragraphe ici. Si on part d'un sujet précis, les questions des sites liés au conflit et on veut retarder, disons, l'évaluation des dossiers qui seront soumis compte tenu du mandat que nous avons confié à l'ICOMOS de revoir. Ce sont deux choses différentes, cela n'a rien à voir avec la surreprésentation et la question des sites liés au conflit. Voilà comment nous devons réfléchir pour faciliter notre prise de décision.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Azerbaijan, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. We thank our colleagues for their comments on the second part of newly-proposed paragraph 3. We support the idea that this can be clarified by the legal advisor. In any case, the intention to put it here was not about the legal obligation of the previous Committee's decisions but the main point here is consistency. As I said, we will be happy to hear the position of the legal advisor on this.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. I believe we have the different acknowledgments of the discussions that we held during the nomination of Naumburg Cathedral. The point we raised, and that was seconded by a number of delegations, was that perhaps we should further reflect on how integrated arts could be the basis for identifying the attributes that convey Outstanding Universal Value. In that sense it was not an over-representation of cathedrals, if I correctly understood the last intervention from Angola.

We would like to keep this paragraph somewhere in any decision. If it is not in the right place, you can move it. From what we heard from the Secretariat, we believe this is an opportunity to have this text and we can have it. I have an issue with the French version. I will speak in French.

Dans la version française il serait mieux de dire *“qu’il décide de convoquer une réunion d’experts sur le patrimoine mondial et l’art intégré, afin de permettre une réflexion et d’élaborer les orientations sur la question de savoir si et comment les œuvres d’art faisant partie intégrante des biens proposés peuvent servir de base pour la valeur universelle exceptionnelle”*.

Je répète : *“sur la question de savoir si et comment les œuvres d’art faisant partie intégrante des biens proposés peuvent servir de base pour la valeur universelle exceptionnelle”*.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to the legal advisor.”

Legal advisor:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. In paragraph 3, if the term ‘should’ is to be interpreted as a legal obligation in the same way as ‘must’, which seems to be the case in the paragraph, as reference is also made to the Convention, which is a legal obligation, I would concur that the deletion of the reference to the previous decisions of the Committee would be appropriate.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je voudrais revenir sur le paragraphe 3 et je comprends très bien le contexte dans lequel les différentes délégations l’ont formulé ainsi. Au risque de me répéter sur ce que j’ai dit hier, on devrait uniquement mettre des tendances et non pas des obligations. Parce que *“rappelle également que toutes ces décisions dont celles concernant les propositions d’inscription devraient être cohérentes avec la Convention”*.

Oui, mais si on veut être cohérent avec les termes de la Convention on ne peut pas dire que *“nous devons suivre les propositions”*. Nous devons tendre à les appliquer, mais nous ne devons pas les suivre sinon ce ne seront plus des propositions. Sur le plan de leur nature elle demeure des propositions, il est évident que l’on devrait s’en inspirer et s’en rapprocher, mais si nous mettons cela, de manière indirecte nous sommes en train de changer leur nature en des précédents. Donc la même proposition faite hier *“devrait tendre à”* afin que ceci soit une ligne de conduite plus qu’une obligation normative ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to the Rapporteur to go paragraph by paragraph.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Indeed the amendments themselves and the comments received are quite complex, it seems it would be helpful if we could just start from the top. Please scroll up on the English text.

Paragraph 1 reads: *'having examined documents WHC/18/42.COM/8B and WHC/18/42.COM/INF8B.3...'*

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Sorry to intervene again madam Chairperson. I just have great difficulty with the amendment that has just been proposed by the delegate of Tunisia. In the English, if we talk about ‘attending to be consistent’ that means that every now and again we might do things that are not consistent. Obligation on the Committee is always to do things that are in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, then we have a problem if we are going to have a recollection that every now and again we might sort of steer ourselves away from what we are required to do.”

The Chairperson:

“Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Je remercie le distingué représentant de l’Australie et je comprends tout à fait sa remarque. Dans ce cas le problème n’est pas dans ma proposition, il est dans le paragraphe lui-même. On ne rappelle pas ce qui est déjà obligatoire. La Convention et les règles de procédures s’impliquent à nous indiscutablement et on devrait les appliquer sans rappeler qu’on les applique. À partir du moment que l’on écrit cela, on n’exprime pas le droit on n’exprime une orientation et dans ce cas on doit inciter les prochaines sessions du Comité à se rapprocher le plus possible de la Convention, mais sinon dans ce cas tout le paragraphe est inutile.

Est-ce que l’on vient, nous, par une résolution dans notre 42^e session rappelée que la Convention s’applique et est obligatoire ? Non, elle l’est par sa nature juridique. Je comprends ce paragraphe comme étant une incitation au prochain Comité de se rapprocher le plus possible de la lettre et l’esprit de la Convention. Nous sommes tout à fait d’accord dans ce cas puisque ce n’est pas le droit, mais c’est une incitation, dans ce cas on met la tendance ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, maybe you have a proposal?”

Australia:

“Sorry madam Chair, I just missed your signal. I think there has been a lot of discussion about this and I worry that the Committee may not be able to find a consensus on the form of the wording. I would actually propose that we delete 3 in its entirety.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, please.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je reviens au 2. Si on doit intégrer la proposition du Brésil qui vient à la fin et qui parle justement de l'art intégré. Il faudra que l'on rappelle également les deux décisions qui sont là sont reliées au site de mémoire. S'il faut rajouter la question de l'art intégré, il faut rappeler également la décision liée à cette thématique. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. We see the legal issue here, but we are still in favour of keeping this paragraph and, as a sign of consensus, we would like to delete the last part of the first part in paragraph 3. If I may make an addition to this, after ‘*Operational Guidelines*’ and ‘*to take into consideration the previous decisions of the Committee*’.

I think with this, we should impose on the Convention and Operational Guidelines and then we just take into consideration previous decisions, which serves for consistency and is important in terms of institutional memory.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, you have the floor.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente. La Tunisie se félicite de la proposition australienne et nous sommes d'avis de supprimer le paragraphe 3 dans sa totalité. Il ne nous avance à rien. On a vu qu'à vouloir trop toucher aux mots, on crée plus d'incompréhension alors que nous rédigeons que dire des prochains comités. Nous sommes donc tout à fait d'accord avec l'Australie pour sa suppression totale. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair. I withdraw my request.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Madam Chair, I am just trying to contemplate what has been said by our colleague from Tunisia and also by our colleague from Australia. Maybe we can make some adjustment in paragraph 3 to read: *‘also recalls that all its decisions should be consistent with the dispositions and the spirit of the Convention, the Operational Guidelines and the Committee’*.”

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. There is a bit of fatigue on our behalf at least, so we support Australia’s and Tunisia’s proposal. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, please.”

Bosnie-Herzégovine :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. La même chose que la Norvège nous soutenons la proposition de l’Australie, de la Tunisie et maintenant de la Norvège. Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I think that there is an agreement to delete paragraph 3 as proposed by Australia. Are there any objections? Azerbaijan, please.”

Azerbaijan:

“Just to say that in fact, we support the new proposal by Brazil, but if there is a general opinion in the room we will not go against the consensus.”

The Chairperson:

“Is there a consensus? We do not want to waste more time. If you agree, we will delete the paragraph. It is now and is adopted. Let us move on to the next.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Before paragraph 3, we need to scroll up to paragraph 2, because that is where we were originally. After the intervention of the distinguished delegate of Angola, who would like to see a reference here. What I suggest to you madam Chair is that we come back to paragraph 2 after we have discussed the paragraph proposed by the delegation of Brazil. Should that paragraph be accepted as it is then we can come back to paragraph 2 and add the reference, if this is agreeable to you.

It is, so we move on to paragraph 4 which reads:

4. *‘Considering that, in compliance with the Convention and the Operational Guidelines, Outstanding Universal Value is recognised at the time of inscription of a property on the World Heritage List and that no recognition of Outstanding Universal Value is foreseen prior to this stage, decides to include the review of the referral procedure and its application for examination in the framework of the next revision of the Operational Guidelines at its 43rd session in 2019;’*

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? No. It is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Paragraph 5 reads:

5. *‘Also decides that the evaluation of sites associated with conflicts shall be undertaken once a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.’*

I just wish to flag that the way I read out the paragraph implied deleting the words suggested for deletion. If you allow me, I will read it out once again, because I think it is important we hear how it would sound the other way around.

5. *‘Also decides that the evaluation of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories shall be undertaken once a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.’*

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“I am just mindful of the intervention by ICOMOS, which pointed out that a broad interpretation of what is meant by conflict would knock out a very large number of future nominations of castles and all sort of properties that may be long going in history. I think, as Angola pointed out, for consistency with the decision taken under 5A it is more appropriate to reference ‘recent conflicts’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Hungary.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary, as before, is in favour of the second version. ‘Reflecting the recent negative and divisive memories’ to be retained. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Norway.”

Norway:

“Just a suggestion. We have been using inverted commas when we have been referring to previous adopted text so we could use that as a compromise.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Are there any objections?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Since we have heard support for retaining the original wording for this paragraph, previously we had suggestions to delete certain parts of it, but now we have heard support for retaining the paragraph as it was. Now you have it on the screen and I read it out once again. Paragraph 5 would read:

5. ‘Also decides that the evaluation of sites associated with recent conflicts and other negative and divisive memories shall be undertaken once a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines.’

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. We would go along with Norway to put inverted commas in the exact wording and in that sense we need to strike out, as noted before, ‘and other negative and divisive memories’. Our suggestion is in line with Norway, as I just said to put inverted commas for ‘sites associated with memories of recent conflicts’. What is quoted is decision 5A that we took last week.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to the Rapporteur to explain the amendments.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. I apologise for coming late at this point. Unless I am mistaken after hearing the Secretariat that intervened earlier, I do believe that this particular part about ‘and other negative and divisive memories’ was not taken from paragraph 5 A because when this decision was drafted by Norway it only made reference to Decision 42 COM 8B.24 and I do believe that after what the Secretariat said earlier that the language ‘and other negative and divisive memories’ was used in that decision. In that sense this part would not be a recalling from decision 5A but from decision 8B.24, but maybe, through you, we could request the original author of the decision, Norway, to explain.

Thank you very much. “

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Norway, please, could you explain?”

Norway:

“As I said we do suffer from a bit of fatigue, so I do remember that the Secretariat commented that it was directly after the original text in 8B.24. I have to admit that we do not have a very strong opinion on it, but we would like to retain the original language.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. It seems that this point with paragraph 5, if we could just scroll down so we can see it in its entirety. We have suggestions to keep the whole paragraph in the original language and we have one suggestion to delete the reference that was lifted from Decision 42 COM 8B.24. Madam Chair, through you, we might request the Committee to express their view on whether they wish to use the reference from the decision or prefer deleting it.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Committee members, do you have any objections?”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. Hungary would emphasise that part of the paragraph proposed for deletion by the distinguished delegate of Brazil would be significant for this paragraph because it is totally different from the ‘recent conflicts’ and for Hungary it means something very important for this paragraph and we would like to retain it.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Angola, you have the floor.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Pour un problème de cohérence entre le paragraphe 2 et ce paragraphe 5, il faudra donc conserver et les “conflits récents et les autres mémoires” parce que l’on rappelle deux textes. Donc il faudra que l’on respecte les terminologies qui sont dans les deux textes. Je pense que cela nous facilitera la tâche. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Saint Kitts and Nevis, you have the floor.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. We agree with the suggestion from Brazil to delete ‘negative and divisive memories’. We think it appears that there seems to be a conflation of two reports and not the one mentioned by Brazil.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We do not have time, so we move on.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. If I follow up proceedings correctly, we still have the proposal to delete, as you can see on the screen; that part. The Paragraph would read:

'5. Also decides that the evaluation of "sites associated with recent conflicts" shall be undertaken once a comprehensive reflection has taken place and the Committee at its 44th session has discussed and decided how these sites might relate to the purpose and scope of the World Heritage Convention and its Operational Guidelines'

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Can we adopt it, are there any objections? Thank you very much."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you very much madam Chair. We move to paragraph 6 which is that which was previously proposed by Brazil under a different decision and it would read:

6. 'Decides to convene an Expert Meeting on the World Heritage and integrated art to allow for reflection and to develop guidance on whether and how works of art as integral components of nominated properties may be proposed as a basis for conveying Outstanding Universal Value, provided that extra-budgetary funding is available and invites the States Parties to contribute to this end'

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any objections? I see none. As adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. Let us go back to paragraph 2 and, consistent with what the distinguished delegate of Angola asked, we can recall Decisions 42 COM 8B.35 and we can put it after Decision 24.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Are there any objections? As adopted."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you. Now we got back to paragraph 7.

7. Also decides to include in the draft agenda of its 43rd session a general item 8 to allow discussion on the nomination process.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections? I see none. As adopted. Now general decision on item 8 is adopted.

Dear colleagues Items 13, 14, 9A and 12A are related as they contain elements that have been discussed by the *ad hoc* group. It is proposed that the respective decisions are examined, each with their respective item. However, the adoption is to be done once the decisions have been agreed in order to ensure consistency between them. Bahrain, as chief of the *ad hoc* group will provide us with an explanation of the proposed approach. Bahrain you have the floor.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you madam Chair. As you know, the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group included several items related to the sustainability of the World Heritage Fund as a follow-up of the Road Map adopted last year, the definition of Upstream Processes, and the analysis of the recommendations of various comparative studies. Therefore, the original Draft Decision 42 COM 12A prepared by the *ad hoc* working group contained paragraphs related to all these matters.

At the beginning of the work of the budget group, it was suggested by The Chairperson to integrate the budget-related paragraphs of Draft Decision 42 COM 12A into the budget Draft Decision 42 COM 14 for more consistency and to facilitate the follow-up with respect to items and topics. Likewise, it was also considered more appropriate to include a paragraph on international assistance for Draft Decision 42 COM 12. and for the Draft Decision on Item 13 dedicated to international assistance, as revised further through discussions by the budget group.

Following the same logic, the delegation of Bahrain proposes an amendment to integrate a paragraph related to the Upstream Process of Draft Decision 42 COM 12A and to the Draft Decision of item 9A on Upstream Processes. This explains why the three draft decisions on the items that the Committee will now examine, Item 13, 14 and 9A, contain elements coming originally from Draft Decision 42 COM 12A.

Accordingly, an amendment was also submitted by the delegation from Bahrain to adjust the content of Draft Decision 12A, keeping only a reference on issues related to nominations, as well as a proposal to extend the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group. We hope these explanations will help clarify the reasons behind the various amendments proposed for the four items that will be discussed now since they are all interrelated.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We now move to item 13 devoted to international assistance. To this end, I would like to invite you to pay attention to Document 13. I invite Ms. Totcharova from the World Heritage Centre to introduce the item. Please, madam, you have the floor.”

Ms. Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. As explained by Bahrain, there are elements which are included in the draft decision but they come from Decision 12A; we will address this at the

end of the presentation. Very briefly, what does this document concern? The international assistance request which has been submitted and approved, and the first part is specifically related to the international assistance request within the purview of the World Heritage Committee; that is what you have to decide on as a Committee and these are the requests above US\$30,000. All requests, as you know, under this amount are within the purview of The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

What you will see in the next slide is the international assistance request for which you have to decide whether it goes beyond the amount of US\$30,000. That first is from Ghana, concerning a preparation of the Management Plan for the Fort and Castles of Ghana. This activity is a priority for this site which has been inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1979 and all the details about this request are available and can be found between pages 3 and 7 of the document. As you can see, the amount is US\$85,086. This is an amount available under the corresponding category that means we still have this amount. Nothing prevents the Committee from approving this request if it wishes to, given the fact that it has been evaluated positively by the panel.

The next one is an international assistance request which exceeds the US\$30,000 threshold by only US\$460, but this again is for your decision and approval. Another request for international assistance which concerns the development of an integration management plan for Gjirokastra and Berat is recommended for approval and if you wish you may do so and nothing prevents this because there are available funds.

Another request comes from Ukraine for the amount of US\$50,500 for the purchase of a trailing lift with a telescopic boom, Dinolift. This concerns a lift for the maintenance of the property Saint Sophia Cathedral and related Monastic buildings. The acquisition has not been considered as a priority and therefore it is not recommended for approval.

What is the status? You can see it on this slide. In 2018, you see that the amount is going down and next year we will have less than what we had in 2018. We will have about 40 per cent on management and conservation and even less for preparatory assistance.

As you know, the IOS mapping study concerning the process and working methods of the Convention had actually recommended that some working procedures and methods be made more efficient and consistent with the method by other conventions and a specific proposal was made for the international assistance mechanism which was considered quite cumbersome, costly and heavy. Therefore, the *ad hoc* group discussed this and made certain suggestions, which were picked up by the group, as explained by Bahrain. In this regard, the agreed-to text by the budget group has been included in the draft decision, which you see on the screen.

Otherwise the draft decision is on page 12 of the English and French versions of your document. Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments or objections? Rapporteur are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Yes, we do have amendments; these are those coming from the working group. You can see them on the screen. I believe they are agreed by everybody, as the decision was distributed beforehand.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any comments? As you know, this will be kept open until the end. We adopt it in total at the end of the discussion on the four items.

Let us move on to the next item, 14. As you know, the working group on the Budget met throughout our session and therefore I would like to give the floor The Chairperson of this working group to present his report and the draft decision proposed on this matter that was distributed to you.”

Mr. Baratti:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I have the pleasure to report on the Budget World Heritage discussions and present Draft Decision 42 COM 14.REV. First, I would like to express my sincere gratitude for the trust you have placed in me and the government of Azerbaijan by electing me as Chairperson of the budget working group. As scheduled, the budget working group met from the 26th until the 29th of June, 2018, for four hours of discussion.

I would like to thank all the delegates, Committee members, States Parties and representatives of the World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS, IUCN and ICCROM who attended the meeting of the budget group. Their input, cooperation and support allowed us to conclude our work in a very efficient and timely manner. Concerning the method, the working group agreed to work on a revised draft decision which combined the original text of Draft Decision 42 COM 14 and the budget-related paragraphs of Draft Decision 12A.

As you may know, I also have the honour to facilitate discussions of the *ad hoc* working group on the matters concerning the follow-up on a number of measures, including the Road Map for sustainability of the World Heritage Fund, which was approved by the 41st session of the Committee in Cracow in 2017. Among these were: the development of a fundraising and communication strategy, informal group of friends, and follow-up of mapping studies of the Internal Oversight Service concerning advisory services.

To present the revised Draft Decision 42 COM 14 which was agreed by the budget group, I would like to concentrate on each of the two sets of core elements explained above. Concerning the first part of revised decision 42 COM 14 the group discussed the paragraph proposed originally by the Secretariat and made constructive contributions, clarifications and adjustments to language in view of streamlining the text and when necessary strengthening the message to stakeholders of the Convention.

The text agreed to include proposed decisions on a number of issues. The issue of foremost importance: the sustainability of the Fund; the timely payment of the compulsory and assessed voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund is highlighted in the first place. The voluntary contributions of a number of States Parties including the totality of their assessed contributions are commended while a call was made to all other States Parties to allocate voluntary contributions to the World Heritage Fund with the target of ten or more States Parties doubling their annual contributions, as foreseen in the Road Map and also in the Resource Mobilisation Strategy that I will address further in my presentation.

The budget group also discussed the need for some flexibility in the management in order to improve effectiveness and the efficient use of the already scarce resources of the Fund. The draft decision recommends authorising the Director of the Centre to make budgetary adjustments when necessary and if possible to consult the Committee in the

second year of the biennium without exceeding a maximum of 15 per cent of the approved World Heritage Fund Expenditure Plan in the second year of each biennium. This aims at increasing efficiency and improving expenditure rates instead of having remaining amounts at the end of the biennium and at the same time meets remaining resources under other budget lines, because the World Heritage Centre did not have the flexibility to make budget adjustments. The Secretariat will report accordingly to the Committee at its following sessions.

A similar solution was proposed with regard to exchange rate fluctuations on the fund. The Committee may wish to allow the Centre to proceed with all necessary budgetary adjustments in the second year of each biennium, with a maximum additional amount of US\$100,000 to cover the provision for exchange rate fluctuations from the operating reserve of the Fund, in case the initial amount approved is not sufficient.

To approve efficiency, the enhanced use of temporary assistance to suitable contractual modalities for the implementation of activities in the frame of the Fund is also proposed. The group also discussed Executive Board Document 204 EX/5 Part II.E on Cost recovery policy: Revised Proposal for a differential rate policy for Management Cost Rates'. After an in-depth discussion, the budget group recommends that the current Management Cost rate of zero per cent continues to apply to the Fund.

The second part of decision 14, in four main parts, that concern the budget-related part from the original decision 42 COM 12A text. Each of these points address a respective item of the mandate of the *ad hoc* working group as it was formulated by the Committee at its 41st Session.

Firstly, the budget group fully agrees with the resource mobilisation and communication strategy framework document developed by the *ad hoc* group and there was a proposed approach in this regard. The decision therefore suggests that a two-year strategy be planned, and developed by the Secretariat with the support of the Advisory Bodies and States Parties wishing to assist the Secretariat in fund-raising activities. The Secretariat will be expected to make a progress report at the 43rd session of the Committee.

The group also supported the proposal about flexible and informal event by States Parties towards resource mobilisation activities of the Secretariat rather than creating an informal core group. Taking into account that it is early, complex and costly to organise a large scale fund-raising event with formal partners or donors before the Resource Mobilisation Strategy is fully in place. The group discussed that this matter could be considered at a later stage when the right conditions are in place. Finally, in accordance with its mandate, the *ad hoc* working group analysed and examined the IOS' comparative study recommendations and the relevant part of these recommendations were also discussed by the budget group.

On IOS recommendation 1, it was agreed to keep the current practice of overhead costs in the contracts of the Advisory Bodies and their elimination will not result in significant savings. On IOS recommendation 2, the summary of the legal opinion according to which the World Heritage Committee is not compelled by provisions of the Convention and the Operational Guidelines to use all the services of the three current Advisory Bodies was taken note of. In this regard, the budget group with a proposal from the *ad hoc* group recommends continued use of the services of the current three Advisory Bodies while further discussing the modalities for the use of services of other entities with suitable experience and knowledge, in line with UNESCO's rules and regulations, possibly through an extended *ad hoc* working group.

In this regard, a proposal for an amended mandate of the *ad hoc* group is included in the amendment of decision 12A submitted by Bahrain as chair of the *ad hoc* working group. In addition to the examination of different possibilities of reforming the nomination process

recommendations in view of increasing the balance and credibility of the World Heritage List, according to Draft Decision 42 COM 12A, it also includes discussion of modalities for possible use of advisory services of other entities in addition to the current three Advisory Bodies.

The budget group also endorsed the proposal of the *ad hoc* working group on Reactive Monitoring missions and the World International Assistance we discussed in previous items. Furthermore, the group discussed a model for sharing the cost for the model, for sharing costs for evaluation of nominations presented by the delegation of Norway and included in Annex E of document 12A by paying an upfront fixed fee based on the average cost of evaluations. The proposal had met the approval of the majority of *ad hoc* group members. The budget group discussed and agreed that further examination of this matter is needed regarding its modalities and bases or implications at its 41st session 2019 with a view to submitting it for examination by the General Assembly at its 22nd session in 2019 as well.

Both paragraphs were related and included in the draft decision in this regard

Finally, in order to prioritise conservation, the budget group recommends encouraging further increase of the proportion of the World Heritage Fund dedicated to conservation.

I hope the distinguished members of the Committee should adopt this draft decision which is the product of an immense collective endeavour. It aims to set us on a path towards greater sustainability of the World Heritage Fund and therefore hopefully in time to ensure better protection, conservation, management and presentation of world cultural and natural heritage.

In conclusion, allow me to personally thank the World Heritage Centre for their constant support, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM for their constructive engagement and all distinguished delegates and colleagues that participated in and attended meetings of the *ad hoc* working group and budget working group. Most of all I would like to deeply thank Your Excellency Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa for your noble, humble and dedicated leadership and Sheik Khalifa al Khalifa for the excellent cooperation in the framework of the *ad hoc* working group.

Thanks a lot Chairperson.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Allow me on behalf of the Committee to congratulate you and to thank you very much for your excellent work and achievements. I saw you personally working in a very serious and dedicated way. Thank you very much.

Allow me to close the session. We will complete and continue after 3:00 pm and we only have two hours as we have informed you. I remind our Bureau members that we will meet at 2:30 pm as we agreed this morning to discuss the matter we referred to this morning.

Thank you very much.”

NINETH DAY – Tuesday 3 July 2018
SEVENTEENTH SESSION
3 p.m. – 6 p.m.
Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chair:

“We do not have much time. We will continue Item 14. We heard Mr. Baratti and his report on the working group. Do you have any comments or questions regarding his report? If you have any points to raise you can do it later because we will not adopt for good now but only at the end. Draft Decision 42 COM 14 is agreed upon and if you have any comments you will be able to express yourself later and we will adopt it with the final decision. Spain, please you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “We just have a question on the procedure. Does this mean that when we come to the end, we will take a look at all the draft decisions with the amendments when we come to considering all these draft decisions together?”

The Chair:

“We are now moving on to item 9A, which concerns the progress report on the reflection concerning Upstream Processes. This report is presented in Document 9A. I would like to invite Mr. Balsamo, from the World Heritage Centre, to briefly present this item.”

Mr. Balsamo:

“Thank you madam Chair. Last year Decision 41 COM 9A established the Upstream Process firmly as statutory procedure and requested the Secretariat to include the Upstream Process request format into the next revision of the Operational Guidelines foreseen in 2019.

Decision 41 COM 9A established the procedure and the format to request Upstream Process advice. The procedure defined two deadlines for receiving requests per year, the 31st of March and the 31st of October, and limited the number of Upstream Process requests to ten per year. In the same decision, priority is given to requests for preparation or revision of Tentative Lists, to Least Developed Countries, Low-Income and Lower-Middle Income Countries and Small Island Developing States, through the mechanism of Paragraph 61.C.

The revised Upstream Process has yielded positive results for States Parties who requested support. By the most recent deadline, the 31st of March, 2018, the World Heritage Centre received a total of 16 Upstream Process requests, a significant number of which were from Least Developed Countries and Lower Middle Income Countries. Most notably, three requests were from States Parties without any inscribed properties and five from State Parties with up to two properties.

Despite the fact that the World Heritage Centre received more than the established a ten request limit, the Centre and Advisory Bodies have collectively agreed to work towards accommodating all of the requests, beginning with the first ten received. In accordance with

their established procedures, the Advisory Bodies are in the process of evaluating the requests and providing advice to the State Parties. And since the number of requests received exceeds the cap of ten, it is suggested to set the following deadline for receiving upstream requests at the 31st of March, 2019.

As you know, the discussion on the definition of the Upstream Process and the effectiveness of the Global Strategy for a balanced and representative World Heritage List was part of the mandate of the extended *ad hoc* working group for 2017-2018.

Document 9A should therefore be read in conjunction with Document 12A. It is in Document 12A that you will find the definition for Upstream Processes as revised by the *ad hoc* working group, as well as the related decision approving this revised definition.

The Committee may wish to have all its decisions on Upstream Process put together into a single decision, and therefore include the paragraph on Upstream of Decision 12A into Decision 9A.

The draft decision is in front of you on page 4 of both the English and French versions of Document 9A. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you now have the decision on the screen? Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, the United Republic of Tanzania commends the *ad hoc* group for their comprehensive report on all the items, but, in particular, regarding the Upstream Process. It also commends the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for their report.

Tanzania notes the challenges related to selection and acknowledges the effort that realised the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to accommodate all the requests and considered the possibility to extend the deadline. Madame Chair, we have seen during this Committee that sometimes we have challenges. Properties are inscribed and suddenly we want to inscribe them on the in Danger List.

Having realised that, the delegation of Tanzania proposes an amendment to openly target those States Parties without sites on the List, to continue their effort and maintain the dynamism within the Upstream Process. Tanzania believes that it is the proper way to better foresee and prepare for the challenge of protection, conservation and management of their property.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, please.”

Burkina Faso :

« Merci madame la présidente. Le rapport présenté sur le processus en amont traduit les points de vue qui se sont exprimés durant les discussions au sein du groupe de travail *ad*

hoc chargé, en outre, de discuter de la définition du processus en amont et de l'efficacité de la stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée et représentative.

Ma délégation souhaite s'associer au processus qui s'est dégagé en faveur d'une définition brève et concise du processus en amont que l'on trouve dans la définition définie dans le rapport. Mon pays connaît la pertinence de cette initiative du processus en amont qui permet d'améliorer les propositions d'inscription et invite le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives à continuer d'accorder toute l'attention qui sert de prestations de conseils.

En outre, nous rappelons à cet égard le lien entre le processus en amont et la stratégie globale pour une Liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée et représentative, car l'objectif à terme du processus en amont est d'aider les États qui en font la demande à bien préparer leurs dossiers d'inscription, de parvenir avec de bons résultats, à corriger le déséquilibre de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et, notamment, la sous-représentation du patrimoine africain.

Nous soutenons enfin l'idée de partenariat que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives pourraient établir avec les Centres de catégorie 2 dans le cadre du processus en amont pour des conseils et le renforcement des capacités des États parties.

Tout en soutenant le projet de décision 42 COM 9A, nous avons proposé un léger amendement.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie félicite le groupe de travail pour cet excellent rapport sur le processus en amont. La Tunisie a déjà eu l'occasion d'expérimenter ce processus pour un certain nombre de ses biens naturels inscrits sur sa Liste indicative et c'était avec des résultats positifs. Elle a cherché également à le faire pour un bien culturel, mais malheureusement cela n'a pas été possible.

La Tunisie considère ce processus comme une sorte de recette miracle. Du moins, une bonne recette pour gagner du temps et de l'argent pour atténuer les incompréhensions entre les Organisations consultatives et les États parties et développer le dialogue entre eux pour améliorer la mise en œuvre de la Convention durant tout ce processus.

L'idéal serait d'étendre ce concept, le processus en amont, à tout le processus de mise en œuvre de la Convention dans les États parties. Bien évidemment, les ressources financières et les possibilités humaines étant très réduites, cela, pour le moment, n'est pas possible.

En attendant, la Tunisie appuie l'amendement proposé par la Tanzanie qui demande à privilégier les États parties qui n'ont pas encore de biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. En attendant aussi, une réflexion globale et approfondie sur tout le processus de l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

Je vous remercie. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? We will move to Item 12A. But before there is a request for the floor. IUCN, you have the floor.”

IUCN:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to deliver on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies, an intervention. This is in the context of 12A, but cutting across the other items as presented. The Advisory Bodies have listened with great interest to the discussions of the recent days and welcome proposals for improving World Heritage processes. The Advisory Bodies share a long-term commitment to the ideals of the World Heritage Convention and also share a collective responsibility for its integrity.

We hold long-term institutional memory which can make a valuable contribution on points of consistency and precedent. We also provide a global perspective that is essential for a Convention based on the Outstanding Universal Value. The World Heritage Convention has greatly expanded in scope and complexity over the last decade. The Advisory Bodies have responded to this by undertaking evolutionary reforms to our working methods, policies and practices so as to be more efficient, effective, transparent and consultative.

We will continue to do so and to explore more substantial reforms where these are needed. We recall for example that the evaluation process was competently revised in consultation with the *ad hoc* working group and the Committee when the Operational Guidelines were revised at the 39th session of the Committee in Bonn in 2015.

We have strongly demonstrated our commitment to dialogue within the time limit imposed by the current calendar in the Operational Guidelines. Dialogue between State Parties and the Advisory Bodies has greatly increased between recent Committee sessions. We value this new way of working as an important step forward. We see that when we work collaboratively with the State Parties the results are almost always beneficial for us all.

The Advisory Bodies are fully committed to creating for the *ad hoc* working group the proposal concerning the development of a resource mobilisation and communication plan as this should indeed be the context to understand the overall resource needs of the Convention and thus find economies which did not compromise quality.

In closing, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM believe that we have much to contribute to these essential change processes which are central to the health of the Convention. We look forward to our collaboration with all parties to continue supporting the Convention with high quality global, independent and expert advice.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to say that Zimbabwe supports the proposal by Tanzania to include the priority to be given to countries that have no properties on the List. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Let us move to item 12A. You will remember that we opened item 12A last Monday and we listened to the report of the two Co-chairs of the group. As you will also remember, we decided to leave this item open to allow for further consultation and to allow for several questions to be discussed during the working group on the budget. I would like to give the floor to Ms. Totcharova on this matter.”

Ms. Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. This is just a little clarification about the approach and the process which was explained by the delegation of Bahrain, as chair of the *ad hoc* group.

You know that the group has produced a report which included a list of recommendations and a draft decision. The item was presented at the time of the opening of this Committee, last Monday, on the 25th.

Many of the paragraphs of the draft decision of the recommendation have been addressed and discussed by the budget group and there has been a general agreement about despatching different elements in the respective decisions and items.

In this regard many parts of what used to be 12A are already included in Decision 13 about international assistance, in Decision 9A about Upstream Process and in the budget decision. Therefore, the delegation of Bahrain has submitted an amendment to the revised decision which takes into account the paragraphs moved elsewhere and it actually contains several elements concerning the mandate of the group for next year.

Meanwhile, I believe there have been other amendments submitted by other Committee members. You may wish to have a look at the decision. This is the way it looks right now, because there have been quite a lot of changes introduced.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Can we see the decision on the screen, please? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chair. I want to speak to the amendments, but if it works for you we are happy to speak once we come in sequence to talk about what Australia has proposed.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, please.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, China extends its sincere gratitude to both Bahrain and Azerbaijan for their excellent work as the Co-chairs of the *ad hoc* working group. As stated in my previous intervention this morning, with the aim to create a more credible and balanced World Heritage List, China is of the opinion that both the nomination and evaluation processes should be improved and the dialogue between the States Parties and the Advisory Bodies should be reinforced.

In this regard China thanks the distinguished representative of Australia for submission of the amendments of the draft decision as distributed to all Committee members who acknowledge the current fruitful outcome of the *ad hoc* working group and points out at the same time, the need for reform in the near future for both the nomination and evaluation process, overall reflection meetings to examine different possibilities for reforming the nomination process and proposes a more constructive recommendation than paragraph 16.

To this end, and with a view to keeping the consistency of the content and relations of these new paragraphs, China would like to support Australia’s amendment to the decision in principle but to propose two slight amendments to the new paragraph when we examine the draft decision paragraph by paragraph.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, please.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Let me first thank the Bahraini and Azerbaijani delegations’ hosting and pleasant chairing of the *ad hoc* working group. After the third year of the *ad hoc* working group we wonder if it is still *ad hoc* or if it is something else. We note with concern that perhaps half of the members did not have the opportunity to take part in these sessions. Most countries cannot participate with experts. This is not an optimal situation.

Some reflections and debates were brought to an end by the *ad hoc* working group, but there are still a number of fundamental questions to be further reflected on. Questions that are at the centre of issues linked to the credibility and liability of the Convention and the World Heritage List. The findings of the IOS recommendation was the base of the discussions which focused on efficiency and cost-saving, as given by the mandate of the evaluation of IOS. Quality, credibility, neutrality, transparency of processes were not.

As Norway has underlined earlier, the Committee must seek more fundamental long-term solutions to solve their budgetary and economic problems, both for the fund as well as for a credible and balanced representative List.

Norway strongly supports the view that looking at the nomination process is a key. We also believe that an inclusive, transparent and structured approach is necessary for reaching a quantitative and common result. A result that answers the concerns that have been expressed in the debates during this Committee session.

Bringing all States Parties in a way where they can participate and experts representing different parts of the world, the Secretariat as well as the Advisory Bodies, in a more focused and simple process is the aim. The Australian and Norwegian amendment which Australia will propose is purposed to achieve exactly that. And we hope for your support in this.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe supports the draft amendment proposed by Australia and Norway, but would like just to clarify a few points once we get to the paragraph by paragraph section because I think that some of the sentiments that I am hearing from the distinguished delegate from Norway do not really appear in the draft amendment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We agree with some of the concerns expressed by Norway and also concerning this continued working group. We have some concerns regarding it continually extending its mandate and we also put a question to those experts that travel to Paris knowing that all delegations are represented by our permanent delegations in Paris, but we might want to look at certain alternatives. We might want meetings the day before the Committee meetings for instance, as we have seen done in other bodies of the United Nations.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie voudrait remercier l’Australie et la Norvège d’avoir proposé cet amendement que nous soutenons à la fois dans sa forme, sa formulation et surtout son esprit. Nous le soutenons très fortement ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Before we go through each decision one by one, with your permission, we will start with this one first, as requested by the Rapporteur, 12 A. Then we will go back to the other decisions. The floor is now to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As we have heard during this discussion, we have received amendments to this draft decision. There was general support for these amendments submitted by Australia and Norway.

These amendments would introduce a series of new paragraphs as we have already heard. If I may make a small suggestion to you, madam Chair, maybe on paragraph 14, since this paragraph has been introduced in a different draft decision, we can strike it out from this one. I believe that the distinguished delegate from Australia wishes to introduce his amendment.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. Firstly, I want to say how delighted Australia is that the suggestions that we have added to the agenda of the Committee next year, and we hope every year after a general item 8, we will have the opportunity to discuss those things we are talking about today.

The Committee’s decision to establish a general item 8 to enable us to work through how the Committee can improve and strengthen the nomination process in this aspect; the submission of the dossier throughout their evaluation and very importantly the dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties. It will allow us to consider important matters such as the proposal from ICOMOS to extend the nomination and evaluation process by up to 12 months, as an example.

We believe it is very important to lay sound foundations for the discussion by the Committee at the 43rd Session, hence this proposal. We have proposed that the Centre should convene a reflection meeting before the end of this year to examine possibilities for improving the nomination process. Our proposal was that the panel of experts, including Committee members from all regional groups, the Centre and the Advisory Bodies make up the experts that would participate in this reflection meeting. It would produce a report that would be considered by the *ad hoc* working group and subsequently the *ad hoc* working group would provide feedback and advise the Committee for consideration.

This would see us all well-prepared for a productive dialogue on reform options next year, feeding ultimately into revisions of the Operational Guidelines if the Committee concludes that this is what is necessary. These things do not happen without financial support being provided to enable these activities to occur.

I do wish to indicate now that Australia has identified an amount of AUD135, 000 which we would put towards the conduct of this process and we would like to encourage other States Parties to join as cosponsors of this proposal.

Lastly, in relation to the amendment itself, I think that item elements 11 through to 14 are really now all made redundant by the decision taken by the Committee earlier in the day. I suggest that 11 through to 14 should all be deleted and look very much forward to listening to China’s suggestions for further amendments.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I appreciate Australia’s initiative and I hope that others will join them. Are there any other comments? I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I also would like to thank the government of Australia for coming forward to support this process, which I think is very, very important. We all agree it is important that we do this review.

I would like to ask the Rapporteur to go to the first paragraph of the Australian and Norwegian recommendation where they are talking about working groups. It is paragraph 8 now. Actually no, it is the paragraph above, where there is the reflection from a panel of experts, including members from original groups, the World Heritage Centre, Advisory Bodies and other experts. I wanted to ask whether a panel of experts is separate from other experts. And if there is a panel of experts, could it be a representative panel of experts? That is all.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Just two things. In suggesting which paragraph to delete, I inadvertently deleted one that needs to stay, which is paragraph 11. I am sorry, I was working off an earlier draft.

In response to the question from the distinguished representative of Zimbabwe: I think she is right to (could you please go back up to paragraph 2) make the observation about experts. What we were trying to convey there was that we wanted the expertise that was available from this process to be drawn sources that go beyond just States Parties and members of the Committee and the Advisory Bodies. An openness to other experts who could contribute. I would be very comfortable for ‘*and other experts*’ to be deleted if that makes it simpler.

The intention there was really to keep it open, so I do not want to delete it. Please do not on the screen. I am just explaining the rationale. Having heard the discussions of the last ten days in the Committee meeting, there is expertise beyond the Advisory Bodies. We want to open this process to experts from outside the World Heritage advisory system.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. China, you have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. As explained just now, China would like to make a very slight adjustment on paragraph 8: ‘*a reflection meeting to examine different possibilities*’

for reforming the nomination process' I think here we should add 'evaluation process' too, in the spirit, the consistency with paragraph 7 that talks about the need for reform of the nomination and evaluation processes.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. The floor is now to Tunisia."

Tunisie :

« Merci beaucoup madame la présidente. Je voudrais revenir à cet article 8 et, si vous permettez, je me permettrai de décaler la période de décembre 2018 à mars 2019 puisque, de toutes les manières, ces décisions et propositions attendront la prochaine session avant d'être mise en œuvre et pour une raison qui me fait plaisir et est très subjective. Si nous faisons ainsi la Tunisie prend option pour accueillir cette rencontre et l'on sera ravi en terre tunisienne de faire avancer notre maison commune ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? Zimbabwe."

Zimbabwe:

"Madam Chair. The Rapporteur did not include my suggestion of a '*representative panel of experts*'."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you, very much. Australia, please you have the floor."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. We would certainly support the suggested addition from the distinguished representative of Zimbabwe. While we are on that point, where it says, '*representative panel of experts*', perhaps we can say '*drawn from*' rather than '*included in*'. I think it is clearer then: '*from a representative panel of experts drawn from Committee members, the ad hoc Working Group, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and other experts*'.

With regard to the proposal from the distinguished representative of Tunisia, we are comfortable with the proposal to change the date. Note that if it is left until then to hold that workshop it would mean that there may be some constraints on the ability of the *ad hoc* working group to actually take notes and discuss the report. In principle we have no difficulty with the suggestion from the representative of Tunisia and would welcome their offer of hosting, of course."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. After the discussion we have included the amendments that were proposed. We can see them now integrated in paragraph 7 ‘*representative panel of experts drawn from Committee members*’. As for paragraph 8 we had a proposal to change the date of the reflection meeting. I do believe here we might have a question on whether March of 2019 would be too late for the outcome of this meeting for the *ad hoc* working group to take place.

Madam Chair, through you, we might request from the Committee whether they agree with this proposed change. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Norway, please”.

Norway:

“Sorry to take the floor again, but we would like to comment on the discussion. We are very pleased with the proposal from Tunisia. We would like to draw your attention to the fact that if we have it as late as March, 2019, there is very little time for the *ad hoc* working group to meet once and for other proper discussions and to make recommendations for the next Committee session.

We think that it is a three-element process. We think all three elements should be very clear in that process so that everybody participates in a timely fashion for us to prepare the document for the next Committee session.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Madame la présidente, la Tunisie est très heureuse de l'accueil qu'a reçu notre proposition. Lorsque je proposais mars je ne pensais pas mars exactement pour la date de la tenue de la réunion, mais je croyais que la technique rédactionnelle dans ce genre de texte fonctionnait de trois, six mois ou un an. Au fond, à voir le calendrier, nous envisagerions et je compte sur les interprètes pour la question de la conjugaison, nous envisagerions de le tenir fin janvier 2019 ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Cuba, please.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. Let me come back to paragraph 7. I am a little concerned that this is a closed working group. It should be clear that it is an *ad hoc* working group, but an open one. If other members would like to participate, I think they should be able to do that. In the United Nations we say an open-end working group. Otherwise it would be difficult when the recommendation comes to the Committee.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. I have not spoken yet in order not to delay the debate. We support Norway’s proposal. We agree that the ideal situation would be for an *ad hoc* working group to be restricted. We do have meetings open to the participation of other members. The reports can also be shared among the delegations.

But I would like the meeting proposed by Australia to be opened to experts of the different regions. Then inform the others to insist that all the working groups be opened to all States Parties; I think that might limit the scope of our work. There are other possibilities of debating these matters with other States Parties of the Convention, after all.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. We would like to see paragraph 7, the proposal to have an open working group.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “I do not want to cause more delay but we have insisted that the working group has functioned very well until now. It has been opened to representatives of different regions. We do not want it to be a totally open working group. We want to have a proper geographical representation. That’s all.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to The Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Right now we have several matters at hand that we are discussing. First of all, for paragraph 7 we have the request from Cuba that the *ad hoc* working group should be an open-end *ad hoc* working group which will now be reflected on the screen. We heard Spain instead opting for the previous form of the *ad hoc* working group. If this could be of any help, I would just like to note that this is a question that I would pose to the authors of the amendment through you, madam Chair. Paragraph 10 reads:

10. *‘Requests the Secretariat to consult with States Parties and other relevant stakeholders of the Convention on the matters addressed in paragraph 14 of this decision in view of the preparation of the reflection meeting.’*

First it is not paragraph 14 anymore but a new paragraph 5. Maybe this paragraph could bridge the difference of views about the *ad hoc* working group, since there is a request from the Secretariat to have consultation and then you see new paragraph 5. It is the paragraph that gives the mandate of the working group. In my reading, actually the paragraph down below would suggest that this *ad hoc* working group might have opened at that session.

Madam Chair, through you, I request from the Committee to see which way they wish to go with the composition of the *ad hoc* working group.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“The Rapporteur has correctly pointed out the intention of the paragraph that she identified. We thought it was important that the thoughts and views of all States Parties were able to be drawn upon by the expert working group, hence the suggestion that the Centre should consult with States Parties and logically that can be done online or through a submission process and that would provide the views of all States Parties that want to contribute to the reflection workshop so that they can be considered.

I also hear the point that the distinguished representative of Cuba is making. I wonder whether in paragraph 7 rather than saying: *‘drawn from Committee members’* we could say *‘drawn from the ad hoc working group’*, and delete the *‘committee members from all regional groups’* because the *ad hoc* working group comprises all the Committee members and also representatives from all regional group. That would ensure that there was the possibility of a wider representation of States Parties at the reflection without making it so big that it became unmanageable.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you for that clarification. A small working group of Committee members to an *ad hoc* working group made up of all the members of the Committee and now in the last part a working group representatives of the different geographical region. With what Australia said, I think that representativeness is ensured and they have been open sessions, open to all the States Parties in the course of the year. We would prefer that we say '*ad hoc working group*' full stop. Not to create confusion.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I do not really understand what is behind limiting this participation. We work in open working groups in the United Nations, there can be geographical representation, but the meetings are open, because of the will of the States. I do not see why there is a limit on participation when it is of interest to all. And the more who participate more actively throughout the process, the better the outcome will be. I do not see why we want to limit it to a smaller group.

What is important is Australia's compromise proposal that there has to be geographical representation and I do not know if it is in the letter and spirit of the paragraph. I think Zimbabwe's proposal at the start should bring proper geographical representation which is the case of the Committee. In any case, I am not going to waste more time. I still do not understand why some countries want to limit the participation of the members of the Committee.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Just to ask guidance from the Rapporteur and the sponsors of this amendment: If we move further up before we talk about the World Heritage and all that detail to show that the Centre has to consult all States Parties first and then go down to the *ad hoc* working group.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je crois que nous pataugeons un peu dans notre propre succès. Tout le monde est d'accord de la nécessité d'organiser pareille réflexion, tout le monde est d'accord qu'entre les deux sessions il doit y avoir une réflexion sereine,

stratégique et d'avenir. Je crois que l'on devrait avoir toutes les volontés de notre côté. C'est une question d'architecture de la réunion elle-même.

On pourrait envisager dans le lieu où se tiendrait cette réunion, une réunion des experts des États membres du Comité, une réunion ouverte aux autres, après tout ils sont membres de la Convention, et après une réunion qui ferait convergence puisque les autres auront intérêt à ce que les États membres du Comité mettent en œuvre leurs recommandations à la 43^e session.

C'est une question d'opportunité et de formulation plus que de rédaction de ce paragraphe. Je suis d'avis qu'on le laisse ouvert et que dans le cadre de l'organisation on précisera tout cela. Mais c'est tant mieux qu'il y ait autant d'engouement pour participer à cette réunion si importante. »

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil is the last speaker. There is a consensus and we understand that this works for all the Committee. We do not want to waste time. Everybody agrees that this Committee is doing well.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I will be very brief. I will just call attention to the distinguished colleague. What is more important in this working group is its efficiency. I ask myself if having an open-ended group with the participation of I do not know how many people can reach efficiency. I believe that representation is already assured by the regional groups. Regional groups could consult and try to convey the views of their different territories to the meeting.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The Rapporteur, you have the floor to finalise the draft resolution. Please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. After the discussion, there seems to be a majority in favour of keeping the *ad hoc* working group functioning as it is now. With your permission, as paragraph 7 looks pretty complicated, I am going to read out the part that talks about this *ad hoc* working group:

‘7. Noting the ad hoc Working Group identified the need for reform of the nomination and evaluation process, and considers this would benefit from further reflection from a representative panel of experts drawn from the ad hoc working group, the World Heritage Centre and Advisory Bodies and other experts, to feed into the work of the ad hoc Working Group.’

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or should we adopt this paragraph? There are none, as adopted. Please, continue one by one.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Paragraph 8 comes back to the question we heard before regarding the dates proposed for this reflection group. The question is whether this meeting should be organised by December of 2018 or March of 2019. During the discussion, we heard opinions on both sides. Madam Chair, through you, we would like to request from the distinguished members of the Committee which deadline for the organisation of the meeting they wish to see in the paragraph.”

The Chairperson:

“Would you like to keep it as it is now or change it to March? Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you. We are happy with the suggested change from Tunisia. Really, the 1st of March is a deadline and the distinguished delegate of Tunisia said that he was planning on late January and that should be good from our point of view, so there is no need to debate the date for us.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you. Let me read out the paragraph:

8. *‘Requests in this regard, the World Heritage Centre to organise, by March 2019, a reflection meeting to examine different possibilities for reforming the nomination and evaluation process and to propose recommendations for consideration by the World Heritage Committee in view of increasing the balance and credibility of the World Heritage List, as outlined in document WHC/18/42. COM/12A.’*”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. As adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Paragraph 9 would read: 9. *‘Calls upon interested States Parties to contribute extra budgetary funds towards the organisation of the reflection meeting.’*”

The Chairperson:

“No objection in the room, it is adopted.”

The Rapporteur:

“The next paragraph 10 would read:

10. ‘Requests the Secretariat to consult with States Parties and other relevant stakeholders of the Convention on the matters that should be addressed in paragraph 5 of this decision in view of the preparation of the reflection meeting;’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Madam Chair, the reflection meeting is already passed and this paragraph goes way before the reflection meeting itself.”

The Chairperson:

“Australia, you have the floor.”

Australia:

“Thank you Chair. I think we are sort of struggling with the dated drafting because paragraphs have moved around. I am going to suggest something that will make it clearer to all. At the moment it says: *‘Requests the Secretariat to consult with States Parties and other relevant stakeholders of the Convention on the matters that should be addressed at the reflection meeting’*. It is absolutely clear that this is to occur before the reflection meeting. I think this would address the concerns expressed by the distinguished representative of Zimbabwe.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. This means that with an online consultation, I suppose, one would be choosing the subjects to be taken up by the group. Let me ask Australia that because that would make things very complex. It would be a previous consultation, but it would be held after the results of the group came out. I would like to have some clarity on that before we accept the decision as a whole.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please answer.”

Australia:

“The intention is to seek the input of all States Parties before the reflection meeting is held so that they can be considered. That was the intention.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you agree? There are no objections? Zimbabwe, you do not have any objections? If it is agreed, it is adopted. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you Madam Chair. The last paragraph would read:

‘Further requests the ad hoc Working Group to review the reflection meeting report and recommendations and to submit these together with the advice of the ad hoc working group, to the 43rd session of the Committee with a view to revising the Operational Guidelines’.”

The Chairperson:

“Can we adopt it? Are there any objections? I see none, it is adopted. You have adopted 12A. We move now to item 13, please, Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. As we have the decision on the screen, you can see the outline of the working group that is now integrated into this draft decision. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“I wonder whether it would be good to read it paragraph by paragraph. Are there any amendments?”

The Rapporteur:

“No, we only have the working group recommendations incorporated in quotation marks in this decision. Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Is this agreeable to you all? Are there any comments or objections? I see none. We did not read it out but we assume you agree. Adopted. We move on to Decision 42 COM 14.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. On this draft decision I have received an amendment from the delegation of Spain. The amendment is for two paragraphs for paragraph 9: it will add a small clause that was not there before; it suggests the deletion of paragraph 10.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, you have the floor.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We are going to try to move fast, but the reason for this amendment is to respond to the serious financial situation which has raised several remarks heard in this Committee, as to the need to strengthen technical assistance and capacity-building.

We thought that paragraph 8 which is related to risk was right, and we understand the margin that is requested in paragraph 8. What we would like is to restrict ourselves to that concern heard from several delegations concerning the difficulties of capacity-building in regional programmes, hence our proposal for this addition.

I would also like to point out concerning the deletion of the paragraph 10 on the funds that we may use and the funds that have not yet been used, particularly for this budget line. I would like to make a zero per cent margin cost rate because I believe that there is some contradiction inside the advisory board. Of course, this Convention has specificity but we must understand that we are doing something different from what has been decided somewhere else at the advisory board.

I wanted to point out as Chair of the Finance Committee within my board and also to take this opportunity to reiterate the importance of paragraph 2 to ensure the payment of contributions. When we look at budget in the advisory board we need further support for culture at large for the World Heritage Centre, as we know that the Centre has many difficulties. The arguments we hear here in the Committee should also be voiced in the executive board when we discuss the net biennium budget.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie par cette intervention entend appuyer fortement la proposition de l'Espagne qui en fin de compte vient à la fin de nos travaux concrétiser de manière pratique tout ce que l'on vient de dire : notre constat d'écart par rapport aux conditions géographiques, aux compétences techniques et la faiblesse de tous les moyens de notre système.

La première proposition d'amendement du paragraphe 9, où on précise qu'ils doivent être dédiés uniquement aux lignes budgétaires relatives au renforcement des capacités et aux programmes régionaux, est tout ce qu'il y a de plus salubre. En conséquence de cela, l'article 10 ne peut tenir ni techniquement ni moralement. La Tunisie appuie les deux propositions de l'Espagne ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe also supports the proposal by Spain and in particular the importance of outlining what this money should be focused on, capacity-building and regional programmes, which I think addresses the key concerns of the members of the Committee. In view of this, we therefore think and agree that paragraph 10 is now redundant.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We would also like to support the amendment presented by Spain. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Kuwait.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. We would also like to join Tunisia, Zimbabwe and Kuwait for supporting this submitted suggestion. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any other intervention or comments? No, so the Rapporteur has the floor.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. We heard support from those who spoke in favour of the amendment presented by Spain. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. You have the floor.”

M. Baakrim :

« J’ai demandé la parole pour essayer d’expliquer ce qu’il y a derrière le paragraphe 9. Comme vous le savez, jusqu’à maintenant, on fonctionne avec une flexibilité de 10 % pour chaque ligne budgétaire. L’objectif est donc évidemment que l’on prépare les prévisions de dépenses deux ou trois années en avance, mais lorsque l’on arrive à la mise en œuvre le prévu ne correspond pas à la réalité. Donc, à chaque fois, il nous faut une flexibilité pour essayer de transférer des fonds de l’une à l’autre tout en restant dans le cadre fixé par le Comité, bien sûr.

Jusqu’à maintenant nous avons 10 % et malgré cela il reste des fonds non utilisés pour la période biennale 2016-2017 nous avons un montant non utilisé de 200 et quelques milles. J’ai le chiffre exact. Parce qu’une fois que l’on atteint 10 % de la limite on ne peut rien faire alors qu’on a un besoin vital ailleurs et on est limité par cela.

Je comprends parfaitement ce que l’Espagne et les autres États membres du Comité ont proposé, mais si vous adoptez le paragraphe 9 tel qu’il est on va faire marche arrière, on va se retrouver avec des fonds non utilisés sur certaines lignes et le taux de mis en œuvre ne sera pas de 97 % comme maintenant, ce sera plutôt de 90 % si ce n’est moins. Je ne pense pas que cela soit très efficace, disons, de gérer de cette manière. Quoi qu’il en soit, on va vous faire des rapports, vous aurez les comptes on est audité régulièrement. Cette flexibilité on en a besoin pour que l’on puisse mettre en œuvre efficacement vos décisions.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I just want to ask a question to get some clarification. While I well appreciate the intent of the amendment, there is one thing that I just want to understand. For example, the Committee made a number of decisions this year to refer dossiers rather than to defer non-inscribed dossiers and that has created, I think, additional work to be undertaken by the Centre and the Advisory Bodies for the coming 12 months. What I wanted to understand is whether the flexibility that is embedded in this recommendation 9 or clause 9, the prospective way, the Centre would need it in order to fund the additional work that the Committee has asked to be undertaken.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any other comments? The Secretariat, please.”

The Secretariat:

“Thank you very much for this question from Australia. As you know, our budget is adopted with a list of budget lines and activities under this budget line. Basically, there are very few lines and most of them concern state of conservation, advisory missions, Reactive Monitoring missions, retrospective inventory, capacity-building, Periodic Reporting and some

regional programmes. In addition, we have the Advisory Bodies' different budgets for activities.

It depends very much whether some of the additional work that has been requested by the Committee falls within some of the budget lines of the approved budget. Only in this case it can be done or included under this budget. Otherwise we need to raise extra budgetary funds for additional activities given that the regular programme is very tight, as you know. Most of it is delegated to statutory activities, organisation of meetings and the production of documents.

I also just wanted to make a small comment concerning the proposal in paragraph 9 concerning the budget lines related to capacity-building and regional programmes. I am sorry that I do not have in front of me our budget approved by you, the Committee, for the biennium 2018-2019, but I believe I remember well the figures. On the budget line capacity building we have only US\$50,000. That is all we have. Basically, this goes for the education programme for our young people's programme which is absolutely insufficient, but that is all we have. Under the regional programmes in the expenditure plan, to be honest my colleagues have the budget, I do not think that we have more than 100 and so dollars for all the regions. Most of them are for Africa and other regions practically have very, very little. These are two budget lines which have extremely little foreseen funding. In this sense, as my colleague, our administrative officer, just mentioned, it will make a mixed bag if we limit the flexibility of these lines, given the very low amounts in these lines.

I just reiterate the need for flexibility, because this year we had US\$224,000, which remained unspent at the end of 2017, while we had serious needs for some activities approved in the budget, while we have remaining amounts on the other budget lines where the expenditure of the amounts depends on the requests from States Parties. We have a budget line on advisory missions where it was not spent totally, completely, because there were not sufficient numbers of requests. At the same time, we needed funding for other activities for which we did not have funds.

This is actually the need to be more efficient. This is a request to allow us to be more efficient, to spend our money better, to spend it in line with what you approved last year for the budget 2018-2019, so that we have not only a better expenditure rate, because that probably sounds bureaucratic said like this; it is to better implement the activities foreseen in this budget in the interests of the Convention. Sometimes you do not even have enough funds, very often for international assistance. Even if we have remaining funds, the ones underlined, we do not have the possibility to transfer them to international assistance.

I hope this answers the honourable delegate of Australia's question."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Ms. Rössler, please."

Ms. Rössler:

"Thank you very much madam Chairperson. I would be very worried that the implementation would go down. In addition, I will share with you one of my main concerns prior to coming to this meeting. We have US\$35,000 to support experts from States Parties to come to this meeting. With a little bit of flexibility, I could have helped other countries. This is not possible. We had to do for one Committee member last minute fundraising to ensure that this Committee member would be represented.

I wanted to share this concern with you as well. Thank you very much."

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. While understanding and appreciating the financial difficulties the World Heritage Centre is going through, I must add that in view of the increased needs for capacity-building, for States Parties who have suffered and continue to suffer from the consequences of natural and military conflicts and the need to strengthen the capacity of the professionals and practitioners in various regions, we think that it is vital and important that some funds are allocated for them and it should be kept for regional needs and for capacity-building and be identified as such.

I do not know how it works internally and what financial systems you have. But I feel that we have been discussing a lot of problems that we are facing after conflicts or disaster. And we are lost; where do we start and who will start and then it is only fire-fighting? I think a small percentage of the fund that is allocated and confirmed for the capacity-building for regional areas and for specific problems should be maintained and therefore Bahrain, Tunisia and other States Parties supported Spain’s amendment.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. The distinguished delegate of Bahrain has just spoken for me. I just want to request to find the way that we can in fact allocate the available resources to regional capacity-building programmes and also to enable the Director to implement assistance programmes like she was talking about. What mechanism do we need? I think we all agree on capacity-building in regional programmes in need. What is the financial mechanism that enables that to happen?”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Please, answer the question.”

Ms. Totcharova:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have a question from Bahrain: how can the capacity building budget be increased? If this amendment is adopted, we cannot increase anything. However, what we can do is to look at the budget for the next biennium; no matter how restricted and small it is, it is taken on board. At this very time, this is the budget that has already been adopted and approved and has been implemented.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Norway.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. If I understood correctly, because I am a bit doubtful now: This change we make to the amendment, does it mean that it is only the budget lines we can move or do something about? Are the capacity-building, regional programmes budget lines? Which means that those very small amounts of money then can be removed and put into other activities. If so, because this was a bit unclear, we would not have you dedicate those budget lines that you could change into other activities. Because capacity-building in regional programmes is very important and it would be better to have some flexibility between the activities that concern conservation, protection, nomination and evaluation processes.

Thank you.”

Ms. Totcharova:

“Thank you for the question. Yes, it would be limited to capacity-building and regional programmes, which is a very small amount. There would be no possibility to have flexibility among other activities and other budget lines such as, for us it is extremely important, the international assistance, in danger sites budget line, special assistance for in danger sites and advisory missions with the upcoming Upstream Process requests. This is actually taking away the current flexibility that we have, which is small, but still there is some flexibility. That is the answer to your question.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Mr. Baratti, please, you have the floor.”

Mr. Baratti:

“Just to follow up on what the distinguished delegate from Norway said. If I remember the discussion on this paragraph, the idea was, and I am sorry to make it simple, where we take money and give the flexibility to take money. The intention of the honourable delegates with this amendment is to bring money to these two budget lines.

Now, we have to figure out what we are discussing. It is about taking money and if this is the case, here, we do not even bring money to capacity-building, but we enable the Director to take money from these budget lines which already have very limited resources as explained by the Secretariat. I do not want to take a position, just to clarify our position and intention.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Then, we would be of the view to rather keep the paragraph as it was originally, so that we keep the money for capacity-building and regional programmes and rather have flexibility between the other budget lines. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you. Our intention was not to limit the possibility of the Secretariat, but rather to focus those funds that are unspent for what we believe is the general feeling that is expressed by this Committee. I do not know whether, and following what has been stated by The Chairperson of the working group, we needed to move that addition after priorities of decisions of the Committee to give priority to capacity-building and regional programmes. That is to say to move. I am just thinking out loud.

Would that perhaps help, to ensure that the necessary flexibility for the Secretariat would go towards ensuring that funds go there to those budget lines, if we move that part of the sentence after: *‘during the second year of each biennium and in conformity focusing on the budget lines related to capacity-building and regional programmes,’*

This would be perhaps a better way of explaining that those 15 per cent are to be allocated to those two areas.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. With the clarifications that were made in the debate, Brazil would favour Norway’s position to keep the original and to take Spain’s amendment in the lines that the ambassador just said and to withdraw the amendment from where it is and add the following: *‘and in conformity with the priorities and decisions of the Committee giving priority to the budget lines related to capacity-building and regional programmes,’* and strike out the amendment where it was originally proposed.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Je ne vous cache pas que j'aurais aimé intervenir quelques secondes avant, je demandais la parole depuis quelque temps. Quoi qu'il en soit, je remercie d'abord les membres du Centre qui nous ont éclairés et nous ont donné une vue réelle de leurs contraintes de gestion de tous les jours. Mais je crois, nonobstant les apparences, que nous nous rejoignons, parce que vous nous avez expliqué qu'il n'y avait pas suffisamment de moyens pour répondre aux priorités que nous pointons du doigt. Je crois que le premier constat de notre échange est que nous sommes tous d'accord pour la suppression de l'article 10 qui devient fortuit de tous points de vue et même des explications qui se dégagent des membres du Comité.

Maintenant est ce que l'on souligne, comme dans la première proposition espagnole appuyée par la Tunisie, le Zimbabwe, Cuba, Koweït, Bahreïn, ou l'on va vers la priorité telle que présentée par le Brésil. Je crois que ce sont des accommodements d'écritures, mais l'idée est là. Le souci de flexibilité que nous vous avez dit, nous le comprenons, mais je cois que si jamais on devrait l'écrire, on doit toujours l'associer aux finalités que le Comité semble vouloir souligner dans cette décision ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. The floor is to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. We go along with the proposal by Brazil after the explanation from the Secretariat.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. Australia, please.”

Australia

“Thank you madam Chair. We would also support the amendment from Brazil with the removal of number 10. I would just like to ask the Centre whether this would have any implications on the work we asked them to do.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[*English interpretation*] “Thank you madam Chair. We would like to thank Brazil for its proposal. I would like to eliminate a word which made this paragraph too binding which was ‘unicamente’. I think that Brazil's proposal makes that clear and we want to have priorities still with flexibility, so we support Brazil's amendment.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. It seems that we are agreeing. I just give the floor to the Centre.”

M. Baakrim :

« On est sur un sujet purement administratif. Pourquoi avons-nous introduit ce paragraphe, parce que, durant les deux dernières années, chaque fois que le Secrétariat du Centre nous présente des contrats pour validation, j'éprouve des difficultés parfois pour valider parce que les modalités contractuelles de l'UNESCO sont assez complexes.

Vous savez que parfois on a besoin de certaines expertises extérieures sur certains points pour un temps très limité et pour cela on a recours essentiellement au contrat de consultant. Mais les contrats de consultant deviennent de plus en plus encadrés et parfois il n'est pas le contrat le plus approprié. Il y a d'autres types de contrats comme le contrat de service qui vise à peu près la même chose sauf qu'il y a une souplesse pour l'établissement du contrat. Pour les détenteurs de ce type de contrat, ils peuvent par exemple être présents dans nos bureaux pendant deux ou trois mois pour aider le Secrétariat a développé certains aspects dont on n'a pas vraiment l'expertise.

Finalement, pour moi, c'est une simple formalité administrative. Je peux juste vous donner un chiffre. Pendant l'exercice 2016-2017, nous avons établi aux alentours de 164 000 contrats de consultants. On n'a pas l'intention d'augmenter ce montant pour la prochaine période biennale, on va juste, et l'on vous demande, simplement de pouvoir utiliser à chaque fois le contrat le mieux indiqué. Cela évite des recommandations des auditeurs qui nous mettent un petit peu en difficulté et nous disent que l'on ne respecte pas les règles de l'UNESCO. C'est une simple question administrative, pas plus ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you have any comments or enquiries, or do we move on to the Rapporteur to see the final wording of the text? The Rapporteur, please, show us the text on the screen.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. After the discussion we have slightly amended paragraph 9 which would read:

9. 'Noting the management constraints of the World Heritage Fund, also authorises the Director of the World Heritage Centre to make budgetary adjustments, when necessary, between approved headings and reserves, without exceeding a maximum of 15% of the approved World Heritage Fund Expenditure Plan, during the second year of each biennium and in conformity with the priorities and decisions of the Committee giving priority to the budget lines related to capacity-building and regional programmes, and requests the Secretariat to report accordingly to the Committee at its following sessions;'

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any objections or you agree on the final wording? We will adopt just this paragraph as there is an amendment to other paragraphs. If there are no objections, we will adopt. Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Ce n'est pas tout à fait une objection, mais une attention. Hier, nous avons affronté ou été appelé à affronter le cas où certains paragraphes ont été adoptés et ensuite lorsque l'évolution du texte posait un problème de cohérence on nous a dit que les paragraphes précédents ont été évoqués.

Il est évident que l'article 9 et 10 ont un lien central. Nous acceptons cette modification de l'article 9 sous la condition que l'article 10 ne se maintienne pas. S'il se maintient tout l'équilibre de l'article 9 tombe. Parce que l'on passe d'une proposition espagnole qui est dédiée seulement à une autre version qui est liée à une priorité. Cette version est acceptable parce que l'article 10 ne sera pas maintenu, comme cela a été évoqué, peut être que l'article 10 sera maintenu, probablement, on reviendra à la rédaction de l'article 9 avec votre permission madame la présidente ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Let us read the whole item and adopt as one. It is better this way. Please, Rapporteur."

The Rapporteur:

"Thank you madam Chair. As you can see on the screen behind me, you have former paragraph 10 proposed for deletion and the distinguished representative of Tunisia pointed out that since these two paragraphs in his view are interlinked, we should come back to paragraph 9 if paragraph 10 is to be deleted. Madam Chair, the question right now, I believe to the Committee, through you, is whether everybody is in agreement with the deletion of former paragraph 10."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Australia, you have the floor."

Australia:

"Thank you madam Chair. I would just like to clarify my understanding of paragraph 10. It is an administrative efficiency to enable the World Heritage Centre to take temporary assistance. I understand it does not affect the overall expenditure on concrete staff. In which case, Australia would not support the deletion of this, as it is just restricting the Centre to doing what we asked them to do."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Mr. Baakrim, you have the floor."

M. Baakrim :

« Merci madame la présidente. Je m'excuse de demander à nouveau la parole. Avec tout le respect que je dois aux membres du Comité, je trouve une cohérence entre les

paragraphes 9 et 10. Maintenant vous avez décidé de donner la priorité au programme de renforcement des capacités. Le paragraphe 10 va dans ce sens parce que si l'on doit par exemple donner beaucoup plus un aspect quelconque du renforcement des capacités, on va juste approprier le type de contrat pour faire cela. Ce n'est pas une fin en soi, juste une validation administrative pour accompagner.

Vous savez qu'en matière administrative on a les contraintes du Comité et aussi celles des États membres. On a les règles de procédures, mais on essaie d'avoir le consentement des deux. Je ne voudrais pas qu'une année les auditeurs viennent et disent, vous utilisez les contrats de consultant alors que ce n'est pas le type de contrat approprié de renforcement des capacités, vous auriez dû utiliser le contrat de service.

C'est juste administratif. C'est à vous de voir si vous voulez le biffer, je n'ai pas d'inconvénient, mais c'est juste pour vous expliquer que c'est une cohérence administrative entre les règles et procédures administratives qui sont dictées par les États membres et ce que vous souhaitez vous en tant qu'États parties.

Merci ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Tunisia, please."

Tunisie :

« Je remercie le Comité de sa précieuse précision. Je crois que dans la version actuelle de l'article 9 puisque l'on permet à ce budget de couvrir les lignes liées aux renforcements des capacités et aux programmes régionaux, bien entendu que ce budget va couvrir, entre autres choses, des recrutements liés à ces problèmes. Cela est couvert par la version actuelle du paragraphe 9 et cela évite quelques utilisations en dehors de ces finalités qui, certainement, sont au centre des intérêts de ce Comité.

Il n'y a rien qui soit perdu. Si ces recrutements sont liés à ces programmes ils sont déjà couverts par l'article 9. C'est une latitude juridique que donne le Comité au Centre pour pouvoir de manière efficiente et souple utiliser ses moyens pour ces finalités. Il n'a rien qui soit perdu si nous enlevons l'article 10 ».

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Spain, please."

Spain:

[English interpretation] "I would like to take the floor because I am a bit confused, I must admit. You are asking for authorisation for something that has already been done. I thought that the World Heritage fund would be divided into the priority sets that are recognised. We are fully aware of the limits faced by the Centre and the continuous demands that we are putting on the Centre. I thought that it was covered by article 9. In the light of the explanations provided, if that is already done, I do not see why there should be another paragraph.

We should continue studying this in order to determine by the next Committee whether those staff needs which unfortunately are not covered by the Secretariat of the

Convention for the ordinary budget can be addressed, when we are fighting in the Finance Committee to get more funding.

At the same time we are trying to cover staff needs that are perfectly comprehensible because there are less and less secondments. What I am saying is that it has already been done; I do not see why we have to say '*further authorises*' here, why we have to have this paragraph '*further authorises*', given the leeway afforded by paragraph 9, we can do that. To give priority to other activities and not focus only on personnel. As Tunisia said, we speak about technical assistance, regional programmes, capacity-building programmes, etc. and this includes the related personnel costs.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. On these points, articles 9 and 10, do you have further comments? Is there any harm in keeping 10? I believe there is none, it is a repetition. Please, Spain."

Spain:

[*English interpretation*] "I think that we were very clear. We can only accept to further discuss; in that way we will better learn the real situation in terms of the need for temporary assistance or even resources to cover the activities, whatever we ask the Committee today. For the study we consider that they should be enough. I really do not see why we need that.

Thank you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please."

Zimbabwe:

"Madam Chair, we also agree that 10 should be deleted."

The Chairperson:

"Tunisia, please."

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. Ce n'est pas l'attachement a des textes c'est la cohérence de ce que nous sommes en train de dire. Il n'y a pas de répétition ou dédoublement comme vous l'avez si bien gentiment suggéré. Si nous maintenons l'article 10, ces programmes peuvent ne pas être associés aux exigences de l'article 9. Par contre, si nous maintenons l'article 9 seulement, les possibilités, y compris de recrutement, peuvent être faites par le budget autorisé par l'article 9, mais lié à ces programmes. Le 9 couvre les deux, mais le dix ouvre la porte à d'autres choses, ce qui semble ne pas être le souhait du Comité si j'ai bien compris le sens de la discussion. Mais ce ne sont pas deux situations équivalentes ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. We understand that maybe most of you agree to delete paragraph 10. It is accepted.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. If we are in agreement to delete this paragraph, we have arrived at the amendments submitted by Spain. However, I have a very small observation which would concern paragraph 21. You will see a little square bracketed part in the middle. I believe after the discussions we could just remove this, possibly all square brackets I mean, so that, now it would read as on the screen.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any comments or objections? Can we adopt the whole of 14 now? Are there any objections? I declare Draft Decision 42 COM 14 as adopted. We move to decision 42 COM 9A. Are there comments or objections? The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We are going to pull up the decision. As we have heard during previous discussions, I have received amendments and we have heard support for these amendments. We had amendments from Brazil, Burkina Faso, as well as the United Republic of Tanzania and this was supported by Tunisia and Zimbabwe. You can also see integrated into the text the findings of the *ad hoc* working group.

Thank you very much madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“Just a reference to the amendment on paragraph 4 made by Brazil. They were with us in the *ad hoc* working group and we thank them for their constructive input during the process. For the definition that was presented on the first day of the meeting, we clearly said that the Upstream Process was a voluntary process and, as it stands, it is a process that happens prior to nomination and not at any stage. As soon as the definition is annexed to this decision, we feel that this paragraph might be a bit redundant. We prefer it to be deleted as well.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway sympathises with Bahrain’s intervention and we do not agree with the paragraph as it stands, as it makes a bit confusing the Upstream Process, another type of advisory process. We would not like to have that paragraph in the decision by the *ad hoc* working group. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections or any further comments? We will delete this paragraph if there are no objections. Everyone agrees.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Because we have several comments and amendments for this decision we are going to run through them from the top. Paragraph 1; you can see that some documents have been added. We have received the proposal to delete what was formerly paragraph 4. If we scroll down further below, we see the amendment of Tanzania that was supported from the floor by Tunisia and Zimbabwe, about putting a special emphasis on those States Parties who do not have any properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

We have smaller amendments to paragraph 7 by Burkina Faso and Brazil, followed by the addition of paragraphs 8 and 9 that reflects what was already discussed in the *ad hoc* working group.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Do you want us to read each paragraph or is it enough for you to see them on the screen? Should we go paragraph by paragraph or adopt it as a whole, as it stands? Are there any objections? I therefore declared adopted Decision 42 COM 9A.

We move on to item 7. You will recall that it was decided to examine the General Decision 42 COM 7 on the state of conservation of World Heritage Property at the end of our debate on item 7A and item 7B. The agenda item was introduced on Tuesday morning last week by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. Before we move to the draft decision, I would like to know whether there are any comments on this matter. Do you have any comments on Item 7? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, you will recall that you asked us to sort out the drafting of a particular paragraph and I am pleased to report that in consultation with those delegations that had the most interest in that particular paragraph 12 – around having both a geographic and thematic focus within the process for identifying which properties under 7A and 7B would be considered at the Committee meeting each year – we have agreed to some text which is now available for the Committee’s consideration.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Zimbabwe, please.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. Zimbabwe would like to thank Australia for leading this process of facilitating a statement that we will all agree upon and we do accept the new paragraph 12 and we would request that we then remove the other paragraphs if everyone agrees.”

The Chairperson:

“I give the floor to the Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Just to sum up where we are with this draft decision that we have already started earlier discussing; we have arrived after the adoption of paragraph 11 and we have finished paragraph 12. The distinguished delegate of Australia has just shared with us this proposed formulation. If you remember, we had several options; it now seems that we have a consensual text for this particular paragraph. I would also just like to point out that we are going to have several amendments to other parts of the text.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Do you agree for us to adopt a consensus text for paragraph 12? You agree, so adopted. Please, Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. Going forward, we did not receive any comments until paragraph 21, if we could just have it on the screen. We have received one amendment from the delegation of Hungary about including the 1970 Convention at the end. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Shall we adopt the full decision, including 21? Do you have any comments on any of the paragraphs? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“Madam Chair, for clarity, you are asking us whether we are happy to approve the whole of the text from the top to the bottom, not just only one paragraph. If that is correct, then from Australia’s perspective we are comfortable to adopt the whole of the amended text, but maybe you should allow the Committee to see each of those that are proposed for change so that we can move on and adopt as a whole.”

The Chairperson:

“Are there anymore comments? Can we adopt it, including 21? We adopt up to paragraph 21 and the others will be approved after. The Rapporteur, please.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you very much. We received a proposal from Brazil to add a new sub-chapter about emergency situations resulting from natural disaster. We can see the three paragraphs proposed under this title. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments on this last amendment? Can we adopt it? Yes, so adopted. Next with the Rapporteur”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. The other paragraphs from 25 to 28 would remain unchanged and then for paragraph 29, which is dealing with climate change, we have a proposal from Saint Kitts and Nevis supported by Brazil that you can see on the screen.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. As we have done in other fora, we believe that the Paris Agreement is fundamental and it requires strengthening and that we do need to stick to the text of that agreement. This is why Spain would prefer not to see this amendment as tabled by Saint Kitts and Nevis, precisely in order to strengthen that difficult and delicate balance that we achieved in Paris without having anything in the forum. We do not have the presence of experts in climate change. So we prefer to stick with the original wording.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I think I said yesterday that Australia is comfortable with the text in 29 as it was proposed by Saint Kitts, as it is a direct replication of a decision taken by the Committee last year, in paragraph 31, introduced by Australia, where we refer to consultation with States

Parties. I think it would be advisable to include States Parties, Advisory Bodies and civil society.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to remind you that the proposed amendment by Saint Kitts repeats exactly what is written in the Paris Agreement – it does not add one word to it. If we all signed the Paris Agreement, my country for example signed and ratified it, I do not see any difficulties in reproducing here the reference to the elevation of temperature.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much. The difficulty when you take a sentence of the text of an agreement with certain paragraphs of a different decision is that you always somewhat modify the meaning. What was said here, especially that part and other parts, are important, as is the Paris Agreement itself in terms of reducing the effects of climate change. That is the source of my concern; I think we need to implement the Paris Agreement as a whole and not especially this or that. This is one of the many elements included in that agreement.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“In this Committee, we have studied sites that are affected by climate change so it is very important. We support the amendment by Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Cuba, you have the floor.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chairperson. Cuba also supports the proposal tabled by Saint Kitts and Nevis; we, in fact, also had a concern, especially regarding the impact on SIDS, but for the moment we agree with the amendment as tabled.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections to the amendment? Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I just would like to ask us to check that the text up there now is an exact replica of what was decided by the Committee last year. I think that the Committee last year said ‘*especially*’, that is ok. If the Committee said ‘*only*’ including ‘*holding*’ then I think we need to be consistent with the position of the Committee last year. I have asked one of my delegates to quickly check for us.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Meanwhile, we can give the Rapporteur time to move on but before, Spain, please.”

Spain:

“Thank you very much. If the majority is in favour of keeping this amendment we would bow to the consensus, but we do want to reiterate that we are not comfortable with a part or paragraphs of an agreement being taken out of context. We would like the text to be as close as possible to the language of previous decisions, even if it is not jurisprudence, because of ‘*especially*’ or ‘*including*’ and in that case we would prefer a compromise position, to stick to ‘*including*’.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Ms. Rössler you can answer the question.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Yes, I can answer. Last year’s decision: *‘reiterates the importance of States Parties undertaking the most ambitious implementation of the Paris Agreement of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (United Nations-FCCC), by holding the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2 °C above pre-industrial levels and by pursuing efforts to limit the global average temperature increase to 1.5 °C above pre-industrial levels, recognising that this would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change.’* End of quote.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, please.”

Brazil:

“Just to accommodate the concerns of our distinguished delegate of Spain, I would be satisfied with the same formulation, we had last year, instead of ‘*especially*’ or ‘*including*,’ we would say, ‘*by holding*’. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Australia, please.”

Australia:

“I agree with the distinguished delegate of Brazil on this matter. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Tanzania, please.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, we also support the consensus. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. It seems that there is no objection and there is a consensus. Please, go ahead Rapporteur.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just in this case I suggest adding a second ‘*by*’ after ‘*pre-industrial levels and by pursuing efforts*’; if I understood, that was the correct wording. Thank you very much. Should I read out the paragraph?”

The Chairperson:

“Are there any other amended paragraphs?”

The Rapporteur:

“Let us move on to paragraph 31 if this paragraph is to be retained amended. We have a suggestion by Australia which was slightly amended by the author himself. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any comments? Can we adopt from paragraph 22 until 32?”

The Rapporteur:

“Just to clarify madam Chair. Paragraph 21 amended is the last amendment that we have received so far for this text.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. We will adopt now from paragraph 22 until 31, if there are no objections, so, adopted. The rest of this item has no changes or comments. Or do you have any comments?”

The Rapporteur:

“Madam Chair, I apologise, we have a small amendment proposed on paragraph 44 by Brazil that you can see on the screen right now. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“There is an amendment on paragraph 44. Are there any objections? I see none, so decided.”

The Rapporteur:

“I do not see any other amendments received so far on the rest of the text. This decision now has 60 paragraphs. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Finally, I therefore declare Draft Decision 42 COM 7 adopted as a whole.

Dear colleagues, under other business, I would like to give the floor to the delegation of Tanzania as agreed during the Bureau meeting regarding consultations for hosting the next World Heritage Committee. Please you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

Your Excellency Madam Chair, thank you very much for giving me the floor. The State Party of Tanzania would like to take this opportunity to inform this Committee that it decided earlier to submit its candidature, so as to bring about the much-needed sense of belonging into the World Heritage community represented by this Committee, taking into memory that this would only be the second time for Africa to host the Committee, last hosted in 2005 by South Africa. Indeed, hosting of the 43rd Session of the World Heritage Committee in Africa could raise the much needed awareness on the importance of managing World Heritage to leaders and the African community at large.

This is especially important at this time that the World Heritage and sustainable development agenda which was earmarked for discussion during the 41st Session of the Committee in Cracow is gaining momentum. Bringing the 43rd Session is in line with the priority Africa Programme of UNESCO which aims at building institutional capacities for sustainable development and poverty eradication, among other things.

It is against this backdrop that the United Republic of Tanzania officially submitted its candidature for hosting the 43rd Session of the World Heritage Committee on the 28th of June, 2018 at the time when it was informed by the Secretariat that there was no other candidate that had done so. But, later it came to our notice that the State Party of Azerbaijan, which earlier expressed its intention to host the 43rd Session, had officially submitted a written candidature immediately after we submitted ours.

In view of what I have said, it was advised by the Secretariat that Tanzania and Azerbaijan should sit together and agree on the best way forward under the Chairpersonmanship of her Excellency the Ambassador of Brazil. We had intensive but constructive consultation with Azerbaijan and agreed that we both continue to consult our capitals for further guidance. On our part, we consulted the higher authorities and in a spirit of maintaining the smooth workings and understanding of the Committee, we have decided to withdraw our candidature.

We believe that Azerbaijan will take the African agenda on board and make it reflected during the 43rd Session. I thank you for your attention.

The Chairperson:

“Thank you. On your behalf I thank the delegations of Tanzania and Azerbaijan for their understanding and cooperation. This is really the spirit of the United Nations organisation. I wish you all the success in your candidature for this Committee and, also on your behalf, I thank the Ambassador of Brazil for her flexibility, understanding and for her successful effort. Thank you very much. I congratulate Azerbaijan for their next hosting of the Committee. Thank you very much.

I give the floor to Uganda.”

Uganda:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. The delegation of Uganda would like to thank the delegations of Tanzania and Azerbaijan for having reached an agreement on the matter of hosting the 43rd Session of the World Heritage Committee.

Uganda therefore wishes to congratulate Azerbaijan and thanks the State Party for its willingness to host this prestigious Committee in the year 2019. It ought to be appreciated that the bid by Tanzania was a bid by Africa. In that regard, therefore, Uganda would like to express its interest to host the 44th Session of the World Heritage Committee in the year 2020.

I thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I now give the floor to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, I would like to thank the Ambassador of Brazil for this wonderful job and for facilitating our work and the negotiations with the Republic of Tanzania. I would like to thank her for her personal efforts and cooperation in this regard.

In the same way, I would like to thank the delegation of Tanzania for a very constructive approach to this issue. We have discussed this a couple of times and I would like to commend the understanding and the spirit of dialogue and cooperation that have prevailed in our discussions.

Of course, I do not want to go into the history of whom presented its candidature first or second; I do not think it is a matter to discuss right now, but I would like to highlight that we fully subscribed to what has been said by the delegation of Tanzania about prioritising Africa and the special emphasis that we give to this priority within this house of UNESCO.

I would like to reiterate my country's commitment to engaging in this issue and to reinforce our efforts and to spare no efforts. I would say, to keep this issue high on the agenda during our chairmanship, I would like to thank all countries, all members of the Committee for their support and for their constructive engagement on this matter.

I thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie se félicite de cet esprit de consensus et de coopération dans lequel se terminent nos travaux et dans lequel d'ailleurs ils ont commencé. Nous nous en félicitons d'autant plus que les propos de l'honorable représentant de la Tanzanie nous rassurent sur l'esprit et sur la volonté de porter la priorité Afrique au cœur de notre programme et l'application de notre Convention.

Je souhaiterais rappeler à l'honorable représentant de la Tanzanie qu'au-delà de la future rencontre en Tanzanie et l'ancienne en Afrique du Sud le Comité s'était déjà tenu en Égypte, en Tunisie et au Maroc qui sont tout autant des pays africains.

Je voudrais également saluer l'esprit de coopération dans lequel le rapprochement des deux positions a été fait sous la direction de son honorable représentante du Brésil. Nous nous félicitons de cet état d'esprit et nous sommes sûrs que nos amis d'Azerbaïdjan assureront toutes les conditions de réussite à notre 43^e session ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Brazil.”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. Just to report, to thank the distinguished heads of the delegations of Tanzania and Azerbaijan for the very constructive spirit demonstrated during the meetings we had, aiming at achieving a consensus decision on the location for our 43rd session. I would like to highlight the atmosphere of cooperation and friendship that brought up this decision just announced by the head of the delegation of Tanzania.

I would also like to register the importance of privileging priority for Africa in our next meeting, as already announced by the distinguished head of the delegation of Azerbaijan. In this regard I would like to propose, madam Chairperson, that when we analyse tomorrow the

agenda for the 43rd Session, we include on the agenda a specific item dedicated to addressing priority for Africa, sustainable development, and management of World Heritage.

Thank you very much madam.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much and thank you again for your efforts to finalise this yesterday. Zimbabwe, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. I would like to congratulate the government of Tanzania for this understanding as well as to congratulate Azerbaijan as our next host. I raised my flag to fully endorse the proposal made by the Ambassador of Brazil for a special agenda item that looks at priority for Africa at the World Heritage meeting next year.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Is there any request for intervention? I see none. As you know, Azerbaijan invited the next session of the World Heritage Committee to Baku. Azerbaijan, I would like to know if you all agree with this proposal. ^[Clapping] So decided.

I congratulate Azerbaijan and I think the delegation of Azerbaijan wishes to propose a candidate as Chairperson of the 43rd Session of the World Heritage Committee. I give you the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Dear friends, delegates, distinguished delegates, it is really an honour to be with you on the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee. I would like to express my gratitude to the host country of Bahrain and thank all those who organised this session.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express our great gratitude to UNESCO for their outstanding activities and contribution to transforming education, heritage and culture in the global common ground which unites us through our differences and develops such common values.

Azerbaijan attaches great importance to relations with UNESCO. Cultural diversity in cultural dialogue, multiculturalism, has huge impacts on our society and these determined priorities for our policy. It was mentioned by the president of our country, Mr. Ilham Aliyev, that the role of Azerbaijan is intercultural dialogue and our strategy is to build trust and understanding among cultures, nations and communities, not only within our country, but also outside it as well.

Being in close partnership, we are also happy to be a part of the project that helps to protect heritage, raise awareness and develop global policies in the different significant issues they deal with, currently participating at the World Heritage Committee, and two sites of Azerbaijan that have been included in the World Heritage List were later given special priority by special decree of the president.

That is why we are happy and responsible to submit our candidacy to hold the 43rd Session of the Committee in Baku next year and I thank everyone for such appreciation of this idea. It is not a coincidence that in recent years it has become a tradition for Azerbaijan to host prestigious international events also addressing universal essential problems of intercivilisational and interface dialogue.

The matter of protecting tangible and intangible heritage, preserving historic and cultural legacies are issues that the Azerbaijani government pays special attention to. We joined the UNESCO Convention concerning the protection of Cultural and natural Heritage in 1993. Since that time, we have actively participated in different programmes in protection of the natural and cultural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value and not only within our country; we implemented several projects concerning the support for countries in different regions of the world, including Asian countries, African countries, Eastern Europe, etc.

The matter today is how to better protect our heritage by minimising threats and maximising benefits, by raising awareness of its value. Proper conversation with building authorities, following the carrying capacity of unique sites, protecting such places from the consequences of wars and terrorism and achievement of sustainable development goals are among the main challenges.

I think that the experience of Azerbaijan in organising high level international events, among them the 8th session of the Committee for the Safeguarding of Intangible Heritage in 2013, the biannual Forum on Intercultural Dialogue held since 2011, and the 7th Global Forum of the United Nations Alliance of Civilisation held in 2016 permits us to ensure all delegates that we will do our best to promote the best facilities and the successful holding of of this event.

Moreover, to conclude, I would like to thank our honourable delegates from the African countries for their understanding and we would like to make a proposal to place their idea to hold a special side event within the session to be held next year in Baku dedicated to the situation in African countries which they can actively participate in.

Once more, I would like to thank all delegates for your support and we are proud to have an honoured cooperation with UNESCO. We hope that we will go further with the same sprit of understanding and cooperation at any time.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Zimbabwe, please, you have the floor.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you madam Chair. In response to your question in the Bureau on who will be the Vice Chair of the Africa group, we agreed that Burkina Faso will be the Vice Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I understand on the warm reception of your announcement that your proposal is accepted unanimously. The newly-elected chairperson of the 44th Session of the World Heritage Committee is His Excellency the Minister of Culture of Azerbaijan. Congratulations and I wish you all success in this honourable position.

I understand that the delegation of China would like to present a candidate representative of the Asia and Pacific region. You have the floor.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. As stated, the Bureau meeting has already recommended Indonesia as the Vice Chair of our group to the next session of the World Heritage Committee. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I take it that the Committee agrees with this proposal. Kuwait please.”

Kuwait:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. The Arab group would like to recommend Tunisia to represent it. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Spain, please.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. We would like to nominate Norway from our group and let me congratulate Tanzania for their noble gesture as well as Azerbaijan for the election of the next president of our Committee, the Minister of Culture of Azerbaijan.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. For Latin America?”

Brazil:

“Thank you madam Chair. After consultations in our regional group, we reached the agreement that Brazil would continue as vice chair. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia for Asia, Brazil for Latin America and Caribbean region, Tunisia for the Arab region, Burkina Faso for the Africa region and Norway for Europe. Now we have to elect the rapporteur of the 43rd Session and China would like to say something.”

China:

“Thank you madam Chair. China may recommend Ms. Mahani Taylor from Australia to be the rapporteur for the 43rd session of the World Heritage Committee. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Congratulations. I now declare item 16 closed. Azerbaijan please, you have the floor.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you madam Chair. Before concluding this item, I would like to invite the Committee to watch a small video about our country. A presentation which will last just two minutes, which will be a good teaser. [a video is played] Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much and congratulations again. Our last item is related to our agenda of the 43rd session. The floor is to Ms. Rössler to present the next agenda.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you madam Chair. As you will see from Document 17 that has been distributed to you this morning, the provisional Agenda of our next session is proposed according to the usual schedule of examination of Items.

Two items and sub-items have been, however, included in this provisional Agenda following requests put forward during this very session:

- Sub-item 5D regarding report on strengthening of dialogue between the Advisory Bodies and States Parties;

And further to the discussion today:

- Concerning item 8, according to what was discussed and decided during our debate, notably today, we would propose to have item 8 named General Matters on the Nomination Process. This has been accordingly corrected in the version of Document 17, which is now on the screen. We will not have an item 8F, which we had proposed. Please also note that examination of this item could be proceeded with in the same way we examine General Decision 7 under State of Conservation. It means this sub-item could be open at the beginning of the examination of item 8 and be kept open until its closing. This will allow taking into consideration all debates, interventions as well as decisions on item 8.
- Another slight change in the title of item 9A is also proposed, to name it the Upstream Process. This is also reflected in the version on the screen.
- Furthermore, as we have just heard on the debate before on Priority Africa. It is an item which is very dear to our hearts as I have been myself in Arusha for the big meeting in 2016 on World Heritage and Sustainable Development in Africa. The delegation of Brazil made a proposal to have an additional item on Priority Africa, Sustainable Development and World Heritage, if I understood correctly. With your permission, madam Chair, this could be added. As you know, next year we have item 5C which is the World

Heritage Convention and Sustainable Development and you can put it underneath, having a new item under 5C on Priority Africa or at another moment in time. I seek your guidance where you wish to have your item which is called Priority Africa, Sustainable Development and World Heritage.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Are there any objections to put the items after 5C? Tunisia, please.”

Tunisie :

« Ce n'est pas une objection madame la présidente, plutôt une grande satisfaction, et je remercie madame la directrice du Centre de nous avoir soumis ce projet qui nous projette déjà dans notre 43^e session, mais d'un avis assez partagé à travers les délégations.

Nous avons remarqué que les points discutés à partir d'hier et d'aujourd'hui alors qu'ils sont extrêmement stratégiques et très importants ne bénéficient ni de la présence massive des États parties à la Convention, qui en général une fois le point relatif aux inscriptions terminé ne restent plus, et, deuxièmement, fait les frais de la fatigue générale cumulée par les États membres du Comité et cela ne leur permet pas la visibilité et la force de discussion contradictoire nécessaire.

Vous avez commencé par placer que cette priorité figure au début de la session, c'était une de mes propositions. Je n'ai pas proposé un projet d'amendement, mais c'est une simple indication et cela serait souhaitable que d'ici la prochaine session cela puisse être reflété.

Il me paraît par exemple que les points 9 relatifs à la stratégie globale, que le point 8 sur l'assistance internationale, que le point 14 sur l'exécution du budget, etc., que d'autres points importants stratégiques bénéficient de l'avantage du début de la session.

D'autres points relatifs à certaines de nos résolutions déjà prises ce sont ceux qui sont relatifs à la clarification de la procédure par rapport à l'adoption et au classement qui gagneraient à être classés en début de session, comme cela la 43^e session elle-même bénéficiera de ces décisions et n'attendra pas la 44^e.

C'est une simple proposition qui tient compte de nos modes de fonctionnement et qui malheureusement ne permet pas à la fin du programme de bénéficier de l'enthousiasme du débat ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you madam Chair. I should say that we agree with the concern expressed by Tunisia. There is a series of subjects that are fundamental to the functioning of the Convention and taking them all in a single day, at the end, when we are all exhausted, is really detrimental to the debates that we can hold. I know that there are budgetary limits in

terms of the duration of the session, but maybe the Secretariat should find a way to strike a better balance on the time allocated to each different subject. These are subjects that we do not take up with the same seriousness as the inscriptions.

When it comes to Priority Africa, as SIDS we are also a priority group of UNESCO and we came up with a strategy for the implementation of the Action Plan. There are challenges dealing with the impact of climate change for SIDS. Cuba is a small island with nine sites on the List and we find this subject to be very important and it should be taken into consideration with agenda 2030.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, you have the floor.”

Uganda:

“Thank you madam Chair. We have withdrawn what we wanted to say. But if susceptible customs and traditions are man-made, we can be flexible with some of them. Madam Chair, you may have noticed after we finished the agenda of inscription the house almost felt empty. My suggestion is that for the coming 43rd session, in the wisdom of the Secretariat, you could have such an item towards the end to keep the house full until the end.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. It is a very practical and good proposal. The floor is now to Ms. Rössler to answer.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. We will try to make the impossible possible and to get a full house. To answer the questions raised by Tunisia: this is not a question of numbering of the items but of the timetable. We can move important items in the timetable before, but we keep the numbering of the items as it facilitates the work between the sessions. With your permission, we will try to do that, but we also try not to prolong the session, as I said earlier today.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Before we close, I would like to again congratulate Azerbaijan and I wish you all success for your next meeting. Tomorrow our meeting will be at 10:00 am as usual and I give Ms. Rössler again the floor to make some announcements.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I am sure you are all eager to read all the decisions adopted. Tomorrow from 9:00 am onwards the decisions report in printed copies will be available for the delegations from the Committee. I think there will be a very limited number of copies because Bahrain is concerned about sustainability, as we all know, so we do not want to use too much paper. We will try to make it possible and the adoption as Madam Chair said will start from 10:00 am.

Thank you very much and have a great evening. Just to tell you there will be a closing ceremony, but maybe Bahrain is in a better position to speak about it. I think there is a party tonight at 7:30 pm. Bahrain, please.”

Bahrain:

“That is correct. 7:30 pm here at the Ritz but in another tent on the other side of the hotel. It is in the Vicinity of the Ritz Carlton as well. There will be members of our teams guiding delegates to the venue at 7:30 pm.

Thank you.”

TENTH DAY – Wednesday 4 July 2018

EIGHTEENTH SESSION

10 a.m. – 11 a.m.

Chairperson: H.E Shaikha Haya Al Khalifa

The Chairperson:

“We now come to our final task, the formal adoption of the Report of Decisions. We will go through the report, which has been prepared on time. Allow me to congratulate the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for this achievement.

The Report is divided into two Parts, which you have in front of you. Before I give the floor to our Rapporteur, allow me to recall that the decisions included in this report have already been adopted by the Committee and therefore the task we have before us is essentially an editorial one, and we will not reopen the debate on the content of the decisions.

I would like to invite our Rapporteur, Ms. Anna Zeichner, to briefly explain the process of preparation of the Report and give you additional guidance for you to consider as you review it.

Madam, you have the floor.”

The Rapporteur:

“Thank you madam Chair. First and foremost, I wish to thank the members of the Committee for having appointed me last November as Rapporteur of this 42nd Session of the Committee. I would also like to express my most sincere gratitude for your constant confidence which has helped me enormously while undertaking this task that came with many responsibilities.

Let me also express my immense pleasure to be here in Manama. I am deeply grateful to the Bahraini authorities and especially to The Chairperson and her team for introducing me to this wonderful country and generously hosting our meeting. Bahrain, with its truly astonishing richness of history, art and culture sets the perfect backdrop to the meeting of the World Heritage Committee.

If you allow me, I would also like to express my admiration to our Chairperson, Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, for her dedication, stamina, firmness, patience and above all wisdom through which she has guided us throughout this session. I feel very privileged that I could work with her. I have learnt very much during this experience and for this I will always be grateful. I also wish to thank the Advisory Bodies and the Observers and representatives of civil society especially the most dedicated ones who are still present with us here today.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the Secretariat for their immense support during this meeting. The job of Rapporteur would not be possible at all without the extraordinary team sitting behind me, the Secretariat staff, under the leadership of Dr Rössler. Here, I would like to say a special thanks to Luba Richard, Olivia and Jean-Marc

who have worked until very late hours to get the document ready for you. I feel very, very grateful and very honoured to have worked with them so closely. I would also like to thank Ms. Petya Totcharova for all the support she has shown me before and during the session. I would also like to take this moment to thank our interpreters who have also worked very hard during this session.

For the preparation of the report, there is a very efficient system in place that was developed by the Secretariat and the Committee. I collected electronically and manually proposed amendments and integrated them into the draft decision that you could see on the screens; we received many, many amendments, 112 by email to be exact. I believe that for the first time, these amendments, received electronically, were uploaded publicly on the Committee website for ease of use and they were also translated. It is my hope that this useful practice that enhances the transparency and efficiency of our work should continue in the future.

I also wish to thank again the delegations for sending substantial amendments before hand, so everyone could study them. While it is preferred that we receive them in advance, in no way does this prejudice the Committee's prerogative to propose amendments from the floor during our debates, as has happened several times during this session.

As you will know from the sheer size of the report, we have accomplished enormous work, as the Committee has deliberated in a total of 225 decisions which are actually ten decisions less than last year in Cracow, although it certainly does not feel like it. Part one of the report contains all the state of conservation reports that were examined; in total, the Committee examined 157 state of conservation reports but only 39 were open for discussion.

The Committee kept 55 properties on the World Heritage List in Danger, while it has placed one new property on it, the Committee has also removed one from it. We have inscribed 19 new properties on the List, 13 cultural, 3 natural and 3 mixed and approved one major boundary modification.

As such, following intensive and fruitful debate, the World Heritage List now has a total of 1,092 properties of which 845 are cultural, 209 natural and 38 are mixed properties. For the preparation of this report, twice a day at the end of each session, all decisions taken were registered and then were double and sometimes triple-checked with the World Heritage Centre.

In preparing this text, particular attention has been paid to stylistic changes, clarification of specific points, material errors, the renumbering of paragraphs and minor spelling mistakes. In the process, duplications have been noted and corrected to make the text more comprehensible at the highest linguistic level, essential for the text of our decisions. Every effort has been made to remain 100 per cent faithful to the deliberation of the Committee. Mistakes, however, are always possible and I welcome any clarification. As The Chairperson said in her introduction, this is not the moment to reopen questions of substance.

Thank you madam Chair."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much. I would now ask whether, in order to be as efficient as possible, the Committee members could indicate to us where they have identified factual or editorial errors which should be corrected, so that we can deal with them. Please, note also that formatting issues will be fixed at a later stage by the Secretariat during the finalisation of the report. I would like to suggest adopting the Report of Decisions part by part. We start with part I.

I would like to be sure that you have all had the chance to review the first part of the report, starting from Decisions 42 COM 2 to 42 COM 7B.101. If there is no objection, I suggest we adopt as a whole the part I. ICOMOS, please, you have the floor.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. To assist the Committee we would just like to point out that with respect to Decision 42 COM 7A.4, the resolution on the Historic Centre of Shakhrysbaz, there appears to be a small error in paragraph 8. At the end of the paragraph there is a reference to paragraph 17, but in fact because of changes that occurred during the drafting this should be clearly a reference to paragraph 18.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. IUCN, please.”

IUCN:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. Also, to assist the Committee in Decision 42 COM 7A.51 a small editorial error in paragraph 12, which currently reads: ‘*also decides to maintain Virunga National Park on the World Heritage List*’. ‘*Maintain*’ should be changed to ‘*retain*’ as part of the standard language for other decisions of that kind.

In Decision 42.COM.7B.72 in paragraph 5, it reads: ‘*Notes that the amendments to the current Management Plan which now do not prohibit (...)*’. ‘*notes that*’ or ‘*which*’ it should be either ‘*that*’ or ‘*which*’ and not both.

Thank you madam Chair.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this clarification. Do you have any other comments? I see none. The first part of the Report of the Decisions is therefore adopted.

We now pass to part II of our Report, which includes Decisions 42 COM 8 to 42 COM 17. Do you have any objections, remarks or comments on this part? ICOMOS, please.”

ICOMOS:

“Thank you madam Chair. The comment concerns 8B.21 which relates to the inscription of the Sassanid Archaeological Landscape of Fars Region in the Islamic Republic of Iran. There were two different sets of amendments when we discussed the decision. One proposed by Australia and one by Spain, China, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cuba and Kyrgyzstan and it was the intention of the Committee to merge the two amendments into a shared one.

It seems that the recommendation of the amendment proposed by Spain, China, Azerbaijan, Burkina Faso, Cuba and Kyrgyzstan to send another mission of the Advisory Bodies to assist the State Party to address the aspects mentioned in the decision was not

documented in the record of decisions and ICOMOS recalls that this mission was explicitly requested.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much for this clarification. Are there any other comments? I see none. Part II of the Report of the Decisions is therefore adopted. Thank you.

I now propose that we adopt the Report of Decisions as a whole. Are there any objections? I see no objection. I declare item 18 closed.

Dear colleagues, we now come to an end of our work, but before we close, allow me to say a few words. These past ten days have been a great success. Thank you all for your work and dedication. I would like to thank Ms. Rössler and Mr. Ramirez and the entire UNESCO World Heritage Centre Secretariat for their assistance and professionalism. I also wish to express my gratitude to the Advisory Bodies for providing us with their expertise and comprehensive evaluation. I also wish to acknowledge the hard work undertaken by the estimate members of the Committee. The quality of your participation and thorough interventions are greatly appreciated. We must also thank the interpreters for their interpretation during the meeting and the events and thank those responsible for the organisation of this international and honourable event.

On behalf of the entire Committee, I wish to thank Her Excellency Shaikha Mai bint Mohammed Al-Khalifa and her team, without whom none of this would have been possible.

As we come to the end of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee, let us talk or take a moment to reflect upon the accomplishment and lessons we learnt during our time together. We must work to build trust and to establish a precedent of mutual cooperation, by ensuring that all decisions made are kept within the regulatory boundaries of the World Heritage Convention. Only then can we ensure that the goals of the Convention are achieved. It is through its implementation that we can ensure that our heritage is preserved and maintained for future generations to come.

It has been an honour being your Chairperson and it is my wish that the following sessions continue to drive the spirit of World Heritage Convention.

Thank you very much.”

Ms. Rössler:

“Dear Chairpersons, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure, to say a few words on the closing of this World Heritage Committee here in Bahrain.

First and foremost, I would like to thank you madam Chair, Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, for your wise guidance throughout the session and for keeping us to our rules and the Operational Guidelines. We are very grateful to your country, the Kingdom of Bahrain, for providing such excellent facilities and for your warm welcome and hospitality and especially last night when you brought us together on the dance floor.

I would like to thank all the Committee members for their substantive contributions to the debate and for all the decisions taken which were not always easy to achieve, especially in terms of consensus.

We are also much appreciated the work of our Rapporteur, who has not an easy job but did it so brilliantly. Many thanks to all the State Party observers for their continued interest and commitment and to all the other Observers in the room, whether NGOs, universities and others, especially civil society representatives and indigenous people. Their interventions were very enriching for the debates and their dialogue most welcome.

Many thanks also go to our dear Advisory Bodies, IUCN, ICOMOS and ICCROM for their further continued collaboration. Let me also thank my own team at the World Heritage Centre, the Policy and Statutory Meeting Unit headed by Ms. Petya Totcharova and the efficient team of PSM; they managed very well together as the host country team.

My thanks also go to the regional teams, chief of the Regional Units from Africa, Arab States, Asia Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean, Europe and North America. Our team as well as the unit providing logistical support. Special thanks to the people behind the screens for supporting our Rapporteur, as you have heard, and for helping in the processing of decisions and texts including for two working groups.

I also wish to thank the interpreters for helping us with dialogue and all other staff, including our camera team and room clerks. Special thanks to our legal advisor who tried to keep us focus on procedures.

Very many thanks to my dear Deputy Director, Mr. Eloundou, who was not always here, but he kept my back free and we are really a great team, I could not do without him. Also special thanks to our Assistant-Director General for Culture, Mr. Ernesto Ottone-Ramirez, who arrived in April and attended his very first Committee meeting here, as well as to his team. I think he was truly impressed.

I would also like to thank all of you who have contributed to our Night for Virunga event, which collected more than US\$10,542 through both online crowd-funding plus ticket sales to listen to the great band.

Thank you very much for all your collaboration, your trust in me and my team and your invaluable contributions. Your excellent presidency, Madam Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, during this 42nd session of the Committee, the very warm welcome of all the people here in Bahrain and the efficiency of your team, including from the ARCWH and Shaikha Mai bint Mohammed Al-Khalifa's team will long be remembered.

Before I wish you safe travels, I have something to give to you because I am sure you now want to visit all the new World Heritage sites and here you have an atlas with all the World Heritage sites. This is for you. Safe travels to all of you."

The Chairperson:

"Thank you very much Ms. Rössler for your kind words and the great work. Before we close I give the floor to the Kingdom of Bahrain."

Bahrain:

[English interpretation] "Ladies and gentlemen, on our closing day of our meeting, I would like to thank the entire team and Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa for chairing the Committee so masterfully, so kindly, while ensuring that we all followed the rules and procedures. It has been a wonderful opportunity to welcome you all and we would like to thank the entire UNESCO team.

We would like to thank all those who have worked with us for the past ten days and I will not mention each by name but you are all in our hearts. Thanks to you all, thanks to the host State team here in Bahrain which has done its utmost to ensure that we have given great visibility to Bahrain and its civilisation. It has been an honour for us to welcome the world here in Bahrain. We have taken historical decisions here and this has been a wonderful and exceptional meeting.

Thank you all.”

The Chairperson:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much to the Kingdom of Bahrain for its exceptional welcome, which has ensured that our session was a great success. Thank you again. Kuwait, please.”

Kuwait:

“We cannot leave the kingdom without showing our appreciation to the people of the Kingdom, to the government for the organisation of this amazing, fantastic gathering. I would like to thank everyone in the first to the last rows and those behind the scenes who have been working day and night. They are the true soldiers, those that made this event fabulous from the technical and social points of view, from friendship.

That is what the Kingdom of Bahrain is all about, bringing people together throughout the years. I would also thank the Advisory Bodies for their technical input, their amazing job, their openness, their amazing availability for dialogue even after the sessions. This is at least our experience as the State of Kuwait. We have road maps to move forward.

I would also like to thank especially all the delegations with which we had disagreement. I think it was a constructive disagreement and based on our understanding of the documents that had been given.

I would also like to thank the members who agreed with our points based on our discussions and our evaluation. Lastly, I would like to thank my team, who are amazing, for giving me all the technical support that gave me the confidence to express our views to my colleagues.

Finally, thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain, to its people and to my dear, amazing Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa. Thank you to all the people of Bahrain, thank you all.”

The Chairperson:

[English interpretation] “Thank you Kuwait. I now give the floor to Tunisia.”

Tunisie :

« Merci madame la présidente. La Tunisie remercie le Royaume de Bahreïn pour l'excellente organisation de cette réunion et pour le plein succès des travaux de notre session. La Tunisie vous félicite et vous remercie, madame la présidente, pour votre immense bonté, votre sagesse et votre grande patience dans la conduite de nos discussions.

La Tunisie félicite et remercie pour les efforts immenses effectués par le Secrétariat, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et également par les Organisations consultatives qui, malheureusement, souvent, font l'objet de critiques injustifiées et non méritées. La Tunisie renouvelle son soutien à ces Organisations et salue les efforts qu'ils continuent à fournir.

Enfin, la Tunisie exprime d'ores et déjà tous ses vœux de pleins succès à notre 43^e session à Bakou en Azerbaïdjan, l'an prochain.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

« Je vous remercie. Now, I give the floor to China. »

China:

“Thank you madam Chairperson. On behalf of the Chinese delegation, I wish to thank you for your leadership and the effective guidance you have provided in the steering of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee, for successfully achieving all its goals and agenda. I am confident that the 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee will have long-lasting contributions to raising the visibility of the World Heritage Committee and endeavours of the World Heritage conservation in the States Parties. I would also like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the government of the Kingdom of Bahrain for their generous hospitality in hosting this session.

As a committed State Party to the 1972 Convention, China assures you of its continuation to further attribute its contribution through sharing expertise with countries or regions underrepresented in preparing nomination files, supporting the World Heritage Centre in improving the geographical distribution of sites on the World Heritage List, encouraging effective implementation of the Committee decisions and through exploring mechanisms to make the World Heritage Fund more responsive to the need of States Parties.

Once again, China would like to extend its sincere gratitude for your Excellency's guidance and leadership in successfully chairing this session and also to thank Dr Rössler and her team for their marvellous work and to all the Committee members for their collaboration and solidarity which was demonstrated during the whole session.

China expects to meet you all next year in Baku. Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Cuba.”

Cuba:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chairperson. My delegation would like to join our colleagues in thanking the Kingdom of Bahrain for its very warm welcome and for the great hospitality that it has extended to us. Also, our thanks to the World Heritage Centre for the work that it has done, and we know how much work is involved in preparing such a complex session.

We would also like to thank the Advisory Bodies for their understanding during our criticism; something which will also contribute to our work and improve it. We would also like to thank all the other States Parties and delegations in this meeting. Cooperation has always won despite our differences and diverging points of view; we have always attempted to find a consensus.

Thanks also to you for your leadership, your flexibility and for leading us to this wonderful success. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I give the floor to Zimbabwe.”

Zimbabwe:

“Thank you Chair. Zimbabwe would like to take this opportunity to thank our host country Bahrain for their warm welcome and friendly hospitality. I will forever cherish our stay in this country. I also want to thank the World Heritage Centre for your support and guidance during this grilling ten days here in Bahrain. Thank you very much. On my own behalf I have learnt a lot.

I would also like to extend my gratitude to the Advisory Bodies for their guidance and support before, and I am sure, during this particular session. I also want to thank the Africa Group for their support, the sharing of experiences, the camaraderie that has prevailed among the African member States. Thank you very much Group Africa.

I also want to extend our appreciation and thanks to all the delegates here in Bahrain; let us continue working together for the preservation of our heritage worldwide. Last but not least, I would like to say thank you very much to our Chair and to our Rapporteur. It must not have been an easy task, sitting there where people have been criticising; you have taken it very well. I salute you, madam, I salute you, Rapporteur.

Thank you very much, bon voyage everyone to wherever you are going.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to Angola.”

Angola :

« Merci madame la présidente. Comme les autres, ma délégation aimerait remercier le Royaume de Bahreïn pour avoir accepté d’abriter la 42^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Les remercier pour leur hospitalité et les conditions mises à notre disposition afin que nous puissions arriver aux très bons résultats qui ont couronné le succès de cette 42^e session.

Notre délégation aimerait vous féliciter également, madame la présidente, pour le travail accompli et nous diriger tout au long de nos travaux. Vous avez fait preuve de beaucoup de sagesse pour nous aider à arriver à des consensus et à prendre des décisions qui vont faire avancer la mise en œuvre de la Convention.

Notre délégation aimerait également remercier le Centre du patrimoine mondial, toutes les Organisations consultatives, les États parties à la Convention, particulièrement les

membres du Comité pour le travail que nous avons accompli ensemble. Nous avons beaucoup appris dans les travaux de ces dix jours. Beaucoup de confrontations parfois, mais je pense que ce qui a caractérisé nos travaux pendant cette 42^e session est l'esprit d'ouverture et de dialogue. Cela a été beaucoup souligné dans nos travaux et nous a aidés à faire avancer les choses et atteindre ce résultat dont nous sommes fiers aujourd'hui.

J'aimerais, en terminant, remercier pour son travail et féliciter le Rapporteur. J'imagine que cela n'a pas été facile pour elle. Elle nous a également aidés en proposant d'arriver à des consensus aussi facilement que possible. Grand merci à tout le monde et tout le travail que nous avons fait et nous pensons que la Convention, de plus en plus, va gagner de l'espace et va permettre à tous les États de pouvoir avancer et continuer, donc à travailler pour le développement du patrimoine mondial dans le monde et dans chacun de nos pays.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is to Australia.”

Australia:

“Thank you, your Excellency Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa. Firstly, let me congratulate you on your excellent stewardship of the meeting. We have appreciated the way you have guided us through this session. We would like to express our deep thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain for its hospitality and generosity in hosting this meeting.

For me, it has been my first visit to the Middle East outside of an airport. I must say that I am personally enriched by that experience and I will always be grateful for having had this opportunity. We would like to thank the Secretariat, the interpreters and all the staff working behind the scenes. They are the unsung heroes of this meeting and without all their efforts we would not have achieved what we achieved.

We would like to extend our special thanks to the Rapporteur and to say simply that we look forward to you returning to this side of the podium next year. We would like to thank the Advisory Bodies and express our continuing gratitude and admiration for the huge amount of work they do to help us make this wonderful Convention and to keep us on the course of good decision-making, as always focused on upholding Outstanding Universal Value.

Here in Manama, we have had many important discussions, with all of us focused on affirming the World Heritage Convention as one of the iconic treaties of the United Nations system, upholding UNESCO's mission of building sustainable development and intercultural dialogue.

The Australian delegation has benefited greatly as a team and individually through the exchanges we have had over these past ten days. We depart Manama optimistic about the future and confident that, here at this meeting, we have laid the foundation for a productive dialogue across many important issues at Baku and beyond. Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Norway, you have the floor.”

Norway:

“Thank you madam Chair. Norway would like to thank the Bahraini authorities for hosting this meeting as well as the wise leadership of Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa. We would also like to thank the Rapporteur, the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the interpreters as well as the rest of the staff.

A special thanks to our Committee colleagues, Observers, States Parties and NGOS who made this a common effort for the best of the World Heritage Convention.

Thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Brazil, you have the floor.”

Brazil:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. In my personal capacity, as well as on behalf of the whole Brazilian delegation, I would like to express our most sincere gratitude for the kind hospitality of the Bahraini people and I would also like to congratulate the government of Bahrain for the impeccable organisation of this 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee.

Since the very first moment, we felt at home. We felt in family, welcomed by Bahraini people and especially because of the friendly touch you gave to this meeting.

We had very intense and challenging days of work, but I think the result was extraordinary; the result was that we managed to foster the protection and promotion of World Heritage. Your leadership, madam Chair, was essential for the great success of this session of the Committee.

This is the first time I have participated in a meeting of the World Heritage Committee. And I think I was privileged to learn with you and I am very grateful, Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa, for this opportunity. I would like to also say a word about the dedication of all the Committee members. We were moved by their dedication and I would like to say a very special word to Ms. Rössler who also gave us lessons every day and we are grateful to you for that. The same goes to Ms. Totcharova, to our very efficient Rapporteur, you have a very difficult job and we all appreciated your competent work very much, to Mr. Lazare, with whom I had the opportunity of working on a very special mission and I am grateful to you, and to all those behind the scenes that contributed greatly to the success of this meeting.

I feel privileged to have worked and shared beautiful moments with you madam Chairperson and with Mai bint Mohammed Al Khalifa; it was a privilege, really. I would like to thank you and all your team madam Chair, for those memorable days in Bahrain.

Thank you very, very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Azerbaijan.”

Azerbaijan:

“Thank you very much madam Chairperson. We would also like to extend our appreciation and thank our host country, the Kingdom of Bahrain, for its great hospitality. Also, to thank you, especially madam Chair, for a successful chairmanship and also all the UNESCO Secretariat and our Rapporteur for their excellent work. We thank all Committee members and Advisory Bodies for their cooperation and constructive dialogue and finally we are looking forward to welcoming you all next year in Azerbaijan.

Thank you so much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Burkina Faso, you have the floor.”

Burkina Faso:

« Merci madame la présidente. Le Burkina Faso remercie le Royaume de Bahreïn pour son hospitalité et l'organisation de la 42^e Session. Nous voudrions remercier l'UNESCO dans son ensemble, et notamment le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organes consultatifs pour avoir créé à travers cette situation les conditions idoines pour discuter du présent et du devenir de la Convention et d'insister particulièrement sur les priorités, notamment la priorité Afrique, qui donnera ainsi l'occasion aux pays en développement de mettre des stratégies de conservation durable en œuvre.

Nous remercions également l'ensemble des délégations pour la franche collaboration. Toute expérience, bonne ou mauvaise, instruit pour peu que nous l'exploitions judicieusement.

Pour finir, une mention spéciale à madame la présidente pour avoir avec célérité conduit la présente session ce qui nous a permis donc de rentrer avec des résultats satisfaisants.

Je vous remercie ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Hungary, you have the floor.”

Hungary:

“Thank you madam Chair. The 42nd meeting of the World Heritage Committee was a big success for all participants. A new, important milestone has been erected here in Bahrain, celebrating the conception and general acknowledgement of the spirit of the World Heritage movement. Many, many thanks to the World Heritage Centre, to the excellent Hungarian Rapporteur of the meeting for her efficient and thorough work done for enhancing our common goals. But, first of all, thank you to the Kingdom of Bahrain for the hosting of the meeting and for the diligent and generous organisation of the meeting.

First of all, the Chairperson, Madam Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa: in the name of the Hungarian delegation, we thank her for her very, very appreciated work done for all of us, for the success of the meeting. The Hungarian delegation, after a long time is again a member of the World Heritage Committee. Of course, congratulations also to all the Advisory

Bodies and organisational teams and all the other Committee members who participated in this success.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Bosnia, you have the floor, please.”

Bosnie–Herzégovine :

« Merci madame la présidente. Nous tenons à faire part de notre respect des valeurs fondamentales de l’UNESCO et de l’esprit des Nations Unies à travers notre activité de membres du Comité pour la première fois où nous avons assisté à une telle conférence. Nous remercions le Royaume de Bahreïn pour son hospitalité et remercions tous ceux qui ont rendu cette réunion, cette conférence possible qui a fait preuve d’un grand succès.

La Bosnie Herzégovine va continuer à suivre l’esprit de l’UNESCO et des Nations unies pour apporter sa contribution dans le futur à ce travail important.

Merci bien ».

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Kyrgyzstan, you have the floor.”

Kyrgyzstan:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, we would like to join all the thanks and congratulations to the host country, the Kingdom of Bahrain, for their very warm welcome and for the professional team of organisers and for your leadership madam Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa. Also, we would like to congratulate and to thank colleagues from the Secretariat of the World Heritage Centre.

It was an honour for us to join, for the first time, the team of Committee members. This session was for us very important from different points of view. We learnt a lot and we also want to thank all the organisers and the interpreters and the professional guidance of the Advisory Bodies and of our Rapporteur and legal advisor.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. The floor is now to Saint Kitts and Nevis.”

Saint Kitts and Nevis:

“Thank you madam Chair. First of all, I wish to express our thanks to the Kingdom of Bahrain for hosting this 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee and for their wonderful, wonderful hospitality; to you madam Chair for your astute guidance and leadership during this important meeting, also the Advisory Bodies for their extremely

important and extensive, detailed work that assisted in making decisions which we have achieved.

The World Heritage Centre for their support and guidance we thank and also a special thanks for those who made it possible for Saint Kitts and Nevis to be represented here at this important meeting. To all delegations here, thank you for having offered their support, guidance and assistance. It was indeed an honour to be here for the first time and a great learning experience.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, the floor is to Spain.”

Spain:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. The delegation of the Kingdom of Spain would like to join the words of thanks for your work and for having managed the entire session; to the Kingdom of Bahrain for their warm welcome to the World Heritage Centre and the technical team for the enormous task they have carried out – a year to make it possible for us to take decisions here. To all our colleagues and members of the Committee for the very fruitful dialogue that has characterised this session, to the observer States, to the Advisory Bodies and the NGOs, thank you.

Thanks to the efforts of all, we have achieved a successful dialogue in order to work for the World Heritage Convention and we hope the dialogue will prevail in the coming sessions as well. We would like to congratulate the government of Azerbaijan and we hope we will continue along the same lines at next year’s Committee meeting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you, very much. Tanzania, you have the floor.”

Tanzania:

“Madam Chair, The United Republic of Tanzania wants to join other distinguished delegations to thank you for a successful guidance, leadership during all the ten days of the 42nd Session. The Tanzanian delegation thanks the Kingdom of Bahrain for their warm welcome and congratulates the Kingdom for the successful organisation of the 42nd Session of the Committee.

Tanzania thanks the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for their work in assisting the Committee in their responsibilities. It also thanks the distinguished Committee members for their cooperation and dedication to keeping to the spirit of the Convention. Tanzania joins other Committee members to congratulate the Rapporteur for the successful accomplishment of her difficult responsibilities.

Madam Chair, the Tanzanian delegation wishes all the delegations a safe journey home. Thank you. “

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Uganda, you have the floor.”

Uganda:

“Madam Chair, the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee has been a fruitful and amazing time for my delegation, attending for the first time. We thank you for your generosity in organising the conference. To all people who participated in organising the conference we are indeed grateful. To the Secretariat, the Rapporteur, the interpreters, security agencies, the hotels and the transporters we are most appreciative.

Many thanks for a fabulous conference in closing this meeting, which has been a great success in all possible respects. Madam Chair, bringing together people from different backgrounds, heritage and languages is not easy. Such a conference involves an immense amount of time and energy. You must have been working so hard lately for everything to fall into place as it has. You deserve a rest now.

It was a perfect mix of global heritage interests, people and social gatherings, and in my opinion, one that paid off. Once again, madam Chair, I congratulate you in organising such a successful World Heritage Committee session in this wonderful city of Manama.

I conclude my brief remarks with looking forward to seeing all of you who will still be on the Committee come the 44th Session of the World Heritage Committee in Uganda.

I thank you.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Now, Guatemala, you have the floor.”

Guatemala:

[English interpretation] “Thank you very much madam Chair. On behalf of Guatemala, I would like to thank the Kingdom of Bahrain for organising this 42nd session. Thank you also to the whole team of the World Heritage Centre. It has shown once again its great competence in pursuing the decisions of the Committee.

I would like to thank all of those, particularly those who have made these fantastic meetings a reality, particularly those people who worked magic behind the scenes to make this Committee an effective one. I will not read the long list. The other members of the Committee have done that very well. We certainly support everything they said.

For Guatemala, the government of Bahrain will obviously remain in the atlas of heritage. It is the case for Guatemala, participating for the first time in this important forum.

We would like to thank all the different bodies involved in enforcing the Convention. We would like to thank all the members of the Committee who were willing to debate, discuss, express different points of view, different opinions, but who were always committed to finding common points for the benefit of World Heritage, which is what has brought us together in the Kingdom of Bahrain.

In the practices of Mayan spirituality, we greet and thank the four corners of the world, the sky and the earth for this opportunity to light our message to the four corners of the earth thanks to the delegations that have come together.

Thank you for this fantastic meeting.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. Indonesia, you have the floor.”

Indonesia:

“Thank you madam Chair. The delegation of Indonesia would like to extend our utmost gratitude and appreciation, first and foremost to our distinguished Chairperson for her excellent leadership throughout this studious yet fruitful session and also to the Kingdom of Bahrain for being an excellent and hospitable host.

We would also like to thank the Secretariat, Ms. Rössler as Director of the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies for the recommendations as well as our Rapporteur for her excellent capability in dealing with very tedious and also demanding tasks, and also the interpreters and other team members behind the scenes.

The 42nd Session of the World Heritage Committee has been a very productive one, despite the heavy load on the agenda we were required to undertake. In this regard, we would like to congratulate all members of the Committee for the excellent work in concluding the work on time. We would also like to take the opportunity to congratulate our next host and we are looking forward to the next Committee meeting in Azerbaijan in 2019, which will also be concluding our mandate in the World Heritage Committee for the period of 2015-2019.

Thank you very much.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. ICCROM, you have the floor.”

ICCROM:

“Thank you very much madam Chair. I make this intervention on behalf of all three Advisory Bodies, ICCROM, ICOMOS and IUCN. We would first like to take this opportunity to thank you madam Chair for your excellent management of this meeting. We also thank the Rapporteur for the hard work in ensuring the successful work on the decisions and on the final report. I have often said that being The Chairperson and the rapporteur of this Committee are the hardest jobs at UNESCO. Both of you have carried out these duties in impeccable fashion and we thank both of you very much for the hard work that you have undertaken in that regard.

We would also like to thank the Secretariat through the new Assistant Deputy Director for Culture and my good friend, Ms. Rössler, and my brother Lazare Eloundou. They oversee a dedicated staff that always makes sure that the wheels keep turning in these meetings. I am always amazed at the amount of work that they are able to carry out at Committee meetings in such an efficient manner.

I would also like to give a special thanks to Sheikha Haya Rashed Al Khalifa and the whole organisational team in Bahrain. I have had the pleasure of coming to Bahrain for many years now for various activities and they are always organised, really in the best way

possible. If this is possible, this meeting exceeded all expectations. This is especially notable given the short time that Bahrain had to carry out all the activities to organise this meeting.

Finally, we would like to thank all the Committee members. You have given us a very difficult but clear task of providing the best scientific and professional advice possible. We take this job very seriously and promise to continue to provide this advice as long as we are called on to do so. We look forward to continuing and enhancing dialogue with all States Parties to the Convention and with you, members of the Committee, into the future.

Finally, of course, we look forward to working with all of you over the next year towards the successful implementation of the 43rd Session of this Committee, which will take place in Azerbaijan next year. We thank the Azerbaijanis and we also thank Australia, which will be the Rapporteur. In advance, we thank them for the work they will be carried out at the 43rd Session.

Thank you madam Chair for giving the Advisory Bodies the floor.”

The Chairperson:

“Thank you very much. I wish you all a safe trip to your countries. I now declare the 42nd Session closed.”

End of the 42nd session of the World Heritage Committee