



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

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

World Heritage

35 COM

Distribution Limited

WHC-11/35.COM.INF.20

Original: English/French

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

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

**World Heritage Committee
Thirty-fifth Session**

**Paris, UNESCO Headquarters
19-29 June 2011**

SUMMARY RECORD

RESUME DES INTERVENTIONS

FIRST DAY – Monday, 20 June 2011

FIRST MEETING

10.00 a.m. –1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms Mai Bint Muhamad Al Khalifa

ITEM 1 OPENING OF THE SESSION

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/INF.1*

The 35th session of the World Heritage Committee was opened on Monday, 20 June 2011 at UNESCO Headquarters, by H.E. Ms Mai Bint Muhamad Al Khalifa, Minister of Culture of Bahrain and Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee.

The 21 Members of the World Heritage Committee were present: Australia, Bahrain, Barbados, Brazil, Cambodia, China, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, France, Iraq, Jordan, Mali, Mexico, Nigeria, Russian Federation, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, United Arab Emirates.

The following 121 States Parties to the World Heritage Convention, which are not members of the Committee, were represented as Observers: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, Cyprus, Colombia, Comoros, Congo (the Democratic Republic of), Congo (Republic of), Korea (Republic of), Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ecuador, Fiji, Finland, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Holy See (Vatican City State), Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malawi, Malta, Morocco, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mauritania, Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, San Marino, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tanzania (United Republic of), Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, United States of America, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

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 World Conservation Union (IUCN) also attended the session.

The Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee, H.E. Mrs Mai Bint Muhammad Al Khalifa, welcomed the participants and expressed her gratitude to participate in a number of important meetings and events related to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* as the Chairperson, such as the expert meeting on the decision-making process of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Bahrain, December 2010), the meeting on the follow-up to the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the Arab States (Morocco, March 2011) and the first annual meeting of the World Heritage related category 2 centres working under the auspices of UNESCO (Bahrain, December 2010). The Chairperson highlighted the obligation the Committee members have to make sure that the technical and scientific information is gathered towards the best and more effective decisions in the utmost interest of the World Heritage properties and their conservation. She mentioned the outline and items to be discussed at this session, and highlighted that the role of the Committee is to address key issues of the *Convention* which cannot be solved in another context. She emphasized that the future of the *Convention* is an essential issue to be considered while it is important to define a vision in this framework to reflect the efforts carried out since almost 40 years for the conservation of heritage of humanity. The challenges are to guarantee the credibility of the *Convention*, the balance within the World Heritage List, the reinforcement of capacities, the consideration for the role of local communities, the awareness-raising and promotion of the principles and image of the *Convention*.

Mrs Irina Bokova Director-General of UNESCO expressed the view that World Heritage is a reminder of everything that unites humanity, and also of the ties between culture, nature and societies. World Heritage sites can be tremendous vectors for dialogue, reconciliation, development and knowledge. She described several World Heritage properties affected by natural disasters different in type and from various regions of the world: this comprised flooding, volcanic eruptions, typhoons and the most recent devastating earthquake and tsunami which hit Japan. She also took note of the potential disastrous impact of industrial activities and pointed out that as the number of World Heritage properties grows, so does their vulnerability. Therefore there is a need to focus on risk-preparedness and long-term management at World Heritage properties.

La Directrice générale précise combien l'éducation des jeunes est importante et évoque à ce propos le Programme d'éducation des jeunes au patrimoine mondial mis en œuvre par le Centre du patrimoine mondial et soutenu par le Comité du patrimoine mondial depuis 1994.

La Directrice générale évoque également l'un des principaux points de discussion de la 34e session du Comité (Brasilia, 2010), à savoir la réflexion sur l'avenir de la *Convention* et le 40e anniversaire de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Sur ce dernier point, elle exprime sa satisfaction de voir que l'un des principaux thèmes retenu est: « Patrimoine mondial et Développement durable – le Rôle des communautés locales ». Ceci permettra de renforcer l'intégration de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* dans le débat global actuel concernant le concept de Culture et Développement. Elle rappelle que de nombreux États parties étudient la possibilité

d'organiser des événements particuliers pour célébrer le 40e anniversaire. Elle exprime sa reconnaissance au Gouvernement du Japon pour son offre d'accueillir l'événement qui clôturera ces célébrations, en novembre 2012.

La Directrice générale souligne l'importance des approches innovantes dans la conservation. Concernant les villes, elle rappelle le projet de Recommandation sur la question de la conservation du paysage urbain historique et le fait que le Comité a été à l'origine des discussions sur la conservation des paysages urbains et a appelé à développer des outils pour faire face aux nombreux défis. Elle se félicite de la nombreuse participation des États membres à la réunion intergouvernementale d'experts organisée à Paris en mai 2011 sur ce sujet. Elle précise qu'un nouvel instrument normatif sera présenté à la 36^e session de la Conférence générale, qui viendra à la fois compléter et renforcer les recommandations actuelles et promouvoir le rôle de l'UNESCO en tant qu'instance internationale à la tête des efforts pour la conservation urbaine.

Par ailleurs, la Directrice générale salue particulièrement l'initiative du Comité du patrimoine mondial, de lancer une réflexion approfondie sur les « processus en amont ». Cette démarche reconnaît les difficultés que présente le processus de proposition d'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et vise à trouver des solutions pour améliorer et renforcer le processus actuel de proposition d'inscription. Cette initiative, pour l'instant menée sur une base expérimentale en coopération étroite avec les organisations consultatives, permettra de cibler au mieux les besoins et d'affiner l'aide aux États parties. Concluant, la Directrice générale invite les participants à visiter l'exposition photographique sur le patrimoine mondial présentée sur les grilles d'enceinte du Siège de l'UNESCO.

H.E. Mr. Davidson Hepburn, President of the General Conference of UNESCO stressed that the *World Heritage Convention* is a crucial instrument in the conservation of the cultural and natural heritage of global significance. This heritage needs to be preserved as part of the World Heritage as a whole, especially considering all the challenges that it faces, like natural or man-made disasters. Thus mutual efforts of the international community are indispensable. He informed that The Bahamas is preparing to ratify the *World Heritage Convention*. He expressed his great interest in the World Heritage Programme for Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) which was adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2005 to coordinate and develop World Heritage activities in islands of the Caribbean Sea and in the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Oceans. The SIDS programme works closely with the World Heritage Marine programme, and in this context, he welcomed the new publication of the World Heritage paper series no.28 on "Navigating the Future of Marine World Heritage".

H.E. Ms Eleonora Mitrofanova, Chairperson of the Executive Board of UNESCO, highlighted that the success of UNESCO to gain global recognition as an organization lies in its normative instruments, like the 1972 *World Heritage Convention* which is one of the most successful instruments for the protection of the cultural and natural heritage of Outstanding Universal Value. She outlined issues discussed at the 186th session of the Executive Board (3-19 May 2011) which related to World Heritage. While the Executive Board members noted the continuing destruction of landscapes and the fact that the lack of adequate policies and guidance create irreversible damages, the Executive Board decided to continue to protect landscapes within existing instruments

such the *World Heritage Convention* as well as to cooperate with other bodies such as the Council of Europe and its European Landscape Convention (Florence, 2000). She also mentioned that the intergovernmental expert meeting on the Historic Urban Landscape which took place in May 2011 at UNESCO Headquarters in light of the comments received from Member States, resulted in the adoption of a Draft Recommendation, which will be submitted to the 36th session of the General Conference for adoption. She noted that the substantial increase of tourism is a major challenge for World Heritage sites for which the World Heritage Committee initiated a broader reflection.

The **Chairperson** of the World Heritage Committee thanked Ms Mitrofanova for her kind words. She commended the Director-General, the President of the General Conference and the Chairperson of the Executive Board for their support to the World Heritage Committee. Then she specially addressed the media and reminded them that the World Heritage Committee being conducted in closed sessions they were invited to leave the room.

ITEM 2 ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS

Document: WHC-11/35.COM.2
WHC-11/35.COM.INF.2

Decision: **35 COM 2**

The **Chairperson**, before presenting the first document requested that each Delegation speaking Arabic or Spanish expresses in its first intervention in which language (English or French) it would wish to be recorded. She specified that the documents provided were bilingual and asked if the Committee members agreed with the list of Observers.

The Delegation of **Jordan** congratulated the Chairperson for her election and requested that two persons from a Jordanian NGO be allowed as observers.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** specified that this request is submitted to the Committee because these NGO could not register within the 15 days deadline prior to the session.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the two NGOs would be added to the List of observers as no objection was made.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 2** was adopted.

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

ITEM 3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND TIMETABLE

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/3A.Rev*
 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.3A
 WHC-11/35.COM/3B.Rev

Decisions: **35 COM 3A.Rev.**
 35 COM 3B.Rev.

Before opening Item 3, the **Chairperson** indicated that that it was not allowed to take photographs during the session. She then gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre to introduce the items.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** expressed his apologies for the problems encountered by some participants during registration and asked for their understanding since it is not accustomed to handling such large numbers of participants. He then referred to the Documents *35 COM 3A.Rev*, *35 COM 3B.Rev* and *35 COM/INF.3A* and announced that 62 documents had been prepared for the Committee, of which 56 had already been dispatched and 6 would be generated during the session. This amounts to more than 50% dispatched by the deadline of 6 weeks prior to the session, while the last dispatches were sent out on 27 May and 6 June 2011 in electronic form and hard copy. In all, the Committee were to adopt 265 Decisions. Concerning the timetable he explained that the Committee would be working for seven and a half working days, since no session could be held on Sunday 26 June 2011 due to logistical issues and costs. 28 June 2011 would be dedicated to preparing the report and its final adoption was planned for 29 June 2011. Some members of the Committee expressed concerns about the evening sessions. The Secretariat indicated that this was only envisaged as an option.

The Draft Decisions **35 COM 3A.Rev** and **35 COM 3B.Rev** were adopted.

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

ITEM 4 REPORT OF THE RAPPORTEUR OF THE 34th SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (Brasilia, 2010)

The **Rapporteur** of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee expressed that it was an honor for her to provide assistance in the report of the session, which covered 248 Decisions, under 44 agenda items, in 62 hours of debate spread over 8 days. She mentioned that the average time per decision was 15 minutes. She recalled that 21 sites were inscribed (15 cultural, 5 natural, 1 mixed), that Kiribati, the Marshall Islands and Tajikistan inscribed a site on the World Heritage List for the first time, and that 8 sites were extended and 4 were added to the World Heritage List in Danger. The Rapporteur also recalled her methodology concerning the amendments. In case of minor amendments, the proposed text was read out to the Committee, more complex amendments were shown on the screen while Decisions with different amendments of several States Parties were distributed in printed version. The Decisions Report was

published in English and French on 7 September 2010 but there have been some delays for compilation concerning the Summary Records due to unavailability of funds. She pointed out the disadvantages of having provisional Statements of Outstanding Universal Value and suggested States Parties to prepare complete Statements in a timely manner and ensure they correspond to the formal requirements. She ended thanking the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson of the 34th session and the Secretariat for the quality of their cooperation and wished the assistance a successful meeting.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Rapporteur on behalf of all Committee members and closed item 4 of the Agenda.

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

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/5A
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.5A.1
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.5A.2

Decision: **35 COM 5A**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the working Document 5A is linked to two Information Documents: INF.5A.1 and INF.5A.2. He indicated explaining the improvements made to the presentation of the report as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its last session, by which the reports on its activities were presented according to a new format and regrouped around the five Strategic Objectives. Highlighting a few of the achievements, the Director noted the progress made in ratification of the *Convention* which currently counts 187 States Parties with the potential of a 188th ratification, that of the Bahamas, as announced by the President of the General Conference in his speech at the official opening.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were comments on the Draft Decision contained in the document.

The Delegation of **Egypt** referred to his comments made during the Bureau meeting concerning the efficiency of the follow-up to the Committee's decisions and underlined the importance of monitoring the decisions taken by the Committee and of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism issue, as mentioned by the Delegation of Switzerland during the Bureau meeting.

The Delegation of **Sweden** wished success for the Committee session and thanked the Secretariat for its report and the achievements, including the conference on religious communities. While recognising the important role of religious communities in the management of sites, it stressed that more time is needed. In particular this applies since before this there are already a number of programmes such as sustainable tourism and others where improvements are needed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite également la Présidente et remercie le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour cette présentation améliorée. Elle est d'avis qu'elle peut encore évoluer si un indicateur sur les progrès ou les lacunes au niveau global et régional est ajouté. Ceci permettrait de mettre en perspective les objectifs programmatiques sur le court et moyen terme, alignés sur les objectifs stratégiques. La Délégation indique avoir soumis un projet d'amendement au paragraphe 5 du projet de Décision qu'elle considère singulariser une activité dont il faudrait définir les contours avant toute action concrète. Elle souligne que le projet d'amendement proposé contient des indications de réponse au point soulevé par la Délégation de l'Égypte.

La Délégation de la **France** félicite à son tour la Présidente du Comité pour son élection et le Centre du patrimoine mondial pour le rapport d'activités. Elle note que les activités de coopération bilatérale dans le cadre de l'accord France-UNESCO ont été mentionnées dans le rapport. Elle fait remarquer que la liste des partenariats demandée est satisfaisante et que l'on pourrait encore l'améliorer en ce qui concerne l'évaluation. Quant au patrimoine religieux, en écho à la Délégation de la Suisse et au débat mené lors du Conseil exécutif, ainsi qu'à la 34^e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Brasilia, 2010), elle considère qu'il n'est pas possible de singulariser une composante du patrimoine mondial. Aussi, il faudrait juste le mentionner dans les lignes directrices générales. La Délégation de la France indique avoir transmis un amendement sur ce paragraphe.

The Delegation of **China** congratulated the Chairperson and expressed its appreciation for the activities carried out by the Secretariat which have been actively supported by China. Therefore it requested that this should also be reflected in the Decision. The Delegation further underlined that the Secretariat had an important role and should serve as a bridge between the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties, especially noting that there is still an imbalance in the distribution of properties. In particular, it stressed that the number of mixed sites being inscribed had been decreasing since 2000. Therefore a thematic study on this issue was suggested by the Delegation. The imbalance of properties from the developed and developing countries was highlighted and the need for assistance in capacity building, human and financial resources were outlined. These countries' efforts should be encouraged and decisions should be based on technical and well informed basis, rather than what is currently the trend that is an increasing politicisation of decisions.

The Delegation of **Mexico** congratulated the Chairperson and thanked the Secretariat for the Report. Acknowledging the importance of religious heritage the Delegation stated that this theme should be directed by general guidelines, which was not reflected in the Decision.

The Delegation of **Barbados** was pleased with the scope of the report and remarked that the enhanced synergetic approach and cooperation with other conventions was guiding and assisting States Parties. While noting the vulnerability of underrepresented regions whose heritage was in need of more support, it also shared the view expressed by the Delegation of China, that there was a lack of progress concerning certain types of heritage and regions such as the Caribbean.

Congratulating the Chairperson and the Secretariat for their impressive report, the Delegation of **Brazil** noted that since the adoption of the *Global Strategy* in 1994 little

progress had been made to improve the geographical and typological imbalance. It suggested that there might be a better way of addressing this.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed the report and format presented by the Secretariat and proposed that in the future the report should focus on results and not only on the activities undertaken. It also appreciated the increased number of inscriptions in the Pacific Region notably from Kiribati and the Marshall Islands which were supported by Australia. Regarding partnerships, the Delegation remarked that it would be commenting on this during the relevant Agenda Item. It concluded by requesting that the wording in paragraph 5 of the Decision should be improved.

The Delegation of **Egypt** welcomed with pleasure the discussion on Item 5 and explained that Egypt has numerous religious heritage sites which are being handled by special divisions for the Jewish, Christian and Muslim heritage. Their management is the responsibility of religious communities, an example which could be adapted to the specific context in other countries.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the point raised by the Delegation of China concerning the imbalance of the World Heritage List. Concerning paragraph 5 of the Decision the Delegation proposed that a small working group should discuss the redrafting of the Decision.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the **Director of the World Heritage Centre** who thanked the Committee members for their interventions and suggestions which shall be considered. As concerns the monitoring of decisions on the implementation of activities, he referred to Annex I which reports in such a manner. The Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism is dealt with in Document WHC-11/35.COM/7.2. Concerning the suggestion made by the Delegation of Switzerland asking for the report to include indicators, results and budgetary implications, he explained that the World Heritage Fund, the Regular Programme and extra-budgetary resources are already included in the budget document. He stressed that UNESCO's Regular Programme and the 36C/5 all activities are fully aligned with the priorities established by the Committee. However if the Committee wishes a separate document, this could be done. The assessment of partnerships suggested by the Delegation of France could also be done and was examined by the External Auditors. Concerning the imbalance of properties, this issue had been examined by the External Auditor who made recommendations to reinforce the *Global Strategy* presented in Item 9A. The Director gave the floor to the Assistant Director-General for Culture to make further comments on the role of communities expressed in paragraph 5.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** indicated that a common reflection on this topic would be useful. The conclusion of the Kiev Seminar was that religious properties were numerous and had specific needs. They are part of the cultural and natural properties and no specific category was created for them. Their values are recognised through the criteria used for nominations. This issue was more complex, these properties have particular needs and are used for example for pilgrimage and sacred rituals. Also, communities live at some of these sites. As some delegations were reluctant to give support to this wording, it requested further reflection.

Le **Rapporteur** rappelle à la suite de la discussion qu'il a reçu des amendements des Délégations de la France et de la Suisse pour l'instant. Il rappelle également qu'un groupe de travail sur le paragraphe 5 sera constitué comme proposé par la Fédération de Russie.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'il serait souhaitable de prendre en considération tout d'abord les amendements au projet de décision existant sans forcément créer des mécanismes ou groupes particuliers.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** proposed to review first the existing proposal and try to come to a proper decision on the basis of this review.

The Delegation of **Barbados** noted that there is no need for additional working groups. It proposed to first have a look at the amendment and then verify whether the Committee could come to an agreement.

This viewpoint was supported by the Delegations of **Mexico, Bahrain and Estonia**. Each of these delegations stated that a working group could still be established if needed after the review

Due to technical problem with the screens, the **Chairperson** decided to postpone the discussion of the Draft Decision to the afternoon session.

ITEM 12 REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

Document: WHC-11/35.COM/5B12A
WHC-11/35.COM/5B12B
WHC-11/35.COM/5B12C
WHC-11/35.COM/5B12D

The **Secretariat** indicated that the Bureau proposed to establish a working group, for the duration of the 35th session, on the future of the *World Heritage Convention*, consistent with what was agreed at the 34th World Heritage Committee session (Brasilia, 2010). The conclusions would be reported to the Committee at the end of the 35th session.

The **Chairperson** noted that Mr. Greg Terrill (Australia) was proposed to chair the working group on the future of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed this invitation and suggested to add the reflections of the meeting on the state of conservation which was held in Dakar, Senegal, in April 2011 as part of the mandate for this working group.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la Présidence de l'Australie pour ce groupe de travail et la proposition d'ajouter les réflexions de la réunion de Dakar au mandat du groupe.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the agreement on the establishment of the working group on the future of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The **Secretariat** noted that the working group is an open-ended consultative body which is open to both member and non-member States of the World Heritage Committee. The **Secretariat** informed that the working group would meet from Tuesday 21 June 2011 onward, during lunch hours (14-15h) in room X.

The **Chairperson** suspended discussion on item 12.

**ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2010-2011 BUDGET AND
PREPARATION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET**

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/15*

Decision: **35 COM 15**

The **Secretariat** explained that the document contained two parts. Part 1 provided an overview of the implementation of the budget for the current biennium 2010-2011. The implementation rate is 60% and all is well on track for the remaining activities of the current year.

The Secretariat further pointed out that the total unpaid contributions of the 78 States Parties amount to US\$239,262 and invited States Parties to settle their dues. There were also additional requests for funds made by the Advisory Bodies, i.e. US\$ 90,000 by ICOMOS and US\$ 56,000 by IUCN, in particular to develop thematic studies and undertake reactive monitoring sessions until the end of the year. The World Heritage Centre has also requested the transfer of US\$ 60,000 from the 'Reinforced Monitoring' to the 'Reactive Monitoring' line to carry out the monitoring missions as requested by the World Heritage Committee.

The Secretariat also commented on Part II of the document which contains a proposal for the budget of the next biennium 2012-2013. The proposal is developed on a 0-real growth scenario, i.e. an increase of 1.65% for staff and 1.25% for activity cost. It was further pointed out that a similar scenario has been proposed for the budget of the Advisory Bodies. Their original proposals would have represented an increase of 42% as compared to 2010-2011 and totalled 82% of the World Heritage Fund which was considered unrealistic. It was also indicated that the proposed budget also responds to the requests made last year during the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010).

The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for its clear explanation and suggested the establishment of a working group to examine the budget for 2012-2013. The working group will be established for the entire duration of the 35th World Heritage Committee session.

The Delegation of **Barbados** recommended this mode of operation and proposed Ms Beatrice Fernandez (Mexico) to chair this working group.

The Delegations of **Brazil, China, France and Switzerland** supported this proposal.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the establishment of the working group for the budget for the future biennium 2012-2013 under Rule 21 of the Rules of procedures, chaired by Ms. Beatriz Hernandez (Mexico). She indicated that the first meeting will be held on Tuesday 21 June 2011.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** rappelle la suggestion de création d'un groupe de travail sur les mécanismes de suivi renforcé. Elle précise que cette question mérite la création d'un groupe de travail, notamment dans le cadre de la réflexion sur l'avenir de la *Convention* et de la célébration du 40ème anniversaire de la *Convention*.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the States Parties for their support in appointing Ms. Beatrice Hernandez as the Chairperson for this working group on the Budget issues.

The Chairperson suspended discussion on Item 15 of the Agenda.

FIRST DAY – Monday, 20 June 2011

SECOND MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

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

La Délégation de la **France** informe les membres du Comité qui ont d'une part un accès gratuit aux musées et aux monuments français pendant toute la durée du Comité et d'autre part, qu'une visite dans le Val de Loire, site du patrimoine mondial, est prévue pour le 26 juin 2011.

The **Chairperson** announced that the Rapporteur had received draft amendments to the Draft Decision **35COM5A** from the Delegations of Switzerland, France and China.

The **Rapporteur** read out the relevant amendments

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted.

La Délégation de la **France** note que le Séminaire international sur le rôle des communautés religieuses dans la gestion des biens du patrimoine mondial s'est tenu en novembre 2010. Elle demande au Secrétariat d'élaborer un manuel de proposant aux Etats parties des lignes directrices générales quant à la gestion du patrimoine d'intérêt religieux, dans le respect des spécificités nationales.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique avoir apporté des amendements aux paragraphes 6 et 7. Elle prend note du « Séminaire international » et demande au Secrétariat, en consultation avec les organisations consultatives de présenter à sa 36^{ème} session, un rapport sur la faisabilité d'un programme thématique sur le patrimoine culturel et naturel de caractère religieux. Elle demande aussi aux Etats parties à la *Convention* d'y contribuer. Elle prie également le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine mondial de tenir les Etats parties informés de toute nouvelle stratégie et/ou plan de travail qui pourrait avoir un impact sur le Fonds du patrimoine mondial en référence au paragraphe 8. au point 6 recoupait celle de la Délégation de la France. La Délégation propose de retirer sa proposition d'amendement au paragraphe 6, celui-ci étant identique à la proposition française, à l'exception de la dernière phrase concernant les contributions volontaires. Elle demande d'ajouter en conséquence cette phrase à la fin de l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la France.

La Délégation de la **France** accepte la proposition de la Délégation de la Suisse.

The Delegation of **Brazil** observed that some of the proposed amendments would require necessary action on the part of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies and asked the Secretariat's opinion regarding financial implications in this regard.

The **Secretariat** expressed its appreciation at the recognition given by the Delegation of Brazil to the role that it would have to play in implementing the proposed amendments. It further pointed out that the development of a manual, as requested by the Delegation of France, would require extensive reflexions and technical deliberations.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** congratulated the Chairperson and welcomed the appointment of the new Director of the World Heritage Centre. Concerning paragraph 6, it stressed the need to consider non-monotheistic religions, and their intangible elements, in the development of any action in line with the requirements of paragraph 6. It further proposed the application of other UNESCO normative instruments in the development of any such document.

The **Chairperson** called for the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 3 bis were adopted.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** proposed the merging of paragraph 3 Bis with Paragraph 4.

The Delegation of **China** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Switzerland on the condition that the essence of its original amendment would not be lost through merging the two paragraphs.

La Délégation de la **France** remarque que la formulation proposée ne prend pas en compte toutes les opinions du Comité. Elle réitère l'importance du patrimoine culturel religieux et souligne la nécessité d'obtenir des lignes directrices pour sa gestion. Elle souhaite conserver le texte en l'état actuel.

The **Chairperson** then proposed the deletion of paragraph 4, the Delegations of China and Switzerland being in agreement in this regard. Paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 were adopted.

Concerning paragraph 7 (former paragraph 6), the Delegation of **Brazil** outlined that it might be useful to request that a feasibility study be carried out on cultural heritage sites with religious interest by 2012 and further asked the Delegations of France and Switzerland to express their views on this proposal.

La Délégation de la **France** indique comprendre l'élaboration d'une étude de faisabilité sur les coûts d'un tel manuel aux Etats parties présentant les lignes directrices pour la gestion du patrimoine culturel d'intérêt religieux. Elle souligne qu'il est également important de reconnaître le rôle des communautés religieuses. La Délégation indique que le Comité est presque arrivé à un consensus et que sa proposition doit être maintenue.

The Delegations of **France** and **Switzerland** indicated their wish to retain their amendment as it was in line with the views of the Delegation of Brazil.

The **Secretariat** reiterated its position in line with that of the Delegation of Brazil regarding the need for a feasibility study for a manual on cultural heritage and religious issues.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed to simplify the language of paragraph 7 by requesting for “elaboration of general guidelines for management” while pointing out that the preparation of a manual requires considerable financial commitment while this is not the case with guidelines. The Delegation underlined that this could be done within the framework of a working group.

La Délégation de la **France** estime que la question des coûts doit être posée. Cependant les communautés religieuses ont besoin d’information sur la façon de gérer ces biens du patrimoine mondial. Le manuel est une bonne solution.

The **Chairperson** observed that with the new proposals for modifications, the paragraph was getting very dense and called for proposals to streamline it.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed a change from its earlier “general guidelines” to “general principles”.

ICCROM welcomed the proposal for a manual. However, underlining comments provided by the Secretariat following the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil, it pointed out that to move ahead with this proposal, lengthy research reflections and discussions were needed over an extended period of time.

The **Chairperson** stressed the need to reach an agreement on the final text in the paragraph: making a choice between “manual”, “general guidelines”, “general principles”; including the proposal by the Delegation of Nigeria. She also called on the Delegation of France to react to the proposal of the Delegation of Mexico.

La Délégation de la **France** estime que la proposition de la Délégation du Nigéria est opportune. Elle réitère le besoin d’avoir un guide pratique pour les gestionnaires et suggère de remplacer le terme « manuel » par « guide ».

The Delegation of **Brazil** emphasised the need to consider the contribution of ICCROM and how realistic it would be to achieve the objective in the light of the issues raised. It further requested feasibility studies on the thematic programme which could come out as a possible outcome.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu’elle considère le terme « guide pratique » comme le plus approprié. Elle estime que le terme « lignes directrices générales » vont beaucoup trop loin.

The Delegation of **Estonia** proposed the use of a generic term to cover the multiples possibilities ranging from “manual” to “principles”.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** pointed out that it would be useful to take into consideration the interesting work ongoing in many States Parties, the comments of ICCROM and the Secretariat, to start off with very general guidelines with provision for follow-up depending on outcomes, of a manual/handbook.

La Délégation de la **France** accepte la proposition d'un outil pratique.

The **Chairperson** closed the debate on paragraph 7 by requesting to put aside the detail of appropriate terminology use. The general framework of the paragraph, including the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Nigeria should be placed within square brackets while the Delegations of France, Switzerland, the Russian Federation, Brazil and Mexico would consult with one another and agreed on the final wording of this paragraph.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** requested a clarification on the period of submission of a progress report on this particular issue. It pointed out that this information was missing in the Decision.

The **Chairperson** underlined that the date was already mentioned in the Decision and then called for the consideration of paragraph 8.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed that the word “urging” in paragraph 8 (a) be replaced with the word “requests”.

The **Chairperson** also proposed the modification of the phrase to read “invites the Director”

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que le problème majeur de l'UNESCO est l'augmentation des ressources du Fonds du patrimoine mondial. Il estime la mention relative au financement dans le paragraphe 8 inutile car il faudrait prendre en compte la réalité du Fonds.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** called the Committee's attention to the fact that the issue raised in paragraph 8 was also addressed in Item 9A, to be discussed later during the 35th session on the external audit report on PaCT. In line with this remark, a new proposal was made to amend the existing paragraph 8 (b) with “taking into account the results of the evaluation of the external auditor on the...”

The **Chairperson** suggested that paragraph 8 be adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that it was not yet ready to provide suggestions.

The **Chairperson** suspended discussion on item 5A of the Agenda.

ITEM 5B REPORT OF THE ADISORY BODIES

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/5B*

Decision: **35 COM 5B**

The **Chairperson** introduced the item and invited the Advisory Bodies to make their presentations.

IUCN welcomed the collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and the other Advisory Bodies, and expressed its particular appreciation to all States Parties for their partnership during the past year. It also acknowledged the exceptional and hardworking team.

IUCN indicated that all three Advisory Bodies had written jointly to the Director-General of UNESCO to express their support regarding opportunities and challenges for implementing the *Convention* towards its 40th year. They recognized that the highest standards were required in the *World Heritage Convention*, which needs more support and new approaches to be considered. They indicated that upstream process appears to be essential to facilitate better and earlier scientific and technical dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies.

IUCN indicated that a key message was that the *Convention* was a global instrument to support wider efforts on conservation and sustainable development, and to engage communities, adding that supporting this were the significant agreements of the 10th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity last year. These include the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity and the Nagoya Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing. Many targets and provisions in these agreements stressed the need for harmonization of conservation and development matters, and connected these to a strategy for the *World Heritage Convention*.

IUCN noted that its vision was that of a world that valued and conserved nature. In that regard it indicated that it would like to recognize on behalf of the Advisory Bodies the statement made at the United Nations Permanent Forum in Indigenous Issues where IUCN is an observer. IUCN strongly welcomed the opportunity to engage with UNPFII in the dialogue it was requesting.

Another important area of sustainable development noted by IUCN was the engagement with private sector interests. It noted alongside that it welcomed new plans on tourism, long-standing partners of the *Convention* in the mining industries had adopted high standards to preserve World Heritage sites, and it added that it hoped these would remain a benchmark for the standards of the *Convention*.

IUCN added that it was pleased to note growing interest across its network for the *Convention* and explained that its delegation at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee included regional partners and focal points in the Arab Region along with a new officer from its Pacific Office, who will be acting as World Heritage Focal point. It noted that it is also working on a range of programme activities in support of States Parties, including the Tentative List of China and the Three Pitons Management Area, with the Government of St Lucia.

IUCN also noted that it responded to the relevant Decision (Brasilia, 2010) to create a position on remote sensing and GIS (Geographic Information System), based in UNEP-WCMC (United Nations Environment Programme – World Conservation Monitoring Centre) in Cambridge, and that their new Officer was present at the meeting.

IUCN stated that it was grateful for support from Switzerland on capacity-building, Australia on a thematic study on criterion vii, where the agreement was close to

completion, Germany's nature conservation agency on a continuing workshop programme and Korea on climate change, during the year.

IUCN added that it was committed to continue increasing its support to the *Convention*, notably through the support of the Swiss-based MAVA Foundation, and further partners including the African World Heritage Fund, the Organization of the African Union and others, and that it would be glad to respond to questions on its report.

ICOMOS noted that the remarks by the Chairperson, the Director-General of UNESCO and the President of the General Conference and the Chairperson of the Executive Board which all underlined the strictness and rigor that must govern all aspects of the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. ICOMOS noted that it reflected continuously on this issue when considering its work, adding that all the methodologies of ICOMOS were guided by the highest professional principles, for which it relied upon its global multidisciplinary and multicultural network of experts and on the additional knowledge provided by their more specialized partner organizations.

ICOMOS also noted that it adhered strictly to the *Operational Guidelines* as the framework for its advisory work. It added that it also listened carefully to the concerns that were expressed by Committee members and also to those made by States Parties regarding the clarity of its work. ICOMOS indicated that it supports the Committee's ongoing objectives to guide the *Convention* as an instrument that will bring greater benefits to the planet, to heritage and to the cultures that once produced them and now sustain them.

ICOMOS stated that over the last decade, dozens of initiatives, conferences and debates had been held throughout the world under the sponsorship of ICOMOS, and, in fact, that its next General Assembly to be held in December 2011 at UNESCO Headquarters had adopted the theme of "Heritage as an Engine for Sustainable Development." Strongly connected to this endeavor is the ICOMOS initiative connecting heritage and World Heritage with Human Rights. Likewise, ICOMOS explained that it had contributed extensively to the discussion on the Historic Urban Landscape (HUL) by fostering a global debate among its members on the nature, implications and potential application of the concept.

ICOMOS explained that it also continued to support the role of communities in the implementation of the Convention as one of the strategic objectives, also known as the 5 "C", by engaging in broader efforts to recognize and enhance the rights of indigenous people worldwide to identify the Outstanding Universal Value of existing and potential World Heritage properties and in taking part in the decisions regarding their use, their management and how they can contribute in their own community's development.

Finally, regarding the *Global Strategy*, ICOMOS stated that it was committed to a representative and credible World Heritage List that embodied in every inscription the standard of excellence for protection and best use of our cultural heritage in a way that can be emulated by all States Parties for the totality of all heritage places in their territories, as envisioned by Article 5 of the *Convention*.

ICCROM noted that in addition to its regular work on Reactive Monitoring, State of Conservation, Review of International Assistance, and Periodic Reporting, it had also

been pleased to organize the annual orientation session for Committee members, which is usually taking place the day before the Committee.

ICCROM summarized the work it is carrying out on capacity-building for World Heritage within the various regions of the world.

In sub-Saharan Africa, ICCROM was closely associated with the Ecole du patrimoine africain (EPA) in Benin, the Centre for Heritage Development in Africa (CHDA) in Kenya, and the Africa World Heritage Fund in South Africa. It explained that these were all important institutions that had been created to ensure the sustainability of World Heritage properties in the region.

In the Arab States region, ICCROM indicated that it had been very active with its ATHAR programme. It explained that the ATHAR programme, through a generous contribution from the Emirate of Sharjah, had been working with professionals in the region for the better protection of World Heritage properties.

Similarly in Latin America, ICCROM stressed its engagement in developing, with experts from the Latin American and the Caribbean region, a long-term programme on capacity-building (LATAM). It added that two countries that had already given their support to this initiative were Mexico and Spain, together with the World Heritage Centre and the two UNESCO category 2 centres in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and Zacatecas, Mexico.

ICCROM indicated that it was working in the Asia and the Pacific Region in partnership with WHITR-AP (World Heritage Training and Research Institute for Asia and the Pacific Region) in China, the government of the Kingdom of Cambodia, the ACCU (Asia Cultural Centre for UNESCO) Nara Office in Japan, SPAFA (an intergovernmental organization located in Thailand), and through a new agreement with the Republic of Korea.

ICCROM mentioned its ongoing collaboration with the other Advisory Bodies. It informed that signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with IUCN about capacity-building for World Heritage at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010). It reported that it was planning to sign a similar MoU with ICOMOS at its upcoming General Assembly in November 2011. Finally, ICCROM indicated that it retained a positive collaboration with both the Culture Sector as well as the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO.

ICCROM explained that its biggest challenge has been its ongoing work on the revision of the Global Training Strategy, adding that the results of this work, the new World Heritage Capacity-Building Strategy would be presented later during this session. ICCROM very much hoped that the Committee as a whole would endorse this Strategy, and that individual States Parties would support it and come together with the Advisory Bodies and other key stakeholders in its implementation.

ICCROM concluded by noting its desire to highlight that all three Advisory Bodies carry out a wide range of work in favour of the *Convention* with the highest possible scientific rigor, as called for in the *Convention* itself and in the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their presentations, and opened the floor for the debate.

The Delegation of **Barbados** noted its pleasure about the State Party of Bahrain's hosting of the World Heritage regional category 2 centre for the Arab region. It added that it would propose a World Heritage category 2 centre in Barbados in close co-operation with the University of the West Indies, in order to deepen understanding and implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in the Small Islands Developing States (SIDS).

The Delegation of **South Africa** congratulated the Advisory Bodies for their work and underlined the work accomplished by the African World Heritage Fund, in particular in the field of training. It also drew the attention to the fact that the reporting period indicated by each Advisory Body was different, and suggested that they coordinate themselves in the future to ensure they were all reporting on the same period of time.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie les organisations consultatives pour leurs rapports qui énumèrent les nombreuses activités mettant en œuvre la *Convention*. Elle se demande si les moyens des ambitions de la *Convention* sont suffisants et indique qu'elle souhaite proposer un amendement afin d'assurer plus de ressources pour mettre en œuvre ces activités. Elle note qu'il est essentiel que les organisations consultatives fassent part de leurs activités de façon concertée, et non pas de façon indépendante. La délégation de la Suisse note qu'une formulation des rapports de façon plus concertée présenterait plus de détails en ce qui concerne la répartition des rôles, la coopération entre les organisations consultatives et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, permettant une prise de décision plus précise en ce qui concerne les recommandations de la réunion de Bahrain (Décembre 2010).

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated its desire that the Advisory Bodies invite independent international organizations to the International Assistance review panels, citing as an example, the International Federation of Geology and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU).

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that the current International Assistance review panel functioned in line with the *Operational Guidelines*, and that any change of procedure would require their modification. He further explained that the document being considered should be read in conjunction with Document WHC-11/35.COM/12B as it related to the expert meeting on Decision-making Procedures of the Statutory Organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Bahrain, December 2010). He reminded that the Committee, during its 34th session, had reaffirmed the division of tasks between the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies on the state of conservation of properties, International Assistance requests, and the evaluation of nominations. He added that the Committee decided to refer this subject to the expert meeting on decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Bahrain, December 2010). Among other things he added that the expert meeting had felt that these roles were now sufficiently clear, but needed to be put into practice and that the various actors to the *Convention* should now follow in practice their mandated roles under the *World Heritage Convention* and its *Operational Guidelines*. The Director concluded by noting that the World Heritage Centre and the

Advisory Bodies continued their biannual meetings in September and in January which included the discussion of work processes. Similarly one additional meeting was held prior to the yearly session of the World Heritage Committee.

IUCN intervened, explaining that it did indeed work closely with other international scientific organizations, such as the International Union of Geological Survey and the Association of Geomorphologists, and that this cooperation provided IUCN with expanded networks. IUCN indicated that it would elaborate this point in Item 8B of the Agenda.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 5B** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 5B** of the agenda.

ITEM 5C FOLLOW-UP OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE EXTERNAL AUDITOR ON THE AUDIT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE

Document: WHC-11/35.COM/5C

Decision: **35 COM 5C**

The **Deputy Director for Management of the World Heritage Centre** provided background on the audit, noting that its 15 recommendations were presented at the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010). She reported that 9 of the 15 recommendations had been implemented, and provided further detail on each of these. She noted that out of the 6 recommendations still in the process of being implemented, not all are of the Secretariat responsibility, as some require a decision by the 18th session of the General Assembly of States Parties. She further noted that in its Decision 34 COM 5C paragraph 6, the World Heritage Committee had underscored the necessity for private partnerships to be fully compatible with the *Convention's* provisions. She added that based on this request and after the first module of the evaluation, the World Heritage Centre had reviewed its Strategy in terms of partnerships with the Section for Multilateral and Private Funding Sources of UNESCO. The Deputy Director for Management of the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO concluded by stating that, according to the remaining recommendations concerning human resources issues, the Secretariat was developing a human resources strategy, which should be submitted to the Assistant Director-General for Culture.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Secretariat for the report on the audit. It also congratulated the new Deputy Director of the World Heritage Centre on her new position. It took note of the recommendations, particularly those relating to the human resources of the World Heritage Centre. With regard to the third recommendation, it noted that this was the mandate of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, and that it would propose an amendment in this regard.

The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the Secretariat for its efforts in the implementation of recommendations and indicated that it looked forward to reviewing the amendments put forward by the Delegation of Mexico.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments provided by the Delegations of Mexico and France.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to include the wording “takes note with appreciation” in paragraph four of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Mexico** suggested that the reference to “Comptroller” be modified to “Bureau of Financial Management”.

La Délégation de la **France** propose l'élimination de la référence au secteur privé.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked for clarification regarding the Delegation of Mexico's proposed amendment on audit plans.

The Delegation of **Mexico** clarified that it wanted to ensure that the information provided in the table under the third recommendation be made available to all States Parties.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 5C** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 5D ROLES OF THE WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE AND THE ADVISORY BODIES

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/5D*

Decision: **35 COM 5D**

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** presented the item, indicating that experts participating in the December 2010 Bahrain meeting concluded that the division of work between the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies was quite clear.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that in practice, the roles of the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies were clear, and suggested an amendment to paragraph four in this sense.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its pleasure about the fact that roles had been clarified. It noted that in the Decision 34 COM 5C (Brasilia, 2010), mention was made of the roles regarding the drafting of the state of conservation reports. It suggested that while roles were clearly described and appropriate, some improvement should be made on the way state of conservation reports should be written. It requested that these reports be more consistently drafted, with regard to both their content and the related Draft Decision. The Delegation of Sweden encouraged the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to continue to reflect on their respective roles in the improvement of the quality of these reports.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 5D** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 5E WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/5E*

Decision: **35 COM 5E**

The **Secretariat** reported that the expert meeting on the relations between the *World Heritage Convention*, Conservation and Sustainable Development (Paraty, Brazil, March 2010) which was also mentioned at the Orientation Session; it also informed on the establishment of an intersectoral group at UNESCO to prepare for the Rio+20 Summit. The positive role of World Heritage for sustainable development can be highlighted in this context. The possibility of convening a consultative meeting was recommended to States Parties but had not received any proposal for hosting the event.

The **Chairperson** commented on the presentation highlighting the absence of propositions from the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Sweden** thanked the Secretariat for the report and indicated that the conservation of sites plays a role in sustainable development which is a precondition to a sustainable society. It expressed its support for the Action Plan.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its satisfaction about the development of the project proposal particularly with regard to capacity-building in Small Islands Developing States (SIDS). It agreed with the content of the programme and its intersectoral approach.

The Delegation of **China** outlined the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of World Heritage properties in the context of sustainable development. It requested that either indicators or a system on the use of sites be developed. This would apply in particular on how to define sustainable use of different sites. The Delegation of **China** suggested to develop a manual for sustainable use of different sites.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne le fait que la notion de développement durable recouvre des réalités différentes en fonction des aires géographiques. Elle note que dans les dossiers d'évaluation de l'ICOMOS, cette notion est insuffisamment prise en compte. Elle encourage à approfondir l'adaptation du concept de développement durable aux spécificités régionales.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to hold a follow-up meeting and expressed its willingness to organize this expert meeting as a preparation to the Rio+20 Summit.

The Delegation of **South Africa** suggested the creation of a working group to address the issue of sustainable development. The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed that this working group could be set up and hosted by Brazil.

La Délégation du **Mali** soutient la remarque de la France sur l'hétérogénéité de la notion de développement durable et approuve la proposition de la Délégation de l'Afrique du Sud de créer un groupe de travail sur cette question.

ICOMOS took the floor on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies to welcome this initiative and indicated that the Advisory Bodies would develop tools as World Heritage is more and more exposed to threats. It concluded by saying that opportunities exist to respond to these threats.

IUCN added that preservation of nature is part of its mandate and World Heritage is exemplary, serving as a reference in this field. IUCN is ready to provide the necessary technical assistance in the elaboration of eventual guidelines.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 4 were adopted. The Chairperson proposed an amendment to paragraph 5 calling for a report on the results of the consultative meeting and thanking the Delegation of Brazil for its offer to host this meeting.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 5E** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 5F WORLD HERITAGE TOURISM PROGRAMME

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/5F*

Decision: **35 COM 5F**

The **Secretariat** informed on the progress in the development of the new and inclusive World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism Programme. The first meeting of the Steering Group was held, chaired by the Delegation of Switzerland, and the design roadmap for the development process was endorsed by the Steering group taking into consideration the need to strengthen the consultative process that reflects a balanced regional representation. The Secretariat confirmed that it would proceed with the agreed process of elaborating the programme and engage a rigorous consultation with States Parties and other stakeholders. An expert meeting would take place in October hosted by the Government of Switzerland. The draft programme structure would outline the objectives of the programme and approach to implementation. It will be shared with States Parties in early 2012 for comment before presenting it to the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session for final consideration.

With regard to the Committee's request to the Director-General of UNESCO to consider the feasibility of a Recommendation on the relationship between heritage conservation and sustainable tourism, a preliminary study was presented to the Executive Board of

UNESCO. The decision on this matter was postponed to the 187th session of the Executive Board in September 2011.

Finally, with respect to the overall interest expressed by States Parties and the importance of tourism as an opportunity for development and yet a challenge in terms of management for World Heritage properties, it underlined the importance of this issue which should be taken into account in the Future of the *Convention* and capacity-building strategies being developed for the overall implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its support for the concept as it was applicable to Small Islands Developing States (SIDS). It expressed the need to explore the concept especially in the light of the 1994 national plan of action which will be beneficial to site inscription.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stressed that it is an important concept. The Director-General already introduced the idea of elaborating the creation of a standard setting instrument. The latter will also be presented at the 18th General Assembly in October 2011. As tourism could be a real challenge to World Heritage sites inscription, there is a need for elaborating a clear policy that leads to the development of the living standard of communities in and around World Heritage sites.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated the Secretariat on its progress report on a new and inclusive Programme on Sustainable Tourism and took note of the first meeting of the Steering Group. It invited States Parties to support it, encouraging them to get in line with the designed process. It informed that Sweden was supporting financially the activities of the Steering Group and that the Nordic World Heritage Fund (NWHF) was providing technical support to this Programme. An announcement was made that the publication on the Nordic-Baltic regional workshop on how to promote World Heritage and Sustainable Tourism through broad-based stakeholder involvement and cooperation (Visby, Gotland, Sweden, October 2010) is now available online at the Nordic World Heritage Fund website.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle l'importance nationale du tourisme et souligne que la Suisse a été un pays précurseur dans le développement du tourisme durable. Elle apporte son soutien au travail du Groupe de pilotage et propose de l'inscrire dans le cadre des réflexions sur l'avenir de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Elle invite à participer à la réunion du groupe d'experts en Suisse, qui illustre le lien entre la préservation du paysage et le développement touristique. Elle encourage le Secrétariat à rechercher des financements pour la mise en œuvre du programme.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** joined the Delegation of Switzerland and other States Parties in emphasizing the need for this Group to look into the relationship between sustainable development and conservation.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its willingness to participate in the activities of the Group.

La Délégation de la **France** se félicite du programme du tourisme durable du patrimoine mondial. Elle souligne que si le tourisme fait certes peser des pressions fortes sur la

préservation des sites, il constitue également un levier économique, en particulier dans les pays en développement. Elle rappelle qu'un débat sur ce thème avait été engagé lors de la 186e session du Conseil exécutif et qu'elle y avait activement participé.

The Delegation of **Egypt** underlined that tourism could also be destructive to society giving as an example the Valley of the Kings. Based on the experience, in 20 to 30 years properties could be seriously damaged. It is recommended to develop a study on this issue.

The Delegation of **Irak** agreed with the Delegation of Egypt citing Babel as an example of an archaeological sites' destruction resulting from tourism which has prevented this property to be inscribed in the World Heritage List. This issue should be looked into.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its view that the Sustainable Tourism Programme should emphasize what an average tourist would experience in a site so that tourists realize the value of heritage.

The **Advisory Bodies** presented a joint statement.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that the working Group was set up with the representation designated by States Parties regional groups. He requested the Delegation of China to consult with its regional group concerning its participation in the Group.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 5F** was adopted as amended.

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

ITEM 6 PROGRESS REPORT ON THE WORLD HERITAGE RELATED CATEGORY 2 CENTRES

Document: *WHC-11/35.COM/6*

Decision: **35 COM 6**

The **Secretariat** informed about a small editorial mistake in the Decision 35 COM 6. The first annual meeting of existing and future category 2 centres was held from 19 to 20 December 2010 in Bahrain. This was the occasion to undertake a mapping exercise of existing training and capacity-building resources. It was also useful to develop an individual strategy for every existing category 2 centre complementary to other category 2 centres. Despite previous technical difficulties the report on this meeting is now accessible online.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated both the World Heritage Centre and the category 2 centres and expressed its appreciation for a coordinated format of the latter, with a view to a result-based management. It supported the capacity-building strategy and the proposed role of category 2 centres to work with the Advisory Bodies. It

congratulated Bahrain for organising the first annual meeting of category 2 centres and encouraged other States Parties to organize such annual meetings in the future.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stressed the fact that category 2 centres are a perfect illustration of Article 7 of the *Convention* regarding an international cooperation system for conservation and insisted to have this reflected in the Draft Decision. It congratulated Spain, India and Barbados for establishing possible category 2 centres in the future.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wished to focus on the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* while respecting certain specificities. It recognized the major role of category 2 centres for building capacities. It indicated that it proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision by e-mail to discuss category 2 centres at the 18 session of the General Assembly, in November 2011.

The Delegation of **Iraq** welcomed the Bahrain category 2 centre and considered it as very important for the Arab Region. It encouraged the cooperation between this category 2 centre and others in the world. It appreciated the commitment of the Delegation of Sweden and was in favour of joining efforts of this category 2 centre with other major stakeholders such as ALECSO for example.

The Delegation of **Egypt** acknowledged support provided to the Bahrain category 2 centre and recalled the promise of the previous Director of the World Heritage Centre to establish a training centre for capacity-building in Cairo, to collaborate with the existing 50 Egyptian universities.

The Delegation of **Jordan** was of the view that the Bahrain category 2 centre is useful. It stressed the fact that there was a repetition in the first annual meeting of category 2 centres in paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Barbados** was supportive of annual meetings to coordinate category 2 centres. It expressed its will to establish a category 2 centre for Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) in Barbados, to work with the University of West Indies in the region. It proposed an amendment to Draft Decision **35 COM 6**.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** recognized the Bahrain category 2 centre as an important capacity-building centre for the whole Middle-East.

The Delegation of **Malta** expressed its intention to establish a category 2 centre in Malta. It will undertake a feasibility study for the creation of a category 2 centre dedicated to Tourism, World Heritage and Culture and Development.

ICCROM took the floor on behalf of the three Advisory Bodies and noted with satisfaction the ongoing progress of World Heritage category 2 centres. It further acknowledged Bahrain for organizing the first category 2 centres meeting and the fact that category 2 centres would represent a useful framework for the capacity-building strategy. It stressed the fact that ICCROM already collaborated with WHITR-AP (World Heritage Training and Research Institute for the Asia and the Pacific Region) and AWHF (African World Heritage Fund) and that ICOMOS had discussions with category 2 centres as well. It concluded by stressing the fact that all collaboration should be made in a concerted manner.

IUCN recognized that category 2 centres are increasing efforts for capacity-building at regional level. It encouraged the Bahrain category 2 centre to work hand in hand with the AWHF, as there was a shortage in terms of scientific knowledge in the region. It was of the view that State institutions need capacity-building and drew the attention on a recent report published by IUCN on natural World Heritage capacity-building.

The Delegation of **South Africa** called for the World Heritage Centre to continue to bring input in the category 2 centres, as they should help improving conservation and building capacities.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendments presented by the Delegations of **South Africa, Bahrain and Barbados**. He started with the three amendments proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Mexico** wished to obtain a clarification on the amendment proposed for paragraph 3. It stated that the results of the Bahrain meeting were not made available and that it was difficult to make decisions in this situation.

The **Chairperson** stipulated that it was a valid observation. However, since it did not impact paragraph 3, she could not take it into account.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested inserting this proposal into the agenda of the 18th session of the General Assembly, to be decided at the end of the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of **Mexico** wished to delete the word 'annual' and requested the report of the Bahrain meeting to be submitted at the 18th session of the General Assembly as well.

The **Chairperson** took note of the fact that this report would be presented at the 18th session of the General Assembly and asked whether the Delegation of Bahrain had any objection.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** confirmed that it had no objection and that the report had to be submitted both at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee and at the 18th session of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** noted that the two States Parties, Mexico and Bahrain were agreeing on this.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked whether one could include IUCN as well.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that this was possible and asked whether there was any objection. She noted a problem in terms of wording as ICCROM is recognized as the leading organization for training.

IUCN indicated that it has a mandate for natural heritage while ICCROM's mandate is limited to cultural heritage.

The **Chairperson** suggested deleting the word 'primarily' as IUCN has to do with capacity-building as well.

La Délégation du **Mali** suggère de supprimer la mention « et ses programmes », jugée redondante, dans la phrase « en partenariat avec l'ICCROM et ses programmes ».

The **Chairperson** confirmed that ICCROM and IUCN had training in their capacities as Advisory Bodies to the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Jordan** insisted in adding 'with other training institutions'.

The **Chairperson** asked whether this mention should be included before or after ICCROM and IUCN.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** a demandé de supprimer la dernière partie et de terminer par un point juste après 'UICN'.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that this would be less complex. She asked whether there was any objection.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** suggère de rajouter l'ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson**, while acknowledging the Delegation of Egypt indicated that training was not part of the mandate of ICOMOS and that the paragraph should be left as it was.

The Delegation of **Iraq** explained that it wished to include ICCROM in this paragraph in order for the Bahrain category 2 centre to be able to carry out its training programmes.

The Draft Decision **33 COM 6** was adopted as amended.

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

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

The **Chairperson** informed that Draft Decision 35 COM. 5 A was now ready. She read the new paragraph 7 and noting no objection declared paragraph 7 adopted.

IUCN pointed out the lack of harmony between the two paragraphs and the two notions of religious and sacred, as raised earlier by the Delegation of Nigeria. It recalled the religious significance of a number of natural heritage properties.

La Délégation de la **France** rappelle que dans la version anglaise c'est le terme « guidance » et non « guidelines » qui a été retenu, aussi elle demande de rectifier la Décision en conséquence.

The **Chairperson** asked whether anyone wished to take IUCN's remarks into consideration.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que si le terme « guidance » est retenu dans la version anglaise, le terme « orientations générales » doit donc être substitué au terme « lignes directrices » dans la version française.

La Délégation de la **France** suggère de ne pas rouvrir le débat sur cette décision qui a déjà fait l'objet de nombreuses consultations, et propose d'adopter la Décision en l'état.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** approuve la proposition de la France et retire ses propositions de modifications de la version française.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 5.A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 5A** of the agenda.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat for several announcements concerning the next day of the session.

The **Secretariat** indicated notably that a USB stick containing all 35th session documents would be distributed, in line with the Greening UNESCO policy.

The meeting rose at 7 pm.

SECOND DAY – Tuesday, 21 JUNE 2011

THIRD MEETING

10 a.m. - 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

**ITEM 7 EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD
HERITAGE PROPERTIES**

**7.1 Recommendations of the International Expert Meeting on World
Heritage and Buffer Zones**

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/7.1*

Decision: **35 COM 7.1**

The **Secretariat** presented the relevant document and the recommendations made by the International Expert Meeting on World Heritage and Buffer Zones (Davos, Switzerland, 2008). It also informed that the publication World Heritage Papers 25 entitled 'World Heritage and Buffer Zones' provides an overview of case studies about communities living in buffer zones, a glossary of terms and other information regarding this topic.

La **Présidente** donne la parole à la Délégation de la **Suisse** qui note la nécessité de protection des biens du patrimoine mondial aussi bien à l'intérieur qu'à l'extérieur de leurs limites et de la nécessité de renforcer les bonnes pratiques. Elle rappelle que depuis la tenue de la Réunion internationale d'experts qui s'est tenue en Suisse à Davos en 2008 sur le Patrimoine mondial et les zones tampons, ce sujet a été abordé plusieurs fois au niveau des procédures. Pour autant, elle rappelle qu'il subsiste toujours une ambiguïté sachant que la zone tampon d'une part n'appartient pas au bien et, que d'autre part, cette zone tampon ne contient pas de valeur universelle exceptionnelle, mais que l'intégrité et la protection du bien devait être garantie par cette même zone tampon. La Délégation indique que des menaces potentielles négatives peuvent se situer hors du périmètre du bien et parfois même en dehors de la zone tampon. La logique voudrait donc que le Comité s'intéresse à ces activités et que ces impacts soient pris en compte au cours de toutes les procédures du patrimoine mondial, comme discuté pendant les sessions du Comité et la réunion d'experts.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its happiness about the successful International Expert Meeting on World Heritage and Buffer Zones in Davos. It stated that buffer zones are very important for the conservation of World Heritage properties and recommended that the publication World Heritage Paper n°25 should be translated into more languages, like Chinese.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the identification of areas outside the properties to safeguard them and considered that the Davos expert meeting clarified many issues on

buffer zones. It suggested maintaining the focus on cultural and natural values and developing research about how the activities affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the properties. It also expressed the importance to develop methods to assess the impact on properties.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the report and the Draft Decision which can be of use especially for the preparation of nominations.

IUCN welcomed the publication of the World Heritage Paper n° 25 as it describes examples of good practices. It pointed out the importance of the buffer zone mechanism but expressed the fact that its implementation varies from one site to the other.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 to 4 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed to add a paragraph 5 that would recognize the adoption of the recommendations resulting from the Davos meeting.

La Délégation de **l’Egypte** signale que de nombreuses discussions et recommandations ont été tenues à la réunion de Davos donnant lieu à un débat politique important sans pour autant avoir abouti à un consensus. Elle noté que ces recommandations n’ont pas été encore discutées par le Comité et qu’il faut donc en tenir compte pour ce point.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that paragraph 4 was sufficient and that paragraph 5 was not needed.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed that it did not want to insist on the amendment and withdrew it.

The Delegation of **China** indicated its wish to add a paragraph 5 which would welcome States Parties to refine and put in place relevant legal tools or management plans concerning the conservation of properties and management of buffer zones. Regarding this draft amendment, **the Chairperson** proposed to change the word “encourages” instead of “welcomes”.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal of the Delegation of China as amended by the Chairperson.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7.1** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 7.1** of the Agenda.

ITEM 7.2 EVALUATION OF THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM

Document: WHC-11/35.COM/7.2

Decision: **35 COM 7.2**

The **Secretariat** presented Document WHC-11/35.COM/7.2 and indicated that, in line of Decision 34 COM 7.2 (Brasilia, 2010), it laid out a short overview of the application of the

Reinforced monitoring mechanism since its establishment. The Secretariat pointed out that 14 properties have been subject to reactive monitoring missions, 12 cases following a decision by the Committee and 2 following a decision by the Director-General of UNESCO. It also indicated that the document shows that, while the primary objective of the mechanism was to enhance communication with the concerned States Parties and ensuring that the Committee is informed about the developments in between sessions, only in a few cases this reporting was requested by the Committee. The Secretariat also informed that the evaluation shows that a major weakness of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism is the lack of a mechanism to respond to the information provided to the Committee within sessions and that a possible solution to this would be for the Committee to mandate the Chairperson, in consultation with the 5 Vice Chairs, to request specific actions from the concerned States Parties in follow up to the reports. However, this would need a change in the Rules of Procedure. The Secretariat explained the main recommendations included in the document and clarified that the budget proposed in paragraph 6 of the Decision is for the biennium 2012-2013.

IUCN explained that at the 33rd session, some modifications were already made to clarify the process, to reinforce the mechanism and to make it more efficient for sites already inscribed on the Danger List. It also stated that the information provided between the sessions was useful and important but that today this mechanism has not succeeded in mobilizing action. It also pointed out the importance of ensuring that the mechanism does not increase the burden of financial and human resources. In reference to the Dakar meeting, it recommended using the existent mechanisms included in the *Operational Guidelines* instead of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

The Delegation of **Jordan** pointed out the need to strengthen the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism, especially for sites in danger and stated, for example, that these missions were supposed to go to Jerusalem since 2008. The Delegation expressed that Israel refused the missions despite the fact that destructive activities has been taking place on the site. It also expressed that the budget allocated to the 14 sites was insufficient and that it should be increased.

The Delegation of **Estonia** clarified a proposed amendment pointing out that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism has not shown its effectiveness and that it should be discontinued. Referring to the recommendations made in Dakar, it advised that the mechanism should be activated only for exceptional and urgent cases. The Delegation stated that effective mechanisms are needed to inform the Committee between its ordinary sessions and proposed to combine the reactive monitoring missions and Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism under one budget.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed that the evaluation report underlines that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism should be used in a restricted manner and supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported previous declarations by delegations about the need of a very clear mechanism in the *Operational Guidelines* and a clear mandate and time slot for the properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation supported the proposal of the Secretariat about merging the budget for the different mechanisms.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested an amendment based on the deliberations of the Committee in Christchurch meeting and stated that if the mechanism is to be maintained it should be applied with the cooperation of the State Party.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** pointed out that all monitoring missions by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies are always done with the cooperation of the State Party concerned and upon invitation. He also expressed that the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism enables the Director-General to undertake missions between sessions, if urgently needed, and that once the mission is done, the report is presented to the Committee for evaluation. He suggested that the provision should be integrated without giving a title to the mechanism and avoiding complexity on its perception.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique avoir suivi avec attention la proposition de la Délégation de l'Estonie et souligne que la valeur du mécanisme de suivi renforcé repose sur les moyens d'intervention qu'octroie ce processus à la Directrice Générale et au Centre du patrimoine mondial durant la période entre chaque session du Comité. Elle précise qu'il faudrait maintenant concrétiser ces actions et procéder à l'examen de la Décision et notamment de l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Estonie, amendement que la Délégation de la Suisse soutient.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Le **Rapporteur** souligne que 3 amendements ont été déposés par les Délégations de l'Estonie, de la Jordanie et de l'Australie. Paragraph 1 and 2 were adopted.

The **Chairperson** announced the amendments to paragraph 3 proposed by the Delegation of Estonia

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** indique avoir pris connaissance de l'amendement présenté par la Délégation de l'Estonie mais précise que le mécanisme de suivi renforcé a montré son efficacité. Elle n'est donc pas en mesure d'accepter l'amendement proposé.

La Délégation de la **France** partage les réticences de la Délégation de l'Egypte concernant l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Estonie. Elle considère qu'il ne faut pas interrompre le mécanisme de suivi renforcé alors que celui-ci a fait ses preuves comme outil pour les biens placés sur la Liste en péril. Elle ajoute qu'il faudrait perfectionner cet outil plutôt que de l'interrompre et soutient la Délégation de l'Egypte en ce sens.

The Delegations of **Bahrain** and **Jordan** supported the proposal of the Delegations of France and Egypt and considered too premature to stop the process at this moment.

The Delegation of **Estonia** explained that this amendment was connected to paragraph 4 of the same Draft Decision and that both should be revised together.

The **Chairperson** asked the States Parties to look at this issue before continuing the decision-making.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that the decision of the Director-General to undertake missions was effective and in concordance with what was required by the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Mexico** suggested the Chairperson to set a working group to take a more extensive look on this matter.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'il est important de considérer la proposition de la Délégation de l'Estonie à propos du paragraphe 4 bis dans le contexte du paragraphe 3 et a réitéré le fait que pour elle le mécanisme de suivi renforcé n'avait pas fait ses preuves. Elle énonce 2 possibilités: soit d'établir un groupe de travail comme demandé par la Délégation du Mexique, soit d'apporter une solution concrète et efficace répondant aux besoins exprimés par le Secrétariat et reflété dans le paragraphe 4 bis présenté par la Délégation de l'Estonie. Cette dernière solution permettrait d'avancer des travaux longs et ardues déjà réalisés et de donner la possibilité au Centre du patrimoine mondial de mettre en oeuvre le travail de sauvegarde dont il a la charge et dont l'Etat partie a aussi la charge.

La Délégation de la **France** note que le mécanisme de suivi renforcé n'existe que depuis quelques années et qu'il serait prématuré de le changer ou de le supprimer, mais qu'il faudrait plutôt l'améliorer pour les biens inscrits sur la Liste en péril.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souligne que le mécanisme de suivi renforcé est récent et a fait ses preuves et appuie la Délégation de la France dans ses propos pour que ce mécanisme soit amélioré. Elle note que le paragraphe 4 présenté avant cette discussion couvre plus largement le paragraphe 4 bis tel que proposé par la Délégation de l'Estonie, et n'accepte donc pas ce paragraphe 4 bis.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique ne pas souhaiter supprimer le processus de suivi réactif qui est une preuve de la présence de l'UNESCO auprès des sites qui en ont besoin.

The **Chairperson** informed the Delegation of Estonia that there was no support for its proposal among the Committee members. She suggested suspending the discussions on the Decision, to allow for the Committee to come to an agreement and refer back to her by the end of the day or latest tomorrow morning.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed and said that it preferred to see all proposed amendments before coming to a conclusion.

The **Chairperson** announced that the Committee would receive paper copies of the proposed amendments, as requested by the Delegations of Australia and Egypt, for its consideration.

In consequence, the **Chairperson** suspended discussion on item 7.2 of the Agenda.

ITEM 7C REFLECTION ON THE TRENDS OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/7C
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C

Decisions: 35 COM 7C

The **Chairperson** indicated that an expert meeting had been organized to discuss the global state of conservation challenges for World Heritage properties in Dakar, Senegal, on 13-15 April 2011. She mentioned that many challenges exist and referred to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010) which reviewed an analytical summary of the perceived threats and how to identify and react to emerging threats.

The item was introduced by the **Secretariat**. The 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010) examined the first trends in threats by a 5 year overview; this showed the need for a comprehensive system to evaluate the state of conservation. Reflections have been initiated together with the Advisory Bodies on modalities and mechanisms, whose results will be presented to the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee. Le Secrétariat explique que la réunion de Dakar a été organisée avec le soutien des gouvernements du Sénégal et de l'Australie, afin de répondre aux défis globaux de l'état de conservation des biens du patrimoine mondial et de profiter de l'expérience de l'Afrique comme étude de cas. Il présente ensuite les recommandations principales figurant dans le Document WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7C.

IUCN, on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, stated that the number of sites has increased significantly, thus stressing the need for improved monitoring of the state of conservation. It welcomes the outcome of the Dakar meeting, in particular its recommendations regarding an online database. It announced that IUCN is planning to compile the information collected over the years for natural properties in a database. It also mentioned that this covers part of the mixed properties, but that IUCN does not have information available for all mixed properties. It also mentioned the new GIS capacity at IUCN, thanks to the recruitment of new staff based in Cambridge.

The Delegation of **Sweden** underlined the need to establish clear guidelines regarding the desired state of conservation for the removal of a property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also mentioned that the decisions regarding properties on the List of World Heritage in Danger is too often a mixture of regrets, advice, demands and that there are often new requests added based on new missions sent to the property. It stated that a better prioritization is needed. The Delegation also mentioned that a similar approach is needed for properties which are not on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It highlighted that a number of conservation issues should be referred to the Periodic Reporting exercises rather than being followed by successive Reactive Monitoring missions; and it proposed a shift from reactive monitoring to periodic monitoring that would not only improve monitoring and reporting, but also reduce the workload.

The Delegation of **Australia** stressed the importance of reflecting on trends in the state of conservation of properties, because it allows for more general discussions rather than site-by-site considerations. Regarding the Dakar meeting, it appreciated to learn about the linkages between decisions taken by the World Heritage Committee and challenges faced by site managers and the fact that many site managers found the decisions to be

helpful. It also mentioned the need to improve the ways in which site managers work, in particular by the development of tools which should not be uniquely based on resources available under the *Convention* or within UNESCO, but which should look beyond that.

The Delegation of **Estonia** drew the attention on the need for drafting state of conservation reports for properties subject to Reactive Monitoring, and not solely for properties inscribed on List of World Heritage in Danger. It stressed parallels between this Item and Items 12A and 12B and that it will be a crucial element in reducing the workload of the Committee as well as of the States Parties.

The Delegation of **South Africa** mentioned that if this issue is not handled correctly it will not only affect the properties but also the integrity of the *Convention* as a whole. It welcomed the good handling of this issue by the Advisory Bodies. It mentioned that since the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee (Christchurch, 2006), the Committee has requested States Parties to submit drafts of the desired state of conservation for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger, and stated that no property should be on the List of World Heritage in Danger without having a desired state of conservation developed. It therefore proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision in this regard.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** se joint aux autres Délégations pour souligner que ce point est très important, et remercie le Centre pour la qualité du document et pour son aide pour guider les gestionnaires de sites qui sont confrontés sur le plan opérationnel à des problèmes généraux pour lesquels ils n'ont pas de réponse ni d'outils pour les gérer ; les gestionnaires de biens ont besoin de ce genre d'outils.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed with previous speakers, especially with the proposal from the Delegation of Sweden to move from reactive to periodic monitoring, as well as with the proposal made by the Delegation of Estonia. It also wanted to add to the proposal from the Delegation of South Africa that such desired state of conservation should be prepared in full consultation with the State Party concerned.

IUCN agreed with the principles outlined by the Delegation of Brazil. It confirmed that these desired state of conservation documents should be prepared quickly and be fully agreed upon by the State Party. It added that the proposal from the Delegation of South Africa presented an ideal picture, but that in reality this often concerns a long process together with the State Party.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted.

Le **Rapporteur** rappelle qu'un amendement est présenté par la Délégation de la Suisse portant sur le paragraphe 5bis et donne lecture de l'amendement affiché à l'écran.

IUCN added that it would be useful to reflect on the implications of the proposed amendment, since the timing of missions is not in the hands of the World Heritage Centre or the Advisory Bodies, as these missions need to be requested by the State Party. It added that the current proposal gave the impression that missions would be limited to the period ranging from 1 September to 1 February, which is not possible for many countries due to seasonal conditions.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** proposed to add “as soon as possible” in order to address this concern. He added that reports can be circulated earlier if this is acceptable to the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** assure le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives de son appréciation quant à l’aide apportée aux Etats parties. Elle se soucie également des cas où les rapports de mission sont transmis tardivement. Aussi elle propose que la fin de la phrase soit coupée et que l’on s’arrête à « dès que possible ».

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the request to produce mission reports as soon as possible and supported any steps taken in that regard.

Paragraph 5bis and paragraph 6 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** announced that an amendment to paragraph 7 was submitted by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed further amendments to that submission based on the interventions made by IUCN. It proposed to read paragraph 7 as follows: “Also requests the Advisory Bodies to develop the desired state of conservation in collaboration with the State Party, before the site is inscribed in the List of World Heritage in Danger.”

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal.

IUCN mentioned that practical aspects should be taken into account, as there are cases in which a State Party requests for a property to be added to the List of World Heritage in Danger without having enough time to develop such a desired state of conservation. It requested to include this kind of cases.

The **Chairperson** suggested including “where possible”.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** mentionne que selon les règles, l’Etat partie peut inscrire « à tout moment » un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et un état de conservation souhaité de ne peut pas toujours être préparé avant. Elle s’oppose donc au paragraphe amendé.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the proposal brought forward by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the suggestion made by the Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to paragraph 193 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and added that this decision should be developed in line with this paragraph.

The Delegation of **Estonia** proposed to specify “before the site is proposed to be inscribed”.

The Delegation of **China** supported the proposal by the Delegation of South Africa, and added that the desired state of conservation would contribute to the conservation situation of sites.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est préoccupée par le fait que ce paragraphe se présente comme une condition que l'amendement atténue certes, mais trouve peu approprié d'introduire un tel paragraphe. Elle considère ce point fondamental et demande au Conseiller juridique s'il faut, selon les textes, avoir le consentement de l'Etat partie pour inscrire un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Legal Advisor** referred to paragraph 193 of the *Operational Guidelines* and clarified that when a property had been seriously deteriorated, the State Party should inform the Committee, but that there was no need for the State Party's permission for the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande alors que l'amendement soit supprimé.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested to use paragraph 193 of the *Operational Guidelines* as a basis for a revised decision and proposed: "when considering the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, the Committee shall develop and adopt, as far as possible, in consultation with the State Party concerned, a desired state of conservation for the property and a programme for corrective measures."

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported this proposal. The Delegation specified that a different order of words would be needed as a decision is to start with a verb like "requests".

The **Chairperson** proposed to start by the first part of the proposal made by the Delegation of South Africa which reads "Also requests the Advisory Bodies", followed by the proposal by the Delegation of Australia which reads: "when considering ..."

The Delegation of **Estonia** said that there is no need to repeat the text of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to the proposal made by the Chairperson and said that this meant that the Advisory Bodies consider properties to be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger which is not the case.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of South Africa, which was also supported by the Delegation of China. It mentioned that there is no difference between this proposal based on the *Operational Guidelines* and the proposal made by the Delegation of South Africa.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** referred to the intention of the Delegation of South Africa to include the desired state of conservation when a property is proposed for inscription to the List of World Heritage in Danger. He referred to the intervention by the Delegation of Australia about the fact that this is already included in paragraph 193 of the *Operational Guidelines*. Therefore, the Director suggested recalling paragraph 193 of

the *Operational Guidelines* and amending it by including the need to add the desired state of conservation.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que du copier/coller des paragraphes 193 à 196 est fait et n'en voit pas l'intérêt. Elle soutient la proposition de la Délégation de l'Estonie.

The Delegation of **Australia** referred to the suggestion made by the Director of the World Heritage Centre and proposed a revised paragraph reading as follows: "Decides to amend paragraph 193 of the *Operational Guidelines* to read ..." followed by a phrase related to the desired state of conservation, as a way to avoid discussions on who is responsible for what since this is all included in the *Operational Guidelines*.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient les propositions des Délégations de la Suisse et de l'Estonie.

The Delegations of **South Africa** and **Brazil** agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia.

The **Chairperson** proposed to suspend Item 7C in order for the Committee to prepare a proper formulation for paragraph 7. She added that this Item will be reopened when the Committee is ready.

Noting no objection on this proposal, the **Chairperson** suspended Item 7C of the Agenda.

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

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/7A
WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add
WHC-11/35.COM/7A.Add.Corr (for the French version only)
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.7A

Decisions: **35 COM 7A.15 and 16 and 35 COM 7A.1 and 2**

The **Chairperson** opened the Item and announced the order of decisions which would start with natural properties (16 properties) followed by cultural properties (18 properties). She further explained that the regions will be discussed in the following order: Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific and Europe and North America. She regretted that the statutory deadline for the submission of State Party state of conservation reports was not respected by all States Parties neither were the working languages of the *World Heritage Convention* and UNESCO. She called upon the States Parties to adhere to statutory deadlines. She gave the floor to the Secretariat to commence Item 7A with Latin America and the Caribbean.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

Belize Barrier Reef Reserve System (Belize) (N 764)

The **Secretariat** stated that no new information was received on this property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** appreciated the implementation of the corrective measure that addresses the threat of invasive species and the publication of information on land ownership within the property. The Delegation further requested details on the steps taken by the State Party of Belize with regard to land ownership issues.

The **Chairperson** noted that the Observer Delegation of **Belize** was not present to respond.

In the absence of any amendments, the Draft Decision **35 COM 7A 15** was adopted.

Los Katios National Park (Colombia) (N 711)

The **Secretariat** indicated the threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger which include illegal logging, unauthorized settlements, fishing and hunting as well as threats from major infrastructure projects. Moreover, the Secretariat informed the Committee that the joint World Heritage Centre/ IUCN reactive monitoring mission requested since the 33rd session of the World Heritage Committee (Seville, 2009) had to be postponed due to security concerns, which resulted in additional delays in the review of the proposal for the desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger and the interim corrective measures. The Secretariat concluded by recommending that, if security issues are not resolved, the State Party invites a joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN mission to Bogotá before the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012, in lieu of a mission to the property to assist the State Party in the formulation of the definition of a desired state of conservation for the removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. It noted that in the Draft Decision, the last paragraph on maintaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger has been omitted by mistake.

IUCN commended the strong collaboration with the National Parks Authority, especially with regard to putting together the interim corrective measures.

The **Secretariat** recommended retaining the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the Decision be adopted without reference to the last paragraph on procedure, due to the fact that the procedure was amended at the

beginning of the Committee, but that this change will come into force only at the 36th session of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** proposed the addition of completed the Decision by adding a paragraph to retain the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Observer Delegation of **Colombia** informed the Committee that the property has been on the List of World Heritage in Danger since 2009 and that the National Parks Authority has developed an emergency plan for the conservation of the property which is enforced through a regular contact with the World Heritage Centre. It supported the suggested mission to Bogota given the United Nations' negative recommendation for travel to Los Katíos National Park at this point in time. Moreover, Columbia referred to its request for International Assistance for the amount of 20,000 US\$ in order to organize an institutional meeting on the conservation of the property. It confirmed that it has submitted all required documents for this request.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.16 was** adopted as amended.

AFRICA

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

The **Secretariat** indicated the threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger which include illegal grazing, uncontrolled poaching by heavily armed groups and subsequent loss of up to 80% of the Park's wildlife as well as a deteriorating security situation and a halt to tourism. The Secretariat stressed that there is little time to prevent the property from losing its Outstanding Universal Value and warned that it meets the criteria for delisting. Therefore, removal from the World Heritage List might have to be considered in the near future.

L'**UICN** souligne la nécessité que l'Etat partie organise un atelier en vue d'élaborer un plan d'urgence, en considérant une zone prioritaire. Un appui peut être sollicité à cet effet auprès du Fonds du patrimoine mondial. Elle rappelle qu'un plan d'urgence sur trois ans avait été proposé en 2009 à l'Etat Partie dans le cadre du programme des aires protégées d'Afrique de l'Ouest et Centrale. Ce plan d'action peut servir de base de travail en vue de l'organisation de l'atelier. Elle encourage l'Etat Partie à exprimer son point de vue sur cette possibilité.

The **Chairperson** wished to give the floor to the Observer Delegation of the **Central African Republic** who was not present in the room.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its concern over the property's loss of Outstanding Universal Value as this loss affects the international community. It urged the Committee to guarantee the maintenance of World Heritage properties.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed concern about the possibility of future removal of the property from the World Heritage List and considered the proposal by the Secretariat to rebuild the Outstanding Universal Value based on the wildlife population in the

adjacent hunting areas a suitable mean to maintain the property on the World Heritage List. It encouraged a strong collaboration between the State Party and the World Heritage Centre.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique que l'information concernant la compagnie pétrolière chinoise, qui serait installée sur le site depuis janvier 2011, est erronée. Après consultation avec l'Etat Partie, il s'avère que la compagnie pétrolière a engagé des prospections à 400 kilomètres du site et non pas dans le périmètre du site. Elle recommande à cet effet que l'information soit vérifiée et rectifiée. Elle soutient également la proposition d'organisation d'un atelier formulée par l'UICN et encourage l'Etat Partie à s'impliquer dans l'élaboration du plan d'urgence.

La Délégation de la **République Centrafricaine** (Observateur) se félicite de la qualité du travail engagé. Elle remercie la Délégation du Mali pour les précisions apportées concernant l'exploitation pétrolière et confirme que l'information figurant dans le projet de Décision est erronée. Les prospections pétrolières ont été engagées à 400 kilomètres au nord du site et non pas dans le périmètre du bien. Elle est consciente de la pertinence des recommandations formulées et salue la proposition de l'UICN d'établir un plan d'urgence. Elle affirme son engagement de contribuer financièrement à la mise en œuvre du plan d'urgence, tout en sollicitant l'appui de l'UNESCO pour la mobilisation de financements complémentaires. Elle informe enfin les membres du Comité et l'UICN que les contraintes de sécurité au sein du Parc sont en voie d'être allégées, un accord de paix ayant été signé avec les rebelles il y a une semaine.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 to 3 were adopted as amended.

In view of paragraph 4, the Delegation of **Brazil** noted that the mentioned developments are outside of the boundaries of the property.

The Delegation of **China** supported the point made by the Delegation of Brazil with regard to the location of the developments.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** sollicite auprès de l'UICN des informations complémentaires, pour évaluer si les prospections pétrolières constitueraient toujours une menace pour l'intégrité du bien, dans l'hypothèse où elles seraient situées à 400 kilomètres du site.

The **Secretariat** clarified that paragraph 4 while petroleum prospecting and mining is said by the State Party to be outside the property with small scale diamond mining occurring within the property.

IUCN stated that the information submitted by the State Party on the location of oil exploration is new. If the oil is located 400 km away from the site, it is likely that the impact on the site is low, but this information needs to be checked carefully.

The **Chairperson** stated that keeping the term "mining" in paragraph 4 seems essential. The Delegation of **China** suggested to keep the term "mining", but to delete "petroleum".

Paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision was adopted as amended. Paragraph 5 and 6 were adopted.

Concerning paragraph 7 the Delegation of **Brazil** referred to the emergency plan mentioned in the State Party report and requested the World Heritage Centre to support a corresponding workshop.

The **Secretariat** suggested the submission of an International Assistance request for this purpose if necessary and pointed out limited resources.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that this point has been included in paragraph 7.

The Draft decision **35 COM 7A.1** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated the threats for which the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger which include potential impacts of civil unrest, the decrease of large mammal populations due to increased and uncontrolled poaching as well as the lack of effective management mechanisms. The Secretariat concluded that the property's Outstanding Universal Value is increasingly degrading if no effective measures are being taken and stated that the instability of the country has impacted negatively on the property. Correspondingly, the site was recommended for retention on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN confirmed the negative impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value, but expressed optimism that the integrity of the property can be restored. In that context, the Advisory Body stressed the need of an effective monitoring system and suggested the designation of a team in charge of its implementation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested further information on specific measures undertaken by the State Party in the implementation of the 2010 recommendations. It assumed, however, that progress has been undertaken by the State Party, including an increase in the staff of the National Park.

La Délégation de la **Côte d'Ivoire** (Observateur) indique que beaucoup d'efforts ont été entrepris pour la mise en œuvre des recommandations, notamment au travers du renforcement de l'équipe sur le terrain. Il ajoute qu'un plan d'urgence a été élaboré et précise que le récent conflit armé n'a pas affecté le périmètre du bien. Il ajoute enfin que le plan de réhabilitation établi en 2010 avec l'UICN est en cours de finalisation.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.2** was adopted.

ITEM 7C REFLECTION ON THE TRENDS OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION (continuation)

The **Chairperson** asked for the amended Decision **35 COM 7C** to be read out having being informed that a consensus had been reached on this matter.

The **Rapporteur** read the amended paragraph 7 of the Decision.

The **Draft** Decision **35 COM 7C** was adopted as amended.

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

SECOND DAY – TUESDAY, 21 JUNE 2011

FOURTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

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

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

The **Secretariat** reported that there is no new information on this property since the preparation of the working document.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** recognized efforts made by Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea and Liberia to eliminate threats from this property, especially through tri-party agreement which is a good example of international cooperation within the context of the *World Heritage Convention*. Nevertheless Nigeria said that threats to the property should be eliminated completely before removing the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. In view of the lack of political stability in the three States Parties and significant progress made by Guinea on the legal status of the property, Nigeria wished to encourage the World Heritage Centre and IUCN to clearly indicate a desired state of conservation of this property before removing it from the List of World Heritage in Danger by 2012.

IUCN responded to the point made by the Delegation of Nigeria that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is now being completed and agreed therefore that it is now an appropriate time to define the desired state of conservation. This should be the priority in coming years.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.3** was adopted.

World Heritage properties of the Democratic Republic of the Congo(RDC)

The **Secretariat** presented the general report of the status of properties in the Democratic Republic of the Congo as requested by the Committee, and informed that the report mentioned about the high-level meeting (Kinshasa, DRC, 14 January 2011), resulted in signing the Kinshasa Declaration by the Director -General of UNESCO and

the Prime Minister of the DRC. The Secretariat invited the State Party and IUCN for their comments.

IUCN welcomed the conclusion of the meeting, and said that the Kinshasa Declaration would draw the attention of the international community to continue its support for securing and rehabilitating the property. IUCN noted that it remains concerned by the ongoing difficult working conditions for ICCN staff and consistent reports from all the 5 properties about continued involvement of elements of the Congolese Army in illegal exploitation of their natural resources. It considered that this issue should be addressed as a matter of priority as a concrete demonstration of the commitments expressed in the Kinshasa Declaration.

La Délégation de la **République démocratique du Congo** a réitéré ses remerciements à la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO, à la Présidente du Comité du patrimoine mondial et au Centre du patrimoine mondial pour l'énergie déployée à l'occasion de la réunion du 14 janvier 2011 à Kinshasa. Il s'agissait d'une réunion historique qui a permis de valoriser le travail accompli sur le terrain, qui est difficile. Cela a aussi permis de mobiliser le gouvernement de la République démocratique du Congo et les partenaires afin de mettre en place le plan de stratégie issu de la réunion. De plus, la Délégation de la RDC a exprimé le besoin d'appui et de soutien pour mettre en oeuvre les mesures correctives et elle reste optimiste.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.35** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** reported new information: while security did improve in 2009 and 2010, over the recent months, the situation has aggravated again with widespread attacks by rebels and bandit groups on vehicles taking the road through the Park and on Park staff. As recent as 9 June 2011, one soldier was killed and 2 guards wounded in a clash with rebels poaching in the Park while on 5 June 2011 a convoy of the Park was attacked which resulted in the killing one guard and wounding another. Over recent weeks, there have been numerous reports of new organized massive invasions into the site, often with the complicity of local politicians. Regarding oil exploration, on 14 March 2011, the Minister of Environment, Nature Conservation and Tourism of the DRC announced the Government's decision to suspend petroleum exploration in the property, following the commitments made in the Declaration of Kinshasa, and pending the Strategic Environmental Assessment.

IUCN regretted the tragic loss of life and violence that continues to affect those working to protect and manage Virunga National Park. IUCN remained extremely concerned by the proposals of SOCO Exploration and Production and Dominion Petroleum Congo and the Congolese Parastatal Hydrocarbons Company (COHYDRO) to prospect for oil within the property. IUCN considered that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property could still be recovered, although it would take at least 10 years to rebuild the dwindling wildlife populations. Based on the recommendations of the mission, an updated list of corrective measures was included in the Draft Decision. A desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger is included in the mission report.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked to elaborate the file regarding the involvement of local communities. Despite various threats in the property, two items related to communities seem positive: sharing profit with local communities and the promotion of alternative energy which is important to reduce the pressure on the illegal charcoal production, and asked for any trend in the shift in increasing towards the use of alternative energy.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted with appreciation the Declaration of Kinshasa and encouraged the government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to closely work with IUCN and the Centre to implement collective measures. South Africa also wished to encourage the international community to support efforts made by the State Party.

La Délégation du **Mali** félicite la République démocratique du Congo et l'UNESCO pour la tenue de cette rencontre de haut niveau et encourage la poursuite des efforts. La Délégation félicite également, en ligne avec la Déclaration de Kinshasa, la suspension des activités de prospection pétrolière. Toutefois, elle souligne que la question est de savoir comment réconcilier la protection, la valeur universelle exceptionnelle et les besoins réels de développement.

The **Secretariat** responded regarding the trend on energy use. Currently two efforts are ongoing in Virunga National Park – a deforestation project around the Park and the development of alternatives for charcoal. However as the charcoal trade in the region attracts business, enforcement remains the important issue to be able to ensure stopping the charcoal trade. Many reports say that the charcoal trade is contributing to finance some army groups, thus this is a complex issue.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.4** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** informed that no new information was received since the preparation of the working document.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its concern that no desired state of conservation for the removal of this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger had been established. It encouraged the State Party to maintain its commitment to the Declaration of Kinshasa.

The **Secretariat** responded in terms of a desired state of conservation, announcement was made last year that the mission went to the site and developed the indicators for the desired state of conservation. The indicators are partially related to the population of wild life. The problem is that there are no recent inventories of the site, thus there is no baseline to fix the numbers of wildlife population and how the wildlife population are recovering. The Centre is waiting for the inventory to be done, and then clear target for different species for a desired state of conservation would be determined.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.5** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** reported new information received recently that the aerial survey which was planned for May, did not take place because of problems with the survey plane. In the meantime, it is too late to conduct the survey this year, as many elephants already moved to the hunting areas around the park and so the survey has to be postponed again to next year. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN note that the survey results are crucial to set a baseline and to determine precise indicators for the desired state of conservation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked clarification on the case of northern sub-species of the white rhino which seems extinct and is waiting for the final result of the aerial survey that would help clarifying if the Outstanding Universal Value under criterion (x) is affected.

The Delegation of **South Africa** took note the response of IUCN and reiterates the need to continue supporting the State Party in its efforts to implement the corrective measures.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.6** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** reported that no new information was received.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.7** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** reported new information recently received on the investigations carried out by the State Party to dismantle poaching networks operating at the site. The research by the Park Authorities shows that various armed gangs continue to set up poaching activities based at the mining areas to the south of the Reserve. Certain elements of the military are thought to be involved and this would explain why poachers are well armed and dispose of large quantities of ammunition. The implication of certain members of the armed forces was also demonstrated on 1 May, when 60 pieces of ivory with a total weight of 137 kg were seized from a vehicle which had on its board an army lieutenant and 2 military Auditors from Kisangani. The fact that poaching is still not under control is also demonstrated by the preliminary results of the 2011 wildlife survey. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that in line with the Kinshasa Declaration, the Government should take urgent actions to curb commercial poaching in the Reserve.

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that assistance should be given by international community; and would like to see some improvement in the next session. It asked about the status of the desired state of conservation.

The **Secretariat** responded that the desired state of conservation has been established already, and the indicators for the removal are laid out in different document.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.8** was adopted.

Simien National Park (Ethiopia) (N 9)

The **Secretariat** noted that the state of conservation report was not received to the Centre to date, therefore there is little information.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** commented on the extension of the boundary of the property and asked the clarification from the Centre and IUCN if this project for potential upstream support which will help the State Party to develop a new nomination and asked the State Party to respond to this.

IUCN responded to Bahrain's observation that it was not a site selected, but considered the site met the criteria for up-stream support. IUCN office in Nairobi also recognized as a priority, IUCN is ready to offer support if the State Party wish so.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Ethiopia to respond to the question raised by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** responded that Ethiopia works with IUCN to remove the site from the List of World Heritage in Danger. The government tries to elevate the level of administration. It noted that the management of the site had been transferred back from the State level to the federal level. This transfer took time, and Ethiopia felt agreeing to accept the decision.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.9** was adopted.

Rainforests of the Atsinanana (Madagascar) (N 1257)

The **Secretariat** reported that the joint World Heritage Centre IUCN mission visited the property from 23 to 31 May 2011. The mission could not be organized earlier in order to allow for the preliminary impact assessment studies and inventories of threats funded through the International Assistance to be completed. Given the late date of the mission, it was not possible to include its findings into the working document.

The mission was able to visit the two components of the serial property, which have been affected by the illegal logging activities, which motivated the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The mission found that illegal logging has been halted in Marojejy National Park, but is continuing in Masoala National park. It showed a map with the 19 valleys that have been affected in Marojejy National Park. In Masoala, logging is moving deeper into the forest along the rivers that allow easy evacuation of the logs. In addition the mission noted that the illegal logging has started spreading to other protected areas.

The mission took note of the ongoing efforts of the State Party to address the issue and to implement the Decree 2010-141 of March 2010, which is prohibiting all cutting, exploitation and exportation of rosewood and ebony. However it received numerous reports from stakeholders that the decree is not fully applied yet.

The main reasons for this seem to be the fact that the decree continues to be circumvented by certain authorities and that most of the people and companies involved in the illegal trade are expecting that new exceptions to the decree will be granted in the future, as it had been the case in the past. The fact that so far no action has been undertaken against the existing stocks of rosewood stocks which are to be considered illegal, is another major issue, as wood illegally exported from these stocks is apparently quickly replaced by freshly cut logs. The mission was informed that according to the official inventory by the Forest Department, these stocks contain at present 120,000 logs. The mission also noted a strong increase in the rate of deforestation in Masoala National Park. This deforestation is not directly linked to the illegal logging but to slash and burn agriculture.

In terms of the outstanding universal value, the mission concluded that the values which lead to the inscription of the site under criterion (ix) and (x) have been impacted in the areas where logging took place. However these impacts have not yet jeopardized the overall values of the site. If the logging is not brought under control and more areas are affected, certain values of the property could be lost. The mission also concluded that logging crisis and the increased deforestation have seriously affected the overall integrity of Masoala National park.

The Secretariat informed that it received the previous Friday from the Ministry of Forest and Environment a proposed action plan to address the corrective measures. However, it could not yet be reviewed by the Centre or IUCN, and the Secretariat asked the State Party to give further information on this.

The **Chairperson** informed that the revised decision was circulated in the room.

IUCN informed that, 9 corrective measures have been developed in order to restore the integrity of the site, which are included in the revised draft decision. Four foresee urgent actions to address the illegal logging, in particular the confiscation of illegal stocks but also the inscription of rosewood species under appendix 2 and 3 of CITES. A Desired state of conservation for removal of the property from the List of World Heritage in Danger was also developed, comprised of 4 specific indicators. The mission also considered that the corrective measures could be implemented over a period of 2 years.

The mission also reiterated the need for other States Parties to the *Convention* to take the necessary measures to close their markets for illegal wood from Madagascar. The CITES listing could be a key element in that.

IUCN wished to emphasize its serious concern about of the increase in lemur bushmeat hunting within those components of the property affected by the illegal logging of precious woods. Some species like the Red-ruffed lemur, which is found only in Masoala National Park are at great risk.

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) remercie le Comité, suite à l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril lors de la 34eme session (Brasilia, 2010), de la mission conjointe de suivi réactif et des mesures correctives proposées. Sur cette base, la Délégation de Madagascar propose un plan d'action engageant le gouvernement, la fondation des aires protégées et de la biodiversité, et le Madagascar National Parks à mettre en place les mesures correctives dans un délai de deux ans. Le

plan d'action a été envoyé au Centre du patrimoine mondial et à l'UICN pour étude et approbation. La Délégation de Madagascar reste disponible pour améliorer le document. Les grandes lignes de ce plan d'action sont reprises dans le projet de décision. La Délégation rappelle que la mise en place de ce plan d'action aura besoin d'un soutien financier conséquent. Elle remercie également la Bulgarie et la Norvège pour leur soutien et appelle tous les bailleurs de fonds à rester ouverts quant à un soutien financier.

The Delegation of **Sweden** reminded one of the points in the Committee decision of last year concerning the channelling of support to the site. Such support should be channelled through reliable and recognized organizations selected by the World Heritage Centre in consultation with relevant authorities. Sweden has submitted the amendment on this.

The **Chairperson** asked the Rapporteur to indicate the proposed amendment by Sweden for consideration of this decision.

Le **Rapporteur** rappelle que la Délégation de la **Suède** a proposé un amendement au projet de Décision.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked regarding paragraph 8, if the State Party can meet the timeframe of 2 years which was proposed and asked Sweden to clarify the rationale.

The **Chairperson** asked Sweden and Madagascar to respond questions of South Africa.

The Delegation of **Sweden** reminded the same situation in last year in the Committee and it is a continuation. There are also potential international supports to this site under this condition.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose que, dans le paragraphe 8 de la décision, les termes «organisations fiables » soient remplacés par « organisations compétentes » et « d'un commun accord avec les autorités concernées ».

La Délégation de **Madagascar** (Observateur) affirme que le calendrier proposé lui convient. En effet, la mise en œuvre a déjà commencé avec l'arrivée de la mission conjointe du Centre du patrimoine mondial et de l'UICN. La Délégation déclare qu'elle n'a pas d'objection à ce que le soutien international passe par des organismes fiables et reconnus. Ceci a déjà débuté grâce à l'assistance internationale de 100 000 dollars US reçus lors de la 34eme session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Brasilia, 2010).

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.10** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** explained that no new information has been received.

The Draft Decision **35COM7A.11** was adopted.

Niokolo-Koba National Park (Senegal) (N 153)

The **Secretariat** presented progress made during the 3-year emergency rehabilitation plan and indicated that no new information has been received since the preparation of the report.

IUCN indicated that an aerial survey has been conducted. The report of this survey illustrated an alarming decrease of wildlife biodiversity which starts to represent an acute danger of wildlife extinction. It is indicated that this situation can be reversed only through serious and immediate action. IUCN welcomed the 3-year emergency rehabilitation plan.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** remercie l’UICN pour sa présentation. Elle présente ses observations concernant la divergence entre la présentation de l’UICN et le rapport sur l’état de conservation. Le paragraphe d) figurant sur la page 28 mentionne que « *le rapport constate que la plupart des pressions connues sur l’écosystème, comme la coupe de rôniers, la divagation du bétail, la circulation de camions et de vélos à l’intérieur du parc, ou le campement de braconniers semblent en très forte régression* ». La Délégation souligne que cette affirmation est en contradiction avec la préoccupation de l’UICN exprimée dans sa présentation. Concernant le paragraphe 6, la Délégation précise que l’Etat Partie est entrain de mettre en œuvre les démarches nécessaires. Concernant le paragraphe 8, la Délégation précise que la carrière n’est plus utilisée. Elle souhaite attirer l’attention du Comité sur le fait que l’une des raisons de l’inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril est la sensibilisation à la préservation la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien. La Délégation souligne que l’Etat partie accomplit beaucoup d’efforts dans cette direction.

IUCN welcomed the information provided by the State Party and explained that the Decision reflects the activities and actions taken as well as the overall status of the property. IUCN acknowledged the engagement of the State Party on the actions taken, but also noted that the condition of the property is in serious decline. IUCN invited the State Party to meet with IUCN and address all concerns in more detail.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.12** was adopted.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Manas Wildlife Sanctuary (India) (N 338)

The **Secretariat** explained that significant progress has been made with the implementation of the corrective measures. It also indicated that the recovery of the property's Outstanding Universal Value has progressed considerably and that there exists a good prospect for further improvement. It concluded by highlighting the recommendation to remove the property from the World Heritage List in Danger.

IUCN welcomed the progress in the management and restoration of the property. It was indicated that the release of funds from the Federal to the State government is of vital importance for the sustainable, long-term conservation of the property. It was indicated that a letter has been received to guarantee the transfer of such funds and confirmed

that the property is in such condition that it can be recommended for removal from the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to clarify the release of funds in the current financial year.

The Observer Delegation of **India** confirmed that the transfer of funds from Federal to State government and eventually to the Park authorities is taking place and that implementation is expected over the course of the current financial year. It also indicated that other funds are being attracted to secure the long-term conservation of the property.

The **Chairperson** asked for any questions or clarifications but recommended to hold off on congratulations.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that this remarkable success should be celebrated in particular the excellent cooperation between the World Heritage Centre, IUCN and the State Party. The Delegation asked the State Party to indicate what it took to bring this effort to a success with the aim of pointing out good practices for the future and circulating them to other properties in a similar situation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported the statement from the Delegation of Australia to learn from this success story, particularly after being for about 20 years on the List of World Heritage in Danger and provided its congratulations to this exceptional cooperation between IUCN-World Heritage Centre and the State Party to reach this success.

The **Chairperson** asked IUCN about the lessons learned from this success.

IUCN indicated that this success was the result of a long-term cooperation and sustained effort over a long period of time which started after the property had been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to a complete lack of management control. The recovery is a result of a restored capacity on the ground backed by a strong political support.

The **Secretariat** explained that the property was inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger as a result of a conflict situation and that particularly the high commitment of the local community ensured this success.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party with this positive development and invited the State Party to make a comment on this historical moment.

The Observer Delegation of **India** stated that this is a story with a happy ending which was the result of hard work over many years, not just by the Federal and State governments, but in particular by the local communities. Without the latter this success would not be possible. It explained that still there is a long road ahead because natural ecosystems require long-term commitment to ensure a continued success and thanked both the World Heritage Centre and IUCN for all the support received.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.13** was adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

The **Secretariat** explained that a mission to the property has taken place from 22 to 27 January 2011 during which both the corrective measures were revised and the desired state of conservation of the property was developed.

IUCN commented that additional corrective measures to those of 2006 have been proposed, in particular to strengthen cooperation among all partners involved in the restoration projects through adoption of a common vision which includes conservation of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as a consistent high priority.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.14** was adopted.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN

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

The **Secretariat** explained that the session 34th World Heritage Committee welcomed an expert meeting to strengthen the capacity of the property and announced that the State Party had requested international assistance on 7 June 2011.

ICOMOS welcomed the international assistance request and was pleased that an expert meeting will be held in coordination with the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It also indicated that a minor boundary modification was necessary to ensure a better protection of the property.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.32** was adopted.

Chan Chan Archaeological Zone (Peru) (C 366)

The **Secretariat** indicated that no new information has been received.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.33** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** explained that no new information has been received.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.34** was adopted.

AFRICA

Tombs of Buganda Kings at Kasubi (Uganda) (C 1022)

Le **Secrétariat**, précisant que ce bien a été inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril en 2010, suite à l'incendie qui a ravagé son bâtiment le plus imposant, qui abritait les tombes royales de quatre rois de l'ancien royaume du Buganda, présente des informations concernant son état de conservation. Une mission conjointe du Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS/ICCROM s'est rendue en Ouganda en novembre 2010 pour faire le point avec l'Etat partie sur sa stratégie de reconstruction, et définir avec lui un état de conservation souhaité, des mesures correctives ainsi que le calendrier de mise en œuvre, en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

L'Etat partie a non seulement soumis un rapport sur l'état de conservation, mais a également transmis un document révisé sur la stratégie de reconstruction qui tire profit des consultations avec les autorités royales Baganda, d'une intensive recherche documentaire et des recommandations de la mission de novembre 2010. Les détails sur les orientations de cette stratégie sont disponibles dans le rapport soumis.

L'Etat partie a également transmis un document révisé sur la stratégie de reconstruction qui tire profit des consultations avec les autorités royales Baganda, d'une intensive recherche documentaire et des recommandations de la mission de novembre 2010.

ICOMOS commented on the revised reconstruction strategy and the importance of the involvement of the local community in its design. The latter is essential to ensure the link between the intangible heritage and the local knowledge which is crucial considering the need for specialized and skilled craftsmen for the recovery of the property. ICOMOS highlighted the need to support these skills through capacity-building initiatives. It was further noted that the protection of the site needs to be considered through a wider master plan including the surrounding area. Considering the importance of this property, it is essential that the rebuilding of the tombs is an exemplary project rather than just a technical one.

La Délégation de la **France** souligne que les Tombes des rois du Buganda à Kasubi sont un chef-d'œuvre universel d'architecture africaine. Elle précise que l'Etat partie manque de moyens pour la restauration de ce bâtiment. Elle informe qu'une collaboration fructueuse a été établie avec l'Ecole d'architecture de Grenoble en vue de cette restauration. Les recommandations ont été prises en compte et une collaboration avec l'organisation CRATerre a été mise en place. La Délégation invite tous les partenaires à joindre leurs efforts, afin d'établir un plan commun pour la sauvegarde des tombes.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** congratulated the joint efforts of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for this mission and the clarity in reporting. It was indicated that the international community needs to continue supporting this property. The Delegation encouraged the State Party to conduct relevant scientific research and take up old and

traditional techniques to ensure the preservation of the property which could also be spread elsewhere in Africa.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated the importance of the tombs and noted that the reconstruction plans look very similar to those of a pyramid. The techniques to preserve such structures are unique in Africa. In this regard it welcomed making use of the expertise of the Archaeological School of Grenoble to engage in this rebuilding effort.

Le **Secrétariat** apporte des clarifications. Il précise notamment que l'Ecole d'architecture de Grenoble, des experts japonais, le Fonds pour le patrimoine mondial africain et d'autres organismes contribuent au projet. Des experts japonais apportent notamment leur expertise aux questions liées à la prévention des risques. Il a assuré que ce travail se poursuivra à l'avenir.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of **Uganda** to take the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Uganda** acknowledged both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their strategic support and Japan for providing the funding to rebuild. It also noted that both the government and the Buganda Kingdom are working well together.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.17** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** explained that no further information has been received since the preparation of the Draft Decision was prepared.

ICOMOS did not provide any comments.

The Delegation of **Sweden** welcomed the progress that has been made for the restoration of the property but indicated that there is need for a logic sequence or order in the implementation of the corrective measures. There is no need to implement them all at the same time and it was therefore suggested that the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre assist with the development of a realistic logic sequence and timetable.

La Délégation de la **France** précise que des difficultés existent. Elle note également le besoin d'établir une coordination au niveau international. Elle souligne que le Ministère des ressources naturelles et du tourisme travaille en collaboration avec l'ensemble des partenaires sur le plan de la mise en valeur du site. Elle précise que les valeurs matérielles, immatérielles et paysagères du bien méritent d'être défendues. Enfin, la Délégation souligne les efforts déployés et exprime son soutien à l'Etat Partie.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.18** was adopted.

ARAB STATES

Abu Mena (Egypt) (C 90)

Le **Secrétariat** informe qu'aucune nouvelle information ne lui est parvenue depuis la rédaction du document de travail.

ICOMOS had no further comments to add to this item.

The **Chairperson** expressed her sympathy for the circumstances encountered by Egypt which delayed the timely submission of this report and although she understood the situation she was obliged to follow the procedures for submission of new data to the Committee. The Chairperson then addressed the States Parties on whether they were willing to accept the presentation of new data without former consideration by the Advisory Bodies. She then allowed the Delegation of Egypt to make a further comment.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souhaite apporter quelques précisions liées au contexte politique actuel de l'Égypte. Elle souligne que la communauté copte a fait un travail important de conservation du bien et que le bien a été sous protection avant et pendant la révolution. Elle précise néanmoins que dû à la révolution récente des changements de responsables sont intervenus qui ont mené à un retard dans la livraison du rapport.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.19** was adopted.

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

Le **Secrétariat** informe qu'après la rédaction du document, la mission demandée par le Comité a pu être menée par un expert, qui représentait à la fois l'ICOMOS et le Centre du patrimoine mondial, en juin dernier. Son rapport n'est pas encore disponible mais les informations principales qu'il a fournies sont les suivantes :

(1) Les effets des eaux du Tigre sont, comme déjà dit dans les rapports précédents, le danger principal qui affecte le site, en raison de l'érosion, des infiltrations et de l'humidité qu'ils entraînent. Ce danger est particulièrement flagrant dans la partie orientale du tell. Le barrage qui devrait aggraver ce problème est toujours en attente, mais les études se poursuivent pour sa réalisation.

(2) Les autres dangers rapportés par la mission sont l'absence d'entretien régulier, le drainage insuffisant, le manque de documentation et de suivi, les mauvaises conditions de conservation des monuments déjà restaurés, et les dégradations multiples dues à l'humidité, le vent, la pluie, la stagnation de l'eau.

Le **Secrétariat** informe que la mission recommande de lancer, avant même la préparation d'un plan de gestion et de conservation, un programme spécifique pour répondre aux besoins urgents, avec des projets pilotes qui permettraient notamment la formation du personnel technique du site.

Le Secrétariat signale que le projet de Décision demande à l'Etat partie de faire son possible pour mettre en œuvre les mesures urgentes identifiées.

ICOMOS recognized the efforts made by the State Party for the conservation of this property and reiterates its support to Iraq for assistance in the formulation of the management and restoration plan and for definition of technical specifications for interventions. It recommended that all proposals of the State Party be submitted prior to the commencement of works so that an adequate course of action can be jointly identified. ICOMOS also reiterated its assistance in finalization of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and desired state of conservation as well as in capacity-building to ensure long-term sustainability of conservation efforts. Furthermore, it noted in particular the importance of conservation of the property with regard to the dam construction which would exacerbate even more the existing conservation conditions. It urged priority conservation measures to be implemented to mitigate threats. It suggested the use of the ICOMOS Guide for Heritage Impact to identify potential impacts on the Outstanding Universal Value well as the necessity to define appropriate courses of action.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested that Iraq be allowed to respond to comments made.

Before requesting Iraq to speak the **Chairperson** wished to receive comments from the States Parties present. As no comments were made, she gave the floor to Iraq.

The Delegation of **Iraq** thanked all parties involved for their efforts to ensure the protection of Ashur. It stated that a lot of work had been undertaken at the property since last year. For example, at the eastern side of the property under threat from the waters of the Tygris, the country has adopted a rescue plan to avoid erosion. Furthermore, at the northern side of the Ashur property, steps were taken to deviate water and implement corrective measures which would begin shortly. It also announced that maintenance work was undergoing.

The Delegation of **Egypt** highlighted the fact that Ashur was of international importance to the heritage of humanity. It wished to commend the Secretariat and request all present to assist and support Iraq which had done everything possible to save this property. It stressed the fact that the Committee was there not to punish but to help and support.

Le **Secrétariat** affirme que le rapport de la mission de suivi réactif n'a pas encore été reçu mais qu'il sera communiqué dès que disponible. Il précise également que le paragraphe 7 du projet de Décision demandant une mission ne s'avère plus d'actualité.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.20** was adopted as amended.

Samarra Archaeological City (Iraq) (C 276 rev)

Le **Secrétariat** informe que la mission demandée a eu lieu après la rédaction du document de travail, menée par un expert représentant à la fois l'ICOMOS et le Centre

du patrimoine mondial. Les observations préliminaires qu'il a transmises de sa visite à Samarra les 5 et 6 juin 2011 sont les suivantes :

(1) Bien que les conditions de sécurité se soient améliorées, et qu'il y ait maintenant des gardes sur le site, il est très difficile pour l'équipe sur place d'assurer la conservation du bien en raison du manque de ressources humaines et financières.

(2) Beaucoup des restaurations et reconstructions partielles anciennes n'ont pas été réalisées selon les normes internationales, néanmoins les conditions d'authenticité et d'intégrité sont acceptables.

(3) La mission recommande les mesures d'urgence suivantes : Retirer les fondations de béton dans la Grande mosquée datant des années 80 ; Conduire des travaux de conservation préventive pour protéger temporairement les vestiges ; Etablir une barrière autour de la mosquée d'Abu Dulaf pour éviter la circulation de véhicules ; Evaluer les dommages causés par l'installation d'une base militaire au centre du site ; Entreprendre des activités de maintenance et de conservation d'urgence ; Préparer un plan de conservation et de gestion.

Le Secrétariat signale en outre que le projet de Décision demande à l'Etat partie de mettre en œuvre des mesures urgentes, de soumettre une demande d'assistance internationale pour les soutenir.

The Delegation of **Iraq** informed the Committee about the latest facts concerning Samarra Archaeological City since it is on the List of World Heritage in Danger. A long-term plan for maintenance works of the Great Mosque had been established and works on the Al-Malwiyya Minaret had started. It informed that country was trying to develop a site conservation and management plan. Furthermore, the promotion of cultural tourism would be included in this management plan. Iraq recommended that Samarra be maintained on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS welcomed efforts made by Iraq to improve security conditions at the property as well as to implement conservation measures. It proposed its assistance to the State Party in the identification of proper forms of interventions as well as potential actions to address past inadequate conservation measures. It supported fully the development of the management plan and proposed guidance in its formulation.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.21** was adopted as amended.

Historic Town of Zabid (Yemen) (C 611)

Le **Secrétariat** informe qu'aucune nouvelle information n'a été reçue depuis la rédaction du document de travail mais signale que l'ICOMOS souhaiterait ajouter une remarque. Il signale que le projet de Décision propose en particulier l'adoption de l'état de conservation souhaité pour le retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril tel que soumis par l'Etat partie.

ICOMOS reminded that this property was placed on the List of World Heritage in Danger due to serious degradation and neglect of the built heritage and also because of socio-

economic problems of the city's local community. It was necessary to reverse this overall decline through corrective measures. Nonetheless, ICOMOS reported progress made in some areas due to the increased degree of political commitment and also support from GIZ which assisted in the sustainable future of Zabid inhabitants. It also highlighted that further dynamic programmes were needed to achieve corrective conservation measures.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** wished to pay tribute to Yemen for the important progress made. It also recommended that the State Party move forward with the management and conservation plan and works planned for mosques and stalls in the city and also on capacity-building for the property. It urged the State Party to adopt new measures.

The Delegation of **Sweden** commended Yemen for its efforts to protect the property despite the current socio-economic problems. It asked for information on the content of the desired state of conservation of this property.

Le **Secrétariat** souligne que l'état de conservation souhaité a été rédigé conjointement par l'ICOMOS et l'Etat partie lors de la dernière mission et propose de donner la parole à l'ICOMOS pour apporter plus de précisions.

ICOMOS informed that based on the state of conservation, corrective measures be put in place so that a robust programme could be undertaken in Zabid to assist the State Party so that a satisfactory and sustainable management be achieved.

The **Chairperson** requested if the Delegation of Sweden was satisfied with these explanations. She received no objection from the Delegation of Sweden and noted that Yemen was not in the room for comments on Bahrain's remarks.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.23** was adopted.

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)

The **Chairperson** informed the meeting that the discussion on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, Item 7A.22, would be postponed.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** demande de préciser à quel moment la discussion du point 7A.22 serait prévue. Elle souligne qu'un nouveau projet de Décision a été proposé qui est actuellement discuté par les parties intéressées et qu'il faudrait définir les prochaines étapes du programme de travail.

The **Chairperson** replied that it was anticipated for discussion and adoption by the end of the week.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** insiste sur le fait que la discussion du rapport et du projet de Décision devraient se faire directement à la suite du point 7A et non pas être reportée après d'autres points de l'ordre du jour tels que le point 8A proposé dans trois jours.

The **Chairperson** explained that the postponement was necessary in order to give the parties maximum time to come to their conclusions

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souligne que l'expérience de la 34^e session du Comité (Brasilia, 2010) a montré qu'il n'est pas d'utilité de reporter la discussion s'il n'y a pas de raison claire pour ce faire.

The **Chairperson** replied that this question would be reviewed by the Bureau tomorrow morning and she would at that time get back to the State Party on this matter.

The Delegations of **Jordan** and Iraq seconded the proposal made by the Delegation of Egypt.

The **Chairperson** took note of these proposals and suspended consideration of this question.

ASIA AND PACIFIC

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

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle que le calendrier pour la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives en vue du retrait du bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril a prévu un minimum de quatre ans dès 2007. Il précise que le Minaret et les vestiges archéologiques de Jam devraient être retirés de la Liste en péril cette année, en 2011. Il informe également que l'État partie a soumis un projet de Déclaration de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle le 8 février 2011 qui est incluse dans le Document WHC-11/35COM/8 E.

Le Secrétariat ajoute que, par lettre du 24 mai 2011, l'Etat partie a soumis un rapport sur l'avancement dans la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives portant sur les points suivants:

a) La consolidation et conservation à long terme du monument, la sécurisation du site et le renforcement des capacités du personnel du Ministère de l'Information et de la Culture (MoIC): Conformément au plan de travail révisé du projet de fonds-en-dépôt UNESCO/Italie, le Centre du patrimoine mondial a envisagé d'effectuer quelques travaux de préservation sur le site de Jam. Les travaux de conservation, y compris le remplacement des éléments internes du minaret en bois et l'élaboration d'un plan de conservation à long terme pour le Minaret de Jam, ainsi que l'élaboration d'un plan de conservation à long terme verront le jour très prochainement.

b) L'identification des limites du bien et de sa zone tampon a été rendu possible grâce à l'élaboration d'un plan topographique qui permettra aux autorités afghanes compétentes de définir précisément les limites du bien et de sa zone tampon. Les cartes du bien et de sa zone tampon préparées par l'institution afghane sont en train d'être finalisées afin d'être soumises au Centre du patrimoine mondial.

Le Secrétariat souligne que l'État partie a confirmé dans son rapport d'avancement sur la mise en œuvre des mesures correctives qu'il n'est pas envisageable de retirer le bien de la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, car il considère que les menaces restent immenses et qu'il y a besoin d'un plan à long-terme pour la stabilisation du Minaret. D'autre part, un véritable système de gestion du site manque et une mission d'experts internationaux de l'UNESCO devrait d'abord être envoyée. Cela n'a pas pu se faire pour l'instant en raison de la situation sécuritaire instable en Afghanistan.

Le Secrétariat conclut que le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives, l'ICOMOS et l'ICCROM, reconnaissent les efforts de l'Etat partie à coopérer avec l'UNESCO pour la préservation de Jam. Néanmoins, tous recommandent de maintenir le site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril, comme demandé par l'Etat partie le 24 mai 2011. Il souhaite également remercier les Etats parties, notamment l'Italie et la Suisse, pour leur soutien technique et financier.

The **Chairperson** requested if ICOMOS had any comments to add to this intervention.

ICOMOS welcomed the work undertaken by Afghanistan for the definition of the buffer zone and the boundaries. It supported the development of the management plan and encouraged efforts to provide capacity-building at the property in co-operation with all concerned.

La Délégation de la **France** suggère qu'il serait opportun d'écouter l'Etat partie sur le sujet de l'état de conservation du bien.

The Observer Delegation of **Afghanistan** was not present in the room.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.24** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee of the one-day conference held at UNESCO Headquarters on 2 March 2011 on this property. Another technical meeting was organized at ICCROM, in Rome, from 15 to 16 June 2011. Fourteen experts from Kabul and ICCROM offices participated in this workshop. In addition, a final meeting will be held in Tokyo from 5 to 12 December 2011 to take stock of the latest developments concerning this property.

ICOMOS noted progress made by Afghanistan together with international partners in the implementation of corrective measures. It commended the State Party on its commitment to meet conservation conditions for the removal of this property from the List of World Heritage in Danger. ICOMOS proposed to assist Afghanistan in the preparation of a strategy for conservation and presentation of this site as a cultural landscape property so as to meet the specific Outstanding Universal Value. It is committed to assisting the State Party in all its efforts through ICOMOS scientific committees for the long-term conservation efforts of this property.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.25** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** informed that there was no further information provided by the State Party since the last working document.

The **Draft Decision 35 COM 7A.26** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** informed that the State Party had taken corrective measures. A reactive monitoring mission was proposed to assess improvements at this property.

ICOMOS noted the work carried out to implement the corrective measures. It proposed further work to mitigate threats at this property. It agreed on undertaking a reactive monitoring mission and welcomed the opportunity of working with the State Party for the completion of plans and conservation action to reconcile the Outstanding Universal Value within the development process.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.27** was adopted.

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

The **Secretariat** informed on the results of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to this property from 13 to 24 March 2011. The mission was informed of mining at the property, tourism developments (cable cars), infrastructure development (widening of roads), construction works which all presented problems to the property.

ICOMOS welcomed the efforts made by the State Party to implement corrective measures identified by the reactive monitoring mission. It approved the grass-root approach to ensure sustained and long-term implementation of conservation measures. Nonetheless, it urged the Philippines to increase conditions so that the property could be removed from the List of World Heritage in Danger. For example, a programme for conservation of collapsed terraces needed to be developed, a community-based zoning and land-use plans were required, enforcement of tourism regulations was also needed in particular concerning infrastructure developments in and around the property which was a new matter for concern.

The Observer Delegation of **The Philippines** underlined its commitment and appreciated the reactive monitoring mission. It mentioned that gold-mining at the property was not approved. Thus it would review this matter in order to respect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It emphasized the need for more resources to support its efforts for the preservation of the property.

The Delegation of **South Africa** mentioned that when it came to mining in World Heritage properties there was some sort of vagueness on the matter. It wanted to know about the potential mining and what was the understanding of this

The Observer Delegation of **The Philippines** recommended that ICOMOS reply to this question.

ICOMOS mentioned that there were proposals made but that no formal submission was received from the State Party.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.28** was adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

The **Chairperson** informed that the item related to Medieval Monuments in Kosovo (Serbia) will be discussed at a later stage.

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that the consultant Professor Bruno was commissioned by the State Party to assist in the preparation of an action plan for addressing corrective measures at the property. A new proposal was submitted in May 2011 on issues related to the Bagrati Cathedral rehabilitation project.

ICOMOS welcomed the state of conservation report and the different approach taken by the State Party including many minimal interventions. It noted the vulnerability of the western façade of the Cathedral, in particular since the property is situated in an earthquake zone and the current state of the cathedral was not sustainable. It warned that only 40% of the whole structure was currently in place. The first step would be for the State Party to prepare a strategy for the rehabilitation plan and to set out a consolidation philosophy to establish how much of the building can be saved. This strategy needed to be based on a retrospective Outstanding Universal Value assessment. ICOMOS noted the State Party's willingness to act along these lines.

The Delegation of **Sweden** commended the State Party for having accepted to include this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It added that being on this List should not be regarded as a punishment but as a way to receive help for improvement so that the property could soon be removed from this List.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite l'Etat partie pour les efforts accomplis mais exprime néanmoins sa vive préoccupation quant à la situation critique continue du bien. Elle se montre satisfaite du fait que l'Etat partie ait accepté d'accueillir une mission de suivi réactif afin de remédier aux problèmes graves persistant sur le bien.

The Observer Delegation of **Georgia** thanked the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for their support. It stressed that some corrective measures were undertaken on the construction work of the cathedral and that a master plan and rehabilitation programme had been in place since 2009. Several experts were consulted. The Delegation also commissioned the consultant/architect, Prof. Bruno to chair the consolidation work of this cathedral. It mentioned that progress had been made with the

religious authorities of Georgia concerning this property and that conservation work was being implemented.

The **Chairperson** noted the very positive actions and was pleased to understand that the State Party was aware of the various problems. She added that goals were set and advancement was on the way.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.29** was adopted.

Historical Monuments of Mtskheta (Georgia) (C 708)

The **Secretariat** informed that additional information was received from the State Party on 7 June 2011. The State Party launched preparatory studies for land use of Mtskheta and works were expected to be finalized by the end of 2011. In addition, on 4 March 2011 a letter was received from the State Party concerning the development of a land-use implementation plan and the clarified boundaries of the property. The Secretariat suggested to the Committee to replace “develop and implement” with “develop and finalize” in paragraph 4 of the draft decision.

ICOMOS welcomed the Master Plan for land use which would facilitate traffic pressures and help identify priorities while also raising awareness of problems that still exist. It noted that although progress was slow, there were still many issues, as this type of implementation demanded a lot of time. It added that ICOMOS was ready to assist the State Party in its efforts.

In response to the Delegation of **South Africa**, **ICOMOS** informed that the request for guidance was part of the corrective measures proposed. **ICOMOS** offered to provide further guidance including as to the authenticity and integrity of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Georgia** stressed that it remained open for further guidance and underlined that it launched the Land Use Urban Master Plan which will be finalised by the end of 2012 co-financed by the World Heritage Fund. It reported on the various activities in this field including on risk-preparedness funded by the European Union and, on work on the legal framework for cultural heritage in the framework of the UNITWIN programme.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.30** with the proposed amendments by the Secretariat to delete paragraph 4 and add provisions for the finalisation of the Land Use Urban Master Plan.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.30** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** proposed to continue with the discussion on Item 7.2 which was still open.

ITEM 7.2 EVALUATION OF THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM (continuation)

The **Rapporteur** read out the five amended paragraphs proposed by the Delegations of Australia, Estonia, France, Jordan and Switzerland.

Paragraphs 1-4 were adopted as amended. The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the proposed new addition to paragraph 4, making it a 4bis, from the Delegation of Iraq, mentioning the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.

The Delegation of **Australia** enquired for clarification from the Legal Advisor especially as to the implications for States Parties which are not signatories to both Conventions.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that the paragraph needed additional introductory words.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient la proposition de la Délégation de l'Iraq. Elle remarque un problème linguistique dans le texte et suggère de substituer « doit être suivi » avec « devrait être suivi ».

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that this paragraph would only apply to States Parties which are signatories to both Conventions.

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed the declaration of the Delegations of Brazil and France and of the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked the Legal Advisor the reasons of the reference to the Hague Convention as it was only for signatories of the 1954 Convention.

The **Legal Advisor** presumed that the objective was to confer a level of improved protection in the event of armed conflict.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that according to paragraph 4 of the Hague Convention, the measures of protection of properties in the event of armed conflict are not binding and apply only to States Parties to the Hague Convention. It considered therefore that the paragraph does not add anything new to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** demande s'il faut considérer seulement la Convention de La Haye de 1954 ou également son Deuxième Protocole de 1999.

The Delegation of **Barbados** proposed to amend the proposal with the mention "to draw attention to the Hague Convention".

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique partager le point de vue de la Délégation de l'Estonie et propose donc d'éliminer le paragraphe 4 puisqu'il s'agirait d'une superposition malheureuse.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie les déclarations des Délégations de l'Estonie et de la Suisse et suggère de renoncer à cet article qui s'intègre très mal. Elle rappelle que les deux conventions n'ont pas les mêmes Etats Parties.

The Delegation of **Iraq** clarified that the 2 Protocols of the Hague Convention should be considered.

The **Chairperson** noted that it seemed that there is no significant majority for the proposed amendment of the Delegation of Iraq.

At the request of the Delegation of **Egypt**, the **Chairperson** explained that she would clarify this if the amendment is put to the vote of Committee Members if necessary.

The Delegations of **Jordan** and **Egypt** supported the proposal from the Delegation of Iraq.

The Delegation of **Australia** called for a consensus on this paragraph.

Paragraphs 6-9 of the Draft Decision were adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **France**, appuyée par la Délégation de la Suisse, demande de reporter la discussion du projet de Décision au lendemain matin afin de rechercher une décision consensuelle

The Delegation of **Barbados** declared its readiness to assist with the draft formulation.

The **Chairperson** invited the concerned States Parties to work together on a draft proposal for presentation to the Committee members at its next meeting. She suspended examination of this item.

The meeting rose at 7 pm

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 22 JUNE 2011

FIFTH MEETING

10 a.m. –1 p.m.

Chairperson : H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

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

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/7B
WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add
WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add.2

Decisions: **35 COM 7B1 to 8 and 7B 28 to 35**

The **Chairperson** opened Item 7B and announced the order of decisions which would start with natural properties to be followed by cultural properties. She further explained that the regions will be discussed in the following order: Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, Arab States, Asia and the Pacific and Europe and North America. She explained that the Secretariat will introduce each item followed by comments from the Advisory Bodies. Unlike previous years, the Committee Member who requested the opening of a debate on a given property will be invited to state the reasons for doing so.

The **Secretariat** made a general presentation of the item in which it indicated that, this year, in addition to the 34 reports on sites inscribed on the List in danger, 135 State of Conservation reports have been prepared jointly by the World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies and are included in the 7B item, compared to 116 last year. It underlined that, in an effort to diminish the workload for the Committee, the secretariat is continuing the policy to establish a 2 year reporting cycle unless special circumstances demand an annual review. It would also like to note that this year, the World Heritage Centre had received 62% of the State Party reports requested by the 1 February deadline, a significant improvement compared to 2010, when only 38% had been received at the same date. However, on 28 March 2011, still no State Party reports had been received for a quarter of the sites (26%) for which they were requested.

IUCN wants to draw the attention of the Committee to the increased number of cases which are reported of properties threatened by planned or existing mining, oil exploration and exploitation projects, pipeline projects and major dam projects. These trends are especially notable to natural properties in particular in Africa.

While in some cases there is concern about projects in the immediate vicinity of sites which might impact its Outstanding Universal Values, several mining or oil exploration and exploitation projects actually are located within the World Heritage Properties. In this regard, it should be recalled that the World Heritage Committee has established a clear

practice that these activities are not compatible with the World Heritage status and should not take place inside properties.

In the case of major dam projects, the Secretariat and IUCN noted that while most of these projects are located outside the properties, and sometimes even at considerable distance from the properties, their downstream or upstream impacts on watersheds can be highly significant, causing flooding or water scarcity in World properties situated in these watersheds. The World Heritage Centre and IUCN consider that the impacts of some of the megadam projects currently under discussion could lead to irreversible losses of the Outstanding Universal Value of some properties.

These and other large scale projects again highlight the importance of impact assessments. Several issues concerning impact assessments were also discussed in the Experts meeting on global challenges to the state of conservation of World Heritage properties, which was held in Dakar in April and of which the outcomes and recommendations were discussed yesterday.

The World Heritage Centre and the advisory bodies also note the important number of sites which have been affected by natural disaster since the previous session. The impacts of these disasters remain a significant challenge and highlight again the importance of the Strategy for Risk Reduction at World Heritage properties, which was approved at the 31 session together with a prioritized list of actions. .

The growing number of natural disasters also presents also a serious challenge to the World Heritage Centre, which has to deal with this emergency situations within its very limited human and financial resources.

In conclusion, the analysis and summary of annual state of conservation reports provides a quick snapshot of the state of conservation of World Heritage properties across the globe and the challenges faced by site managers, as well as new themes which are emerging as key areas for the future. The World Heritage Capacity Building Strategy, which will be discussed under item 9B using the state of conservation process as one means of identifying key capacity building needs and develop activities to respond to these needs.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (UNPFII).

UNPFII reported that the Chairperson of the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010) addressed concerns raised by indigenous people in connection with the property “Ngorongoro Conservation Area”, United Republic of Tanzania as one of several issues. UNPFII explained that the Permanent Forum was established by the United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) with a mandate to discuss indigenous issues relating to economic and social development, culture, the environment, education, health and human rights within the UN System. The tenth session of the Permanent Forum took place in May 2011 and the publication of the corresponding report was announced for July 2011. UNPFII welcomed UNESCO’s initiative of reviewing the *Operational Guidelines* taking into consideration indigenous issues and offered advice in this regard. The Permanent Forum considered that this is the beginning of a long-term collaboration.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Cerrado Protected Areas: Chapada dos Veadeiros and Emas National Parks (Brazil) (N 1032)

The Delegation of **Australia** noted a rising number of dam projects. In previous sessions of the Committee, numerous bridge projects at World Heritage properties were discussed over the past years. The Delegation of Australia further stressed that any decision to inscribe a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger should, for the sake of consistency, be based on the impact that new developments have on the Outstanding Universal Value of a property and not on the developments themselves according to the *Operational Guidelines*. This impact depends on the nature, size and location of the projects. The Delegation of Australia suggested that inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger be considered in 2012.

The **Rapporteur** stated that 3 amendments had been submitted for this decision by the Delegations of Australia, France and Mexico.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 of the Decision was adopted. Paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 were adopted as amended by the Delegations of France and Mexico. Furthermore, paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** reconnaît les efforts fournis par le Brésil pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations des Organisations consultatives, mais rappelle que les menaces sur l'intégrité du bien ont été mises en avant depuis 2003. Elle propose de conserver, dans le projet de Décision, la mention d'une éventuelle inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril lors de la 36e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Australia** deemed that the deleted part of paragraph 6 needs to be discussed further.

The Delegation of **Mexico** observed that the timeframe given to Brazil was insufficient in order to implement the recommendations of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** announced that it will adopt a new decree in 2012 to ensure the legal protection of the property. Furthermore, the development of a mosaic of protected areas is planned involving local communities. It stated that efforts in this regard are underway, but that the process will need time.

IUCN referred to paragraph 180b of the *Operational Guidelines* elaborating that the absence of re-instatement of legal protection presents potential danger and invited the Committee to take this into account.

La Délégation de la **France** estime que les informations complémentaires transmises par la Délégation du Brésil concernant l'élaboration du cadre juridique sont pertinentes. Ces informations sont susceptibles d'offrir une garantie sur la capacité de l'Etat Partie à prendre les mesures nécessaires pour mettre en œuvre les recommandations issues des missions d'expertise.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the Delegation of Brazil for the steps and measures taken. It considered that the State Party should be given the time it needs to implement these measures.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que certains paragraphes du projet de Décision ne sont pas très lisibles.

The Delegation of **China** agreed with the Delegation of Egypt and considered that legal matters should have no serious impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed the steps outlined by the Delegation of Brazil and recalled their previous point on the need for consistency.

The Delegation of **Russia** suggested to delete paragraph 6 b as time is needed to reach the re-instatement of legal protection.

Paragraph 6 was adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.28** was adopted as amended.

Río Plátano Biosphere Reserve (Honduras) (N 196)

The **Secretariat** indicated that the property had already been inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger in 1996 because of illegal settlements within the property. It was taken off the List in 2007, as the State Party had made efforts to evacuate the site from illegal occupation. The Secretariat noted that illegal occupation eventually resumed, mainly due to drug trafficking. In addition, deforestation increased pressure on the site, and threatened the Outstanding Universal Value. The Secretariat further reported the planned construction of a hydraulic dam, which will potentially impact the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Secretariat regretted that no impact assessment has been carried out so far and referred to the joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN Reactive Monitoring Mission that was conducted in March 2011. It informed that, in recognition of the gravity of the situation, the State Party decided to request the re-inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Accordingly, and in light of the threats to the Outstanding Universal Value, the Secretariat concluded by recommending the re-inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN recognized the State Party's initiative to re-inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and explained that it is meant to prompt long-term action. IUCN indicated that the UNESCO Office in San José, Costa Rica will be willing to

provide assistance in this regard. It stated that the environmental and social impacts of the hydro-electric dam project are not yet clear.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that the State Party requested the site to be re-inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger and regretted that it could not submit in advance an amendment to this Decision. With regard to paragraph 8 it suggested to replace the word “halt” by a less “military” expression in appreciation of the State Party’s efforts.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the Delegation of Brazil’s point.

The **Secretariat** referred to paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines* and requested the State Party to consult the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies in the further process of the dam project.

IUCN expressed reluctance to accept the Delegation of Brazil’s amendment without having assessed the project. It offered to examine the case on a technical basis. And therefore it considered that the term “review” is inappropriate in this context.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested writing “examine in coordination with the World Heritage Centre at the appropriate time”.

The **Chairperson** welcomed this proposal and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Honduras** to comment.

The Observer Delegation of **Honduras** recognized the importance of an evaluation based on the findings of the 2011 joint World Heritage Centre/IUCN reactive monitoring mission and appreciated IUCN’s continuous assistance. It reported that as per presidential decree dated 15 February 2011 a “zone of special interest” has been declared in response to the need for immediate measures. It further stated that governmental institutions have been called upon to implement protective action and explained that the current threats are a result of several factors. For the dam project, an environmental license has been granted based on Honduras’ environmental law.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft decision paragraph by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 to 7 were adopted. She then invited the members of the Committee to consider the amendment to paragraph 8d as proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the Delegation of Switzerland in proposing to keep the original wording to halt the construction of the hydraulic dam.

The **Chairperson** asks the Delegation of Brazil if it wishes to maintain the proposed amendment after the interventions of the Delegations of Switzerland and Estonia.

La Délégation de l’**Egypte** souligne l’esprit de coordination entre le Centre du patrimoine mondial, l’Etat partie et les Organisations consultatives. Il est clair que ce qui est demandé est de la coordination et pas un jugement sur les Etats parties. Elle souligne

que le thème du quarantième anniversaire de la *Convention* est le développement. La Délégation propose de ne pas biffer l'amendement demandé.

Given the divergent views on the issue, the **Chairperson** invited the States Parties to reflect on this issue while continuing with the adoption of sub-paragraphs 8 e and f and the remaining paragraphs 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, all of which were adopted. The Chairperson then referred back to sub-paragraph 8 d to agree on an accommodation of language.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its support to the original wording.

However, the Delegation of **Brazil** upheld the proposed amendment to the Draft Decision highlighting the already existent international cooperation system and the work that has already been done together with the Advisory Bodies and the Centre, and in particular the fact that Honduras itself requested the inclusion in the World Heritage in Danger List. Given these conditions, the Delegation of Brazil questioned the use for the proposed hard wording.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its support to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** exprime le souhait de ne pas passer au vote car l'amendement de la Délégation du Brésil est clair et simple et ne va pas à l'encontre de la *Convention*. L'examen est fait avec les Organisations consultatives. La délégation est de l'opinion qu'il faut accepter l'amendement sans discussion.

In view of the divergent views, the **Chairperson** proposed to proceed to a vote in order to find a solution.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique aux Délégations du Brésil et de l'Egypte que cet amendement ne va pas contre leur proposition. Il risque d'y avoir un impact important à l'avenir et il convient de réfléchir au précédent que cela peut créer pour d'autres cas. Le Honduras demande lui-même l'inscription du site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Il faut aider l'Etat partie concerné à promouvoir le bien en danger, en coordination avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les Organisations consultatives. La Délégation de la Suisse s'est donc opposée à l'amendement.

The Delegations of **Ethiopia, Nigeria, Barbados** and **Bahrain** expressed their support to the Delegation of Brazil's amendment proposal considering that it answered adequately to the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

In reaction to the majority of views expressed verbally in favour of the Delegation of Brazil's amendment, the **Chairperson** referred to the opposing Committee Members who were in favour of a stronger wording of the Decision suggesting a show of hands to find an agreement.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déclare rechercher un consensus et regretter cet amendement. Elle considère que le Comité était en train de diluer l'esprit de la *Convention*. Malgré cela, la Délégation accepte l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Brésil.

Both Delegations of **Sweden** and **Estonia** also aligned their opinion with the majority of the States Parties for the sake of a general agreement and accepted the amendment.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegations of Estonia, Switzerland and Sweden for helping to move on towards the paragraph adoption and subsequently declared sub-paragraph 8d adopted.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.31** was adopted as amended.

She however reiterated the importance of maintaining the spirit of the *Convention*, which will be, at all times, kept in mind by the Committee.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Talamanca Range-La Amistad Reserves / La Amistad National Park (Costa Rica / Panama) (N 205bis) –35 COM 7B.29

Galapagos Islands (Ecuador) (N 1)56 - 35 COM 7B.30

Monarch Butterfly Biosphere Reserve (Mexico) (N 1290) - 35 COM 7B.32

Coiba National Park and its Special Zone of Marine Protection (Panama) N 1138 rev) - 35 COM 7B.33

Manu National Park (Peru) (N 402) - 35 COM 7B.34

Pitons Management Area (Saint Lucia) (N 1161) – 35 COM 7B.35

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

AFRICA

Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) (N 407)

The **Secretariat** outlined the concern about the Dja Wildlife Reserve (Cameroon) property regarding the development of a cobalt mine by the company GEOVIC covering an area of 150,000 ha 40 km east of the property. It reported that the Centre had not yet received the new Environmental and Social Impact Assessment requested by the Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). It added that the discussion on the property had been requested by a Committee member and announced that IUCN and the State Party wished to comment.

L'UICN rappelle que la réserve de faune du Dja est le seul bien d'Afrique centrale qui n'est pas sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. En revanche, l'UICN note que le braconnage et les activités minières risquent de compromettre la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien. L'UICN estime que la mission prévue en 2011, demandée par la 34e session du Comité du patrimoine mondial (Brasilia, 2010) devrait étudier les impacts des activités minières et du braconnage sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien.

La Délégation du **Cameroun** a fait état d'informations complémentaires sur la réserve de faune du Dja. Suite aux recommandations faites par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de sa 34e session (Brasilia, 2010), le Gouvernement du Cameroun a informé la société minière GEOVIC que le démarrage des travaux ne serait effectif qu'après une nouvelle évaluation d'impact environnemental et social. En avril 2011, cette nouvelle évaluation a été effectuée et transmise au Ministère de l'environnement du Cameroun. Cette nouvelle étude prend en compte toutes les recommandations faites par le Comité. Le rapport sera transmis au Centre du patrimoine mondial. L'Etat partie s'est également engagé à faire état de toute avancée.

The Delegation of **South Africa** urged the Committee to take the reported improvements and interventions by Cameroon into consideration.

Le **Rapporteur** indique avoir reçu deux amendements concernant cette Décision. Et précise que l'amendement de la Délégation de la **Suisse** propose la suppression du paragraphe 8 du projet de décision.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendment proposed by the Delegation of **Australia** concerning a rather technical aspect of the wording seeking clearer conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*, which would read: "to consider if confirmed the possible inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger".

The Delegation of **Australia** specified that its amendment was of rather technical nature in order to flag the possible inscription on the Danger List by adjusting the language further to the conditions of this procedure as described in the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Chairperson** confirmed the technical nature of the amendment and suggested applying it generally to other similar amendments for the sake of consistency in the form of language of the Decisions.

The Delegation of **Switzerland**, in support of the Delegation of Australia's view to suppress the paragraph, suggested that the paragraph would convey that inscribing on the List of World Heritage in Danger is equivalent to that of a blacklist, which is not the case.

IUCN welcomed the proposal from the Delegation of Australia regarding the introduction of a different wording in paragraph 9 in a more sensitive mode, and asked to amend the French translation accordingly.

The **Chairperson** agreed to harmonize the translation with the original.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.1** was adopted as amended.

Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) (N 801bis)

The **Chairperson** noted that the state of conservation of Lake Turkana National Parks (Kenya) was open to discussion as requested by Committee members.

The **Secretariat** stated that new information on the property has been received about a hydro-electric dam project in Ethiopia, the so called GIBE III Dam, on the Omo River, one of the rivers leading into the Lake, which is likely to seriously threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, as explained in the working document. The World Heritage Centre has received this information in a report from the African Development Bank, and has moreover received a petition letter from 18 international NGOs protesting against the dam project.

IUCN expressed its serious concern about the potential direct and indirect impact of the dam project, which could cause a significant decline of the Lake's fresh water affecting the species and associated biological systems which represent the basis for the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List, as subsumed under criterion (x). It also referred to accumulative impacts of a planned G4 and G5 dams, as well as outstanding derogation projects along the Omo River of further significant concern.

Even though the situation may be paralleled to similar cases in general, the Delegation of **Australia** stresses the unusual fact that the property is affected by a threat originating in a different State Party. It therefore requested statements from both States Parties Kenya and Ethiopia.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** expressed also its serious concern about the situation especially in reference to information found on the internet related to the site which states that 40% of the dam have already been built. It requested, in support of Australia's intervention, clarification from both States Parties concerned on the actual status of the dam, the coordination among both States Parties and on the way to minimize the possible impact in the future.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** referred to the case as a typical example of the conflict between development (e.g. power generation) and conservation, which here became even more complex given that there are two States Parties involved. It appealed that World Heritage sites however should be used as instruments for development. It also requested further clarification from both States Parties.

Invited by the **Chairperson** to react to these interventions, the Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked for the opportunity to be given the floor. It pointed out that the dam construction was located 500km away from the World Heritage property in Northern Kenya and that all concerns so far were based on biased and unverified assumptions. The project had been agreed upon between the two States Parties, the Environmental Impact Assessment was available online, and claimed that IUCN had not been yet to the site to assess the situation. The electric dam would be used also by Kenya to overcome its power shortage. It referred to the risk that any objection to the project would discourage a developing country like Ethiopia to exploit its own resources which are so dearly needed for development, to emerge from poverty and be benefiting local communities. He claimed that Ethiopia respects conservation and warned about a premature decision on unfounded assumptions. Also it proposed that the paragraphs 1 to 8 of the Draft Decision should be dropped.

The Delegation of **Kenya** confirmed that it had a friendly relationship with neighbouring Ethiopia and that high-level bilateral consultations about the project had taken place

about two weeks before. It argued for an appropriate examination of the EIA to avoid negative impact of the intervention.

IUCN confirmed that the Decision would request an Advisory Body's mission on site for an evaluation of the situation and reiterated that the alarming information was provided by credible and serious sources such as the African Development Bank, warning about the risk that the dam would deprive Lake Turkana from 85% of its annual water inflow. It shared the Delegation of Kenya's concern about the development issue and the need for a proper impact assessment evaluation, which was the intention of the proposed Draft Decision and intended Advisory Body's mission.

The **Chairperson** noted one technical amendment from the Delegation of Australia, which would be taken into consideration on a general level, and one from the Delegation of Mali.

Le **Rapporteur** fait état de deux amendements proposés. La Délégation du **Mali** propose de supprimer les paragraphes 1 à 8 et de modifier le paragraphe 9 de la Décision ainsi « [...] demande aux Etats parties de l'Ethiopie et du Kenya de soumettre un rapport au Centre du patrimoine mondial d'ici le 1 février 2012 pour examen par le Comité lors de sa 36e session en 2012. » Le deuxième amendement est proposé par la Délégation de l'**Australie** qui voudrait ajouter : « dans le cas d'un péril potentiel ou prouvé sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, l'inscription éventuelle du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. »

The **Chairperson** claimed that paragraph 1 cannot be suppressed technically.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s'oppose à la suppression des paragraphes 1 à 8, ce qui rendrait la Décision inutile et modifierait la philosophie de travail du Comité.

The Delegations of **Sweden, Australia** and **Bahrain** supported the intervention from the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation du **Mali** indique se soumettre à la majorité quant à la non-suppression des paragraphes 1 à 8. Toutefois, elle réitère sa demande concernant l'amendement du paragraphe 9.

Paragraphs 1 to 8 were adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the two amendments received from the Delegation of Mali to delete paragraph 9, and from the Delegation of Australia to be considered in a second step. She invited the Committee to react to the Delegation of Mali's amendment.

Whereas the Delegations of **Switzerland, Estonia** and **Australia** expressed their disagreement with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Mali, the Delegation of **Nigeria** strongly supported it arguing that it did not differ much from the proposal from the Delegation of Australia, as it simply requests that a support be submitted in 2012 by both States Parties in the case when the World Heritage Centre would recognize that the project does not affect the Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** stated that a majority supported the retention of paragraph 9.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.3** was adopted as amended.

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

The **Secretariat** stated that this Item was opened for discussion upon request from a Committee member based on the concerns about the North Road project. This project comprised a 53 km tarred road, which may irreversibly affect the property's fauna and flora and its Outstanding Universal Value, and engender the inscription of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger. It stated that the World Heritage Centre had not yet received the Environmental Impact Assessment from the State Party, which is reportedly completed and opened for review. It further noted that the World Heritage Centre recently received a statement from Birdlife International and its Tanzanian affiliate the Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania expressing its opposition to the project.

IUCN wished to comment on the situation as several NGOs had asked to be given the floor for a joint statement. It confirmed that the proposed road project across Serengeti raised serious and high level concerns. A letter from the Director-General of IUCN and the Chair of the World Commission on Protected Areas has been sent to the State Party expressing their concerns. Both Germany and the World Bank had offered their technical and financial support to the United Republic of Tanzania for a strategic environment impact assessment of the road network, which would also be crucial to better understand and consider the economic, ecological and social impact.

Upon the request from the Delegation of **Brazil**, the **Chairperson** agreed to first give the floor to the Committee Members before hearing the NGO's statement.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that it would have preferred to first listen to the NGO to allow the Committee members to get a clearer idea of the situation.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its serious concern about the road network in this protected area, which it equalled to an icon area for the whole of Africa and a synonym for bird and wild beast migration and other important natural phenomena. Also following apprehensions from Swedish NGOs, it expressed its strong support to IUCN recommendations to develop an alternative route system.

In support of the Delegation of Sweden's serious concern and favouring consideration of an alternative road, the Delegation of **Australia** further proposed to technically amend the Draft Decision by adding the potential listing on the World Heritage List in Danger if the project is confirmed.

The Delegation of **South Africa** specified that if the 53 km Road project was built, the impact was ascertained and suggested hearing the clarification of the concerned State Party.

The Delegation of **China** expressed the concern that the road would impact irreversibly the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and pointed to other threats including illegal transportation, poaching. It further urged the State Party to take the necessary measures to mitigate the impacts including undertaking impact assessment to assist the State Party.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the declaration of the Delegation of China.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked the concerned State Party whether the impact on fauna had been taken into account.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** informed the Committee members that 2-3 years ago the status of the road project was to cut 450 km through the Northern tip of the Serengeti Park. The State Party had however reconsidered its position following a general consensus felt that the tarmac road should not go through the Park. The current plan is to connect the East of the Park with its Eastern neighbourhood and the West with the Western neighbourhood. The existing road network will remain the same.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** for its statement and pointed out that this information should have been with the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies before the World Heritage Committee session in order to allow for time to evaluate the situation.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commended the efforts of the United Republic of Tanzania and enquired why the state of conservation of this property was presented to the Committee members this year without specific request by the World Heritage Committee.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** commented that all the information available to the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies to date pointed to a “serious threat” to the property.

IUCN supported the Director of the World Heritage Centre and requested the United Republic of Tanzania to submit the information to allow for assessment of the situation.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer NGO Birdlife International to take the floor. The Observer of Birdlife International called for considering alternatives indicating that BirdLife International was a global partnership of conservation NGOs in 116 countries, with around 10 million members and supporters worldwide. He underlined that the Wildlife Conservation Society of Tanzania (WCST) is the BirdLife partner in Tanzania and that BirdLife partners across the world are supporting WCST’s national campaign to re-route the Serengeti highway. He indicated that, together with Tanzania National Parks, The Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS)- which goal is the conservation of ecosystems where natural ecological processes still occur, for their intrinsic values and for the long-term benefit of people - has been active in the Serengeti for over 60 years. He mentioned that the proposed Serengeti highway as currently routed would cut through nearly 55 km of the Serengeti National Park World Heritage Site. This route would do immense ecological and economic damage and seriously degrade the values for which the site is inscribed on the World Heritage List. He stated that the NGO fully recognize the desire of the United Republic of Tanzania to develop including upgrading its transport infrastructure, but indicated that viable, much less destructive and cheaper alternative routes exist; for example one that follows the Southern perimeter of the Park. As well as reducing impacts on wildlife, a road constructed on the Southern route would also be of considerably greater benefit to local communities. Coupled with an extension

to the East of the Serengeti, it would also address the Tanzanian government's objective to provide road access for the people of Loliondo.

He underlined that the Serengeti National Park supports one of the greatest migrations in the world involving 1.8 million wildbeast, zebras and antelopes which drive the Serengeti's ecology. He stated that it should be noted that concerning the East of the Serengeti the proposed road will also pass close to the shores of Lake Natron, a key site for the globally threatened Lesser Flamingo, a designated Ramsar site and potential World Heritage site, with serious impacts. The NGO called upon the World Heritage Committee to take a strong decision building on the Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.7** and while the statement from the Observer Delegation of the **United Republic of Tanzania** sounded positive this would need to be investigated in detail.

The **Chairperson** proposed to suspend the examination of the Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.7** to allow for the State Party to discuss the situation with the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies and evaluate the situation properly.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Mount Kenya (Kenya) (N 800) – 35 COM 7B.2
Djoudj National Bird Sanctuary (Senegal) (N 25) – 35 COM 7B.4
Vredefort Dome (South Africa) (N 1162) – 35 COM 7B.5
Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 199) – 35 COM 7B.6
Mana Pools National Park, Sapi and Chewore Safari Areas (Zimbabwe) (N 302) – 35 COM 7B.8

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Keoladeo National Park (India) (N 340)

The **Secretariat** presented the property on and reported that it had no further comments.

The Delegation of **Australia** was surprised that the Secretariat had no comments.

The Observer Delegation of **India** stated that it is aware of the need to solve conservation issues in a comprehensive way. It reported on a strategy to address the issue of water scarcity. Firstly, a water system is put in place in cooperation with the Ministry of Environment. Secondly, the construction of a water channel approved by the Government of India is to be completed by 2012. Finally, it reported that the Park would be allotted with funds next year. It also mentioned that the management plan prepared is being implemented and considered that all the demonstrated efforts would not warrant inclusion on the World Heritage List in Danger. It also thanked the World Heritage Centre and the United Nations Foundation for their support.

IUCN noted the commitment by the State Party on the two points of the finalisation of the water channel project as well as of the new budget allocation.

The **Chairperson** suspended consideration of the Draft Decision in order to allow to fully assess the new information received by the State Party and underlined the importance of a timely submission of all information.

Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154)

The **Secretariat** reported it had no comments.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that it is surprised that there are no comments on behalf of the Secretariat given the concerns raised in the state of conservation report regarding the gas mining exploration. Australia confirmed its commitment to the sustainable development and the sustaining of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It reported the use of comprehensive management tools and informed that the matter raised had been subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Delegation of **Barbados** welcomed the forward thinking approach concerning the Impact Assessment and asked the Delegation of Australia how it could ensure for the Outstanding Universal Value not to be damaged in the long-term.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated that it supports the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **Sweden** indicated that a major boundary modification might solve the issue.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that the area is considered as a marine reserve and that the State Party would not wish to address a boundary modification but would prefer the area to be examined by a mission and undertaking a strategic Environmental Impact Assessment to ensure that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property would not be damaged.

IUCN acknowledged the new information provided and underlined the importance of paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*. It underlined that the Draft Decision was based on the information available.

The Chairperson proposed to move to the Draft Decision and noted amendments proposed by the Delegation of Barbados.

The **Rapporteur** read out the proposed amendments to Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.9**.

The **Chairperson** noted that these were significant changes to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** stated that it would prefer to have these changes in paper form. It was supported by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that it had also proposed an amendment.

In order to examine the proposed amendment in paper form, the **Chairperson** suspended consideration of the Draft Decision.

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167)

IUCN notes that due to the size of the property and time constraints, the mission was limited in its coverage and met a number of challenges in carrying out a comprehensive review of all components of the property. The mission confirms that, as reported by the State Party, there has been some progress across a range of issues affecting the property's Outstanding Universal Value and conditions of integrity. However, despite this limited progress, several serious, widespread and urgent issues continue to adversely affect the property's Outstanding Universal Value. In particular, the mission considered that the 4 proposed roads in Kerinci Seblat National Park represent a potential danger to the integrity of the property (in line with Paragraph 180 (b)(ii) of the *Operational Guidelines*), and that the ongoing encroachment on the borders of all three clusters continues to represent an ascertained danger to the property (in line with Paragraph 180 (a)(iii) of the *Operational Guidelines*).

The mission finds that the property continues to be threatened by various illegal activities, including logging, wildlife poaching and trafficking. Furthermore, efforts and measures to restore degraded lands, encourage the engagement of relevant ministries, and improve coordination between the Central Government and local stakeholders, have not progressed significantly. The mission recommends that road construction plans be immediately halted, and highlights the need for better integration of the property's conservation within overall local development schemes in order to address the multiple threats affecting its Outstanding Universal Value, which mostly stem from external pressures.

IUCN and the World Heritage Centre consider that, despite some limited progress, the overall level of threat to the property's Outstanding Universal Value clearly provides a basis for its inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. Consistent with the mission's conclusions, IUCN and the World Heritage Centre recommend that the Committee should consider the property for inclusion on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The primary objective of this listing would be as a call to action thereby strengthening national and international conservation efforts and promoting rapid action to safeguard the property.

IUCN recalls its suggestion that the State Party make provision within Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) and the Forest Investment Programme (FIP) to prioritize conservation of the property's forest ecosystem, and notes its willingness to assist the State Party in designing and implementing an effective programme in this regard. IUCN also advises that its Asia Regional Programme and Species Survival Commission are offering to work with the State Party in overall conservation efforts for rhino with a focus on TRHS. IUCN noted that Flora and Fauna International have submitted a briefing to the World Heritage

Centre regarding road construction proposals in Kerinci Seblat National Park, and that a representative of Flora and Fauna International is present in the room.

The Delegation of **Australia** reminded that this property had been discussed for several years and requested to seek information from the concerned State Party on the measures it proposed to address the issues raised.

The Delegations of **Brazil, Barbados and Egypt** supported the Delegation of Australia.

The Observer Delegation of **Indonesia** reiterated the commitment to conservation and assured that the property is under highest protection of conservation law. It reported on a proposal to improve the three tracking paths. It affirmed that it is further elaborating a proposal for the existing traditional paths in line with the evacuation plan to also address the earthquake and volcano risk. It further reported that no construction has started so far and that the challenge is to balance conservation and emergency control. It also proposed to establish a joint Commission to study the feasibility of an improvement plan of the existing road network. It also reported all mining takes places outside the property. The State Party concluded that the inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger is not the best response to address the issues and proposed to delete paragraph 6.

The **Chairperson** indicated that an Observer Delegation is not allowed to propose any amendments to an Draft Decision. The Chair then invited the NGO Association Flora and Fauna to take the floor. The representative of the NGO indicated that both the NGOs Fauna and Flora and the AKAR Network of local NGOs worked together to deflect and mitigate threats to Kerinci-Seblat National Park – one of the three parts of this serial property – over the last 15 years. He further informed that Fauna & Flora International also manages the Rapid Response Facility (RRF) on behalf of the World Heritage Centre. He added that one of the RRF grants was given to the AKAR network to help their advocacy against plans for roads across the property some years ago.

He informed that three new roads are now proposed which will cut through the core zones of the Kerinci-Seblat National Park. He confirmed that the State Party of course has the right to build roads where it pleases, but that the proposals would, if realized, compromise the property's Outstanding Universal Value and contravene two national laws. Changes to these laws can only be made by government after approval by Parliament and, if passed for this case, this would set an important precedent which could endanger other properties and other conservation areas.

The new roads are proposed as 'evacuation routes' from volcanic eruptions and earthquakes. But there are already roads in the area connecting population centres. Sadly, they are slow and poorly maintained, but they could surely be improved at a much lower cost than building new roads through the steep and unstable terrain of the core zones. Even the State Party's Geology and Vulcanology Agency feel that the natural disaster threats would not be alleviated by the proposed roads.

Therefore, in consideration of this matter and the other prevailing threats to all parts of the property, and notwithstanding the ongoing efforts by the State Party to make management improvements to this troubled property, he strongly supported the Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.16** and urged the Committee to adopt it.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.16** and noted that no amendment had been received.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested a moment for reflection to take into account the information received from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that a mission had taken place very recently in April 2011 to the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed to move to the adoption of Draft Decision. **35 COM 7B.16**

The Delegation of **Brazil** addressed the World Heritage List in Danger mechanism and underlined that it is perceived outside of UNESCO as a 'punishment' . It proposed to adjourn the consideration of this Draft Decision. It also remarked that the concerned State Party is aware of the threats to the property and addresses them.

The **Chairperson** drew the attention of Committee Members that a mission had recently visited the property with clear recommendations.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the Delegation of Brazil and proposed an amendment to paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the reconsideration of paragraph 5 about inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger in order to provide hope for the State Party of Indonesia.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee Members of success story to remove a property from the World Heritage List in Danger which is proposed in general as a help framework. She suspended consideration of the Draft Decision.

THIRD DAY – WEDNESDAY, 22 JUNE 2011

SIXTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Central Highlands of Sri Lanka (Sri Lanka) (N 1203)

The Delegation of **Switzerland** expressed its concern about the fact that the State Party has not submitted the state of conservation report nor implemented any of the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). The Delegation asked the State Party for a clarification on this.

The Observer Delegation of **Sri Lanka** noted that a state of conservation report is being drafted and that it will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible.

IUCN explained that progress should be noted in the report and seeks no change in the Draft Decision. The **Chairperson** noted that no amendments to this Decision have been received.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.18** was adopted.

Tropical Rainforest Heritage of Sumatra (Indonesia) (N 1167) (Continuation)

The **Secretariat** indicated it was informed that the State Party is not ready to proceed with the proposed Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Barbados** proposed an amendment to the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1-4 were adopted.

Concerning Paragraph 5, the Delegation of **Switzerland** expressed its concern about the consistence in the Decisions made by the World Heritage Committee and noted that a double standard seems to be used. While here it was proposed to cut the wording "halt", in the Decision made about Rio Platano earlier in the day, this wording had been used in the Decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that there is no indication of a double standard because in the case of Rio Platano there was a clear commitment from the State Party on the Decision taken concerning the property.

The Delegation of **Barbados** confirmed this point of view.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.17** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ASIA PACIFIC REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Purnululu National Park (Australia) (N 1094) - - 35 COM 7B.9

The Sundarbans (Bangladesh) (N 798) – 35 COM 7B.11

Three Parallel Rivers of Yunnan Protected Area (China) (N 1083 bis) – 35 COM 7B.12

Kaziranga National Park (India) (N 337) – 35 COM 7B.13

Lorentz National Park (Indonesia) (N 955) – 35 COM 7B.15

Tubbataha Reef Marine Park (Philippines) (N 653) – 35 COM 7B.17

Dong Phayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex (Thailand) (N 590) – 35 COM 7B.19

Ha Long Bay (Vietnam) (N 672bis) – 35 COM 7B.20

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719)

The **Secretariat** explained that a mission to the property was undertaken from 3-11 October 2010. The mission focused on the questions of boundary modifications and mining in Yugyd Va National Park (YVNP), the northern component of the property. It was further explained that four areas have been excised from the park and that no request for a boundary modification of the property was submitted to the Committee before the changes to the boundaries of the park were made. The Secretariat along with IUCN concluded that the excisions remove the legal protection status of these parts of the property, therefore jeopardising the protection status of the property. It was further noted that the mission was informed that the State Party has given a licence to the Russian company Gold Minerals for a proposed gold mine in one of the areas excised from the park but which are part of the property. It was noted that the World Heritage Centre has received a letter from the State Party indicating its objection to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

IUCN explained that the proposed mining operation has a negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value, and particularly on the integrity of the property, and therefore requires that any request for boundary modification should be considered as a '*major boundary modification*', e.g., requiring a re-nomination of the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that in large countries such as Brazil and the Russian Federation, the setting of boundaries for protected areas is a difficult task. The Delegation further indicated that the State Party is aware of the seriousness of the situation and the negative impacts of its activities and that it therefore decided to present a revised Draft Decision aiming at allowing the State Party to prepare the request for a major boundary modification.

The Delegation of **China** indicated that the State Party concerned covers vast areas of land and forest and suggested that the State Party prepares a study on the boundary modifications so that issues which threaten the Outstanding Universal Value of the property can be eliminated. It noted further that some development activities could be carried out but not when it impacts the Outstanding Value of the property. The Delegation recommended that the property is not inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** indique appuyer la proposition de la Délégation de la Chine.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** indicated its concern about the potential inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger and explained that the property already had economic activities before the inscription of the park on the World Heritage List. According to Russian national legislation, there were no limitations for protected areas until 2008. It indicated that these forests are one of the last ones in Europe and that the small area discussed here does not affect the Outstanding Universal Value of a property which is approximately 3 million hectares in total. It was further stated that the property had already lost some of its ecological and biological values over the past 40 years. It asked IUCN and the World Heritage Centre to engage in the work. It stated that the State Party will undertake to request a major boundary modification. The Delegation indicated its preparedness to change the wording of the Draft Decision based on the work it plans to undertake.

The Delegation of **Estonia** asked whether it is possible for IUCN to evaluate if the overall values of the property are indeed unaffected as suggested by the concerned State Party.

The **Chairperson** took note of this proposal.

IUCN pointed out that there are two issues identified with the property. First, the above-mentioned area discussed is located within the property and not at the margins of it. Therefore it changes its protection status. Secondly, while some parts of the property are fine, the gold mining licence that has been given is a more challenging type of extraction and therefore requires a major modification of the boundaries in order to be able to secure the integrity of the site. The area discussed has a central role in securing the property and maintaining its integrity.

The Observer representing **Greenpeace** and **Russian Environmental NGOs** stated that the proposed boundary modification of the property is setting a dangerous precedent for the *World Heritage Convention* that would result in a *Convention* that does not work properly. It recalled that the inscription on the World Heritage in Danger is not a punishment but an alarm to the international community. The conservation of the

property is in danger and urgent action is needed. It made an appeal to the World Heritage Committee to adopt the Draft Decision as it stands and made a second appeal to the international investment community not to plan any disruptive activities in properties which are exceptional to humankind.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que la Délégation du Brésil a introduit des amendements aux paragraphes 5, 6, 9, 10 et 11.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination paragraphs by paragraphs of the Draft Decision. Paragraphs 1 to 4 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked whether the recommendations made by the monitoring mission clarify the intended changes.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked IUCN what the recommendations are.

IUCN responded that the recommendations are formulated at length in the mission report and indicated that they can be summarized as (a) a halt of mining and (b) a major modification of the boundaries requiring a re-nomination of the property.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that since paragraph 4 has already been adopted which mentioned the threat to the Outstanding Universal Value is mentioned, thus it is now impossible to delete paragraph 5 from the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that a simple inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger will not solve the problem. The Delegation noted that the State Party was not able to reverse the boundary due to national legislation.

The **Chairperson** suspended of the discussion on this Draft Decision until Delegations have been able to review the proposed amendments on a paper version.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee Members to complete the last remaining Item that needs to be discussed under Agenda Item 7.2 on the evaluation of the Reinforced Monitoring Mechanism.

ITEM 7.2 EVALUATION OF THE REINFORCED MONITORING MECHANISM (continuation)

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendments have been submitted by the Delegations of Iraq, Estonia and Barbados on paragraph 5 which indicates the applicability of the 1954 Convention on the protection of cultural properties in the case of armed conflict.

The **Chairperson** announced the recommendation of the Legal Advisor to consider replacing the word "signatories" by the word "parties" and noted no objections to this proposal. Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7.2** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **Item 7.2** of the Agenda.

ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

NATURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Golden Mountains of Altai (Russian Federation (N 768rev))

The **Secretariat** explained that the World Heritage Centre and IUCN have received information about plans for the proposed gas pipeline to China traversing the property and noted that this construction would pose threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It further explained that the World Heritage Centre asked the State Party for a state of conservation report on 10 January 2011 and 4 February 2011 which was eventually received on 15 June 2011. Due to the late submission it was not possible for the World Heritage Centre to review the report but a quick consultation reveals that the State Party has not taken any decision regarding the issue, that an ecological assessment of the proposed activity is currently being undertaken and that already in 2007 an ecological study was undertaken to identify the anthropogenic threats to the property.

IUCN recalled that the 2007 joint World Heritage Centre-IUCN monitoring mission had already indicated that the proposed gas pipeline would pose a serious threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It further noted that a letter was sent to the Director-General of UNESCO on 15 December 2010 by the "Sosnovka" coalition, a group of non-governmental and indigenous rights organizations from Siberia and the Russian Far East. The letter suggested that a reasonable alternative pipeline route exists along the Chuiskii track through Mongolia.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** clarified that the Government did not make any decisions and that the resolution would help the Government to make a right decision.

The **Chairperson** announced that no amendments had being received regarding the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision 35 COM 7B.26 was adopted.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Pirin National Park (Bulgaria) (N 225)- – 35 COM 7B.21

Lagoons of New Caledonia: Reef Diversity and Associated Ecosystems (France) (N 1115) – 35 COM 7B.22

Lake Baikal (Russian Federation) (N 754) – 35 COM 7B.23

Western Caucasus (Russian Federation) (N 900) – 35 COM 7B.24

Doñana National Park (Spain) (N 685bis) – 35 COM 7B.27

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

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

The **Secretariat** indicated that the request to examine this case had been introduced by the Delegation of Barbados.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Barbados the rationale for opening this state of conservation report.

The Delegation of **Barbados** indicated that some clarifications from ICOMOS and the Secretariat were needed.

ICOMOS welcomed the important progress that has been made regarding the management arrangement for the property and planning tools to ensure larger coordination and more efficient decision-making among stakeholders. However final approval of the buffer zone and enforcement of corresponding regulatory measures, particularly at Santo Domingo East are necessary to ensure the protection of the property setting by providing effective regulations to new constructions. The 2009 reactive monitoring mission identified that view should be protected to ensure that the relationship between the city, the river and the sea is not compromised. The relationship attributes to the Outstanding Universal Value should be maintained. ICOMOS considered that a good visual relationship between these elements and existing urban landscape must be preserved. As for the existing project on the East bank, the Sans Souci project, ICOMOS does not object to the urban renewal and new development of the area. However as requested by the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee (Brasilia, 2010), the project proposals have to balance the need for new development and urban conservation. Cultural heritage assessment should be carried out to identify the potential impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Secretariat** reported that additional documentation had been submitted by the Permanent Delegation of the Dominican Republic on 16 May 2011. It consisted of a report prepared by the enterprise VICINI, sent to the State Party, providing answers to the recommendations proposed by the reactive monitoring mission from last year. The World Heritage Centre was informed by the Direction of Historic Heritage of the Dominican Republic that the document is under revision, since the two banks of the Ozama River should be part of the integral urban project under process headed by the Ministry of Culture.

The **Chairperson** asked the Observer Delegation of the Dominican Republic to add further information, if any.

La Délégation de la **République Dominicaine** (Observateur) a remercié la Présidente. Il indique reconnaître l'intérêt de la conservation de la Ville Coloniale de Saint Domingue

conformément à la Décision **34 COM 7B.108** prise lors de la précédente session du Comité (Brasilia, 2010). Elle informe de la mise en place d'un cadre normatif prévu pour 2011, prévoyant une zone tampon. La Délégation précise qu'une partie des recommandations de la mission de suivi réactif de décembre 2009 a été mise en œuvre. Cependant, elle mentionne que les mesures « régulateurs » ne peuvent empêcher de dynamiser la zone Est du bien et que les autorités dominicaines procéderont aux adaptations pour garantir la préservation de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle.

ICOMOS welcomed this new information and would like to see it to be able to assess it.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.123** was adopted.

Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129)

The **Secretariat** presented new information that the Permanent Delegation of Honduras sent by letter to the World Heritage Committee on 3 June 2011 to be transmitted to the Chairperson of the World Heritage Committee. The letter focused on the decision of the government to build an airport near the World Heritage property. In the letter, the Honduran Institute of Anthropology and History (IAHA) says that an ultimate decision on the location for the airport has not yet been taken, leaving different options open.

The report stated that the site of La Concepción, which is located outside of the national protected area, 36km away from the property, was discarded because of its high cost. The second option concerns Rio Amarillo, which is a nationally protected area, 17 km away from the property. The report stated that IAHA requested additional measures to mitigate potential negative impacts to be submitted by 1 October 2011 before its approval for the construction of the airport.

The Ambassador of Honduras visited the World Heritage Centre and declared that the Government of Honduras considered the construction of the airport in Rio Amarillo to be the best option and requested a new technical mission to the property in September 2011 in order to re-assess the conditions of the location for the airport.

ICOMOS reminded that the construction of the airport had been discussed in previous Committee sessions on several occasions since 2003. It has a potential impact on the property. The recent information provided by the State Party has been previously assessed by ICOMOS. ICOMOS did not consider that further review of materials or missions to the site could change the conclusion. ICOMOS underscored that several concerns pointed out by previous decisions remain unresolved such as the conservation of archaeological tunnels and the management plan. ICOMOS also expressed its concern regarding the potential replacement of protective shelters for which no technical specifications have been submitted for review.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked the map of the location of the new airport and new development, and requested the State Party how it plans to address the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Honduras** pointed out that the process for tunnel consolidation and stabilization will continue, and expected to have by the end of year,

the beginning of an integrated conservation programme for the property. Regarding the project to build the airport, the state of conservation report submitted to the World Heritage Centre in February 2011 mentions that the final decision on the location has not been made yet. The 2005 ICOMOS mission report did not have all necessary information. Significant additional information has been gathered since and more study has been produced. Honduras requested a new mission with main objectives to analyze the Rio Amarillo project. A new evaluation and report are necessary in order to motivate the decision of the World Heritage Committee.

ICOMOS said that new information which has not been assessed before would be helpful as a basis for further review. An evaluation in the light of any future mission could be useful.

The **Chairperson** urged the Observer Delegation of **Honduras** to provide significant information, to present the information to the World Heritage Centre as soon as possible, and in advance for the consideration of Decision.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that two amendments were received from the Delegations of Brazil and Mexico on paragraphs 5 and 6.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked for more precise information on these paragraphs - airport or airfields, as the State party provided new information that is important to consider.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** mentionne que le Comité du patrimoine mondial s'est déjà prononcé deux fois sur le projet de construction de l'aéroport. Elle demande la suspension des discussions pour prendre connaissance du contenu du projet de Décision. Elle souhaite revenir plus tard sur les détails du contenu car il y a une incohérence entre le texte en anglais et sa version française sur la demande de suspension du projet de construction de l'aéroport à Rio Amarillo.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed with the proposal by the Delegation of Switzerland. He indicated that the French term "Terrain d'atterrissage" reflects better the reality than "airport".

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie la Présidente et informe qu'elle préfère l'amendement suggéré par la Délégation du Brésil car pour le moment aucun travaux de construction n'ont été entrepris sur le bien. Elle estime que la notion proposée par la Délégation du Brésil et son texte en anglais sont plus adéquats que la version proposée par la Délégation de la Suisse.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime que le texte en anglais est illogique, le terme devrait être « malgré ». Le texte en français doit faire foi. Le terme « terrain d'atterrissage » est plus approprié que le terme « aéroport ». Il faut intégrer le terme « malgré les recommandations ...du Centre du patrimoine mondial » et non de « suspendre les travaux ». Elle indique qu'on ne peut pas demander la suspension de travaux qui n'ont pas encore commencé.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of France to assist with the clarification of the language to use.

La Délégation de la **France** mentionne être en accord avec la Délégation de la Suisse en indiquant qu'on ne peut pas suspendre des travaux qui n'ont pas commencé.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** suggère « des projets visant la construction d'un terrain d'atterrissage ».

The **Chairperson** asked the status of the project to the Observer Delegation of **Honduras**.

The Delegation of **Honduras** responded that no decision has been taken so far to initiate the construction.

The Delegation of **Barbados** said that it is not asking the State Party to suspend the consideration.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked if previous decisions had requested the suspension of the project.

The **Secretariat** informed that already at the 2007 World Committee session it was noted that a proper site to set up an airport should be chosen. With information received in 2008, the World Heritage Committee (32nd session, Quebec City, 2008) decided to request the State Party not to proceed with the construction of the airport. Firstly, the report stated that the site was not the best setting in view of meteorological conditions, climatology and stability. Secondly, all of this area is naturally and culturally protected. Thirdly, the site has a high archaeological significance.

La Délégation du **Mexique** remercie le Secrétariat pour ses commentaires présentés lors des précédentes sessions du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle précise qu'il faut donner l'occasion à l'Etat partie de proposer un nouveau projet et lui permettre de proposer une alternative.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested trying to find a consensus with new information provided by the Delegation of Honduras, together with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Body.

The Delegation of **Barbados** suggested that the State Party should notify any intention to proceed with the Decision.

ICOMOS said that the World Heritage Committee had discussed about the Heritage Impact Assessment being carried out as early as possible. This should be submitted for assessment before any decision or any approval of projects is made. The original paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision was meant to capture this idea of a Heritage Impact Assessment.

The **Chairperson** proposed the suspension of the examination to allow the Delegations to agree on a text.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested more time to assess the new information provided by the Delegation of Panama regarding "**Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of**

Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama)” and “**Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá)**”, and asked to postpone discussion on this Item.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the World Heritage Centre agreed to discuss the items later on to give new information. Therefore two properties proposed for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger would be discussed later.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tiwanaku: Spiritual and Political Centre of the Tiwanaku Culture (Bolivia) (C 567 rev) – 35 COM 7B.119
City of Potosi (Bolivia) (C 420) – 35 COM 7B.120
Brasilia (Brazil) (C 445) – 35 COM 7B.121
San Augustin Archaeological Park (Colombia) (C 744) – 35 COM 7B.122
City of Quito (Ecuador) (C 2) – 35 COM 7B.124
National History Park – Citadel, Sans Souci, Ramiers (Haiti) (C 180) – 35 COM 7B.125
Historic Centre of Mexico City and Xochimilco (Mexico) (C 412) – 35 COM 7B.126
Camino Real de Tierra Adentro (Mexico) (C 1351) – 35 COM 7B.128
Lines and Geoglyphs of Nasca and Pampas de Jumana (Peru) (C 700) – 35 COM 7B.131
Historic Centre of the City of Arequipa (Peru) (C 1016) – 35 COM 7B.132
City of Cuzco (Peru) (C 273) – 35 COM 7B.133
Historic Centre of Lima (Peru) (C 500bis) – 35 COM 7B.134

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked to open the discussion on "Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay)".

The **Chairperson** noted this request and informed that the discussion will be opened at a later stage.

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

AFRICA

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)

Le **Secrétariat** présente le rapport concernant le bien du Paysage Culturel de Mapungubwe. Le Secrétariat indique qu'il a reçu, ainsi que l'ICOMOS, des nouvelles informations concernant ce bien. Ainsi l'Etat partie a soumis un rapport en mars 2011, présentant les termes de référence permettant de compléter l'Etude d'Impact Environnemental (EIE) demandée par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de sa précédente session (Brasilia, 2010).

ICOMOS was concerned about the impact of an openpit mining in the buffer zone. The mining is proposed in the area of high archaeological interest. Thus, if an adequate Environmental Heritage Impact Assessment has been carried out which takes into account the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and come to a negative conclusion, a mining permit should not have been granted. ICOMOS welcomed the fact that the State Party instructed to halt the mining operation in order to revise its mining methods subject to an environmental impact assessment at the time of the mission in November 2010. ICOMOS has provided suggested Terms of Reference for this impact assessment; however no progress has been reported. As water licences for the mining operation have been approved now and as preliminary clearing of the area has been carried out, ICOMOS called for the impact assessment as soon as possible.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked whether the State Party could clarify the outcome of the technical study that has been undertaken as a part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.

The Delegation of **Sweden** considered that the Draft Decision covers what needs to be done, and hoped that the State Party would halt the planned mining operation. This case also illustrates how the Committee and States Parties discuss about boundaries and buffer zones rather than solely on the impact to the Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation of Sweden supported the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that it has submitted a minor amendment, but it is not a substantial amendment that changes the position of the decision. The Delegation of Australia took the point raised by the Delegation of Sweden to focus the issue on impact and values rather than on boundaries, and asked the State Party to address the issues.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked the State Party how the land use plan is taken into account in this heritage sensitive area.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** said that there is a distance between the proposed mining area and the World Heritage site according to the report. The challenge confronted by the South African authorities is the slow pace of the land acquisition process. There is information from the mining company which joined the International Council of Mining and Metals (ICMM) and that the property should receive the assessment that has been proposed.

Le **Secrétariat** informe que depuis la préparation du rapport, de nouvelles informations sur la situation du bien ont été recues. Il s'agit de la décision prise en mars 2011 par le Département des Affaires environnementales, de finalement attribuer la licence d'exploitation d'eau, à la Société d'exploitation minière CoAL of África. L'Etat partie a aussi soumis au Centre du patrimoine mondial, en mai 2011, les termes de référence qui permettront de réviser l'étude d'impact environnementale, en tenant compte de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien, comme recommandée par la mission de novembre 2010.

The **Chairperson** announced that there will be an evening meeting and that there are several options that will be decided later on.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the States Parties for their questions. Replying to the question from the Delegation of the Russian Federation, it stressed that there was a mission in November 2010 and that not all studies of the scientific presentations indicated a negative impact on the property. Answering the question from the Delegation of Sweden, it wanted to apologize for any new information it might present. There are 7 km between the mining site and the boundary of the World Heritage property. The Delegation stated that it met with the concerned stakeholders: the Department that issues mining permits did not allow additional mining applications in the 7 km area around the site. It stated that it received the support from the land owners (especially from the eastern part of the boundaries). Finally, it stressed that although the scientific studies did not indicate an impact, it decided to undertake an environmental impact assessment study. The Delegation added that the mining companies wanted to join ICMM (International Council on Mining and Metals). Answering the question from the Delegation of Brazil it stated that the State Party is working with Zimbabwe and Botswana on a management plan for the Transfrontier Conservation Area in order to refocus on all conservation issues in the area.

ICOMOS welcomed the confirmation of the Delegation of South Africa to complete the environmental impact assessment study on the Outstanding Universal Value (OUV) of the property. The environmental impact assessments carried out so far did not focus on the impact on the cultural property or on the Outstanding Universal Value and the new impact assessment would fill that gap. It added that the buffer zone should include the area to the East. It noted a confusion of what was envisioned at the time of inscription and the current state of conservation.

Le **Rapporteur indique** dit avoir reçu plusieurs amendements au projet de décision de la Délégation de l'Australie et de la Délégation de l'Éthiopie.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of South Africa for the significant information pointing to a positive reaction to a monitoring mission. The positive steps from the State Party should be considered.

The **Chairperson** proposed to postpone the adoption of the Draft Decision to allow time to integrate amendments made by the Delegations of Australia and Ethiopia to the Draft Decision.

Stone Town of Zanzibar (United Republic of Tanzania) (C 173rev)

Le **Secrétariat** informe que l'Etat partie a eu une séance de travail avec le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS, le 10 juin 2011. L'Etat partie a soumis des documents détaillés sur le projet architectural de l'hôtel qui pourrait être construit à côté du bâtiment historique de grade I, le Mambo Msiige. Lors de cette séance de travail, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et l'ICOMOS ont fait part de leurs commentaires sur la proposition architecturale soumise. Selon le Centre et l'ICOMOS, cette proposition devrait être revue car son dimensionnement et son aspect architectural ne respectent pas les règles édictées dans le plan de conservation de la Vieille Ville. La Délégation s'est engagée à revoir cette proposition architecturale et a sollicité les conseils de l'ICOMOS et du Centre du patrimoine mondial.

ICOMOS welcomes the progress made in the management arrangements, which were carried out with many stakeholders. Nevertheless, it is concerned by the state of conservation of the property. It expressed its concern at proposals to build a large hotel complex on a designated public space and adjoining the Mambo Msiige building. This proposal could pose a serious threat to the authenticity and integrity of the property. The construction of a new hotel complex should not impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **South Africa** stated that the Committee should note the commitment for the renovation of the building and urges the State Party to continue working with the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in order not to impact the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Sweden** added a small amendment to paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision indicating that technical information should be received by the Centre.

Le **Rapporteur** indique avoir reçu deux amendements de la Délégation de l'Australie sur les paragraphes 6 et 7.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** fait remarquer qu'il y a une différence entre la version de l'amendement reçu par les membres du Comité et celle qui est projetée à l'écran, surtout au paragraphe 6. La Délégation demande qu'à l'avenir, le Secrétariat annonce clairement lorsqu'il y a une différence entre les deux versions (papier et écran) pour plus de compréhension.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.45** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Lamu Old Town (Kenya) (C 1055) - – 35 COM 7B.39
Timbuktu (Mali) (C 119 rev) – 35 COM 7B.40
Aapravasi Ghat (Mauritius) (C 1227) – 35 COM 7B.41
Island of Gorée (Senegal) (C 26) – 35 COM 7B.42
Island of Saint-Louis (Senegal) (C 956 bis) – 35 COM 7B.43

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

ARAB STATES

Petra (Jordan) (C 326)

Le **Secrétariat** présente le point 7B 49, Petra, indiquant qu'il n'avait pas reçu de nouvelle information.

ICOMOS expressed its great concern about the state of conservation of the property. The mission report of the joint monitoring mission in December 2010 showed a lack of

maintenance, unregulated public use and aggravated conditions. It pointed out that there is a lack of a decision making mechanism.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noticed that the master plan was prepared due to be finalized in 2011. It welcomed the efforts by the State Party and wished to listen about the updates from the State Party.

The Delegation of **China** emphasized the importance of the cultural World Heritage property of Petra. It asked the State Party of Jordan if it had an archeological plan.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked a similar question as the Delegation of Bahrain and wished to hear about progress made.

The Delegation of **Iraq** asked the Delegation of Jordan for more information.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commended the intervention of the Delegation of China with regard to the unique value of the property. It stressed that archeological excavations are very important and vital and proposed that perhaps these excavation works should be done in cooperation with the World Heritage Centre. It trusted that the Delegation of Jordan would provide Committee Members with updated and useful information.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** commended the interventions of the Delegations of China, Iraq and Egypt.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that Petra is one of the largest sites on the World Heritage List. The State Party makes great effort, a management plan is ongoing since 1996, always updated and implemented. It emphasized that excavations are vital for this site and that there is a need to conduct further excavations for maintenance, it is not sufficient as it is now. It wanted to halt excavations until it would obtain further information. The Delegation acknowledged the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS for their cooperation. A mission is working currently to determine a buffer zone.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce avoir reçu des amendements des Délégation de l'Egypte, des Emirats Arabes Unis, de Bahreïn et de l'Australie concernant le projet de résolution.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.49** was adopted as amended.

Tyre (Lebanon) (C 299)

Le **Secrétariat** annonce qu'il a reçu des informations nouvelles de la part du Liban, mais que ces informations sont arrivées le 11 juin 2011 au Centre du patrimoine mondial, trop tard pour être étudiées. Le Secrétariat reconnaît néanmoins que d'importants progrès ont été réalisés, notamment l'évaluation archéologique du projet d'autoroute, les échantillons sont considérés comme suffisants pour évaluer le potentiel impact du tracé de l'autoroute sur le site. La documentation du site a été réalisée ainsi que la cartographie. La carte des risques a également été réalisée et utilisée pour identifier les interventions urgentes.

ICOMOS took note of information of the State Party. Limited progress has been identified since the 2009 monitoring mission. It noted concern about the efficiency and regulatory measures. It stated the need for additional information on the impact on the Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** was pleased to hear that the World Heritage Centre has received the State Party's report. It appreciated efforts made by the State Party and its willingness to invite a reactive monitoring mission, hopefully in the near future. It asked the State Party about what is being done about the conservation efforts. It submitted an amendment to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se dit préoccupée par le manque d'information mais prend néanmoins note que l'Etat partie a soumis le rapport, même tardivement. La Délégation a par ailleurs dit qu'elle était heureuse que l'Etat partie veuille accueillir la mission conjointe ICOMOS / Centre du patrimoine mondial et reste convaincue que cette collaboration aboutira sans doute à une meilleure situation.

The Delegation of **Australia** confirmed a technical amendment. It understood that the State Party is happy to accept the mission.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** emphasized that this property is very important. It was very concerned about the reactive monitoring mission. It wished to allow the State Party to provide further information.

The Delegation of **Jordan** agreed with the Delegations of Switzerland, Nigeria and Bahrain and wished to listen to the State Party.

The Delegation of **Egypt** welcomed the information and report submitted by the State Party and asked for further clarification.

La Délégation du **Liban** (Observateur) confirme toutes les informations apportées par le Secrétariat. L'Etat partie dit être conscient de la valeur de Tyr, mais reconnaît que la situation politique du Liban a beaucoup contribué à ce retard. La Délégation a par ailleurs confirmé qu'elle est disposée à recevoir la mission conjointe ICOMOS/Centre du patrimoine mondial et a donc demandé au Comité de prendre en compte les informations fournies pour sa prise de décision. Le Liban a toujours respecté les décisions du Comité, mais les récents événements dans le pays l'ont empêché de rendre le rapport à temps.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraphs.

The **Rapporteur** informed that he received amendments from the Delegation of Bahrain and Australia.

Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted; paragraph 3 was deleted as proposed by the Delegation of Bahrain; paragraph 4 was also proposed for deletion by the Delegation of Bahrain, but the Delegation of Switzerland requested the floor.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** suggère une modification d'ordre grammatical dans le paragraphe 4 du projet de Décision.

The **Chairperson**, requested convergence between the French and English texts.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose de modifier, au paragraphe 4 du projet de Décision, « a bien fourni le rapport... » au lieu de « n'a pas fourni de rapport... ».

The **Chairperson** informed that the French and English texts were now aligned therefore paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

The **Rapporteur** informed that paragraphs 6 and 7 were proposed for deletion.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked for clarification from the Delegation of Bahrain about the exact meaning of their amended paragraph, to which the **Chairperson** replied that indeed the wording was unclear and asked the Delegation of Bahrain to clarify.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** replied that it proposed to keep the wording of the paragraph to “2012” only and to delete the remainder of the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested retaining the words “progress accomplished” referring to the need for follow-up by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** accepted the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia.

The **Chairperson** referred to this final revision of the new paragraph 5, which was adopted as amended. Then she moved to paragraph 6, which the Delegation of Bahrain had proposed for deletion, but to which the Delegation of Australia proposed an amendment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique ne pas être d'accord pour supprimer le paragraphe 6 du projet de Décision concernant l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor, respectively to the Delegations of Egypt, France and Nigeria.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** est d'accord avec l'amendement de la Délégation du Bahreïn qui propose la suppression du paragraphe 6 du projet de Décision (ancien paragraphe 7) concernant l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient l'amendement de la Délégation du Bahreïn pour la suppression de la décision d'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril et propose de se tenir à la demande de l'Etat partie d'inviter une mission de suivi réactif conjointe Centre du patrimoine mondial/ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the proposal to retain paragraph 6, in particular the words “to inscribe on the List of World Heritage in Danger” in the last sentence. It reminded the Members of the World Heritage Committee that inscribing on the List of World Heritage in Danger is foremost a mechanism to draw the attention of the

international community to provide support and that it is by no means to be perceived as a punishment, therefore supporting the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Australia to retain the section with “progress accomplished”.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, referring to its keen awareness of the situation in Tyre, supported the proposal put forward by the Delegations of Bahrain and France and stated that there was no need to mention the word “endangered”.

The **Chairperson** asked whether to retain or delete paragraph 6.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** appuie la proposition du Nigeria de garder la proposition d’inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril mais de l’ajouter dans le paragraphe 5.

The **Chairperson** replied that in order to do that she had to re-open paragraph 5 to accommodate the suggestion made by the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation de l’**Egypte** rappelle que le paragraphe 6 du projet de décision, tel que amendé par la Délégation de l’Australie, a été proposé avant d’avoir reçu les informations de l’Etat partie et invite à tenir compte de ces nouveaux éléments. Elle réitère son soutien à l’amendement de la Délégation du Bahreïn.

The **Chairperson** replied that there was a split among the Members of the World Heritage Committee on this issue and gave the floor to the Delegation of Australia.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Nigeria to retain the last sentence and stated that this concerned a technical change only, which would send a strong signal to the State Party, while the World Heritage Committee could make a decision next year on whether or not to go for Danger listing.

La Délégation du **Mali** soutient la Délégation du Nigéria dans sa proposition de rechercher une solution de compromis.

The Delegation of **Estonia** also supported the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Nigeria.

La Délégation de la **France** propose de rédiger différemment le texte du paragraphe 6 demandant à l’Etat partie de soumettre un rapport pour examen par la 36e session du Comité afin de considérer, en l’absence de progrès substantiels, l’inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

The Delegation of **Jordan** aligned with the position of the Delegation of Egypt not to inscribe the property of Tyre on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated it would follow the other Members of the World Heritage Committee to keep paragraph 6 with the amendments put forward by the Delegations of France and Australia.

The **Chairperson** replied that there was no more proposal to delete paragraph 6. She announced that the Paragraph was adopted as amended by the Delegations of France and Australia, thanking France for putting forward the solution to the issue.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.51** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ARAB REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Tipasa (Algeria) (C 193) – 35 COM 7B.46

Kasbah of Algiers (Algeria) (C 565) – 35 COM 7B.47

Historic Cairo (Egypt) (C 89) – 35 COM 7B.48

Um er-Rasas (Kastrom Mefa'a) (Jordan) (C 1093) – 35 COM 7B.50

Ouadi Qadisha (the Holy Valley) and the Forest of the Cedars of God (Horsh Arz el-Rab) (Lebanon) (C 850) – 35 COM 7B.52

Archaeological Site of Cyrene (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 190) – 35 COM 7B.53

Rock-Art Sites of Tadrart Acacus (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (C 287) – 35 COM 7B.54

Ksar Ait-Ben-Haddou (Morocco) (C 444) – 35 COM 7B.55

Historic City of Meknes (Morocco) (C 793) – 35 COM 7B.56

Gebel Barkal and the Sites of the Napatan Region (Sudan) (C 1073) – 35 COM 7B.57

Ancient City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic) (C 20) – 35 COM 7B.58

Archaeological Site of Carthage (Tunisia) (C 37) – 35 COM 7B.59

Old City of Sana'a (Yemen) (C 385) – 35 COM 7B.60

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that it had no objections to this list of properties that required no discussion by the World Heritage Committee, but referring to the property of Historic Cairo, it clarified that similar to the discussion involving the property of Abu Mena earlier, the country recently had experienced a revolution, that the Ministry of Culture had changed, and that there had been no possibility to prepare a state of conservation report on time, and these constraints had been discussed already with the Chief of the Arab States Unit.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite féliciter la Délégation de la Tunisie (Observateur) pour l'abrogation de tous les décrets des 15 dernières années concernant le site archéologique de Carthage.

FOURTH DAY – WEDNESDAY, 22 JUNE 2011

SIXTH MEETING

7.30 p.m. – 10.30 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

The **Chairperson** asked the Director of the World Heritage Centre to inform the members of the World Heritage Committee about the state of conservation reports of which examination had been suspended

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** informed that the examination of the state of conservation of Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania, Decision **35 COM 7B.7**), the Great Barrier Reef (Australia, Decision **35 COM 7B.10**), Virgin Komi Forest (Russian Federation, Decision **35 COM 7B.25**), the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru, Decision **35 COM 7B.38**), and the Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama, Decision **35 COM 7B.125**), as well as the Archaeological Site of Panama Viejo and the Historic District of Panama (Panama, Decision **35 COM 7B.130**), and the Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay, Decision **35 COM 7B.135**) are still to be continued.

La Délégation du **Maroc** ajoute quelques éléments d'informations concernant les deux rapports sur les sites marocains du Ksar Ait-Ben-Haddou (Maroc) (C 444) et de la Ville historique de Meknès (Maroc) (C 793).

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested the order of decisions to be addressed during the evening session.

The **Chairperson** announced that with regard to suspended Decisions regarding state of conservation of natural properties on the World Heritage List, the World Heritage Committee had indicated to be ready with the proposed revised Decisions for Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154) and Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719). She also announced that the discussions regarding Serengeti National Park (United Republic of Tanzania) (N 156) were still ongoing; and that the revised Decision regarding the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274) was being typed. She suggested going back to the suspended Decision regarding the Great Barrier Reef.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Great Barrier Reef (Australia) (N 154) (Continuation)

IUCN said that it had no additional comments.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee that printed copies of the revised Decisions had been distributed in the room. She proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 to 4 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to delete the term “deeply” from paragraph 4, to read “Also regrets”.

Paragraph 4 and 5 were adopted as amended.

Concerning paragraph 6, the Chairperson proposed to retain the first part of the original draft and to add the new proposal submitted by the Delegation of South Africa until “2012”.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** note que la partie de la phrase supprimée par la Délégation de l’Afrique du Sud est importante. Cette phrase a été présente dans toutes les Décisions jusqu’à maintenant et devrait donc être conservée.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to the request by the State Party for this item to be discussed, which was said to indicate its strong commitment. It raised the question as to whether the site should be inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its support for the statement made by the Delegation of Brazil. It said that there was no need to threaten States Parties. It also said that the inclusion of a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger would need to be discussed after a review had taken place. It added that already threatening the State Party to include it on the World Heritage in Danger List at this point would be prejudging the results of experts.

The Delegations of the **Russian Federation** and Bahrain also expressed their support for the position of the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se base sur la première partie de la phrase et accepte les modifications apportées par la Délégation de la Barbade pour rendre le texte moins contraignant. Donc, si le Comité décide de supprimer cette phrase, elle sera dans l’obligation de demander à rediscuter les paragraphes 1 à 6.

The Delegation of **Brazil** added that the World Heritage Committee can inscribe a site on the List of World Heritage in Danger at any point in time, without requiring a prior threatening paragraph in its Decisions. It also added that it understood that the previous paragraphs had been approved and therefore that it was not possible to reconsider them.

The **Chairperson** expressed the need to consult the Legal Advisor on the issue of coming back to previously approved paragraphs in the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souhaite intervenir sur la question de la mention de la Liste en péril dans les paragraphes de décisions. Elle insiste sur le fait que des solutions simples doivent être recherchées plutôt que de systématiquement inscrire cette possibilité dans les décisions.

The **Legal Advisor** was consulted regarding the previous statement made by the Delegation of Brazil. She said that the Committee is adopting Draft Decisions paragraph by paragraph, and that there is no specific legal provision in this case where the complete Decision has yet to be adopted. She said that it was up to the Committee to decide whether it wanted to come back to one of the previously approved paragraphs, as long as the Decision was not adopted as a whole.

The **Chairperson** went back to the concerned paragraph. She summarized that a number of States Parties were in favour of deleting the second part of the paragraph. She added that one member of the Committee had expressed its deep concern that the Decision might be weakened and asked to reopen the paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** a exprimé son esprit de compromis et indique accepter non seulement de supprimer la dernière partie du paragraphe mais aussi de ne pas réouvrir le débat. The **Chairperson** noted the sense of compromise of the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.10** was adopted as amended.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Virgin Komi Forests (Russian Federation) (N 719) (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that paragraphs 1 to 4 of the Draft Decision had already been adopted and that a proposal had been made to delete paragraph 5 and a new formulation had been submitted.

The Delegation of **Estonia** referred to the Committee having recognized the clear potential threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property by adopting paragraph 4. It said that this should lead to the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It also added that, if not, the Committee would jeopardize the *Convention* and the *Operational Guidelines*. It also said that the goldmine would clearly impact the Outstanding Universal Value and integrity of the property and that the State Party had already given the green light for these activities. It also added that no official request for the modification of boundaries had been submitted by the State Party. It added that there was a need to prove that there would be no impact on the property and that until then, all mining needed to be halted. It reminded that mining concessions were incompatible with the *Convention* and requested the State party to clarify whether some boundary modifications were to be proposed.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se base sur l'approche logique du texte, donc si le paragraphe 4 indique qu'il y a une menace évidente sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, alors la possibilité d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril semble évidente.

The Delegation of **Brazil** informed that it was not possible to consider paragraph 5 without looking at the following paragraphs. It believed that there could be a potential threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and that it would like to request the State Party for information regarding measures which it intended to take to prevent this threat.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its support to the Delegations of Switzerland and Estonia.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that this was a challenging discussion. In principle it is against a goldmine within a World Heritage property, however it also referred to the deficient process. It said that there were two options. One was to express concerns. The other was to look forward and focus on the remaining large part of the property, including through a revision of its boundaries. It proposed to take a more constructive approach and request a modification of boundaries. It called upon the State Party to adhere to the processes of the World Heritage Convention. It requested to hear from the State Party whether it would be willing to do so.

La Délégation de la **France** appuie la Délégation du Brésil, il est important à ce stade d'entendre les informations fournies par l'Etat partie et de se focaliser sur les engagements à venir. Il existe à présent des outils performants permettant de délimiter de manière précise le bien, aussi la Délégation aimerait entendre l'Etat partie pour plus d'informations.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recalled that the boundary modification taking the goldmine into account would concern less than 1% of the total surface of the property. It also repeated that mining activities had been existing there for more than 40 years. It said that there was no threat to the site as a whole and that very strict regulations are applied. It was of the view that paragraph 8 included in the Draft Decision was a big mistake as by Russian law any economic activities are strictly forbidden in protected areas. It referred to paragraph 6 of the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil and said that this would require a major boundary modification. It also expressed the fact that it would follow the recommendations made by IUCN mission in 2010. Finally it informed that taking into account the psychology of the local government, inscription of this property on the List of World Heritage in Danger would certainly make the conservation of the property even more difficult.

The **Chairperson** noted the concern. She requested the Committee whether – taking into account the additional information – it was now able to take a decision. Having no objection, she decided to consider Decision **35 COM 7B.25** for adoption. She recalled that paragraph 5 of the Draft Decision, referring to adding the property to the List of World Heritage in Danger. A new paragraph 5 had been proposed, based on paragraph 6 of the Draft Decision with deletion of the 2 subparagraphs.

IUCN made the observation that deleting the 2 subparagraphs represented the deletion of the 2010 World Heritage Centre-IUCN mission recommendations.

The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of the remaining paragraphs of Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.25**

The new paragraph 5 was adopted and both subparagraphs were deleted.
Paragraph 6 and its 4 subparagraphs as well as Paragraph 7 were adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed deleting the original paragraph 9. This proposal was adopted.

A new paragraph 8 was proposed combining parts of the initial paragraphs 9 and 10.

The original paragraph 11 was proposed for deletion.

A new paragraph 9 had been proposed.

The Draft Decision **7B.25** was adopted as amended.

MIXED PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) (C/N 274)

The **Secretariat** presented new information provided by the State Party regarding the tourism use plan, which envisages a considerable increase in the number of visitors to the site. It also concerned the planned development of a risk-preparedness plan and a solid waste removal strategy. In addition, it included two contradictory proposals regarding the western access to the property.

The first one concerns the construction of massive infrastructures such as a national road, while the second one concerns access by train and air. It includes an airport, railroad bridges and a cable car to access the citadel. Additional information was provided on Supreme Decree n° 26, which was adopted on 16 June 2011 and concerns the construction of the national road. The Decree did not halt the construction of the road, and clearly indicated the decision to construct the road, through the buffer zone of the property. Finally, the State Party submitted Supreme Decree n° 003, which was adopted on 17 June 2011. This Decree concerns a modification in the management unit for the property, to include the local government as well. It also underlined the fact that threats were reported for the site for the last 10 years.

ICOMOS expressed its strong concern about the lack of substantial progress with regard to the implementation of the emergency plan for the property. It added that many of the actions remained at the level of planning, and that there was a lack of resources to implement the emergency plan. It stressed that the property meets all criteria for its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. This is especially with regard to the lack of governance and existing gaps in the decision-making process, as well as the lack of conservation policies for all components of the property, all of which make that tourism is preferred over the sustainability of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

It welcomed the additional information provided with regard to the revised management structure, but added that sustained efforts are needed over time. It also noted the threats represented by the proposed new developments, such as the national road, and those related to uncontrolled urban development at Machu Picchu village. It recalled that the new information provided clearly stated the intention of the State Party to continue the road construction. No further information being provided with regard to public use issues that had been raised; the issue of the western access remains. It added that there is further indication of a rise in visitor numbers to the property. It finally recalled that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is a call for action for cooperation with the international community, for sharing conservation measures and allowing mobilization of resources.

The **Chairperson** opened the discussion on the Historic Sanctuary of Machu Picchu (Peru) by giving the floor to the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Brazil** declared that it had followed closely the previous contribution of ICOMOS. It also acknowledged the progress made by the State Party of Peru in addressing governance issues at the property. It called on the Chairperson to request the State Party to elaborate on the construction of the proposed road through the property as well as the possible implications of the effects of the property limits on the Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation de la **France** note que beaucoup d'Etats parties ont un intérêt particulier pour ce site remarquable et sont préoccupés par l'état de conservation du bien. Elle souligne que la gestion est un élément essentiel pour la conservation du bien et se félicite des efforts déjà accomplis par l'Etat partie. Elle souhaite néanmoins demander à l'Etat partie des précisions quant aux progrès accomplis dans la gestion du Sanctuaire et à l'implication des autorités régionales et locales dans la gestion du bien.

The Delegation of **Iraq** appreciated the work of the Secretariat in conserving the property and the State Party's effort to produce the report on the state of conservation of the property. It also expressed its satisfaction about the consensus reached at various levels of government, thus assuring the long term sustainability of the property. Accordingly the Delegation of Iraq saw no need to put the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It was of the view that with the efforts already put in place by the State Party, constant monitoring would suffice to maintain the Outstanding Universal Value at this stage.

The Delegation of **Egypt** acknowledged the considerable efforts that had been made by the State Party of Peru to ensure the conservation of this outstanding site that embodies the remarkable Inca culture. It also revealed that it had held discussions with Peruvian experts who have assured it of their commitment and the close work with the Secretariat in this regard. The Delegation expressed its support for the positions of the Delegations of France, Brazil and Iraq not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'il s'agit d'un bien remarquable mais très fragile. Elle note que le bien souffre d'une pression publique considérable et de problèmes graves de conservation et de gestion. Tandis qu'elle se félicite des efforts accomplis par l'Etat partie et l'encourage à les poursuivre, elle souligne que les actions non pas encore

été suffisantes pour remédier aux menaces qui pèsent sur le bien. Elle considère que l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril d'un bien apporte des effets positifs pour l'état de conservation du bien. Elle insiste sur le fait que Machu Picchu remplit tous les critères de mise en péril et qu'il faudra ainsi soutenir l'Etat partie dans la conservation du bien.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Secretariat and IUCN for the report. It called upon the Chairperson to give the State Party an opportunity to explain to the Committee what actions had been taken to put in place the Action Plan drawn up by the last ICOMOS mission.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** recognised that this was another clear case of conflict between development and conservation efforts and emphasized that the proposed road is critical for the local economy. It wondered what balance could be achieved and called for the State Party to be given the opportunity to address the Committee about possible alternatives if they exist.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its full support for the position of the Delegation of Switzerland and ICOMOS. It further pointed out that inscribing on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not a punishment but rather a corrective measure to help preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

La Délégation du **Mali** constate qu'un total de neuf missions a été mené sur le bien entre 1997 et 2010. La dernière en février 2010 a été une mission technique d'urgence. Elle interroge l'Etat partie ainsi que le Centre du patrimoine mondial si l'état actuel du bien permet encore de le considérer comme étant encore un véritable Sanctuaire.

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the Advisory Bodies for their sustained efforts regarding the property. It expressed astonishment at the poverty of pictorial evidence that had been shown in the PowerPoint presentation. It supported the position of the Delegation of Egypt in favour of inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger and further requested the Committee to provide available assistance to the State Party.

The Delegation of **China** observed that the high altitude of the property's location makes it challenging to manage. It further asked the State Party if it would be able to address the issues raised should the Committee decide against the inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the original Draft Decision and further noted that the inscription of a property on the List of World Heritage in Danger is not a punishment but rather an encouragement for international support and assistance.

The **Chairperson** called on the State Party of Peru to respond to the questions that had been asked by various members of the Committee.

In its response, the Observer Delegation of **Peru** emphasised that the Santa Maria road remained a mere proposal and was *not* under construction. A supreme national decree had been promulgated that expressly stated that any road proposal would not pass through the historic centre of the property. The decree also specified the commitment of the Peruvian authorities to ensure the protection of the property. The decree also makes

provision for the World Heritage Centre to collaborate with the State Party to propose concrete measures to meet the challenges. The State Party invited the World Heritage Centre to undertake a mission in November and participate in an international panel to discuss the issues at the site. Furthermore the State Party expressed that there was no justification to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 were adopted without debate.

The **Chairperson** brought the Committee's attention to the amendment of paragraph 4 by the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** fait remarquer que le nouveau paragraphe 4 répète en quelque sorte le paragraphe 3 et que l'on pourrait donc supprimer le paragraphe 3.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that in view of the State Party's explanations, it concurred with the proposition of the Delegation of Switzerland and proposed the deletion of the paragraph 3 as it was similar to paragraph 4, under consideration and as it was already adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Brazil but pointed out that the State Party's presentation was unclear as to whether all the issues pointed out by ICOMOS had been addressed.

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed finding an intermediate position in view of those expressed earlier by the Delegations of Brazil and Switzerland. To assist in this, it called for the replacement of the word "inform" with the phrase "as well as" in paragraph 3.

The **Chairperson** reminded the Committee that paragraph 3 had already been adopted and observed that the proposal made by the Delegation of Mexico was an amendment to paragraph 3 and therefore called on the Committee to adopt the amended paragraph.

Paragraph 3 was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** then reintroduced paragraph 4 for discussion, recalling the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Australia and wondered if it would be possible to seek clarification from the State Party, about the threats which it had been able to address successfully.

The **Chairperson** called on the Observer Delegation of **Peru** to take the floor.

The Observer Delegation of **Peru** explained that the electronic control over the western access to the property had been increased in line with the given threshold. It further restated the fact that the Santa Maria road was not under construction. Furthermore, it confirmed that no feasibility study had been carried out yet and that in the event when it would be, it should be submitted first to the World Heritage Centre for due consideration. However it explained that a study was currently underway to identify which measures should be taken to protect and preserve the property adequately.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** suggère que dans l'amendement du paragraphe 4 les mots « accueille favorablement » soient remplacés par « prend également note » afin d'assurer la cohérence avec le paragraphe 3.

Paragraph 4, 5 and the new text of Paragraph 6 were adopted.

Concerning paragraph 7, the Delegation of **Brazil** suggested looking at the first half only as the second portion of the paragraph had been in the original paragraph 8.

Concerning the content of paragraph 8, **IUCN** noted that the standard procedure is to amplify site monitoring for properties inscribed on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested changing the word “Reinforced” to “Reactive” and “Mechanism” to “mission”.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that this had already been addressed in the following paragraph 9.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** insiste sur le fait qu'il y a un problème fondamental car il est précisé que le bien est déjà entré dans un mécanisme de suivi renforcé et qu'il s'agit surtout de continuer à demander à l'Etat partie de traiter les problèmes existants.

The Delegation of **Sweden** found it difficult to make a decision on the basis of individual paragraphs which made it impossible to understand the context. It expressed that it would not be taking any decision on reactive monitoring until all paragraphs could be viewed in the context of the full Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** subsequently said that the Delegation of Sweden would be called upon to take a decision after all other paragraphs had been examined. She then called for the consideration of all the sub-sections of the paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que le processus de prise de décision du Comité va trop vite. Elle remarque notamment que les mots « entourage immédiat » ont complètement disparu du paragraphe amendé. C'est pourquoi elle demande que l'on accorde davantage de temps pour la rédaction et la relecture des paragraphes amendés qui devraient être fournis en version papier.

The **Chairperson** returned to the present proposals, observing that the paragraph was becoming heavy and called on the Committee to consider dividing the paragraph. She asked the Rapporteur to read the paragraph as amended, including the request to retain reference to inscribing the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. She proposed to the Delegation of Sweden whether it might want to consider that the portion of the paragraph referring to the List of World Heritage in Danger could be moved to another paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** read out the text as requested.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Sweden if it would consider adopting the paragraph as amended if the text on the List of World Heritage in Danger was moved further down in the Decision.

La Délégation de la **France** fait remarquer qu'il n'y a pas d'adéquation entre la version française et la version anglaise du paragraphe amendé et demande si la version anglaise fait foi. Elle constate que dans la version anglaise du paragraphe amendé, le Comité ne demande plus l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Par conséquent, elle demande que la version française soit corrigée et la référence à la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril enlevée.

The **Chairperson** called on the Committee to consider the English version of the amended text while the French version was being updated.

The Delegation of **Estonia** emphasised the need to view the document in its entirety, on paper and proposed discussing the Decision at a later moment.

The **Chairperson** responded saying that the sub-paragraphs under consideration were included in the original text and only sub-paragraphs (a) and (e) had been amended. She appreciated the difficulties that the Committee members faced having to read the document on the screen.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** suggested that paper copies could be produced for the Committee Members and the discussion moved to the next day.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** considère que la discussion étant presque terminée, une lecture lente du projet de Décision par le Rapporteur pourra permettre au Comité de clore la discussion dès ce soir et ainsi éviter de la reprendre le lendemain.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to read out the text as amended by the Delegations of Switzerland and Brazil again and slowly.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended text as requested.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** signale une incohérence des versions française et anglaise du paragraphe. Elle indique que seule la version française reflète l'amendement de la Délégation de la Suisse et qu'il faudrait adapter la version anglaise en conséquence.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Switzerland and called for the text to be amended as requested.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amended text.

The Delegation of **Brazil** called for the English version of the text to change the word "asks" to the word "requests".

Paragraph 7 which was subsequently adopted.

The **Chairperson** called for the adoption of paragraph 8 while pointing out the need to consider the concerns of the Delegation of Sweden and the amendment of the Delegation of Brazil. Paragraph 8 was adopted.

IUCN pointed out that the modalities of the mission as outlined in the text had not been established and it was not clear if the text on paragraph 8 required a monitoring mission.

The **Chairperson** clarified the issue by stating that the State Party had already invited a mission and that it might thus be redundant to invite IUCN on mission within the context of the present Decision.

IUCN stated that it was not clear what the Committee's request is in this paragraph. It recalled previous missions and said that the information in the Decision might merely be for noting by IUCN.

The **Chairperson** called for clarification and since there was none, invited the Delegation of Sweden to take the floor.

The Delegation of **Sweden** agreed for deletion of the text on the List of World Heritage in Danger as there was no majority.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.38** was adopted as amended.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Maya Site of Copan (Honduras) (C 129) (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** proposed to revise the draft decision for the site of Copán, Honduras and called on the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** informe de deux amendements, l'un sur le paragraphe 5 proposé par le Brésil et l'autre pour paragraphe 6.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft decision paragraph by paragraph, Paragraphs 1 to 4 were adopted.

The **Chairperson** proposed to return to the paragraph 5 and asked if it would be adopted as amended by **Brazil** and **Mexico**.

La Délégation du **Brésil** rappelle la discussion autour du texte entre les Délégations du **Brésil**, de la **Mexique** et de la **Suisse**. Elle propose également d'ajouter au paragraphe 6 une phrase concernant «L'étude par le Comité du Patrimoine Mondial»

The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt paragraph 5 as amended by delegations of **Brazil**, **Mexico** and **Switzerland**. Paragraph 5 was adopted

The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of paragraph 6. As no objection was formulated, paragraph 6 was adopted as amended. Furthermore, Paragraphs 7, 8 and 9, were adopted.

The Draft Decision **35COM 7B126** was adopted as amended

Fortifications on the Caribbean Side of Panama: Portobello-San Lorenzo (Panama) (C 135)

The **Chairperson** proposed to come back to the Draft Decision **35COM 7B129**.

Le **Secrétariat** rappelle qu'une inscription sur la Liste en péril a été proposée pour le site Portobello-San-Lorenzo en raison des dégâts par des pluies torrentielles. Un rapport sur les mesures préventives de conservation prises notamment sur le site et le port adjacent a été préparé.

ICOMOS expressed its serious concerns about the State of Conservation of the property and highlighted the vulnerability for the past nine years. She informed that the Reactive Monitoring Mission carried out in 2010 confirmed the extent of the deterioration of historic fabric in the area and absence of effective management system. ICOMOS considered that the attributes of outstanding and universal values are impacted and it stressed that the property meets all criteria for its inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. In spite of the confirmation that some progress has been made, ICOMOS concluded the extent of the deterioration for historic fabric which reconstitutes the danger to the property. The inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger would be the appropriated mechanism to ensure the significant threats. It would be serve to govern the necessary support at international, national and local levels and provide assistance for the conservation. ICOMOS was looking forward to work with the State Party and identified any support in its implementation.

La Délégation du **Brésil** informe avoir demandé de reporter cette discussion car la Délégation du Panama a fourni des informations relatives aux actions significatives prises pour garantir la conservation et l'atténuation des menaces ainsi que pour enrayer la dégradation du site. La délégation propose de donner la parole à l'Etat Partie, pour qu'il informe des mesures prises pour garantir la préservation de la valeur universelle exceptionnelle, son intégrité et son authenticité ainsi que les engagements futurs.

The delegation of **Sweden** acknowledged the efforts related to the site management that had been made by the State Party and encouraged the implementation of all actions required by the Committee. It revealed that this site presented the object of precedent discussions and it supported the inscription of the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger. It further pointed out that the inscription is not a punishment but rather a corrective measure to help preserve the Outstanding Universal Value of the Property.

La délégation de la **Suisse** soutient l'inscription du site sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial en péril. Tandis qu'elle se félicite des efforts entrepris par l'Etat Partie, elle souligne que ces actions non pas encore été suffisantes et que l'état du site a été altéré. Elle considère que l'inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial en péril présente un bon moyen pour mobiliser des forces pour remédier à cet état de fait

La Délégation du **Panama** (Observateur) a souligné que le gouvernement national a déclaré le site comme la zone d'urgence dans le but de renforcer les fortifications et réhabiliter ce site remarquable. Cependant car pendant longtemps rien n'avait été fait, il est évidemment impossible de rattraper le retard pendant quelques mois. Aujourd'hui, des sources de financement durable ont été mises en place via des institutions pour l'établissement d'un « plan maître et de conservation » sur toute la zone.

Malheureusement le début des travaux de restauration des fortifications a été stoppé par la catastrophe naturelle ce qui a entraîné une déclaration d'état d'urgence pour permettre le relogement des populations affectées. Le ministère des finances a décidé de déplacer non loin du site les populations pour une durée de 6 mois – le temps de faire les travaux nécessaires afin qu'ils regagnent leurs lieux de vie.

Par conséquent, elle souligne qu'au vu des changements et résultats en seulement dix mois, le pays est en droit de demander un nouveau délai pour progresser dans la réhabilitation. Cet aspect est très important pour motiver la population, obtenir l'aide d'experts, trouver des financements.

Elle précise que la mise en place de l'article 5, qui prévoit une étude de l'impact sur l'environnement et en particulier les mesures qui soient prises pour réhabiliter ce site, a été réalisée. En met l'accent sur l'implication de plus de 20.000 personnes dans le projet de la défense de leur patrimoine et sur l'effet de resocialisation.

La Délégation du **Panama** considère qu'il est injuste d'inscrire le site du Portobello-San-Lorenzo sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondiale en péril et elle demande au Comité de donner à Panama plus de temps

The Delegation of **Australia** asked to the State Party if the timeframe proposed by the Draft Decision to imply actions are reasonable.

La Délégation de la **Mexique** soutient la position de la Délégation de l'**Australie**, consistant à donner de plus de temps à l'Etat Partie pour résoudre des problèmes rencontrés sur le site.

The **Chairperson** called on the Delegation of **Panama** to respond if the State Party could respect the time frames and asked to precise the reasonable timeframe.

La Délégation du **Panama** précise que le délai d'un an, jusqu'à 2013, est raisonnable pour adopter toutes les mesures nécessaires pour la formation d'un réel projet réaliste, objectif et efficace. Elle note qu'un an est nécessaire pour évaluer et refaire le point sur les progrès déjà réalisés. En outre, elle propose de présenter chaque année au Comité les résultats obtenus et souligne l'importance de l'assistance technique et financière qui pourra être apportée par les Etats.

The Delegation of **Australia** considered that there is no need for an additional year and proposed to extend till the next Committee the measures defined in the Draft Decision and implement within one year the measures defined in the sub-paragraph 7.b. It added that the World Heritage Centre as well as **ICOMOS** have been asked about it.

Le **Secrétariat** indique que le site est un patrimoine historique très important et qu'il est en grand péril. Les photos présentées ont démontré les fissures et l'état du site négatif. L'urgence est de prendre de mesures nécessaires à la sauvegarde du site.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. Paragraph 3 was adopted as amended. En ce qui concerne le paragraphe 4, la délégation de la **Suisse** réitère sa position d'inscrire le site sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial en péril. Elle estime que le niveau de dégradation du site constitue bel et bien une menace. Il est donc impensable de ne pas l'inscrire sur la liste, le site ayant besoin du soutien de tous les pays.

La Délégation du **Mali** propose de mettre en évidence «la préoccupation de tous quant à l'état de conservation du site».

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its support for the position of the Delegation of **Switzerland**.

The **Chairperson** asked the **Rapporteur** to read out the paragraph as amended by delegation of **Brazil, Mali** and **Switzerland**.

The **Chairperson** proposed to add «and that the degradation of the historic fabric» after «the state of conservation».

La Délégation du **Brésil** a demandé si la délégation de la **Suisse** était d'accord de garder le paragraphe du texte d'origine sans retenir la phrase «pourrait constituer une menace».

The **Chairperson** proposed to consider the revised text and then proceed to the original text of paragraph 4, unless the delegation of Brazil chooses to remove the amendment.

La Délégation du **Brésil** retire son amendement et propose de s'en tenir à la version originale.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its support to the original text the paragraph 4. The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the paragraph 4 in its original version. The paragraph 4 was adopted in its original version.

La Délégation d'**Estonie** est assurée que le paragraphe 5 d'origine reste le même et insiste sur son importance en tant qu'outil pour la Convention.

The **Chairperson** reminded that the original paragraph 5 has been proposed for deletion by Delegation of **Brasil** and the Committee has to take decision related to restore or not the origin text of the paragraph 5, as proposed by the Delegation of **Estonia**.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** soutient la position du Brésil en soulignant le progrès accompli par l'Etat Partie.

La délégation de la **Suisse** exprime son soutien à l'inscription du site sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial en Péril ainsi qu'à la proposition de la délégation d'**Estonie**.

La Délégation du **Brésil**, reprenant l'intervention de l'**Egypte**, insiste sur l'engagement très fort et évident de l'Etat Partie pour la conservation du site. Elle lance un appel pour suivre les volontés de l'Etat Partie qui a lui-même souligné que l'inscription risquerait d'entacher « l'auto-estime » des populations locales. Elle fait ainsi référence à sa propre expérience et a proposé de répondre aux demandes de l'Etat Partie.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** soutient la proposition du **Brésil** visant à apporter un soutien aux autorités du Panama et exprime son accord pour le délai d'un an, demandé par la délégation du **Panama**.

La Délégation de la **Mexique** reconnaît les efforts extrêmement importants par l'Etat Partie pour faire face à cette difficulté. Il est important de donner à **Panama** le délai évoqué auparavant d'un an ou deux ans pour permettre à l'Etat Partie de réagir. D'autre part elle a insisté sur la nécessité de resocialiser le Patrimoine, c'est à dire la ré-implication de la population locale.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souligne l'importance de donner une opportunité, c'est-à-dire un délai à l'Etat partie en espérant éviter l'inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondiale en péril pour le moment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** reconnaît les efforts importants de l'Etat Partie, elle met l'accent sur le fait que l'état de conservation critique du site présente une raison pour son inscription sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondiale en péril. Cependant elle précise sa bonne volonté de retirer cette proposition si le Comité décide unanimement de donner au Panama du temps d'un an et de reporter la décision.

La Délégation d'**Estonie**, reconnaissant l'engagement de l'Etat Partie, insiste sur l'inscription du site sur la Liste du Patrimoine mondial en péril car c'est un moyen important pour assurer l'assistance internationale.

La **Présidente** souligne que la majorité des délégations sont favorables à ne pas inscrire le site sur la Liste du Patrimoine Mondial en péril aujourd'hui mais qu'il faudrait prendre en compte les préoccupations exprimées notamment par la Suisse et l'Estonie afin de s'assurer que les références soient faites à cette inscription possible plus tard.

Taking into consideration that the majority of countries was not in favour to inscribe the site in the World Heritage List in Danger but some countries wish to give at least a year to redress all issues, the **Chairperson** requested if there are no objections to note the progress made by the State Party and add at the end the text, which recognizes the potential inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger. Then the **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the paragraph 5 as indicated. The paragraph 5 was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to keep the original text and not inscribe the property in the World Heritage Danger List.

La délégation de l'**Egypte** estime que la proposition du Brésil ne changeait pas grande chose si le paragraphe 9 n'a pas été encore adopté. Elle pose la question relative au paragraphe 9, qui concerne la soumission d'un rapport sur l'état de conservation le 1 février 2012 du bien et elle a précisé qu'il est plus raisonnable de changer cette date à 2013 pour obtenir un progrès substantiel.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to adopt the text proposed by the Delegation of **Brazil** for paragraph 6 as well as all sub-paragraphs. The paragraph 6 was adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed to complete the paragraph 9 as follows: “[...] at its 36th session in 2012, with a view to considering, in the case of confirmation of ascertained or potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value, the possible inscription of the site on the List of World Heritage in Danger”.

The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the paragraph 9 revised by the Delegation of the **Australia**.

The final paragraph 9 was adopted. The Draft Decision **35COM 7B.129** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE AFRICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Ngorongoro Conservation Area (United Republic of Tanzania) (C/N 39) – 35 7B.36

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

Ibiza, Biodiversity and Culture (Spain) (C/N 417rev) – 35 7B.37

The Draft decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY, 23 JUNE 2011

SEVENTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Archaeological Site of Panamá Viejo and Historic District of Panamá (Panamá)

The **Secretariat** indicated that the State Party submitted an additional report to inform about the plans to change the National Law for Culture, to set up a National Committee for World Heritage, the difficulties in creating a special zone decree for the Historic Centre, and the request for technical assistance to finalize the Emergency Plan for the Historic Centre. No progress has been achieved in terms of rehabilitation and maintenance of historic structures. Furthermore deficiencies in the implementation of the legislative framework for protection continue seriously affecting the property. The State Party of Panama also included a technical proposal to re-trace the Via Cincuentenario and the related landscaping components that will be analyzed as per paragraph 172 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

Furthermore, on 9 June 2011 the Minister of Public Works of Panama, accompanied by the members of the Permanent Delegation of Panama to UNESCO and the Director of the National Institute of Historic Heritage visited the World Heritage Centre and deposited a large amount of technical documentation regarding the proposed developments for improving circulation (Cinta Costera III). Three proposals had been presented. These include the construction of a tunnel that would circumvent the Historic District. The creation of a ringroad on a massive artificial platform around the property and the construction of an elevated suspension bridge would encircle the site. The Secretariat informed that the Government is in favor of building the landfill highway, which is contested by civil society and ICOMOS Panama. Especially the latter two options would severely affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The authenticity of the historic district urban layout, which has so far been preserved in its original form, would be strongly affected, as well as the integrity of the site and its buffer zone. The Secretariat further informed that no buffer zone had been officially submitted by the concerned State Party.

ICOMOS noted the efforts that have been made by the State Party in addressing concerns identified in previous Decisions made by the World Heritage Committee. ICOMOS also recognized that the complexity of the situation explains to a certain degree the slow progress that has been made and welcomed the commitment of the State Party to continue its efforts. However, the existing conditions regarding the management arrangements, the effective enforcement of regulations and the continued significant deterioration of the historic fabric and speculation, constitute threats to the property according to ICOMOS. In addition, the potential implementation of Phase 3 of the Cinta Costera project would severely compromise the integrity of the property. Consequently, ICOMOS considered inscribing the property in the List of World Heritage in Danger as an important call for action to address the significant threats to the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that in its view the current situation is not reflected in the state of conservation report of the working Document. Therefore it requested further information from the concerned State Party concerning the project and the state of conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated that the legal framework is one of the issues and reported on a meeting with the concerned State Party and ICOMOS Panama in order to reach an agreement. It supported the Delegation of Brazil to ask the State Party for further information especially regarding the implementation of legal measures for conservation of the property.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** confirmed the importance its government attaches to preservation and requested not to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It explained that the Cinta Costera III project aims to alleviate urban blight. It added that any further decision regarding this project is depending on the Decision of the World Heritage Committee. It reported on legislative change and commended the cooperation with the World Heritage Centre. It further informed that the State Party is currently investing in housing policies and that it will take more than three years to finalize the project. It further informed that a management entity was put in place for the Historic Centre having at its disposal 20 million US\$ funding for conservation measures.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked the State Party about the current status of the project works especially in relation to the state of conservation of the property and the maintenance of the Historic Centre.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** responded that the Cinta Costera III project had been tendered. It explained that the project route consists of three sections, two of which are located outside the Historic Centre and one located next to the property. For the latter section, two alternative proposals were shortlisted and presented to the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for consultation. It underlined the need of its country to address the socio-economic issues as well as to reform the conservation legislation. It also reconfirmed the willingness of its government to continue to cooperate with the World Heritage Centre.

The Delegation of **Mexico** insisted on obtaining additional detailed information from the concerned State Party in particular with regard to measures taken for rehabilitating the

Historic Centre and its built fabric and addressing real-estate development in the Historic Centre.

The Observer Delegation of **Panama** reiterated its government's serious commitment to preserve the Historical Centre in line with the requirements of the *Convention*. It stated that necessary measures were taken to control real estate projects and to penalize decay of built fabric, referring to the case of Hotel Central. It reported that significant investments of a total of 120 million US\$ are made for infrastructure with 37 million US\$ for sewage and electricity. It further stated that the amendment to Law 14 includes World Heritage considerations. This amendment has been submitted to its parliament for consideration and it is meant to improve the country's cultural policy. It reiterated its appeal not to include the property on the World Heritage List in Danger and give it additional time to update its legislation. It considered that the project needs a more detailed review and that inscribing on the World Heritage List in Danger would be unfair given the efforts made for the conservation of the property and for developing a set of best practices as requested by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Egypt** considered that the statements by the Observer Delegation of **Panama** confirm its readiness and ability to cooperate with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and that the concerned State Party should be given some hope.

ICOMOS reiterated that there exists a potential danger to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It pointed out that no heritage or environmental impact assessment has been carried out and that despite this the project seems to be carried on.

The Observer Delegation **Panama** explained that it shall undertake no activity that would damage the property and that it is ready to provide additional information regarding the site. It stated that after two decades of neglect, Panama is dedicated to preserving the property in the best possible way.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to consideration of the Draft Decision.

Le **Rapporteur** informe que la Délégation du Brésil a apporté des amendements aux paragraphes 3, 4 et 5 et qu'elle a proposé la suppression des paragraphes 6 et 7 du projet de Décision.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne son désaccord de supprimer complètement l'alinéa e) du paragraphe 5 et propose de l'amender par « de ne pas reprendre les travaux de construction de la Phase 3 du projet Cinta Costera à l'intérieur du bien.. ».

The **Secretariat** drew attention of the Committee members to the fact that the project would be located in and outside the property and underlined the importance of buffer zones for the protection of the property.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie le Secrétariat pour ses précisions et demande que les mots ajoutés par elle «à l'intérieur du bien..» soient donc retirés de l'alinéa amendé puisque le projet concerne également les abords du bien.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that the buffer zone is already addressed in paragraph 3 and that it has received the information that the concerned State Party has already submitted the buffer zone. It also informed that only one part of the large project is located in the vicinity of the historical city.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souhaite reprendre l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Brésil en y ajoutant « de ne pas reprendre les travaux de construction de la phase 3 du projet Cinta Costera ayant éventuellement un impact sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien. »

The **Secretariat** clarified that the buffer zone of the property had not been officially submitted yet.

Paragraph 5 was adopted as amended, paragraph 6 was adopted, paragraph 7 was deleted as proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Sweden** proposed to include reference to potential inscription on the World Heritage List in Danger.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** manifeste son soutien à l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la Suède.

The Delegation of **Sweden** noted that there was no progress in comparison with last year's Decision.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** s'oppose à cet amendement et se demande si le Comité est censé être une instance de jugement des Etats parties. Elle est de l'avis que si le danger était avéré pour ce bien à l'avenir, le Comité pourrait toujours revenir sur le cas et prendre une décision adéquate au moment approprié. Elle souligne qu'elle n'est pas en faveur de l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la Suède.

The **Chairperson** proposed to move forward with a vote of show of hands.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed the wish to hear the opinion of the other Committee members.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the Delegation of Egypt.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle que l'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril ne se fait pas en raison du manque de volonté de la part de l'Etat partie mais à cause de l'état critique du bien. Elle souligne son appréciation du fait que l'Etat partie a exprimé son fort engagement pour la conservation du bien mais souhaite maintenir le paragraphe 6 avec l'amendement de la Délégation de la Suède. Plus généralement, elle rappelle que l'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril est censée aider l'Etat partie concerné à améliorer l'état de conservation d'un bien. Néanmoins la Délégation de la Suisse exprime aussi sa compréhension que la

Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril peut projeter une mauvaise image dans certains Etats parties et que la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril est donc souvent perçue comme une sorte de «liste noire» du patrimoine mondial. Elle constate également que le Comité semble réticent quant à l'inscription de biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril. Elle suggère qu'une réflexion plus générale sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril soit menée afin de renforcer les connaissances des objectifs et des mécanismes liés à cette Liste afin qu'elle soit considérée davantage comme un outil de conservation, ce qui permettrait d'atténuer son image négative.

The Delegation of **South Africa** also supported the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of **Australia** clarified that the proposed amendment with reference to the List of World Heritage in Danger was suggested as a compromise to flag the Committee's concern regarding this property. It wished to maintain the amendment, supported by the Delegation of Estonia.

The **Chairperson** reiterated her proposal for a show of hands.

The Delegation of **Egypt** clarified that it did not misunderstand the inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger but that it wished to provide some hope for the concerned State Party.

The Delegation of Sweden decided to withdraw its amendment.

Consequently, the Draft Decision **35 COM 7B 130** was adopted as amended.

Historic Quarter of the City of Colonia del Sacramento (Uruguay)

The **Secretariat** indicated that some information was recently received. It asked the State Party to submit an updated report on the state of conservation for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

The **Chairperson** stated that the Committee has taken note of the commitment of the State Party to provide information on the state of conservation. It also noted the new information to be brought to the attention of the Committee and Advisory Bodies.

Le **Rapporteur** signale qu'un seul amendement a été soumis pour ce projet de Décision par la Délégation du Brésil concernant le paragraphe 3 qu'elle souhaiterait supprimer et remplacer par un nouveau paragraphe. Il informe que la Délégation souhaite également modifier la date figurant au paragraphe 6

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B 135** was adopted as amended.

AFRICA

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099)

ICOMOS, on behalf of the Advisory Bodies, noted that in reference to paragraph 5 of the original text of the Draft Decision, the State Party has halted mining operations. In paragraph 7, what has been agreed with the State Party is that an assessment will be supplemented by a Heritage Impact assessment. The Terms of Reference were drafted in collaboration with ICOMOS and no further evaluation is needed. With regard to paragraph 8, the monitoring of the mining activity may not be easily implemented and thus ICOMOS proposed to revise the paragraph by adding that mining licensing has already been addressed by the State Party. With regards to paragraph 9 it should be slightly corrected, replacing 'through' with 'and'. The State Party is asked to hold a mining assessment until the heritage assessment is submitted to the World Heritage Centre for evaluation by ICOMOS. It concluded by saying that this is logic in order to reinforce this Decision.

Le **Secrétariat** indique que, par rapport au paragraphe 9, il est habituel pour le Comité de demander la suspension des débats en attendant que la question soit résolue. Il souligne que l'étude d'impact patrimonial demandée pourra certainement répondre à certaines inquiétudes.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed the technical assessment but announced that it would come back to this paragraph later. The Delegation of Australia asked the Delegation of Ethiopia, the State Party and ICOMOS to set up an informal working group to look at this Decision.

For accuracy, the **Chairperson** noted that this development will be recorded in the minutes and proposed to come back to this Item after further reflection.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** proposed that paragraph 9 should be retained and called upon the State Party to continue halting mining operations.

The **Chairperson**, decided to suspend examination of the Draft Decision.

ASIA-PACIFIC

Vat Phou and Associated Ancient Settlements within the Champasak Cultural Landscape (Lao People's Democratic Republic) (C 481)

The Delegation of **Australia** clarified that the nature of the proposed amendment is mainly technical and it wished the World Heritage Centre to present it.

The **Rapporteur** noted that a number of amendments were received from the Delegation of Australia for paragraphs 3, 4, 6,7,8,9 and 10.

The **Secretariat** informed that the details on the main threats identified for the property are summarized in working Document 7B.Add. In compliance with paragraph 179.b of the *Operational Guidelines*, the property is currently facing several potential threats that include the a) New infrastructure construction including the new proposed road, b) Lack of coordinated management mechanism, c) Parking lot and visitor centre and d) Lack of sufficient professional staff. With regard to the road construction, in June 2002 the possibility of constructing a new road through Vat Phou was brought to the attention of the Committee. In April 2010, after a long period of inactivity concerning the road construction, UNESCO received reports that the construction had started again and would pass through Zones 1 and 3 of the property, thus creating a threat to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

To assess the emergency situation, a UNESCO mission was undertaken from 14 to 17 December 2010. According to the mission report, road construction plans provided by the State Party, show that out of a total length of approximately 60 km, an 18-km section of Route 14A will be situated within Zone 1 of the property.

The World Heritage Centre received on June 2011 further information from the UNESCO Office in Bangkok on the Implementation Plan of the Rapid Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment on the construction and operation of Route 14A, which was the result of January-February 2011 mission dispatched by UNESCO. This information has also been shared with ICOMOS and ICCROM.

The World Heritage Centre, ICOMOS and ICCROM noted with great concern that in spite of a request by the Committee in 2003 for information on the planned road and repeated requests made by the World Heritage Centre, construction works have started again without the submission of any detailed survey and mitigation plans, and without a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to consider the impact of the proposed works on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It was considered that work on the planned roads should stop immediately, while a thorough review is undertaken of the whole project, with a view to the project impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and to other socio-economic aspects.

The Secretariat suggested that the Committee may wish to request the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS/ICCROM reactive monitoring mission to the property in 2011 to assess the overall state of conservation of the property. It requested alternative options for the proposed road construction to be considered in relation to their cultural and socio-economic impacts as well as their impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It insisted in assessing the property management system. In the case of ascertained danger to the property, as defined in Paragraph 179.a of the *Operational Guidelines*, the Secretariat requested the Committee to considering the possible inscription of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS indicated that its comments are reflected in the document 7B.Add. The Advisory Bodies are extremely concerned to note the large works being undertaken without the appropriate impact assessment being made upstream. If the road is constructed as planned, this will destroy the Outstanding Universal Value of the site. An Impact Assessment study is extremely needed. It concluded by requesting that all works on the road to be halted.

La délégation de la **France** indique que le site a déjà fait l'objet de plan d'urgence et qu'il est important de reconnaître les actions de l'Etat Partie. Elle note que le Comité est là pour fournir une expertise et de l'assistance.

The Delegation of **China** considered the challenge represented by balancing socio-economic development with the protection of the Outstanding Universal Value at local, regional and national levels. It expressed its understanding of the difficulties faced by the State Party and took note of its efforts. It asked the Committee to give the State Party a chance to provide more information.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies for the good assessment report and supported the request expressed by the Delegation of China.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** thanked the Secretariat for its excellent report and detailed presentation. A 3D simulation could also be made to visualize what will happen. The Delegation strongly supported the request made by the Delegations of Australia and China to support the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** thanked the Committee Members for their statements and inputs, as well as the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies and other partners for their support for the protection of this site. For the issue previously discussed, it informed that the construction of road A14 is halted. It encouraged members of the monitoring mission to meet with the local authorities. It wished as much as possible the mission to include engineers from the Pont et Chaussées. It upheld the guidelines setup and pointed out that a solution does exist if one shows goodwill and takes a holistic approach to the entire development process.

The **Rapporteur** read out proposed amendment to paragraphs 6, 8 and 9.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 to 5 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** qualified that the amendment was essentially technical and that its formulation matches the *Operational Guidelines* as it leaves the solution for the State Party to undertake.

The **Chairperson** noted that no objection has been raised to the amendment proposed by Australia, consequently Paragraph 6 was adopted.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that paragraph 7 in the English document is missing in the French text.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to make sure about the appropriate concordance of documents.

La Délégation de la France note que l'Etat Partie a indiqué que les travaux de construction ont été arrêtés et qu'ainsi il n'est pas nécessaire de mentionner la construction de cette route.

The Delegation of **Australia** replied that it is useful to retain the reference made to the construction. It added that the real question is what happens next.

ICOMOS requested clarification whether the works were halted only temporarily or permanently.

The Observer Delegation of the **Lao People's Democratic Republic** replied that the works have been suspended until such time that the monitoring mission is completed and agrees with all stakeholders together whether an alternative road is possible and where it is possible.

Paragraph 9 was adopted.

La Délégation de la **France** note que le processus d'examen du projet de décision est trop rapide. Elle souhaite revenir au paragraphe 9 et propose le retrait de l'amendement de l'Australie, se basant sur le fait que les experts ont indiqué qu'ils n'y avait pas de menace sur le site.

The Delegation of **Australia** stressed that the amendment is entirely technical. The approach is consistent and should not be considered as negative.

La Délégation de la France indique qu'elle ne souhaite pas retarder les discussions mais que l'ajout de n'est pas pris en considération. Elle souhaite une référence claire aux efforts de l'Etat partie quant à la protection d'un des plus beaux sites inscrit sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the Delegation of France.

La Délégation de la France revient sur sa proposition de retirer l'amendement proposé par l'Australie au paragraphe 9.

The Draft Decision **35COM 7B 72** was adopted as amended.

Historical Monuments at Makli, Thatta (Pakistan) (C 143)

The **Secretariat** informed that the State Party report addressed a number of issues but that, however, certain issues remained unresolved. It reported on dangers such as lack of conservation policy and program and proper management system as well as adequate management capacity. Slow progress had been made on recommendations of December 2006 Joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission. Factors included the significant decay of the property due to the climatic conditions and other environmental factors such as alluvial erosion. The Secretariat further informed about the lack of definition of boundaries of the property and buffer zone of the necropolis as well as lack of maintenance and monitoring. The State Party had not reported on any issue of the monitoring program and the prioritized emergency intervention plan as requested by the

Committee. The State party reported that the defining of the property boundary and the establishment of a buffer zone would be completed before the end of June 2011. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies were concerned about the degradation of the property, especially of the situation of deflooding and the lack of preparation for emergency situations. They considered that the formal adoption of the Master Plan by the Sindh Government, and the subsequent development of the Management Plan were critical to sustain the Outstanding Universal Value of the property and suggested that, based on the findings of the October 2010 Post-flood Assessment Mission, a reactive monitoring mission would be carried out to the property. This aimed to enable the Committee to re-examine the state of conservation of this property, with a view to considering, in the event of ascertained threats to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property, the possibility of inscribing the property on the List of the World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS added that the post-flood assessment of 2002 had confirmed serious concerns such as lack of definition of boundaries and buffer zones and implementation of measures.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its condolences to Pakistan for this natural disaster and invited them to report on the measures taken since the flood to rebuild and better manage the property.

The **Chairperson** called on the State party of Pakistan to report on mitigation efforts post-flood.

The Delegation of **Pakistan** reported that the total cost of the damage to infrastructure caused by the flood in 2010 was around 70 billion Dollars and therefore the ability of the government was severely curtailed. The rescue and relief operation took a priority. It informed that the government was still dealing with the after effects of the floods and prepared for the July and August rain this year. It appealed to Member states to support Pakistan to protect, preserve and conserve the World Heritage sites with a special focus on properties in the flood zone. The Delegation informed that the provincial governments were directly responsible for the administrative look-after and conservation of the properties in their respective jurisdiction in order to allow speedy approval of the development and conservation plan and better implementation of World Heritage Committee's decisions as well as the 2010 mission's recommendations. Regarding the master plan of preservation and development for the Makli Thatta it was expected that the devolution would allow speedy approval of the plan by the Sindh government and implementation of priorities of the management plan.

The **Chairperson** turned to the rapporteur since there were no further questions by the Committee.

The **Rapporteur** announced an amendment of Australia on Paragraph 3, Paragraph 5 and Paragraph 9.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination paragraph by paragraph of the Draft decision. Paragraph 1 and 2 were adopted.

The **Rapporteur** announced a further amendment from China on Paragraph 8.

ICOMOS pointed out the wording rehabilitation was not an appropriate term and proposed to keep the wording “post-flood emergency action plan”. The delegation of **China** proposed instead the wording “post flood emergency and conservation action plan”.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.76** was adopted as amended.

STATE OF CONSERVATION REPORTS FOR THE ASIA AND PACIFIC REGION TO BE ADOPTED WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

The Ruins of the Buddhist Vihara at Paharpur (Bangladesh) - 35 COM 7B.61
Old Town of Lijiang (China) - 35 COM 7B.63
Historic Centre of Macao (China) - 35 COM 7B.64
Historic Ensemble of the Potala Palace, Lhasa (China) - 35 COM 7B.65
Group of Monuments at Hampi (India) - 35 COM 7B.66
Taj Mahal, Agra Fort and Fatehpur Sikri (India) - 35 COM 7B.67
Champaner-Pavagadh Archaeological Park (India) - 35 COM 7B.68
Prambanan Temples (Indonesia) - 35 COM 7B.69
Sangiran Early Man Site (Indonesia) - 35 COM 7B.70
Historic Monuments of Ancient Nara (Japan) 35 COM 7B.71
Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia) - 35 COM 7B.73
Lumbini, the Birthplace of the Lord Buddha (Nepal) - 35 COM 7B.74
Kathmandu Valley (Nepal) - 35 COM 7B.75
Archaeological Ruins at Moenjodaro (Pakistan) - 35 COM 7B.77
Old Town of Galle and its Fortifications (Sri Lanka) - 35 COM 7B.78
Historic Centre of Bukhara (Uzbekistan) - 35 COM 7B.79
Samarkand – Crossroads of Cultures (Uzbekistan) - 35 COM 7B.80
Complex of Hué Monuments (Vietnam) - 35 COM 7B.81

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

NATURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA

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

The **Secretariat** informed about meeting with WHC, IUCN and the State Party to clarify the information provided by the Minister concerning the plans of the proposed road through the Serengeti National Park. Following this meeting, the State Party transmitted a written clarified statement. Afterwards, the Secretariat submitted a revised draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State party to read out the statement.

The **Delegation of Tanzania** read out the statement whereas the proposed road would contain two sections with a tarmac road of 214 km and a second tarmac road with a distance of 117km. The 12km road from Mugumu to Serengeti National Park plus the correspondent strait of 57,6 km from Loliondo to Serengeti National Park would not be tarmacked. The 53km section through the Seregenti National Park would remain a gravel road, would not dissect the park and therefore would not affect the migration and conservation value of the property. This issue should address the increasing socio-economic threats of the rural communities in northern Tanzania while saving the outstanding universal value of the property.

IUCN welcomed that the road through the park would remain a gravel road to be managed by the park authorities because it indicated its touristic and administrative purposes. There were still some proposals for roads in this area but not for this critical section. Traffic flow may be affected by the changes and should be considered in an environmental assessment process.

The **Secretariat** presented a revised Draft Decision following the statement of Tanzania. Former Paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 have been deleted and replaced by Paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 6. There would also be a new Paragraph 10 regarding the reporting.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.7rev** was adopted as amended.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Historic Centre of Český Krumlov (Czech Republic) (C 617)

ICOMOS commented and noted with concern the negative impact of location of the theatre in the castle garden on the authenticity and integrity of the property. It encouraged the State Party to implement past Committee's decisions.

The Delegation of **Australia** announced a technical amendment in Paragraph 9.

The Delegation of **Estonia** underlined that any hint on the danger-listing of this property would be inappropriate but did not oppose to the reference in the future.

The **Chairperson** called for the adoption of the un-amended Paragraphs 1 to 8.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** demande des clarifications concernant la date de 2013 pour la soumission d'un rapport sur l'état de conservation du bien et sur la mise en œuvre des demandes.

The **Chairperson** explained that this date was agreed upon.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.88** was adopted as amended.

Archaeological Areas of Pompei, Herculaneum and Torre Annunziata (Italy) (C829)

The **Secretariat** informed that further to the structural collapses, a mission was undertaken in December 2010 and January 2011 to the site. Following the mission report, the State party informed about a capabilities enhancement plan, a knowledge management plan and a plan of work as well as a legislative decree. The decree defined the amount of 900 000 Euros per year for hiring staff as well as a special assistance program for Pompei and the area of jurisdiction of the Superintendency where the total amount was 105 million Euros. The Centre could not examine the comments of the State Party that had been transmitted very short ago.

ICOMOS expressed concern about the decay of the property that could threaten its OUV. The mission had highlighted deficiencies in the management arrangements and in the implementation of measures to sustain maintenance and conservation as well as pressures derived from the extensive visitor's use at some portions of the site. It welcomed the legislative arrangements taken by the State Party as well as the increased financial and human resources.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se montre soulagée que l'effondrement d'un mur n'ait pas eu un impact sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien et que l'Etat Partie a mis à disposition des fonds importants.

The **State Party** of Italy underlined the cumulative impact of the legal, technical and financial package in the framework of decree that had been immediately set and approved in order to react to the needs identified during the missions.

The **Chairperson** proceeded to the adoption of the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed about amendment of the State Party of Australia on Paragraph 10.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.97** was adopted as amended.

FOURTH DAY – THURSDAY, 23 JUNE 2011

SEVENTH MEETING

3 pm – 7 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 7B EXAMINATION OF THE STATE OF CONSERVATION OF WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (continuation)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 544)

The **Secretariat** indicated that it proposed this report for discussion as the draft Decision recommended inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Centre reported recent communications with the State Party, in which the State Party had expressed disagreement with elements of the state of conservation report. The Centre explained that the State Party considered that the proposal for inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was premature, and had proposed to invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property.

ICOMOS described the property, and enumerated the elements that contributed to its Outstanding Universal Value. It indicated that the cityscape was the finest example of neoclassical architecture still existing today, as other such sites that originally had had similar rich neoclassical cityscapes had since been degraded. ICOMOS proceeded to describe how the Outstanding Universal Value of the property was at risk from unsuitable development.

The Delegation of **Mexico** called for the State Party to be given the chance to make comments.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** indicated that it understood that the last monitoring mission dated back to 2009, and that since then some urban development had taken place within the property. It noted that there appeared to be a lack of detailed information on construction projects in the area, and indicated that it would be useful to obtain further information before considering inscription onto the List of World Heritage in Danger. The Delegation proposed amendments that would eliminate the reference to inscription on the World Heritage in Danger List and instead, invite a joint World Heritage Centre / ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission to the property. It also suggested that the State Party submit to the World Heritage Centre a state of conservation report by 1 February 2012.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that there seemed to be willingness to cooperate on the part of the State Party and suggested that a reactive monitoring mission be called for. It

recommended that the conclusions of this mission be brought to the attention of the World Heritage Committee so that the latter could be in a better position to consider if inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger was warranted or not. The Delegation asked that the Delegation of the Russian Federation be given the possibility to comment on the situation.

The Delegation of **China** indicated that it understood the challenges facing the State Party of Russia, and expressed its agreement with the Delegation of Mexico's proposal to give the floor to the Russian Federation, so that it could provide additional information on the current situation.

The **Chairperson** sought to confirm that other Committee members having indicated a desire to intervene would accept to have the State Party of Russia to provide a response to queries raised.

La Délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** présente un bref descriptif de la situation et explique que le site avait été inscrit en 2005. En 2007, un plan d'urbanisme de la ville avec l'identification des zones tampon a été réalisé et approuvé par le gouvernement. Un groupe d'experts composé d'architectes et de représentants de la société civile a été nommé pour produire un rapport d'enquête sur la situation du site. Le rendu du rapport a conclu que l'état de conservation du site était bon mais que le problème se posait à propos des constructions modernes. Pour 52 demandes de projets de construction, seulement 12 ont été accordées, 14 sous condition de changements et 26 ont été refusées.

The **Chairperson** asked the members of the Committee if they wished to proceed to the debate, or if they wished to consider the draft Decision and amendments.

The Delegation of **Egypt** echoed the Delegation of Ethiopia.

ICOMOS indicated that the additional details that had been provided by the State Party on development projects, after the earlier mission that had taken place had been helpful. ICOMOS noted that the new information clarifies the pace and amount of development, and that this information had not been made available during the mission.

The **Chairperson** called on the Committee to focus on the draft Decision, and its proposed amendments, and gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

Le **Rapporteur** mentionne avoir reçu un amendement demandant la suppression des paragraphes 8, 9 et 10 et la proposition de nouveaux paragraphes 8 et 9 ainsi qu'une proposition d'écrire un paragraphe 5 bis de la part de la Délégation de la Barbade.

The **Chairperson** explained that paragraphs 1 to 3, and paragraph 4 with its subparagraphs a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h remained unchanged, as did paragraphs 5, 6 and 7. These paragraphs were adopted. The Chairperson moved to paragraph 8 and its amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déclare ne pas avoir d'objection et mentionne que le tissu urbain où tout un catalogue de projets est cours de planification pourrait avoir un impact

irréversible sur le site. C'est pour cette raison qu'il invite l'Etat partie à gérer les constructions pour maintenir la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien.

The **Chairperson** declared paragraphs 8 and 9 adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** called on the Committee to consider the proposed deletion of certain paragraphs.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed uncertainty about the procedure, and suggested that paragraphs originally approved should remain open, as there were links between them.

The **Chairperson** requested that the proposed amendments be distributed on paper to the Committee before continuing the discussion.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed uncertainty – and suggested that the original proposed text to amend the World Heritage List in Danger, along with the request for the reactive monitoring mission should not cause any misunderstanding. It added that the intention of the proposed amendment was only to reflect the proposed deletion of the paragraph requesting that the property be inscribed onto the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The **Chairperson** sought to explain to the Delegation of Brazil the absence of clarity in the proposed amendments, and indicated that there was a need to provide paper copies to the Committee. She decided to suspend discussion on this Item.

Historic Areas of Istanbul (Turkey) (C 356)

The **Secretariat** explained that after the finalization of the state of conservation report, it had received two letters from the State Party providing further information and clarifications. The new information related to a joint meeting that had been held for the site management of the property by both its consultative and its executive boards – which include ICOMOS members and the National Commission for UNESCO, as well as local stakeholders. The letter included an English translation of the first draft of the management plan, which had been unavailable at first. Three other documents had been submitted, including a traffic management plan, a conservation programme for Ottoman period timber houses within the property, and a tourism strategy consisting of a two page outline of the chapter which would eventually be incorporated into the management plan. The second letter received from the State Party contained a memo regarding the Eurasia tunnel project and indicated that the Istanbul municipality had identified three experts to provide advice for future project phases in line with the recommendations of the Committee. It also noted that the management boards will be responsible for the implementation of the management plan. Finally, the letter corrected a factual error that had been made in the state of conservation report.

ICOMOS explained that two impact assessments had been undertaken on the Golden Horn Bridge and that a draft management plan had been produced for the Bridge. Though welcome, ICOMOS noted that these developments had been offset by the plans to proceed to build the Bridge. ICOMOS regretted that the Bridge construction was

brought to the attention to the Committee only *after* much work had started. The first impact assessment identified significant impacts on the almost pristine landscape of Istanbul and its Outstanding Universal Value. It concluded that the bridge would impair the cityscape, despite the efforts made by the State Party to reduce the impacts. ICOMOS considered that the modifications made to the Bridge design would still deliver major impacts on the property's Outstanding Universal Value. It suggested that all possible efforts should still be made to mitigate the Bridge's impact. It also noted that other major issues, including the lack of legislative arrangements and buffer zone, along with the absence of a strategic approach and of an overall management plan remained a serious concern. It acknowledged that though work had been started on a management plan, more work was needed to ensure that clear roles and responsibilities for an effective management system were identified and put in place, particularly in view of the enormous complexity of the property. ICOMOS also considered that a satisfactory Environmental Impact Assessment had not been made available for the proposed Bosphorus Bridge. ICOMOS considered that all these issues rendered the property vulnerable to a wide range of threats, and that an independent advisory committee should assess them as a whole, and advise on the development of a strategic framework for management of the property.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** propose, pour gagner du temps, que l'Etat partie fournisse une lettre pour faciliter la décision.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that it has proposed a technical amendment for consistency of this draft Decision. It noted that the property had faced many challenges over a long period, but that it was heartened to have learned about progress as reported by the Centre and ICOMOS. It asked if the State party would speak to the apparent conflicting statement that the impacts on the property were not significant. It asked for additional information on the traffic management efforts being undertaken by the State Party.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** n'a pas de question mais souhaite suggérer que l'Etat partie réponde aux priorités du Comité en demandant peut être à des experts de suivre le projet et de prendre des mesures pour la conservation du site.

The Delegation of **Jordan** noted that it had followed the evolution of the challenges faced by this property closely, and that it had appreciated the positive response of the Turkish authorities in attempting to reduce the impacts of the Bridge on the cityscape. It noted the reduction in the size of the piles, and also noted the interesting archaeological findings that had taken place during its construction. It also explained how it had witnessed the participatory process involved identifying alternative impact reduction solutions.

The Delegation of **Sweden** indicated that the Item had been considered by the Committee for a long time. It observed that the State Party had made many efforts to deal with the recommendations made by the Committee. It summarized its understanding of the work carried out to date. It asked if the State Party could be given the floor so that it could explain how further management could be strengthened.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Turkey** to respond to the different queries.

The Observer Delegation of **Turkey** indicated that the second draft of the Management Plan had been completed. It indicated that it is not only restricted to the site but includes the surrounding historic area awaiting legal approval. Regarding the bridge, two impact assessments were completed. A summary of the conclusions of these assessments indicated that impacts were minimized. It indicated that it found the recommendations of these assessments feasible and usable and that changes were made, such as the lowering of the cable structure and a reduction in the diameter of the piers. The experts will be asked to continue providing advice on the project for further mitigation. The management plan was prepared by experts, including ICOMOS Turkey and since 2006 regulation for the management of sites has been included. These regulations establish consultation and this is already functioning. Regarding the bridge, the implemented recommendations will reduce traffic. The Observer Delegation of **Turkey** indicated that it is available to answer further questions.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested deleting the words 'possible inscription to the List in Danger', in the amendment submitted by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to **ICOMOS** who indicated that it would be interested in receiving a copy of the second draft of the Management Plan for reviewing.

The **Rapporteur** read the amendment from the Delegation of Australia concerning paragraph 10 of the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.111** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for its efforts in conforming to and implementing recommendations made.

Historic Centre of the City of Yaroslav (Russian Federation) (C 544) (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee if it had had an opportunity to reflect on Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.103**.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that it submitted an amendment on paragraph 9 of the Draft Decision together with the Delegations of **Estonia, Brazil, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, France, Mali and the United Arab Emirates**.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that this amendment was consistent and important.

La Délégation de la **France** constate que l'amendement est prématuré puisqu'il est déjà prévu que l'Etat partie soumette un rapport sur l'état de conservation. L'amendement pourrait donner le sentiment de faire peser une menace sur l'Etat partie. Elle souhaite laisser le temps à l'Etat partie d'agir. La Délégation considère que l'amendement de la Délégation de l'Estonie n'apporte pas grand-chose.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** revient sur ce qui a été dit par la Délégation de l'Australie. Elle a confiance dans les capacités de l'Etat partie, mais précise qu'on parle de l'état de conservation ici et non pas de la confiance.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that this amendment was not premature.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** soutient l'intervention de la Délégation de la France.

The **Chairperson** indicated that it was necessary to find out what was the majority and that the Committee should continue to think about the matter.

The Delegation of **Sweden** indicated that there was an error in language as in the English version it should read 'address' instead of 'assess'.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** supported the Delegation of Sweden.

Paragraph 9 was adopted.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** considère que le contenu du projet de Décision envoie un message fort à l'Etat partie et considère que l'on ne peut pas inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril.

La Délégation du **Mali** exprime son opposition à l'intervention de la Délégation des Emirats Arabes Unis car l'idée d'inscrire le bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril se trouve déjà dans le texte.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the retention of the amendment submitted by the Delegation of Estonia.

The Delegation of **South Africa** indicated that a paragraph should be included regarding a mission. Also it did not see the need to introduce the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Estonia.

The Delegation of **Australia** said that it would adopt the position taken by the Delegation of United Arab Emirates and would not get in the way of a consensus.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that if the Delegation of Sweden agrees, the proposed amendment would be removed. The Delegation of **Sweden** agreed.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.103** was adopted as amended.

Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488)

The **Secretariat** gave a brief summary of the state of conservation of the site and indicated that the item was opened for discussion as it concerns a possible inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger. The World Heritage Centre received a letter on 25 May 2011 from the Department of Culture, Media and Sports and also a map of 28 high-rise buildings planned or under construction in the vicinity of the Tower. On 9 June 2011, the World Heritage Centre also received another letter on the state of conservation and

the complexity of conservation of this site. It concluded by indicating that the State Party is not in agreement with an inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

ICOMOS noted the report of the State Party and also the additional information received. It indicated that the boundaries of the Tower are tightly drawn and that the setting of the site is crucial. It requested the State Party to undertake studies as the management system was also insufficient. ICOMOS indicated that these issues have not been adequately addressed. The setting of the Tower and its buffer zone are important. The setting must be defined according to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. Challenges exist at local planning level and while there is national guidance, this could be withdrawn at any time. The lack of protection was pointed out as well as the fact that buildings are being constructed which are impacting the setting of the site.

The Delegation of **Barbados** recalled that the State Party was doing a visual impact assessment and requested information from the State Party on progress made and on plans at the local and national levels.

The Delegation of **Sweden** enquired if there was really little progress as there had been no mission to the property since 2006. Therefore it was of the view that the Committee should not be making such an important decision based on a lack of information. A fact finding mission was required. Inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger could be possible in 2012 after information was received. The Delegation of Sweden also indicated that the Committee needed to continue the discussion on the role and use of buffer zones. The Delegation of Sweden called on the State Party to explain any development that had taken place in recent years.

The Delegation of **Australia** took the floor to seek clarification of ambiguous terms relating to setting and visual impacts. An understanding is needed of the relationship of the setting with the Outstanding Universal Value. A study of Historic Urban Landscape principles may provide guidance on this.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that it disagreed on the fact that conservation of the site has not improved since 2006. Similarly, it did not agree on the fact that the view is impacted, and that conservation of the property is inadequate. The lack of a buffer zone does not imply that a management framework is missing. Development has always taken place in settlements such as London with changes throughout the years since its construction.

La Délégation de la **France** reconnaît que l'Etat partie a entrepris des efforts mais aimerait savoir quels sont les projets en cours pour la protection du paysage urbain de Londres.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** asked ICOMOS if the State Party was objecting to the proposed inscription on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

The Delegation of **Brazil** commented that a similar situation existed at Yaroslavl and that the Committee was not yet ready to inscribe the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger. It asked the State Party to clarify the status of the buffer zone in relation to the protection of the landscape.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to provide answers relating to the buffer zone of the site, advancements in studies to be conducted and other activities related to the protection of the property.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** stated that the Tower of London is an important monument and that significant improvements have been made since the 2006 mission. Work has been accomplished at national level with regard to policy guidance which has force of law. Regarding the management plan, all stakeholders have signed it up. A protected view of the site is effective. The World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies attach a lot of importance to buffer zones; however the *Operational Guidelines* do not stipulate that the buffer zone is the only way to protect the property. New guidance is being developed for the site setting; however the buffer zone is of limited value to the site. Modern requirements in a growing city are important and it looked forward to further work on Historic Urban Landscapes.

ICOMOS recognized that buffer zones are not the only way to protect the property, but in the absence of a buffer zone, protective mechanisms need to be identified.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que les Délégations de l'**Australie**, de la **Barbade**, de l'**Estonie**, de la **Suède** et de la **Suisse** souhaitent amender le projet de Décision.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** estime que les zones tampon sont très importantes. Elle demande à l'Etat Partie des précisions sur les options de protection actuellement disponibles et comment est interprété le point d'ICOMOS concernant les autres moyens de protéger un site qu'une zone de tampon.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** indicated that its views and those of ICOMOS are not far apart. However, the buffer zone is not the only way to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. The Greater London Authority has been doing work and should a mission be requested, information will be made available. The Observer Delegation ended by welcoming a mission to the property.

The Chairperson proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1-3 were adopted.

Paragraph 4 was adopted. As amended by the Delegations of **Estonia** and **Sweden**

Paragraph 4bis and 5 were adopted as amended by the Delegation of **Australia**.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that a line should be added for the State Party to develop appropriate layers of protection for the landscape. It asked **ICOMOS** to help with the text.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the proposal of the Delegation of Brazil. It agreed that the State Party should also invite a mission.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the point raised by the Delegation of Brazil. It indicated that perhaps everyone was thinking about buffer zones too much in a two dimensional format. Nevertheless, it was of the view that the concept of buffer zone should be widened thus becoming a 'buffer space'.

The Delegation of **Australia** strongly reiterated its position to develop mechanisms.

ICOMOS welcomed the information provided by the State Party regarding progress. It looked forward to the studies that would be completed on the site's setting.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that the buffer zone should be kept as an option and that paragraph (5) as amended should include a mention that the State Party invites a mission to the property.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the mission would be dealt with further on in the discussion of the amendment but that it should be added that the State Party is working on mechanisms to protect the setting. Similarly comments made by the Delegation of Barbados should be added regarding the concept of buffer zones.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** veut ajouter les mots « garantissant l'intégrité visuelle du bien » à ce paragraphe.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the discussions should not get into the matter of integrity.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that paragraphs 96 to 119 of the *Operational Guidelines* relate to management. Also it strongly reiterated that the State Party should develop appropriate guidelines.

The Delegation of **The Russian Federation** indicated that clear explanations have been received from the State Party.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that rather than having a proliferation of statements for this paragraph, there was a need for the State Party to consult with ICOMOS and agree on the proper language to be used.

The Delegation of **Estonia** suggested a choice between maintaining the original paragraph 5 or requesting the State Party or ICOMOS to add appropriate words, such as "buffer zones", as they deemed fit.

The Delegation of **Mexico** expressed its preference for the Chairperson's suggestion to form a small working group. It further stressed that even though a buffer zone is protective by nature, the important consideration to bear in mind in the case of this property is that of the visual impact around the site. It recalled that this was a fundamental point raised at the expert meeting on Historic Urban Landscapes. It further explained that a working group would address better the issue of visual integrity as the buffer zone would not be useful to protect the Outstanding Universal Value in this case.

The **Chairperson** suspended further consideration of paragraph 5 and proposed that the State Party and ICOMOS consult to reach a consensus on this paragraph.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stressed the need for the State Party and ICOMOS to sort out the outstanding issues, given the uniqueness of the property. It was of the view that there was no need for a working group.

The **Chairperson** clarified her previous statement saying that the contribution of other States Parties would be welcome to the consultations between the State Party and ICOMOS.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** concurred with the Chairperson's suggestion.

The **Chairperson** requested that the feedback from these deliberations should be reported back to the Committee before the closure of the day. Then she called on the Committee to consider paragraph 6 which was subsequently adopted. The Committee also adopted paragraph 7, as amended by the Delegations of **Australia, Estonia** and **Sweden**. The Chairperson then proceeded to consideration of paragraph 8, as amended by the Delegations of Estonia, Sweden and Australia.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out an inconsistency in the wording of the amended paragraph 8 presented for consideration, noting that the substance of the text was obvious. It also expressed the need to avoid any conflict with the *Operational Guidelines*.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** précise que comme l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Australie lui convient, elle accepte de retirer son amendement.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Estonia if it agreed with the proposal of the Delegation of Sweden.

The Delegation of **Estonia** expressed its agreement with the position of the Delegation of Sweden.

The **Chairperson** called for the relevant text to be removed in line with the expressed desires of the Delegations of Sweden and Estonia.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that the portion of the text starting with the phrase ".....with the state of" was no longer relevant in the text as it currently stood.

The Delegations of **Barbados** and **Egypt** supported the position expressed by the Delegation of Brazil.

The **Chairperson** called for consideration of paragraph 8 with an amendment proposed by the Delegation of Australia, while calling at the same time for any opposing view.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle ses commentaires antérieurs concernant les autres sites et précise qu'il serait judicieux de garder le paragraphe 8, sur le péril, à sa place puisque la possibilité de péril sur le bien est avérée.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Switzerland for its position but pointed out that there remained oppositions on the proposition of amendment introduced by the Delegation of Australia.

The Delegation of **Australia** returned to its earlier position, stressing that the importance was for the paragraph to be understandable, in addition to substance. Thus it would be

willing to withdraw its amendment but it warned that this would not preclude the outcome of the 36th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Sweden** called for the retention of the latest amendment of the Delegation of Australia while recalling the Decision from the 34th session of the Committee (Brasília, 2010).

The Delegation of **Nigeria** concurred with the position of the Delegation of Sweden in view of the explanation previously given by the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation de la **France** estime que l'amendement australien est redondant et propose le retrait définitif de cet amendement.

The **Chairperson** called for a vote on the two positions, by a show of hands, to break the existing tie. The majority of the Committee members voted against retaining the amendment of the Delegation of Australia. Following the result of the vote, the Chairperson called for the amendment to be deleted. She explained that it meant that the original paragraph 8 was now retained.

However the adoption of the full text of the Draft Decision was held in abeyance pending the result of the consultation between the Observer Delegation of **the United Kingdom** and ICOMOS, on paragraph 5, as requested by the Chairperson.

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

The **Secretariat** revealed that the State Party had provided new information on the property in a letter dated 10 June 2011. The letter outlined issues concerning the planning of the urban area around the property.

In its reaction to this new information, **ICOMOS** referred to a previous mission report dated 2006 and stated that the present settings as explained in the State Party's communication were still inadequately established. It further explained that there is no defined framework for new projects as the present practice involves the consideration of new projects on individual bases rather than within the context of overall environmental planning

The Delegation of **Barbados** stated that in the light of the work undertaken by the State Party to address the visual impact assessment around the site, it was necessary for the State Party to clarify certain issues as raised by ICOMOS in its statement.

The Delegation of **Australia** brought to the attention of the Committee that it had proposed certain amendments to the Draft Decision concerning the Item under discussion.

The **Chairperson** called for discussion or additional contributions, while inviting the State Party to address the question raised by the Delegation of Barbados and the concerns of ICOMOS.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** explained that much of the development around this property is treated in parallel to that of the Tower of London as the issues are similar. These are alluded to in the state of conservation report and it seemed that there was a misunderstanding on the part of ICOMOS concerning the six development schemes that were outlined in the report. It clarified the issue explaining that one of the schemes had been approved long before the ICOMOS mission. The other five schemes had been scaled down, in keeping with the observations of the ICOMOS mission. A decision had been taken by the State Party hereafter not to allow any further development, which could trigger visual impact issues or take place close to the property. Concerning the setting around the property the local authority, the Greater London Authority, is working to establish a wider framework to address this through a document to be presented in 2012. Further work is also being carried out on the silhouettes around the property to fit within the established framework. Finally the Observer Delegation stressed that it believed that the property is well managed, protected and conserved and that the protection frameworks it has established are fully functional.

The **Chairperson** expressed the hope that the explanation of the State Party had sufficiently addressed any doubts on the item under discussion.

ICOMOS expressed that it would like to carry out a reactive monitoring mission to the property and assured of its willingness to collaborate with the State Party to move forward.

The **Chairperson** called for the consideration of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs and called on the Rapporteur to read out the amendments that had been received on this Draft Decision.

Le **Rapporteur** a déclaré que la Délégation de l'Australie a introduit un certain nombre d'amendements portant sur les paragraphes 4, 6, 7 et 9.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** observed that the buffer zone had been considered as unnecessary for this property and called upon ICOMOS to clarify this.

ICOMOS replied that once the consultations had been held with the State Party, it would be able to move forward on this.

The **Chairperson** called for the consideration of paragraphs 1, 2 and 3.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** expressed its dissatisfaction with the response of ICOMOS to its earlier question and repeated it, asking if the issue of buffer zones, as addressed with respect to this property, was general and could be applied to all properties.

The **Chairperson** expressed her understanding of the preoccupations of the Delegation of Nigeria but pointed out that the current consideration was for a specific case and not a general application. She drew the Committee back to the consideration of the Draft Decision.

Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 were adopted.

The **Chairperson** called for paragraph 6 to be placed within square brackets and called for the consideration of paragraph 7.

Paragraph 7 was adopted as amended and Paragraph 8 was adopted.

The **Chairperson** called for clarification on the amendment to paragraph 9 before it could be considered.

La Délégation de la **France** propose donc le retrait de l'amendement proposé par l'Australie (concernant le paragraphe 9) pour rester cohérent avec les autres décisions déjà prises.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the Delegation of France.

The **Chairperson** called for a consensus to adopt paragraph 9 as amended by the Delegation of France and decided to suspend consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.115**.

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

The **Secretariat** presented new information received from the State Party including letters dated 23 May and 17 June 2011 respectively.

ICOMOS reported that the issue of the urban renewal proposed around the property was well addressed in the state of conservation report submitted by the State Party. The outlying planning request for development, referred to in the report, is expected to take place over 30 years ICOMOS did not oppose the urban renewal plan but rather expressed its fear for the Outstanding Universal Value of the property if care was not taken.

The Delegation of **Barbados** observed that although the typology of the property is different from the others already looked at in the United Kingdom, it called on the State Party to elaborate on how the impacts of the proposed development on the Outstanding Universal Value will be managed.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** was given the floor by the Chairperson. It explained that the proposed development plan encompasses the property and that there is an urgent need to regenerate the area. It welcomed any actions to bring life back to the Liverpool docks. It further stated that negotiations were ongoing and that constant changes were being made to the proposed development plan. Since the ICOMOS mission in 2006, supplementary planning documents were adopted in 2010 to boost investment and regeneration. Concerning the buffer zone, the property possesses one, even if it is not large enough to cover all the visual-related settings. It concluded by indicating that this matter is covered in the referred document.

The **Chairperson** called on ICOMOS for comments on the presentation of the State Party.

ICOMOS reiterated its willingness to work with the State Party at the planning stage of the urban renewal project.

The **Chairperson** called for the consideration of Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 to 6 were adopted..

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested the deletion of the second part of paragraph 7 in order to maintain consistence with previous Decisions taken.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s'oppose à l'amendement du paragraphe 7. Elle rappelle que dans le cas présent on est en face d'un projet qui porte atteinte à la valeur universelle exceptionnelle du bien. Il faut que le Comité envoie un message fort aux autorités locales. Elle souhaite donc le maintien du paragraphe 7 en l'état.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient l'amendement du Brésil qui consiste à éliminer la dernière partie du paragraphe 7.

The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that paragraph 7 already makes provision for a state of conservation report in 2012. Therefore, there was no need for the contentious line.

ICOMOS expressed its concern that the local authority might be minded to approve the scheme in its current state. It further feared that this might take place before the proposed 2012 mission and before adequate steps are taken to protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** pointed out that the explanation provided by ICOMOS was irrelevant. It called on the Chairperson to mandate the State Party to consult with ICOMOS on the utility, or otherwise, of the paragraph under consideration for the State Party.

The **Chairperson** wondered if as the three properties of the United Kingdom are dissimilar, the same levels of agreement can be reached.

ICOMOS requested the Chairperson to give the State Party the opportunity to respond to the proposal of the Delegation of Brazil. It said that it would then like to respond en suite.

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** responded to the proposal of the Delegation of Brazil and said that the first part of paragraph 7 summed up the relevant issues while the second part was redundant. It welcomed the mission and expertise and emphasised that there are existing mechanisms to ensure that the issues are critically examined.

The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for its responsive position and suggested that in view of the intent to put its own mechanism to work, paragraph 7 might not be considered.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s'exprime contre la suppression de la dernière partie du paragraphe 7.

The **Chairperson** called for a vote by show of hands and the majority of the Committee voted for the deletion of the second part of paragraph 7.

The Delegation of **Egypt** raised a point of order stating that the question for the vote had been improperly framed.

The **Chairperson** made a clarification and repeated the results of the vote. A majority of the Committee voted to delete the relevant portion of paragraph 7. Paragraph 7 was subsequently adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.118** was adopted as amended.

State of conservation reports for the Europe and North America region to be adopted without discussion.

Historic Centres of Berat and Gjirokastra (Albania) (C 569 bis) – 35 COM 7B.82
Historic Centre of the City of Salzburg (Austria) (C 784) – 35 COM 7B.83
World Heritage properties of Vienna (Austria) – 35 COM 7B.84
Architectural, Residential and Cultural Complex of the Radziwill Family at Nesvizh (Belarus) (C 1196) – 35 COM 7B.85
Old Bridge Area of the Old City of Mostar (Bosnia and Herzegovina) (C 946 rev) – 35 COM 7B.86
Ancient City of Nessebar (Bulgaria) (C 217) – 35 COM 7B.87
Historic Centre of Prague (Czech Republic) (C 616) – 35 COM 7B.89
Historic Centre (Old Town) of Tallinn (Estonia) (C 822) – 35 COM 7B.90
Mont-Saint-Michel and its Bay (France) (C 80bis) – 35 COM 7B.91
Prehistoric Sites and Decorated Caves of the Vézère Valley (France) (C 85) – 35 COM 7B.92
Upper Middle Rhine Valley (Germany) (C 1066) – 35 COM 7B.93
Tokaj Wine Region Historic Cultural Landscape (Hungary) (C 1063) – 35 COM 7B.94
Budapest, including the Banks of the Danube, the Buda Castle Quarter and Andrassy Avenue (Hungary) (C 400 bis) – 35 COM 7B.95
Historic Centre of Naples (Italy) (C 726) – 35 COM 7B.97
Vilnius Historic Centre (Lithuania) (C 541) – 35 COM 7B.98
Curonian Spit (Lithuania / Russian Federation) (C 994) – 35 COM 7B.99
Seventeenth-century canal ring area of Amsterdam inside the Singelgracht (Netherlands) (C 1349) – 35 COM 7B.100
Centennial Hall in Wroclaw (Poland) (C 1165) – 35 COM 7B.101
Churches of Moldavia (Romania) (C 598 bis) – 35 COM 7B.102
Historic Centre of Saint Petersburg and Related Groups of Monuments (Russian Federation) (C 540) – 35 COM 7B.104
Kremlin and Red Square, Moscow (Russian Federation) (C 545) – 35 COM 7B.105
Ensemble of the Ferrapontov Monastery (Russian Federation) (C 982) – 35 COM 7B.106

Cultural and Historic Ensemble of the Solovetsky Islands (Russian Federation) (C 632) – 35 COM 7B.107

Tower of Hercules (Spain) (C 1312) – 35 COM 7B.108

Works of Antoni Gaudí (Spain) (C 320bis) – 35 COM 7B.109

Cathedral, Alcázar and Archivo de Indias in Seville (Spain) (C 383 rev) – 35 COM 7B.110

Kiev: Saint-Sophia Cathedral, Kiev Pechersk Lavra and Related Monastic Buildings (Ukraine) (C 527 bis) – 35 COM 7B.112

L'viv – the Ensemble of the Historic Centre (Ukraine) (C 865) – 35 COM 7B.113

Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (United Kingdom) (C 373bis) – 35 COM 7B.116

Old and New Towns of Edinburgh (United Kingdom) (C 728) – 35 COM 7B.117

The Draft Decisions related to the sites mentioned above were adopted.

The Chairperson announced that the examination of several Draft Decision have been suspended in order to allow discussions between Delegations. She proposed to turn now to the concerned pending Draft decisions.

AFRICA

Mapungubwe Cultural Landscape (South Africa) (C 1099) (*Continuation*)

Le **Secrétariat** précise que des clarifications ont été apportées par les Délégations de l’Ethiopie et de l’Afrique du Sud en réponse aux demandes de précisions formulées par le Secrétariat et l’ICOMOS. Le projet de décision ainsi amendé est soumis pour examen.

The **Chairperson** adopted paragraphs 1 to 14 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that the final paragraph, related to the inclusion of the property on the List of World Heritage in Danger, should be removed.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked the State Party if it agreed with the proposed deletion.

The State Party supported the proposed deletion.

The Delegations of **Ethiopia and Nigeria** requested the deletion of the concerned paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** s’oppose fermement à la suppression du paragraphe. Celui-ci s’intègre dans la logique de la décision et du processus accepté par l’Etat Partie. Il est essentiel que la suspension soit maintenue dans l’attente de la réalisation des études.

Le Secrétariat précise que la suspension a été décidée suite au constat - formulé lors de la mission - que de premières activités ont été mises en place. Cette décision avait été validée par le Comité du patrimoine mondial lors de la dernière session.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported deletion of paragraph 12.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that activities should be halted until the mission is undertaken. The Delegation also wondered why paragraph 12 was reviewed another time as it was deleted.

The **Chairperson** indicated that paragraph 12 would be reviewed as a matter of consistency, taking into account that paragraph 14 was also reviewed;

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that the State Party guaranteed that no mining activities would be undertaken in the property, so the Committee has to trust the State Party. As a consequence deletion of paragraph 12 is deemed not required.

La Délégation du **Mali** estime que le paragraphe peut être maintenu.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported by the Delegation of **Barbados** requested to change the wording in the Decision, in order to recognize the commitment of the State Party.

The Delegation of **Estonia** its wish to keep paragraph 12.

ICOMOS reiterated that the water license was already granted to the mining company and that it was difficult to guaranty that the State Party would be able to halt all mining activities.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed the commitment of the State Party for halting the mining activities until a mission is undertaken.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** supported the Delegation of Australia.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** rappelle que ce paragraphe avait été inclus en vue de lancer un signal et d'encourager l'Etat Partie à poursuivre ses efforts. Elle souhaite qu'il soit maintenu. Elle reconnaît toutefois les efforts engagés par l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Barbados** asked whether it would be possible to get the comments of the State Party on the status of its mining activities. As this was already stated the Delegation preferred to continue with the adoption of the Decision **35 COM 7B.44**.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** agreed with the statement of the Delegation of Australia

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.44** was adopted as amended.

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

Tower of London (United Kingdom) (C 488) (Continuation)

The Chairperson gave the floor to **ICOMOS** who read the amended Decision and clarified that this text was agreed upon with the State Party.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B 113** was adopted as amended.

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

The Chairperson gave the floor to **ICOMOS** who read the amended Decision and clarified that this text was agreed upon with the State Party.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7B 114** was adopted as amended.

After consultation of the Committee, the **Chairperson** gave the floor to an NGO, the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) which presented a Statement on behalf of over 70 Indigenous organizations and NGOs in relation to the nominations of:

- Western Ghats (India)
- Trinational de la Sangha (Republic of Congo / Cameroon / Central African Republic)
- Kenya Lake System (Kenya).

It expressed concern about the fact that the mentioned nominations were prepared without adequate involvement and consultation of Indigenous peoples and without obtaining their free, prior and informed consent. Therefore, it considered that Indigenous cultural values, rights and needs are not duly taken into account. The NGO called on the Committee to defer these nominations, in order to provide time for meaningful consultations and collaboration with the Indigenous communities concerned. This would be in line with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, the views of the UN human rights bodies, UNESCO's commitment to human rights, as well as the Five Strategic Objectives (The Five 'C'). The NGO also urged the Committee to revise the Operational Guidelines in order to ensure that the implementation of the Convention is consistent with the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

**ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF
21 APRIL 2011, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL
GUIDELINES**

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/8A

Decisions: **35 COM 8A**

The **Secretariat** presented the Tentative Lists submitted by the States Parties as of 21 April 2011 in conformity with the *Operational Guidelines*.

Le **Rapporteur** présente l'amendement introduit par la Délégation de la Jordanie sur le paragraphe 2 du projet de décision.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested clarifications with regards to the amendments

The Delegation of **Jordan** made a statement supported by the Delegations of **Iraq** and **Egypt**. [The statement by the Delegation of Jordan can be found in **Annex II** of the present document.]

The **Chairperson** requested advice from the Legal Advisor.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that there was no need to request such advice as there was a United Nations Resolution.

The **Chairperson** insisted on getting legal advice.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that the Chairperson should be sympathetic to law and repeated that the request of legal advice was no necessary.

The Delegation of **Russia** requested the Delegations supporting the amendment to point 2 to avoid raising such political issues. It indicated that the Committee cannot resolve international conflicts.

The **Chairperson** postponed the debate until the following day.

The meeting rose at 7 pm.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY, 24 JUNE 2011

EIGHTH MEETING

10 am – 1 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

**ITEM 8A TENTATIVE LISTS SUBMITTED BY STATES PARTIES AS OF
21 APRIL 2011, IN CONFORMITY WITH THE OPERATIONAL
GUIDELINES (Continuation)**

The **Chairperson** called for the consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 8A** with the proposed amendment of paragraph 2 proposed by the Delegation of Jordan.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed concern for the amendment made by the Delegation of Jordan in relation to the Tentative List as, if adopted it will apply to all States Parties. The delegation of Australia underlined that the key point of interest of the proposed amendment is generic therefore it would impact on all States Parties. It proposed that the Legal Advisor should advise concerning this point.

The Delegation of **Jordan** proposed that the Committee vote on the Draft Decision **35 COM 8A** without amendment.

The **Chairperson** proposed to adopt the Draft Decision taking into consideration the intervention of the Delegation of Jordan.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the Delegation of Jordan's intervention and its proposal to vote on this point.

The **Chairperson** underlined that it is for the Committee to decide.

The Delegation of **Australia** was of the opinion that there is no need to vote, and put forward that it is not opposed to reflection in order to move quickly.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** agreed with the intervention of the Delegation of Jordan as it is logical and confirmed the need to find solutions for conflicting cases. It added that this Item should not create new conflicts in the future.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested the adoption of Draft Decision **35 COM 8A** with amendment to paragraph 2.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** n'a pas d'objection et se joint aux remarques faites par la Délégation de l'Australie.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8A** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed **item 8A** of the Agenda.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

Documents: **WHC-11/35.COM/8B**
WHC-11/35.COM/8B.Add
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.8B1
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.8B1.Add
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.8B2
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.8B3

CHANGES TO NAMES OF PROPERTIES INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **Secretariat** introduced three proposals for name changes to World Heritage listed properties for possible approval by the Committee: (1) “*James Island and Related Sites*” to “*Kunta Kinteh Island and Related Sites*” (Gambia), (2) “*Royal Chitwan National Park* to *Chitwan National Park*” (Nepal), and (3) “*Historic Area of Willemstad, Inner City and Harbour* to *Historic Area of Willemstad, Inner City and Harbour, Curaçao*” (The Netherlands).

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.1, 8B.2 and 8B.3** were adopted.

WITHDRAWN NOMINATIONS

The **Secretariat** stated that a total of **8** nominations were withdrawn before the commencement of the session.

India – Santiniketan (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 29/04/2011)

Mexico - Fundidora Monterrey (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 24/05/2011)

Saudi Arabia – Historic City of Jeddah (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 26/05/2011)

Israel – Land of Caves and Hiding (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 02/06/2011)

Nigeria – Oke Idanre Cultural Landscape (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 09/06/2011)

Turkey - Old City and Ramparts of Alanya with Seljuk Shipyard (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 14/06/2011)

Iran – Harra Protected Area (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 21/06/2011)

China – Wudalianchi National Park (withdrawn at the request of the State Party on 21/06/2011).

The Secretariat indicated that the Committee will examine 35 properties for inscription: 8 natural, 3 cultural and 24 mixed. It concluded by mentioning that the complete pdf files are available for consultation.

FACTUAL ERROR LETTERS

The Secretariat noted that a number of letters were received, however only some of them were considered as containing factual errors. The factual error letters were translated and distributed. These letters concerned the following nominations: Bridgetown and its Garrison (Barbados), Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park (Jamaica), Hiraizumi Temples, Gardens and Archaeological Sites Representing the Buddhist Pure Land (Japan), and Selimiye Mosque and its Social Complex (Turkey). The Secretariat indicated that the Advisory Bodies were going to comment the identified errors during their presentations on the related nominations.

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

The **Chairperson** recalled the essential procedures of nominations in accordance with the *Operational Guidelines*. Giving the floor to IUCN and ICOMOS for the general introduction, she requested them to be brief in their presentations.

The **Chairperson** recalled the Rules of Procedure, specifically the paragraphs on advocacy, and underlined that clarifications could only be provided on specific points.

IUCN thanked the IUCN team present at the session, the IUCN panel, the field evaluators and the global network of reviewers. It outlined the consideration of the Outstanding Universal Value as well as the three main pillars which are: the criteria met, integrity and protection management, and the four following principles: (1) high standards; (2) strong partnerships; (3) flagship programmes; and (4) cooperation with the earth sciences. It summarized the cooperation of IUCN from the stages of technical evaluation to the nomination file, the results of which represent a complex process, stressing the importance of the *Operational Guidelines* throughout this process. He acknowledged the statement of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues of 23 June 2011, and expressed the willingness of IUCN to cooperate in the approach as proposed by the group.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS underlined that ICOMOS evaluation involves a wide-ranging cooperation of experts, approximately 40-50 persons, and favors a holistic rather than individual approach. It pointed out that if mission experts are the most active in this process, they have no influence in the outcome however. It summarized the priorities and approach of ICOMOS in the process of evaluation. In 2011, ICOMOS evaluated 48 nominations, 29 new nominations and 269 sites. It mentioned that the date of the panel meeting was brought forward to December 2010 instead of January 2011. It also stressed that ICOMOS does not consider any new information received after 28 February, and that therefore any new information submitted after this date will not be evaluated. It mentioned that the Advisory Bodies have identified new work for the upstream process including the processes of submission for the Tentative Lists.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** remercie les organisations consultatives et avance qu'il faut se mettre d'accord sur l'esprit de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* et garder en tête qu'elle œuvre pour la préservation des biens du patrimoine mondial. Elle souhaite donc qu'un travail de communication soit fait entre les organisations consultatives et les Etats

parties avant la visite d'évaluation des experts. Elle demande aussi si le processus d'évaluation des sites est harmonisé.

The Delegation of **Brazil** gave a general reminder on the fact that the Committee having finalized 7B consideration for Item 8B had started. At the beginning of the *Convention*, the most important Article is Article 8 covering the inscription of properties; however as the *World Heritage Convention* evolved, the state of conservation of properties became also important, now both Items are equally important. It congratulated the Advisory Bodies for their work and wished to identify ways of strengthening dialogue between States Parties and the Advisory Bodies. Article 8 was mentioned as it refers to this dialogue. Better mechanisms need to be developed as the work of the Advisory Bodies is important.

The Delegation of **Estonia** remarked that the Outstanding Universal Value cannot be forgotten, as it is the key concept that underpins the *World Heritage Convention*.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** n'approuve pas les observations formulées par la Délégation du Brésil. Les questions des rapports sur l'état de conservation des biens et celle de l'équilibre de la Liste du patrimoine mondial sont totalement différentes et doivent être abordées de façon distincte. Un bien est inscrit sur la base de sa Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Après l'inscription d'un bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, la question de son état de conservation devient essentielle.

The Delegation of **Egypt** directed its questions to the Advisory Bodies: Firstly, it wished to know whether the nomination of properties helps conservation; Secondly, it asked whether contact is made with the State Party prior to an official visit regarding the goals and objectives of the mission; And thirdly, it wished to know how harmonization could be achieved to reach consistency between evaluation processes.

IUCN indicated that this is part of an important process for how we will proceed. In response to the questions posed by the Delegation of Egypt, it indicated that with regard to nominations, the inscription concerns conservation but not only. It added that paragraph 52 of the *Operational Guidelines* indicates conservation criteria and read the paragraph aloud. Then it mentioned that this is a part of the evaluation, interaction, and use of time. It welcomes suggestions on this process if Delegates wish to express any. For what concerns the Advisory Bodies, it informed that they are on a journey of cooperation and that for the past two years both IUCN and ICOMOS have participated in each others' panel processes. Significant improvements have been happening. IUCN thanked the Delegation of Egypt for its questions.

ICOMOS indicated that it agreed with IUCN. Regarding point 3, ICOMOS tried to achieve consistency in approach and how outcomes are formulated, but may not have consistent outcomes. Outcomes are specific to every property.

A. NATURAL PROPERTIES

A.1 AFRICA

A.1.1 New Nominations

Property	Trinational Sangha
Id. N°	1380
State Party	Congo, Cameroon, Central African Republic
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(ix)(x)

L'**UICN** présente le rapport d'évaluation du bien. Le site recouvre trois parcs nationaux au Cameroun, au Congo et en République centrafricaine. Ce paysage forestier est habité par des populations semi-nomades et abrite une grande diversité faunistique et floristique. L'évaluation du bien a été réalisée sur la base des critères (vii), (ix) et (x). Le statut de protection du bien remplit les conditions posées et des efforts importants ont été engagés par l'Etat partie pour développer la coopération transfrontalière. Toutefois, la justification de l'inscription doit être précisée, en particulier pour le critère (vii). Par ailleurs, la chasse, l'agriculture et l'exploitation minière ou forestière peuvent constituer des menaces sur l'intégrité du bien. A cet effet, les limites du site doivent être reconsidérées pour permettre une gestion globale du paysage et le statut de gestion des concessions forestières autour du bien doit être clarifié. Enfin, des mesures doivent être prises pour assurer une meilleure représentation des populations autochtones. L'**UICN** recommande donc de différer l'inscription.

One amendment on paragraph 2 was proposed by the Delegation of **South Africa** to the Draft Decision.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** note que l'**UICN** recommande l'extension du périmètre pour assurer l'intégrité du bien. Elle s'interroge, à cet effet, sur la faisabilité de cette extension et sur la surface recommandée pour le périmètre du bien et ses zones tampons.

L'**UICN** précise que le bien est limitrophe de concessions forestières. L'extension du périmètre est essentielle pour garantir son intégrité à long terme. A cet effet, elle sollicite auprès de l'Etat Partie des précisions sur la relation entre aires de conservation et zones de concession forestières.

IUCN commented regarding the scale of this property, noting that the area is extensive plus adjacent areas. Therefore trilateral arrangements will have to be made. It noted also that the question of boundaries is an open one as well as that of the relationship with adjacent sites in and outside the buffer zone. A re-submission of the nomination should be made considering other areas with a connection to the property. It recommended that the Decision be taken for a deferral.

La Délégation du **Congo** (Observateur) précise que suite à l'examen réalisé par l'UICN, les trois Etats parties souhaitent demander le renvoi du dossier plutôt que son examen soit différé. En réponse à la demande de l'UICN de préciser les conditions de préservation de l'intégrité du bien, ils envisagent de réviser les limites du bien, en incluant les zones forestières. A cet effet, des discussions ont d'ores et déjà été engagées avec les compagnies forestières.

The Delegation of **South Africa** asked IUCN some clarification specifically relating to paragraph 10, if the property meets criteria (ix) and (x) as the Draft Decision states however that justification needs to be enhanced.

IUCN stated that the criteria and conditions for integrity and criterion (vii) were unclear, while criteria (ix) and (x) are clear, however the integrity of the site is not met, as it is a complex relationship.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite les trois Etats Parties pour les efforts réalisés. Elle salue l'approche globale développée dans le dossier, reconnaissant les droits des peuples autochtones. Elle soutient toutefois les remarques formulées par les Organisations consultatives et recommande de différer le dossier.

La Délégation de la **France** félicite les trois Etats Parties pour leurs efforts et les encourage à poursuivre ce travail. Considérant que des solutions ont été proposées pour assurer la préservation de l'intégrité, notamment par le biais de la création de zones tampons, elle soutient l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Afrique du Sud.

La Délégation du **Mali** soutient l'amendement proposé par les Délégations de l'Afrique du Sud et de la France.

The Delegation of **South Africa** explained further the amendment proposed in this Draft Decision. It noted that according to IUCN, the management criteria were not met, but underlined the existence of funding and of a Foundation.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** soutient l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Afrique du Sud concernant le renvoi du dossier. Les explications fournies par l'UICN montrent en effet que le site remplit les conditions et critères d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Jordan** and **the Russian Federation** supported the Delegations of South Africa, France and Mali.

The Delegations of **Nigeria** and **Ethiopia** supported referral stating that it is a good example of a trans-boundary nomination.

The Delegation of **Brazil** commended the States Parties for the regional cooperation and understood the difficulties of the Advisory Bodies when the Committee changes decisions.

The Delegation of **Sweden** posed a question to the State Party if it was possible to return to the Committee session within one year with the stated technical requirements.

The Delegation of **China** supported the amendment indicating that it was a matter of management which is difficult anywhere. It was of the view that the property meets the criteria for inscription as a trans-boundary site.

The Delegation of **Barbados** complimented IUCN and stated that the nomination is a good example of cooperation. It supported the amendment.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the three States Parties and endorsed the amendment.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that the site is important. It added that cooperation is tremendous and that at least two criteria have been met. The site could be considered and the issues dealt with during that time.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne que les questions posées démontrent l'intérêt de différer le dossier. Elle demande au Conseiller juridique s'il est possible de solliciter l'avis de l'Etat partie sur ce point.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that according to the *Rules of Procedure – Rule 22.4*, the State Party shall not speak to approve a request and that deliberations are to continue before allowing the State Party to intervene.

La Délégation du **Mexique** sollicite une réponse aux recommandations formulées par l'UICN.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that the point of information put by Committee Members should first be discussed and then requests should thereafter be made to the State Party.

The **Chairperson** stated that based on an examination of the *Rules of Procedure, Rule 22.4* the State Party would then be given the floor to respond to questions posed.

La Délégation du **Congo** (Observateur) confirme que les trois Etats Parties sont déterminés à poursuivre et renforcer leur coopération dans la gestion du site. Une rencontre tripartite est prévue à cet effet le 9 juillet 2011 à Brazzaville, au Congo pour discuter et mettre en œuvre les recommandations de la Décision.

The **Chairperson** asked the Observer Delegation of **Congo** if it would be able to respond to the requirements if the Committee proceeds with a referral.

La Délégation du **Congo** (Observateur) confirme qu'elle sera en mesure de répondre aux exigences si le dossier est renvoyé.

IUCN stated that it welcomes further information from the State Party. Two parts are actions able to be delivered in 3 years or for a future recommendation. It expressed no objections to three years, regarding the Delegation of **Brazil's** request. If the Committee adopts a referral, there are ways to ensure on site verification; however these are matters for extra budgetary funding.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.4** was adopted as amended.

A.1.2 Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Pendjari National Park (extension of W National Park of Niger, Niger)
Id. N°	749 Bis
State Party	Benin
Criteria proposed by State Party	(x)

L'**UICN** indique que, situé au Nord-Ouest du Bénin, le bien appartient à un vaste complexe d'aires protégées. Le dossier a déjà été présenté pour inscription en 2002, mais ne remplissait pas les critères naturels. Dans le contexte d'une proposition d'extension du site du patrimoine mondial du Parc du W, il permettrait de renforcer les valeurs globales du site dans son ensemble, notamment au regard de la biodiversité.

L'**UICN** salue la qualité de la gestion et les efforts engagés en matière de protection juridique. Elle note que le braconnage y a été éliminé. Aucun projet de barrage ou d'exploitation minière n'y a été relevé. Le tourisme constitue une source de revenus et les flux touristiques sont conformes à la capacité du site.

Toutefois, l'**UICN** constate que le Parc du W est inscrit au titre des critères (ix) et (x), alors que l'extension est proposée au titre du critère (x). Elle rappelle à cet effet que dans le cas d'un bien en série, les mêmes critères doivent être appliqués à tous les éléments. Une nouvelle proposition doit donc être formulée.

Par ailleurs, afin de remplir les critères d'intégrité et de fonctionnalité, des zones tampons devraient être identifiées. Aucune information n'a été fournie par l'Etat Partie à ce sujet. Au regard de ces deux motifs, il est donc recommandé de différer le dossier.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** sollicite une clarification sur les raisons motivant la recommandation de l'**UICN** de différer l'inscription, bien que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien soit reconnue.

La Délégation de la **France** demande une précision auprès de l'Etat partie sur les mécanismes d'intégration existant au niveau des trois pays concernés.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested to provide the opportunity to the Observer Delegation of **Benin** to comment on the issues raised concerning the potential physical connection of the proposed site to the already inscribed one.

La Délégation du **Mali** salue la volonté de l'Etat partie d'envisager une gestion transfrontalière du site, en coopération avec les Etats parties du Burkina Faso et du Niger. Elle rappelle qu'une rencontre des sites du patrimoine mondial de la sous-région a récemment été organisée et encourage les Etats Parties à s'appuyer sur cette structure régionale pour faciliter leur coopération.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** recapitulated that the main issues of the site refer to its boundaries and the interconnectivity between its different components. It expressed interest in hearing the comments of the Observer Delegation of **Benin** on these issues. It further requested IUCN to provide supplementary information on the issue of boundaries.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Benin** to comment on the points raised.

La Délégation du **Bénin** (Observateur) rappelle que le Bénin, le Niger et le Burkina Faso mettent en œuvre depuis dix ans un programme de conservation et de gestion du Parc national du W pour assurer l'intégrité de cet écosystème unique. La proposition d'extension s'inscrit dans cette démarche et constitue une étape vers une proposition d'inscription globale.

IUCN explained that the recommendation to defer the inscription of the property is based on several aspects. While IUCN considered that the protection and management of Pendjari National Park are carried out to a high standard, it believed that the boundaries of the nominated property do not meet the requirements set out in the *Operational Guidelines*, in relation to the apparent lack of connectivity to the existing World Heritage property of W National Park in Niger.

IUCN further noted that poaching has been largely eliminated from the area and thus the hunting zones appear to provide an effective buffering function. IUCN regretted that no information was received from the State Party on a possible buffer zone although this information has been requested. IUCN welcomed an extension of W National Park for biodiversity reasons, but pointed out that the criterion according to which the extension has been nominated does not coincide with the criteria according to which W National Park was inscribed.

The Delegation of **Egypt** did not object the recommendation made by IUCN for deferral, but recalled that the Advisory Body in its recommendation recognized the good management and state of conservation of the site.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the gap between the inscribed property and its proposed extension.

IUCN recalled that Pendjari National Park has been examined by the Committee at its 22nd session (Kyoto, 2002) being the subject of a previous joint nomination with the W National Park. The Bureau, at that time, considered that the proposed nomination did not meet natural criteria and decided that this nomination be referred back to the State Party. IUCN clarified that, for the above-mentioned reasons, the site does not qualify for inscription at this point.

The **Chairperson** reported that no amendments have been received for this site. The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.5** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that in order to save time un-amended Decisions should not be showed on the screen. It further asked the Chairperson how she envisaged the congratulatory process for nominations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the Chairperson conveys congratulations on behalf of the Committee.

The **Chairperson** welcomed this suggestion and suggested to use the break for personal congratulations.

A.1.3 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley
Id. N°	1060 Rev
State Party	Kenya
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(ix)(x)

IUCN introduced the site of the Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley which is composed of three alkaline lakes and their surrounding territories (Lake Bogoria, 10,700 ha; Lake Nakuru, 18,800 ha; and Lake Elementaita, 2,534 ha). The Advisory Body explained that those lakes are found on the floor of the Great Rift Valley where major tectonic and/or volcanic events have shaped a distinctive landscape. It added that the corresponding criteria under which the nomination file was submitted are (vii), (ix) and (x). It further elaborated that some of the world's greatest diversities and concentrations of bird species are recorded within these relatively small lake systems and that for most of the year, up to 4 million Lesser Flamingos move between the three shallow lakes in an outstanding wildlife spectacle.

IUCN further described the natural setting of the lakes providing an exceptional experience of nature with hot springs, geysers and the steep escarpment of the Rift Valley with its volcanic outcrops. It added that this nomination had been first submitted in 2001 and considered by the World Heritage Bureau in June 2001[Indicate which session and location]. At that time, the Bureau had noted several concerns, principally the unclear legal protection status of Lake Elementaita, but also the importance of Lake Natron in the United Republic of Tanzania to the viability of the Great Rift Valley flamingo population; threats from pollution and deforestation to Lake Nakuru; and incomplete management plans for the three components of the nominated property. The Advisory Body noted that significant progress has been made since 2001. In conclusion, it clarified that the revised nomination dossier does not include Lake Natron, but an extension at a later point in time might be considered.

The **Chairperson** informed that no amendments have been received for this site and moved to the adoption of the Decision **35 COM 8B.6**.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List with regard to the global significance of the Great Rift Valley as a migratory corridor for millions of birds. However, it requested information from the Observer Delegation of **Kenya** as to how impacts of tourism will be mitigated in the future.

La délégation de la **Suisse** demande des informations à l'Etat partie du Kenya concernant une collaboration avec l'Etat partie de la République de Tanzanie visant à l'inclusion du Lac Natron dans le futur.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** explained that Lake Nakuru, Lake Bogoria and Lake Elementaita are under different forms of protection and confirmed that the management of all three lakes foresees tourism development it informed that local communities are involved in the management of the lakes in coordination with the Kenya Wildlife Service. Concerning the possible future inclusion of Lake Natron, it expressed its intention to collaborate with the State Party of the United Republic of Tanzania in the future.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.6** was adopted. The Chairperson, on behalf of all States Parties, congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Kenya** on the inscription of the Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** expressed its joy over the inscription of the Kenya Lake System in the Great Rift Valley on the World Heritage List and reassured the Committee of its commitment to the *World Heritage Convention*. It acknowledged the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF), the World Heritage Centre, the contributing States Parties and the local communities involved in the nomination for their support. It emphasized the key role of local communities in the management of the property. It concluded that this inscription might inspire further inscriptions in the Great Rift Valley, the cradle of mankind.

A.2 ASIA / PACIFIC

A.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Ningaloo Coast
Id. N°	1369
State Party	Australia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(viii)(x)

IUCN introduced the site nominated under criteria (vii), (viii) and (x) and stressed its high level of terrestrial species endemism as well as its high marine species diversity and abundance with an estimated 300 to 500 whale sharks aggregating annually. The Advisory Body added that the marine portion of the nominated property contains a high diversity of habitats that includes the lagoon, reef, open ocean, continental slope and shelf. Moreover, IUCN drew the attention of the Committee on potential threats to the

site such as future bombing activities on the Learmonth Air Weapons range and pollution resulting from accidents, including those provoked by natural disasters. IUCN emphasized that the involvement of local and indigenous stakeholders is crucial for the effective management and local acceptance of conservation efforts. In this context, IUCN particularly referred to the negotiation of native title claims and pastoral leases. In conclusion it considered that the nominated property meets criteria (vii) and (x) as outlined in the *Operational Guidelines* and recommended its inscription.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested the State Party of Australia to elaborate on the issue of indigenous land claims related to the site.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its support for the inscription and asked for details from the State Party of Australia with regard to the possible inclusion of criterion (viii) in the future.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the points brought up by the Delegations of Brazil and Bahrain.

The **Chairperson** drew the attention of the Delegation of Bahrain that a re-nomination of the property might be considered under criterion (ix), not under criterion (viii). She then gave the floor to the Delegation of Australia to respond to the questions raised.

The Delegation of **Australia** envisaged the establishment of a "Ningaloo Coast World Heritage Advisory Committee" after a possible inscription of the nominated property. This entity which would bring together representatives from the traditional owners, local government, scientific experts and members of the community is highly commended.

IUCN noted that platforms and exchange mechanisms of this nature can be helpful even at a much earlier stage, including nomination processes.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.7** was adopted. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated the Delegation of Australia on the inscription of the Ningaloo Coast on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Australia** reaffirmed its commitment to follow the recommendations of the World Heritage Committee to conserve the values of the site.

FIFTH DAY – FRIDAY, 24 JUNE 2011

NINTH MEETING

3 pm – 8 pm

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

**ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(Continuation)**

A.2 ASIA / PACIFIC

A.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Western Ghats
Id. N°	1342
State Party	India
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vii)(x)

IUCN presented the information on the serial nomination of the Western Ghats, a 1,600 km long mountain chain to the World Heritage Committee. This serial nomination consists of seven different areas (the 'subclusters') covering a total of 795,300 ha. The property was nominated under criteria (vii) and (x), and the State Party has also indicated in supplementary information the possibility to consider criterion (ix).

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to consider IUCN's recommendations and whether there were any questions.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that it was impressed by the biodiversity significance of the property which includes endemic species present. It wished to introduce amendments in particular a proposal for referral instead of deferral, and called for clarification on a few points, namely whether the State Party is able to play a coordinating role and whether there is an overarching legal framework in place for the protection of the property's values.

The Delegation of **Egypt** shared the opinion of the Delegation of Australia, in that the decision ought to be referred instead of being deferred.

The Delegation of **China** supported the preceding comments and was deeply impressed by the diversity and large number of species.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** acknowledged the importance of the property and the endemism of species. It added that it did not believe that there were any serious issues with regard to the criteria being met but enquired about the inclusion of any dams within the boundaries of the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that it believed that the property should have been inscribed on the World Heritage List since a long time and added that it was convinced that criterion (x) could be met. Then it asked IUCN how criteria (ix) could be met and whether this would require a mission.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** endorsed the opinions of most Delegations who had spoken before and who supported the nomination of the property, in particular with regard to its rich biodiversity. It believed that the nomination should be referred.

The Delegation of **Barbados** noted that the Committee had a very rich property in terms of biodiversity before it but that it would first await further comments regarding the management of the property. Thus it informed that it supports the referral of this nomination.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** acknowledged the efforts of the Government of India in putting together this nomination. Thus it concluded that it would be fairer to refer the property than defer it.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Niger** who supported the referral.

The Delegation of **South Africa** also aligned itself with Committee Members who supported the referral of this nomination.

The Delegation of **Cambodia** also agreed with the referral of the nomination.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** mentionne que le dossier présente de très bons atouts. Elle note que la série de 39 composants reflète le choix de l'Etat partie mais qu'il existe des problèmes de conservation relatifs au plan de gestion du site proposé. Ce dernier ne couvre pas la totalité des biens proposés en série. Elle considère que le choix de passer du renvoi à différer le dossier est un cadeau empoisonné. Par ailleurs elle indique que beaucoup de sites naturels méritent l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial mais que la Suisse donne de loin la préférence pour l'examen soit différé qui donnera plus de temps pour la préparation du dossier d'un site bien protégé.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the referral of the nomination on the basis of the comments by the Delegation of Australia.

IUCN stated that with regard to the question of 'referral' or 'deferral' of the nomination, it had also weighed this up. Given the complexity of the properties under consideration, along with the issue surrounding criterion (ix) all of this led IUCN to recommend deferral. Clarifying points which were raised about management plans, it indicated that much information has been prepared and provided by the State Party (over 600 pages of plans) but IUCN would like to see consistent management objectives across the multiple properties which would tell the history of the site in its entirety.

The Observer Delegation of **India** welcomed the acknowledgement of the rich biodiversity of the property. In response to concerns raised about the protection of the property, it reiterated that the property is protected by an overarching legal framework. As a mechanism to coordinate site management and protection, a national Committee has been set up which will provide for a common vision and establish linkages with NGOs and other agencies. This Committee will provide guidance, oversee and coordinate all individual management plans.

The federal Government has brought in other principles such as tourism regulations, livelihood enhancement for local communities and stringent controls of land use. The dams which some States Parties raised concerns about earlier on in the discussion, have been in existence for over 100 years and are integrated in the natural eco-system. None has been built recently and no new one is being planned. If there were to be new requests for planning permissions, the legal framework described would provide for adequate protection as requests would be reviewed by the stringent framework of the federal Ministries. With regard to concerns over land tenure, all land within the nominated property is owned by the State which will also implement the management plan adequately.

IUCN replied that if a mission was considered necessary and that this would be linked to a number of components rather than criteria.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that in the light of the position of the State Party and IUCN, it seems that the property deserves to be on the World Heritage List. The Delegation of Egypt believed that there is no need for a future mission only to ensure an overarching management plan but asked IUCN for further information about the reinforcement of the buffer zone and the impact of the dams.

The Delegation of **Brazil** considered that following on from the comments made by the Delegation of Egypt there might be a possibility to inscribe the property at this session. It thought that while there is some integrity lacking, the inscription could be decided.

IUCN stated that the State Party provided maps which confirmed the existence of dams. GSI maps would need to be assessed in detail with regard to the issue of referral or deferral.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that it did not receive an answer to the question it raised earlier, i.e. whether the dams in the property's boundaries were really 100 years old. It also asked more information about GSI maps and how details about buffer zones could be obtained.

IUCN stated that the property contains a number of different dams and that these would need to be assessed on a site by site basis. The Chairperson requested the Committee to move forward in its consideration in order for a decision to be reached.

The Delegation of **Egypt**, referring back to IUCN's report, noted that in its opinion, the property is an exemplary serial nomination. It wondered what it would bring to ask the State Party to prepare a new nomination file. It wished to draw the Committee Members' attention to their belief that listing would strengthen the management plan at a broader

scale. It asked what information the State Party would need to provide if the nomination file is to be reviewed and whether there may be a possibility to provide this information following inscription on the World Heritage List.

IUCN thanked the Delegation of Egypt for its comments and noted that while the region has the potential to meet criterion (x), one should recognize that it does not meet criterion (vii). With regard to the point on boundaries, the aim of the mission would not be to reconsider these.

The **Chairperson** thanked IUCN and asked the Committee to consider Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.9**, and then gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

The **Rapporteur** noted that an amendment has been proposed by the Delegation of Australia.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** réitère sa position et rappelle qu'elle ne veut pas faire un cadeau empoisonné à l'Inde. Elle préfère que l'examen de ce dossier soit différé.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Switzerland for its comments which were clearly noted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** queried what the brackets mean in paragraph 2g.

The **Secretariat** noted that it would be problematic to deal with paragraph 2g within the framework of 'referral'.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested the deletion of paragraph 2g for the sake of coherence as the Secretariat explained that this would require a new nomination.

The Delegation of **Australia** was in agreement with the deletion of paragraph 2g.

The **Draft** Decision **35 COM 8B.9** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **India** thanked the Committee and promised to abide with this Decision.

Property	Ogasawara Islands
Id. N°	1362
State Party	Japan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(viii)(ix)(x)

IUCN presented the information on the nomination of the Ogasawara Islands, nominated under criteria (viii), (ix) and (x). The values are significant though too narrowly

considered. IUCN noted that the property does not meet criteria (viii) and (x) but that it is set apart from other properties because of its educational value. The property is well protected, boundaries are appropriate and its management is effective. IUCN recommended that the property be inscribed under criteria (ix) taking note of the threats of an invasion of alien species.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the State Party and IUCN for their work and the former for its tourism management plan in particular. It asked whether the recent disasters (the tsunami and nuclear reactor explosion) have had an impact on the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the State Party and IUCN for putting forward a fine nomination. It wished to listen to comments from the Observer Delegation of **Japan** and IUCN on the two amendments suggested by the Delegation of Australia.

La Délégation de **Mali** remercie l’UICN pour sa présentation et félicite la délégation du Japon (Observateur). Elle demande à l’UICN s’il existe des menaces pesant sur le bien étant donné que la région est touchée par des catastrophes naturelles.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Japan** to respond to the questions raised about the impact of the disasters and comments on amendments.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** thanked all Committee Members for their support during the recent natural disaster. Fortunately the tsunami caused no damage to the nominated property. With regard to the proposed amendments it is not so keen about them but will accept them.

IUCN responding to the Delegation of Mali, said that the immediate threat is that from an invasion of alien species. Access to the island is restricted (i.e. no access by air) therefore high visitor levels are unlikely and thus do not pose a threat at this point in time.

The **Chairperson** turned to the Rapporteur regarding the amendments.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that a number of amendments applying to the entire Decision were received.

The **Draft Decision 35 COM 8B.11** was adopted as amended. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated the State party on the inscription of the property on the World Heritage List.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** thanked the Committee.

A.2.2 Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Phong Nha - Ke Bang National Park
Id. N°	951 Bis
State Party	Viet Nam
Criteria proposed by State Party	(x)

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** dit avoir déjà discuté de ce bien avec l'Etat partie du Vietnam et a un autre point de vue à propos de ce site qui est de renvoyer l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Jordan** endorsed the statement made by the Delegation of Egypt on referral rather than deferral.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the suggestions made by the Delegations of Egypt and Jordan in favour of "referral" rather than deferral and hoped that the State Party will respond to questions raised by IUCN.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed to maintain the original Draft Decision which recommended deferral.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** shared the proposal made by the Delegation of Egypt and expressed its appreciation of the considerable amount of work produced by the State Party.

The Delegation of **Sweden** shared the view expressed by the Delegation of Australia. It added that there is still a lot of work to be done and that from the practical point of view, deferral would allow more time for the State Party to address various issues which still need to be addressed.

The Delegation of **Estonia** was of the view that the nomination needed more elaboration, in particular in the better definition of the protected area and the integrity issues of this property.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souhaite s'associer à la proposition de la Délégation de la Suède qui est de différer l'inscription plutôt que la renvoyer parce que l'Etat partie propose le critère (x) pour garantir la protection de la valeur naturelle. La Délégation de la Suisse estime que le statut de protection ne remplit pas ce critère de la biodiversité.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** appreciated the efforts made by the State Party for the re-nomination of the property. It expressed the wish to listen to the State Party in particular regarding the boundaries and management issues.

La Délégation du **Mali** félicite l'Etat partie du Vietnam pour les efforts entrepris, mais pense néanmoins que la décision de différer la proposition d'inscription est appropriée. Le rapport de l'UICN dans son point 103 montre des cas de braconnage et de manque de moyens pour la gestion du Parc. Aussi la Délégation du Mali est d'avis que différer l'examen de ce dossier est justifié pour ces raisons.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the State Party to address the issues raised.

The Observer Delegation of **Viet Nam** informed that it made efforts to accommodate and implement IUCN's recommendations. This included discussions with the Lao PDR with a view to a trans-boundary cooperation. It added that more cooperation will be made in the future with the Lao PDR for the property. It confirmed the issue of illegal logging and other issues are being addressed. It will take note of all the decisions/recommendations of the Committee, and whenever the final Decision will be referral or deferral, it would make its best efforts to fulfill the requirements expressed by the Committee.

IUCN clarified that this is not an extension of the property but a re-nomination in order to include biodiversity values under the criterion (x). Therefore deferral would represent a more constructive option for the State Party with more time to address the issues raised, in particular the questions of meeting the possible criterion (ix), as well as the trans-boundary cooperation.

La Délégation de **l'Egypte** comprend le souci de l'UICN d'élargir la superficie du site, de vouloir la coopération avec les pays voisins, de souhaiter que l'Etat partie adopte le critère (ix) plutôt que le critère (x). Mais elle fait remarquer que le site est menacé, Aussi il convient selon elle d'accélérer son inscription afin de pouvoir le protéger. Dans cette perspective, la Délégation de l'Egypte préfère le renvoi plutôt que de différer l'examen de ce dossier.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the adoption of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted. She then proposed to adopt paragraph 3 and asked whether any objection to the proposal made by the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** preferred a referral to a deferral and asked whether there is any specific problem to decide a referral.

The Delegation of **Australia** maintained its position for deferral, in order not to give a poisoned gift to the State Party therefore it did not accept the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the Delegation of Australia. It explained that with the decision of deferral the State Party can better implement the decision made by the Committee.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment made by the Delegation of Egypt.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient les Délégations de la Suède et de l'Australie, elle met en avant les mêmes arguments que précédemment, elle souhaite différer l'examen du dossier.

IUCN expressed the fact that since the State Party is already addressing issues such as an extension of the boundaries, as well as a trans-boundary cooperation, the deferral would provide enough time to it to deal with all these issues.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee Members what decision they wished to take. She proposed proceeding with a vote.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souhaite demander à l'Etat partie la décision qu'il souhaite. Elle signale qu'elle ne souhaite pas retarder la discussion, mais que toutefois elle pense qu'il y a urgence pour l'inscription de ce site. Elle dit avoir posé une question à l'UICN à laquelle il n'a pas été répondu.

IUCN indicated that with the option of deferral, the State Party could come back at the earliest in two sessions, while with the option of referral, the State Party could come back to the Committee with its nomination the next year. In this context, referral would be a disadvantageous option for the State Party as it would leave little time to deal with possible trans-boundary cooperation as well as with criterion (ix).

IUCN understood that the State Party has already begun implementing these two issues. Therefore it thought that deferral would allow the State Party to proceed with it. It confirmed that currently there is no boundary modification proposed in the present nomination.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** having listened to the various comments wished to clarify its position. It stated that based on the commitment of the State Party, it preferred referral.

The **Chairperson** proposed proceeded with a vote by a show of hands. Proceeding with the vote, the majority of the Committee decided to refer back the property voted for referral. She then proceeded with the adoption of paragraph 3 of Decision **35 COM 8B.12** which was adopted with referral.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souhaite que le site soit renvoyé de sorte que l'Etat partie puisse revenir l'année prochaine. Elle est d'avis que plus le Comité débat, plus le temps passe et plus le danger pesant sur le site s'accroît. Le report peut prendre deux, trois, quatre ou parfois cinq ans et accroît les dangers d'autant. Elle souhaite qu'on adopte provisoirement la Décision et que l'on étudie ensuite avec l'UICN et le Secrétariat une décision définitive à la clôture le 29 juin 2011, ce qui permettra au Comité d'avancer dans son calendrier.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested the suspension of this Item until a consensus could be reached.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee members whether they agreed with the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est d'avis que la proposition de la Délégation du Brésil est pleine de sagesse et la soutient.

The **Chairperson** suspended the examination of this item and suggested the Committee Members to get IUCN's assistance in this matter.

A.3 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

A.3.1 Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List

Property	Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (extension of the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians, Slovakia and Ukraine)
Id. N°	1133 Bis
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ix)

IUCN proceeded with the brief presentation of this extension submitted under criterion (ix).

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked IUCN in which other countries such forests exist.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** took note of IUCN's recommendation to defer the extension in order for the State Party to consult other concerned States Parties such as Ukraine and Slovakia. Then it asked IUCN about the timeframe required for this.

The Delegation of **Australia** proposed to maintain the original Draft Decision for deferral.

The Delegation of **China** questioned the State Party on whether the nominated area was more distinguished and representative.

The **Chairperson** turned to the Observer Delegation of **Germany** to respond to the issues raised by Committee Members.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** explained that German components which are presently being discussed by the Committee add representative sites of ancient beech forest communities to the components already inscribed in the Carpathians with examples from the mountain to sea level, thus better representing the complete bio-

geographic history of European forest re-colonization after the last glacial period. Therefore, it was of the opinion that the proposed nomination would subsequently contribute to complete the Outstanding Universal Value of the already inscribed property. It added that in order to include every element of beech forest in Europe spread in various countries, it would need an additional 7 to 10 years, therefore it would prefer a phased process rather than waiting for the completeness of the nomination dossier including all other beech forest elements in Europe.

IUCN mentioned that the evaluation which it carried out reveals a wide scope of beech forests in Europe which could complete this nomination. Therefore, deferral would offer more time for the State Party to elaborate further the nomination dossier in particular in relation with the conceptual scope of the nomination.

The Delegation of **Australia** took note of the comment made by IUCN regarding the conceptual scope of the nomination and questioned whether it is necessary to proceed with an extension.

La Délégation de la **France** considère que cette extension est une bonne démarche et la soutient. Elle indique que son pays possède également des forêts de hêtres et peut échanger ses informations et ses données avec l'Etat partie de l'Allemagne. Elle questionne l'Etat partie sur l'existence d'une telle forêt transnationale ailleurs, dont l'Allemagne pourrait s'inspirer ?

The Delegation of **Jordan** suggested hearing the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** explained that beech forests are also to be found in Bulgaria and Romania. However, if the nomination has to include all beech forests to be found in other countries it was of the opinion that it would take 20 years to complete.

IUCN further questioned on how the concept diffuses and if the inscription of the proposed site would represent a risk by opening up something which is not clear without definition of scope in this nomination.

The Delegation of **Brazil** wished to listen to other Observer States Parties concerned.

The Observer Delegation of **Bulgaria** expressed its view that this extension should be considered individually. It informed that it was not involved in the elaboration process of this extension.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** indicated that the ancient forests deserved to be protected under the *World Heritage Convention* and that they form part of the system of primeval forests in Slovakia and Ukraine, as they are surrounded by it. It added that it had worked for years with Slovakia and Ukraine on the establishment of a joint management system.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of **Germany** for its reply and proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** recalled the amendments proposed to paragraph 2 and 3 concerning the statement of outstanding universal value. It stated that

the IUCN evaluation indicated that the property would meet the requirements for inscription on the basis of a serial nomination approach, based on criterion (ix). It continued by saying that the overall goal was to ensure protection of the beech forests of Outstanding Universal Value and not to wait any longer, that it provided for an additional value to the inscribed property in Slovakia and Ukraine, as nature does not stop at borders. Therefore it proposed that the property be inscribed, further stating that the Russian Federation has a good experience in the conservation management of this type of forest ecosystems and that it is willing to share this experience with Germany.

Paragraph 1 of the Draft Decision was adopted. The Chairperson then moved on to paragraph 2 with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation and asked the Secretariat to clarify.

The **Secretariat** explained that if the proposed property is going to be inscribed, a common name for the whole inscribed property has to be considered.

The **Chairperson** put forward that therefore an amendment for a new title for the property was needed.

The Delegation of **Australia** stated that based on the evaluation report prepared by the Advisory Body and the clarifications provided by the State Party it would not support the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the proposal by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that in its view the criteria for inscription had been met, under criterion (ix) and that boundaries were identified. Therefore it supported inscription. It further proposed to suspend the session to work on an agreed text for a title for the new property.

La Délégation de **France** appuie la Fédération de Russie et estime que le site peut être inscrit.

The Delegation of **Estonia** questioned the fact that if the Advisory Body evaluation indicated that all criteria for inscription had been met, why it proposed a deferral? The evaluation mentioned that if it concerned an extension to an existing property, it could be inscribed, although the property as a whole needed to be renamed, and therefore it supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The **Chairperson** asked if a new proposed title could be put on the screen.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the amendment of the Delegation of the Russian Federation based on the answers provided by IUCN and the clarifications of the State Party.

The Delegation of **China** supported the amendment of the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that all elements of the proposed property to meet the criterion of Outstanding Universal Value had been demonstrated and therefore it would support inscription.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the new name proposed by the Delegation of Estonia.

The **Chairperson** asked the new proposed name to be put on the screen, “Extension of the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians (Slovakia and Ukraine) and the Ancient Beech Forests of Germany”, and the Secretariat to clarify how this paragraph should be treated.

The **Secretariat** explained that if the extension is approved, the original name has to appear supplemented by the phrase “to include the Ancient Beech Forests (of Germany)”, which then has to lead to a new name as proposed by the World Heritage Committee.

The **Chairperson** asked for a suggestion for the new name of the whole property.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested “Ancient and Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians and Germany”.

IUCN reminded the Members of the World Heritage Committee of the principals put forward by the Advisory Bodies as regards serial nominations and that this discussion is moving into uncharted waters, but it would support the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Estonia.

La Délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** est d’avis que le projet de Décision concerne une proposition d’inscription. Si on approuve l’extension, il faut mettre dans le chapeau du paragraphe 2 « inscrire ».

Thereupon the **Chairperson** clarified that currently the proposal for an extension to an existing property was being examined.

La Délégation de la **Fédération de Russie** indique que le dossier a été proposé comme une proposition d’inscription et que l’UICN peut donner plus de détails si nécessaire. Dans le titre, il faudrait indiquer: « inscription ».

The **Chairperson** remarked that the confusion originated from the initial language and that the formal language “approval of the extension”, as used in similar cases, should be used. She invited the Members of the World Heritage Committee to consider approving the amendment put forward by the Delegation of the Russian Federation with further amendments by the Delegation of Estonia.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** dit ne pas avoir d’objection. Toutefois, pour une question de logique, on parle des forêts « primaires » en ce qui concerne les Carpathes alors qu’on parle de forêts « anciennes » pour l’Allemagne; Il faut indiquer les deux dans le paragraphe comme proposé par la Délégation de l’Estonie, c’est-à-dire « les forêts primaires et anciennes ».

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** remarked that the proposal put forward by the Delegation of Switzerland was not correct, as the Carpathians are not located in Germany, thus it should read “to include the Ancient Beech Forest [Germany] as an extension to the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians [Slovakia and Ukraine] on the basis of criterion (ix)”.

The **Chairperson** replied that finding a name was still a point of issue and that for the time being it could be put in brackets, and since the majority was in favour of the inscription as an extension she proposed to deal with the name later. Upon receiving no objections to the amendment put forward by the Delegation of the Russian Federation with further amendments by the Delegation of Estonia, the paragraph was adopted and while moving on to the other paragraphs, the Chairperson asked the Secretariat if it had spotted any other difficulties.

The **Secretariat** put forward the question to IUCN whether the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would cover the whole property or only the extension.

IUCN in replying put forward three observations. First, the position of IUCN was not to approve the extension at this stage and therefore any Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would have to be drafted by other entities. One Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the total trans-national property would have to be drafted, and this could be adapted from the existing Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to cover the extension. Finally, and as regards the new name, as stated earlier, there would be an issue of logic as there is a reference to both primeval and ancient forests.

Thereupon the **Chairperson** asked whether IUCN was expressing any concerns.

IUCN replied that an extension does not have its own Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, but the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would need to cover the whole property with all its components.

The **Chairperson** responded that more time for this would be needed and gave the floor to the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** clarified that the statement put forward covered the whole site as requested by IUCN.

The **Chairperson** asked for the amendment to be put on the screen.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** proposed to set up a small working group to further look into the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** suspended discussion on the Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.13**, and requested the Committee to return with a proposal as soon as possible to be able to adopt the Decision.

The **Chairperson** announced that the draft text regarding the property of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls was ready and had been distributed. She indicated she

understood that a number of Committee Members had requested sufficient time to examine the draft text. She therefore announced that Item 35 COM 7A.22 would be examined as the first Item on Monday 27 June 2011 in the morning.

The Chairperson also announced that she had been informed that the Mayor of Hangzhou (China) had to leave earlier for an important commitment. She therefore requested the Committee to first consider the Draft decision Item 35COM 8B.25 before continuing with the earlier agreed order of nominations to be examined.

C.3 ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1 New Nominations

Property	West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou
Id. N°	1334
State Party	China
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination. The evaluation recommended inscription of the property under criteria (ii), (iii), and (vi).

The Delegation of **South Africa** said that, like ICOMOS, it has also noticed the natural beauty of the property but it would like said to support the recommendation expressed by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Brazil** referred to the property being witness of over 4,000 years of history and was of the view that the entire international community would gain from this inscription.

The Delegation of **Estonia** reminded the Committee that there is a certain mis-presentation in the pictures of the property displayed and stressed that it should be understood that the beautiful views which are shown on the screen are situated in an urban setting. However, it supported the recommendation for inscription.

The Delegations of the **Russian Federation, Egypt, Jordan, Barbados, the United Arab Emirates, Nigeria, Thailand, Australia, France, Switzerland, Bahrain, Sweden** and **Mali** supported the nomination.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.25** was adopted.

La Délégation de **France** exprime brièvement à quel point elle est impressionnée par cette candidature.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite la Délégation de la Chine.

La Délégation du **Mali** félicite la Délégation de la Chine mais également l'ICOMOS pour son travail remarquable.

The Delegation of **Mexico** said to be very pleased with the proposed inscription. It also wanted to stress that this concerned a cultural landscape and that this category is very important for the *World Heritage Convention*. It insisted on the importance of landscapes globally. It said that such inscriptions offer the possibility to better understand what this complexity entails for the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **China** said that this day is a remarkable day for all Chinese people because the West Lake Cultural Landscape of Hangzhou (China) has gained worldwide appreciation. The landscape presents an ideal of aesthetics and serves as a spiritual home. It expressed its sincere thanks to the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies and all the international peers for their warmest appreciation and full support. It also expressed its thanks to all the Chinese people who have put their utmost efforts in the nomination, preservation and management of this heritage. It has been more than 2,000 years since the West Lake Cultural Landscape took its original form and it is confident that it will be able to conserve it for at least another 2,000 years. It took the opportunity to thank all the Committee Members for their support in conserving Chinese heritage and in their continued efforts for the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention*. It welcomed all to visit China and its sites which represent the common wealth of all human beings.

B. MIXED PROPERTIES

B.1 AFRICA

B.1.1 New Nominations

Property	Saloum Delta
Id. N°	1359
State Party	Senegal
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(v)(vii)(x) + CL

L'**UICN** et l'**ICOMOS** présentent le site Saloum Delta (Sénégal) qui est proposé pour inscription sur la base de critères culturels (iii), (iv) and (v), l'Etat partie ayant proposé aussi les critères naturels (vii) et (x).

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Advisory Bodies and expressed its support to the nomination under cultural criteria (ii), (iv) and (v) as recommended by ICOMOS. While acknowledging IUCN's analysis of criterion (vii), it questioned the evaluation of

criterion (x) and was of the view that the State Party should be given a better rating. It further referred to IUCN mentioning another area within the property which if included in the nomination file, could increase the natural value of the site. It therefore proposed to amend the draft Decision in order to refer the nomination file with regard to natural criteria. This would allow the State Party to rework the statement of Outstanding Universal Value. It also proposed that the State Party be given the floor to reassure the Committee that it would be in the position to undertake this work.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** soutient la proposition de la Délégation de l'Afrique du Sud. Elle souhaite que la parole soit donnée à l'Etat Partie. Elle s'étonne de l'évaluation de l'IUCN concernant le critère (vii) alors qu'elle voit le potentiel du site pour remplir ce critère. La Délégation se réfère également au critère (ix) comme critère possible pour considération dans le dossier de nomination, tel que l'ICOMOS s'y réfère dans son évaluation.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Advisory Bodies for the evaluations and noted that ICOMOS' and IUCN's conclusions did not coincide. In regards to the natural criteria, and in reservation against the recommendations of IUCN, it suggested that the State Party should further elaborate the justifications of the natural values of biodiversity. It asked the State Party, which attributes it intended to put forward under criterion (x).

La Délégation du **Mali** félicite les organisations consultatives pour leur présentation d'un site qu'elle a déjà visité. Elle fait remarquer la biodiversité et le potentiel du bien, notamment par rapport aux critères naturels

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of **Senegal** to answer the questions raised regarding the nomination file.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** (Observateur) félicite les organisations consultatives pour le travail accompli mais constate le manque de mention des valeurs naturelles du bien par rapport à toute l'information fournie dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription, notamment sur les tortues et d'autres questions.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that these elements indeed answered to their question about threatened species.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** (Observateur), fait un résumé de ses commentaires sur la faune ailée et a déclaré que, en accord avec le tableau élaboré par Birdwatch, cette faune est plus riche qu'en autres sites du monde. Il considère que l'IUCN a présenté l'Information d'une façon très générale avec des phrases au conditionnel et a demandé plus d'évaluation à ce sujet avant la conclusion finale.

IUCN clarified that it had not received any factual error report during the evaluation process, which could have been taken into account in regards to comparative analysis of turtle and birds occurrence. It highlighted how important it was to follow the process as outlined in the *Operational Guidelines* in respect of IUCN's accountability to the Committee. In reference to natural values of the property, IUCN stressed that it had repeatedly mentioned the site's international recognition by the alternative international RAMSAR Convention and the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Programme. Natural

values would further be emphasized by the site's inscription as a cultural landscape as recommended by ICOMOS.

In contrast to the several different views expressed by the States Parties, IUCN's opinion on the non-applicability of the natural criteria was based on a clear comparative analysis and therefore remained firm on this judgement. In relation to criterion (x) IUCN stated that even though the proposed area was of great importance to the West-African region in general, it did not figure amongst the most important areas. It therefore reiterated its recommendation not to inscribe the site under criterion (x). Referring to the additional distant area, which could be included in a serial nomination, a referral or deferral could be recommended. In conclusion, even if neither natural criteria have been met in the framework of this nomination file, the international recognition is fully valid and confirmed.

La Délégation de l'**Égypte** fait remarquer qu'elle n'a pas obtenu de réponse de la part d'IUCN sur le critère (ix) relatif aux écosystèmes et aux processus écologiques et biologiques en cours en matière d'eau douce et de systèmes côtiers.

IUCN replied that in the framework of the comparative analysis process for biodiversity criteria (ix) and (x), IUCN usually screens the nominations for both biodiversity criteria. In this case it could not detect a potential for criterion (ix).

The Delegation of **South Africa** requested clarification from the State Party following IUCN's statement concerning the possibility of a serial nomination, in regards to their willingness to propose a serial nomination.

The Observer Delegation of **Senegal** stated that it could consider a serial nomination taking into account IUCN's recommendation highlighting the increased potential of the Kousmar Island, about 50km away from the currently proposed site, to reply to natural criterion (x).

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its inclination to judge in the benefit of the doubt and to allow the State Party to reconsider the nomination under criterion (x) concerning threatened species in the site.

L'**ICOMOS** considère que l'Etat partie pourrait envisager une extension du site en tant que bien culturel.

The **Chairperson** proposed to proceed with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph and invited the Rapporteur to present the amendments received.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the two amendments received were proposed by the Delegation of South Africa and concerned paragraphs 2 and 3. Paragraph 1 was adopted

The Delegation of **Brazil** reiterated the appeal to consider criterion (x) with regard to threatened species.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique que le travail accompli par les organisations consultatives a été bien mené par des experts et que les Etats parties n'ont pas l'air de

le prendre sérieusement, ce qui pourrait être vu comme un manque de respect envers ce travail. Elle rappelle aussi que, en accord avec l'avis des organisations consultatives, le site ne devrait pas être inscrit sur la base de critères naturels.

La Délégation de la **France** soutient l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Afrique du Sud et déclare faire confiance à l'Etat partie du Sénégal pour son observation à propos des critères naturels.

The Delegations of **Egypt** and **Iraq** agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegation of **Iraq** expressed its full recognition of the natural values of the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed a deferral with regard to criterion (x) to allow the State Party to further study threatened species and come up with a revised justification for nomination under criterion (x).

The Delegation of **Sweden** argued that IUCN's evaluation was convincing and therefore supported the non-inscription of the site under natural criteria.

The Delegation of **Australia** welcomed that the property was proposed for inscription under cultural criteria and expressed its preference not to amend the Decision as proposed. However, it saw a chance for a compromise in the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil in terms of a new evaluation of threatened species to be undertaken by IUCN for reconsideration of the nomination under criterion (x) and supported the proposal for a deferral.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** also welcomed the inscription under cultural criteria. However it supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa to refer the file with regard to the natural criterion highlighting the clear commitment of the Observer Delegation of **Senegal** to follow up on the recommendations.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** supported the inscription of the site as a cultural property and refers the file under criteria (vii) and (x).

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the proposed amendment of a referral.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** welcomed the recommended inscription of the site under cultural criteria. It added some remarks to the State Party referring to reported threats of erosion of the islets potentially affecting the site's integrity. It encouraged the State Party to provide for protection means and concluded from the evaluation report that an important work remained to be achieved. It therefore supported the Delegation of Brazil's proposal for a deferral rather than a referral.

The Delegation of **Estonia** stated that it followed the recommendation for a substantial evaluation report and supported the inscription of the property exclusively under cultural criteria, not under natural ones.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked IUCN if, in case of a referral, it would be able to assess criterion (x) without a mission.

IUCN clarified that it had not received factual errors with regard to criterion (x) even though the process had been foreseen, so that it could not be upheld. It further noted that in the case when the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South African would be adopted, a new management system would have to be assessed to consider the inclusion of the added site to the serial nomination. This would indeed require a mission. Therefore, a referral would rather be an obstacle than of actual use to the State Party.

La Délégation de la **France** est en faveur de l'inscription du bien sous des critères culturels et soutient l'amendement de la Délégation de l'Afrique du Sud.

The Delegation of **China** supported referral as proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegation of **Mexico** agreed with the inscription under cultural criteria and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande à l'UICN d'expliquer la différence entre le renvoi de l'examen et le fait de non recommander pour inscription. Dans ce cas si l'UICN recommande la non inscription, cela veut dire qu'il n'y a pas de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle tandis qu'un renvoi de l'examen signifierait l'existence avérée de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle.

The Delegation of **Brazil** withdrew its amendment for a deferral and aligned its view with what it considered a consensus among the Committee in favour of a referral.

The Delegation of **Sweden** restored the Delegation of Brazil's proposal for a deferral.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of South Africa for a referral.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Sweden for a deferral to give a chance to the State Party to further work on the justification of the natural criteria and despite its preference for a non-inscription as recommended initially by IUCN. It clarified that there was no consensus in the Committee for a referral as suggested by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** agreed with the inscription under cultural criteria and supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

IUCN referred back to the difference between a referral and a deferral, suggesting that in the absence of any factual error to be reconsidered, a referral would not be justified since the same nomination would be re-submitted a year later with no expected new information to be added. In the case of a deferral new points could be considered and new possibilities could be opened.

The **Chairperson** requested the Committee to proceed with the consideration of paragraph 2 as amended by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegations of **Switzerland, Australia, Sweden, Estonia and Bahrain** expressed their objection to the proposed amendment.

The **Chairperson** proposed two ways to move forward. Firstly, one could adopt paragraph 2 as amended in accordance with the supposed opinion of the majority noting the reservations of some of the opposed Committee members. Secondly, she could call for a vote to decide on this paragraph.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par la Délégation de la **Suède**, demandé un vote secret sur cette question.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Switzerland and invited the Delegation of Sweden to take the floor.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the call made by the Delegation of Switzerland for a secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** explained that two Members of the Committee having called for a secret ballot this complied with the *Rules of Procedure*. The Legal Advisor was then called on for advice.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that two States Parties must support a proposal for a secret ballot. A two thirds majority is needed to inscribe a site. After a vote has been taken on inscription then the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa can be voted on.

The **Chairperson** clarified by stating that this only applied to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** demande des éclaircissements pour savoir si la question qui se pose avec le vote n'est pas d'inscrire ou non le site ou plutôt de différer ou de renvoyer l'inscription.

The **Chairperson** requested the Legal Advisor to finish its presentation.

The **Legal Advisor** noted that a two thirds majority is needed to adopt the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

The **Chairperson** then called for the distribution of the ballot papers and stated that two tellers would be appointed in order to have a proper vote.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** demande des clarifications de la part de la Conseillère juridique concernant le vote à bulletin secret.

The **Chairperson** responded by making clear that the question had been put to the Committee and that two Committee Members had called for a secret ballot.

The **Legal Advisor** referred to Rule 41 of the *Rules of Procedure* which states that "A decision shall be voted on by secret ballot whenever two or more States members shall

so request or if the Chairperson so decides.” The Legal Advisor also made clear that a simple majority is what was needed.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Switzerland for a point of order.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande plus de clarifications de la part de la Conseillère juridique concernant la raison qui a amené au vote secret.

The **Legal Advisor** said that it was correct to say that a two thirds majority is needed when it is about Decisions of the Committee on matters covered by the provisions of the *Convention*. However referral and deferral only requires a simple majority which was consistent with past procedure. Nevertheless the Legal Advisor pointed out that the Committee was its own master in these matters.

The Delegation of **Egypt** wondered why this instance of referral differed so much from an earlier case of the same session.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the *Rules of Procedure* had been respected and that two States Parties had called for a secret ballot and that the Chairperson should respect that. The Chairperson then noted that the Delegations of China and Nigeria had offered to act as tellers. No objections were made and the Chairperson called for the vote to proceed.

The Delegation of **Egypt** requested to have the text on which the vote was taking place.

The **Chairperson** reiterated the Delegation of South Africa’s proposal to amend the Draft Decision by referring the nomination of Saloum Delta (Senegal) back to the State Party. The Chairperson explained that this amendment was being voted upon before the others as it was considered the furthest from the wording of the original Draft Decision. If it were not to pass, a vote would be held on the Delegation of Switzerland’s amendment which would be to defer the nomination. The Chairperson then invited the Committee to the podium to place their votes in the box after making sure that it was completely empty.

The **Committee** proceeded with the vote by secret ballot.

The **Chairperson** reported that all 21 votes were valid and that the majority needed was 11. She informed that there was no abstention and that 11 votes were in favor of the proposal and 10 against.

The Delegation of **Australia** sought clarification from the Legal Advisor on the requested majority for such a vote.

The **Chairperson** invited the Legal Advisor to respond to the enquiry of the Delegation of Australia.

La Délégation de l’**Egypte**, par point d’ordre, précise qu’il est inutile de demander de nouveau des clarifications de la part de la Conseillère juridique puisque la question a été déjà posée précédemment et que le vote a eu lieu.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of Australia if it agreed with the previous statement.

The Delegation of **Australia** responded by saying that the question asked was a factual one and was not a point of order.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** maintient son affirmation et propose à la Délégation de l'Australie de s'adresser directement à la Conseillère juridique.

The Delegation of **Australia** repeated the question after noting that there was no explanation about the exact meaning of the term 'simple majority'.

The Delegation of **Egypt** contested the intervention made by the Delegation of Australia stating that the question and the answer were clear before the vote. It further added that this was not the place for such a question.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** insiste sur le fait qu'en votant, les membres du Comité savaient sur quoi ils votaient. Elle ajoute que la Délégation de l'Australie aurait dû faire objection avant le vote si elle n'avait pas bien compris la question.

The **Chairperson** made clear that the result of the secret ballot had been declared and could not be changed. However a response to the Delegation of Australia would be provided for the sake of clarity.

The **Legal Advisor** specified that a simple majority is more than half of those voting and thus the vote was valid and carried.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to continue with its work concerning the remainder of Draft Decision after pointing out that paragraph 2 was adopted as amended. Paragraphs 3 – 9 were also adopted without any objections. The Chairperson then pointed out that before continuing there was a need to know for what purpose the referral of the nomination had been called for.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested that the Delegation of South Africa explains its amendment before requesting to amend paragraph 2 by adding 'to develop studies on threatened species within the property'.

The Delegation of **South Africa** made it clear that it is not an Advisory Body and thus called upon IUCN for advice.

The **Chairperson** invited the Advisory Body to intervene.

IUCN pointed out that it did not believe that the property met natural criteria (vii) and (x) and therefore recommended that the property should not be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed an amendment to add the following text 'to allow the State Party to further develop studies...'

The **Chairperson** called upon the Secretariat to change paragraph 2 to read as “refers the nomination of the Saloum Delta, Senegal on the World Heritage List back to the State Party under natural criteria (vii) and (x).’

The **Chairperson** then asked the Committee to decide whether or not criterion (vii) would be included with criterion (x).

The Delegation of **South Africa** explained that when it intervened earlier and called for this amendment it was to say that it agreed with IUCN on criterion (vii) but disagreed with it on criterion (x). It then proposed the deletion of criterion (vii).

The **Chairperson** turned to the Committee to see if it agreed. There were no objections and this amendment was therefore deleted. The Chairperson then asked if the revised paragraph 2 could be adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested that the phrase ‘within the property’ be added as per its original request, and that ‘biological diversity’ be added after the word ‘species’.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections. There were none and the revised paragraph 2 was adopted. The Chairperson then asked if the whole Decision could be adopted. There was no objection.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.14** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Senegal** on the property’s inscription on the World Heritage List and invited it to take the floor for a two minutes statement.

La Délégation du **Sénégal** (Observateur) remercie les membres du Comité pour l’inscription de son bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et fait part de sa joie concernant la reconnaissance de la Valeur Exceptionnelle Universelle du site. Il promet de ménager tous les efforts pour une bonne conservation du site.

The meeting rose at 8 pm.

SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY, 25 JUNE 2011

TENTH MEETING

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST
(Continuation)

A.3 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

A.3.1 Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List
(Continuation)

Property	Ancient Beech Forests of Germany (extension of the Primeval Beech Forests of the Carpathians, Slovakia and Ukraine)
Id. N°	1133 Bis
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ix)

La Délégation de l'**Egypte**, évoquant le soutien de la Délégation de la France sur le sujet, propose qu'avant de commencer les travaux, le Comité rende hommage à Mme Christiane Desroches-Noblecourt - dont le décès vient d'être rendu public - qui est à l'origine de la Campagne internationale de sauvegarde des monuments de Nubie et donc également à l'origine de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Elle demande qu'à ce titre une minute de silence soit respectée.

The **Committee** observed a minute of silence.

The Chairperson then requested the Delegation of Australia to check into a proposal for taking forward the idea of a tribute in the context of the Future of the *Convention* or the celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the *Convention* in 2012.

The agreed text for Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.13** was displayed on the screen. The Chairperson noted also the agreement of the Committee regarding criterion (ix). There were no objections and the paragraph on criterion (ix) was adopted.

IUCN agreed that the amendment made by the Delegation of Estonia with regard to the title “Primeval Beech Forest of the Carpathian and Ancient Beech Forests of Germany”, seems to fit best but approval by the State Party should be requested.

The **Chairperson** asked the Observer Delegation of **Germany** and the Committee if there is agreement with the new name of the site. She noted the necessity to retain the States Parties of Slovakia and Ukraine in the title to read “Primeval Beech Forest of the Carpathian (Slovakia and Ukraine) and Ancient Beech Forests of Germany”.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** indicated its agreement.

Noting no objection with other amendments proposed, the Draft Decision **35 COM 8A.13** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party in the name of the Committee.

La Délégation de l'**Allemagne** (Observateur) se dit reconnaissant de cette inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, surtout à l’occasion de l’Année internationale des forêts en 2011. Il invite les Etats parties qui le souhaitent à participer à l’élargissement du bien.

B.2 ARAB STATES

B.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Wadi Rum
Id. N°	1377
State Party	Jordan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi)(vii)(viii) + CL

IUCN and **ICOMOS** presented the information on the nomination to the Committee,

The Delegation of **Australia** commented that the rock-art is outstanding. It noted IUCN’s evaluation and agreed with its conclusions on criterion (vii). It confirmed that it meets the *Operational Guidelines*. The Delegation wished to obtain some clarifications concerning the nomination file on whether the property was nominated as a cultural landscape or not; secondly it wished to know more on rock-art integrity and the methods used as they were not described in the nomination file; and thirdly, it wished to estimate to what extent the inventory is complete.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed with IUCN’s evaluation that the property is an exceptional landform with exceptional features. It felt that the integrity of boundaries is

satisfied and the conditions for inscription are clear. Regarding its management it would like to hear from the State Party how far it is progressing on a management plan.

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted its conviction that Wadi Rum should be inscribed but that one would need to have more information from the State Party on the progress towards a management plan.

The Delegation of **China** requested the State Party to comment on the status of the management plan and buffer zone.

The Delegation of **Brazil** believed that the property is ready for inscription as a natural property but that the cultural elements need to be more fully developed. It further stressed the need to know the stage of development of the management plan and buffer zone protection.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** commented on how important the property is to the State Party and local population. It supported and hailed the nomination. It questioned the State Party as to whether any financial resources accrue to the local populations to support their livelihoods.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated that it has no doubt as to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It recalled that the *Global Strategy* and the Human Evolution Thematic Programme agreed to at the 33rd session (Seville, 2009) noted the priority for this type of site that documents this period of human history. It agreed with IUCN's assessment. It questioned the State Party on the inventory of the various items of rock-art.

The Delegation of **Thailand** considered the site as an outstanding example of high cliffs and sand dunes and supported the inscription based on criterion (viii).

The Delegation of **Bahrain** associated with the position of the previous comments on cultural landscape. It questioned the State Party regarding the management as it was not completed in the evaluation.

La Délégation du **Mali** pense qu'en ce qui concerne la valeur naturelle analysée par l'UICN, les éléments techniques fournis montrent que le bien mérite d'être inscrit. Quant aux aspects culturels, les vestiges archéologiques et l'art rupestre du site sont bien les preuves d'établissements humains fournies par l'Etat partie.

The Delegation of **Iraq** thanked the Chairperson and State Party. It considered the property important and felt that both the natural and cultural criteria are met and the property should be inscribed in both categories.

The **Chairperson** invited the State Party to respond to the questions raised.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that it appreciated the efforts of IUCN. It confirmed that it addressed the concerns regarding management of the property. Three management plans have been finalized and implementation would be put in immediate effect. A ten-year management plan has been developed following IUCN's guidelines and standards.

It had revised the regulatory framework in the buffer zones and developed a three-year capacity-building programme.

The Delegation of **Jordan** said that the evaluation of ICOMOS is not correct as the nomination was put forward as a mixed cultural and natural site and not under the category of cultural landscape. It also tried to explain its position regarding the evaluation of ICOMOS to criterion (iii) of the nomination. The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that regarding the requested inventory, a comprehensive list identifying and documenting 45,000 petroglyphs and inscriptions has been carried out. Regarding the provisions of financial resources that would benefit the local population, it explained that this is part of the Business Plan of the site and that there is a programme to support the local communities through basically enhancing sustainable tourism and ensuring their well-being.

The **Chairperson** invited IUCN to clarify the matter of criterion (viii) and to ICOMOS to clarify the difference of the treatment of a mixed site versus a Cultural Landscape nomination.

IUCN recalled that the statutory deadline for providing information is 28 February and welcomed the new information provided by the State Party. It explained that due to the delay it was not possible to include it in the presentation. Regarding the deferral, IUCN stated that there is a need for further studies to analyze if the property meets the requirement of criterion (viii). Thus it recommended considering the Decision proposed.

ICOMOS explained that the property was evaluated as a cultural landscape in response to the information provided regarding criteria (iv) and (v). It welcomed the good news provided by the State Party about the inventories but recommended the inclusion of this information in the nomination file. ICOMOS also welcomed the inventory mentioned by the State Party and expressed its expectations about a management plan based on cultural and natural attributes and not just on natural ones, as it had the impression during the mission.

The Delegation of **Iraq** expressed that some questions about cultural aspects were not answered by the State Party. It explained that one of the Committee Members asked about the chronology and dating of rock art of this property.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that the information was sent to the Secretariat before the deadline and pointed out that the inventory was done with a team which included French, Swiss and Italian experts. It added that the results of this inventory were published in several volumes showing the extraordinary value and the oral history of the region.

The Delegation of **Jordan** clarified that the earliest evidence dates back to 8,000 years ago and that there is evidence of a continuous occupation. All of this tells about the daily life of the people at that time.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed that after the explanation of the Delegation of Jordan it supports the inscription as a natural site. However it wished to request further clarification by ICOMOS about the analysis of the property as a Cultural Landscape.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** trouve que l'Etat partie a fourni toutes les réponses nécessaires. L'UICN a démontré qu'elle était convaincue de l'importance du bien. En revanche, la décision de l'ICOMOS n'est pas très claire. Elle demande donc davantage de clarifications. Elle remercie l'UICN pour la qualité du rapport et demande à l'ICOMOS de prendre le relais.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the statement of the Delegation of Egypt.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to clarify why the property was evaluated as a Cultural Landscape.

ICOMOS explained that the nomination dossier focused on the landscape and that the property was nominated under criterion (v) which is related with human settlements land use. It pointed out that the justification from the State Party includes descriptions of ancient human settlement in the deserts and that the value of the property is not just rock-art and archaeological findings but also about the adaptability of these human settlements. For this reason ICOMOS confirmed that the property is evaluated as Cultural Landscape.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the property should be inscribed.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Le **Rapporteur** informe le Comité que la Délégation de Bahreïn a présenté des amendements aux paragraphes 2, 3, 6 and 9.

The Delegations of **Sweden, Nigeria, Ethiopia, Russian Federation, United Arab Emirates, South Africa, Barbados** and **Mali** supported the inscription of the property under criterion (vii).

La délégation de la **Suisse** soutient l'inscription du bien au titre du critère (vii).

La Délégation de la **France** considère que le dossier présenté remplit bien toutes les conditions pour l'inscription sous le critère (vii) et soutient donc l'amendement présenté par la Délégation de Bahreïn.

The Delegation of **China** stated that the only obstacle for the inscription was the management plan and that, after the intervention of the State Party, it recommended the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the inscription of the property under criterion (vii) and the deferral of the inscription under the cultural criteria. It also pointed out its concern about the inscription of the property only under this criterion.

The Delegation of **Mexico** welcomed what previous interventions by Members of the Committee proposed the inscription. However it pointed out that it still had doubts about how the cultural criteria would be addressed in the Decision.

IUCN made a clarification regarding the comment made by the Delegation of Australia pointing out that according to the *Operational Guidelines* criterion (vi) should be accompanied by another criterion and not by criterion (vii).

Paragraph 1 of Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.15** was adopted.

Paragraph 2 of Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.15** was adopted as amended.

Regarding paragraph 3 of the Draft Decision, IUCN recommended that the headings “Integrity” and “Protection and Management” should be separated.

IUCN pointed out that the last sentences of paragraph 4 should be amended.

La Délégation de la **Suisse, soutenue par la Délégation du Bahreïn**, mentionne que le paragraphe 4 devrait être supprimé.

Le paragraphe 4 du Projet de Décision est supprimé.

IUCN agreed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to include paragraphs 4 and 5 into the last paragraph.

Following the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil, the **Chairperson** proposed to include these paragraphs as subparagraphs of the previous one.

IUCN pointed out that having deleted paragraph 4, it is not possible to integrate the new paragraphs 4 and 5 to the previous paragraphs as far as this one is the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Brazil** clarified its proposal explaining that paragraphs 4 and 5 should be included at the end of the Decision.

IUCN proposed to delete the word “new” in paragraph 4 and to modify paragraph 5 as follows: ‘request to ensure to implement its Management Plan’.

Paragraph 4 was adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to include the word ‘further’ in paragraph 5.

Paragraph 5 was adopted.

The **Chairperson** informed that the Delegation of Bahrain proposed to amend paragraph 6 and refer the inscription of the property under cultural criteria.

La Délégation de l’**Egypte** insiste sur la bonne conservation de ce paysage culturel qui montre bien l’interaction entre l’homme et le désert. Elle recommande l’inscription de ce

site, suite à l'engagement de l'Etat partie de fournir un complément d'information et demande un amendement du paragraphe 6.

The **Chairperson** stated that if such a proposition is considered it will be necessary to obtain a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and thus, to suspend the discussion as far as this Statement of Outstanding Universal Value cannot be posted on the screen.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** demande à ce que l'inscription soit différée en raison d'un manque d'information dans le dossier d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed that it would be inclined to support the proposal made by the Delegation of Egypt but considering criterion (iii) it invited the Delegation of Bahrain to explain the logics of its proposal to refer.

The **Chairperson** recalled the need for a complete text to move towards the inscription.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** propose, tout d'abord, de concentrer les efforts sur une prise de décision et de décider, par la suite, d'une possibilité d'ajournement. Elle mentionne que l'Etat partie a fourni les informations nécessaires. Elle ajoute que cela n'empêche pas l'inscription du site tout en demandant à l'Etat partie de compléter certaines informations plus tard.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported the deferral of the nomination and provided clarification about the difference between deferral and referral. It suggested combining referral and deferral into one category to prevent lengthening the process.

The Delegation of **Iraq** stated that Wadi Rum is an exceptional property with a number of ancient civilizations occupying it for a long time and with many exceptional remains.

The Delegation of **Sweden** commented the proposal made by the Delegation of Estonia pointing out that deferral and referral are two different processes and that the State Party should wait anyway.

ICOMOS clarified that the dossier as it is presented does not provide enough information to inscribe the property. Nevertheless it considered that the property has the potential for its inscription as a cultural landscape. It also highlighted that the nomination dossier becomes the document where you can see what has been inscribed.

The **Chairperson** asked the Committee to decide between deferral, referral, and inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that the property has more than a great value to be inscribed. It added that perhaps the State Party has not achieved all the work in order to provide the whole information. It also expressed that every archaeologist in the world is well informed of this value and proposed the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** explained that ICOMOS in its comment recognized the Outstanding Universal Value and the cultural values of the property. It added that the requested information did not go against the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Brazil** declared that its opinion differs from ICOMOS' in the sense that the World Heritage Committee inscribes properties and not nominations. In its view despite the fact that nominations could always be better justified, the property under consideration spoke for itself. Its cultural attributes justify the Outstanding Universal Value. The Delegation proposed to suspend the debate and create a working group to develop a proper text.

The **Chairperson** expressed its agreement with the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil to move forward given the time that had already been spent on the discussion and the remaining work.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with the Delegation of Egypt's declaration on the extraordinary qualities of the property, and ascribed Outstanding Universal Value. Despite the undoubted cultural values however, it referred to the *Operational Guidelines*, which should be followed. It reiterated to retain referral as middle ground as per rules and procedures knowing that the State Party would be able to undertake the required work and agreed on referral.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** a déclaré qu'au vu de la qualité du dossier et de tous les points soulevés, elle était en accord avec la Délégation des Emirats Arabes Unis quant à l'inscription du site.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se déclare en accord avec la Délégation de l'Australie.

The **Chairperson** reminded that the proposal for inscription was furthest away from the original Draft Decision. She therefore proposed to take first a decision on the inscription, which referred to cultural values. Then, once the decision on inscription is made the rest of the Draft Decision with reconsiderations of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value would be considered. She reminded that the Delegation of Egypt had proposed the inscription on the basis of criterion (v) and the Delegation of Brazil as well, but on the basis of criterion (iii).

La Délégation de la **Suisse** réitère son opposition à l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de l'Egypte.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** proposed to proceed with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt on the inscription of the property and thereafter take in other considerations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that it had consulted with the Delegation of Egypt. It proposed to proceed with the Decision on the inscription and thereafter form a working group to proceed with the justification of the criteria and the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** asked for clarifications about criteria under which the property should be inscribed, namely on the basis of criterion (v) or on the basis of criteria (v) and (iii).

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** propose d'adopter les deux critères (iii) et (v) car ils sont de même nature.

The **Chairperson** clarified that Wadi Rum Protected Area, Jordan, should be proposed for inscription under cultural criteria (iii) and (v) and asked whether there were any objections to this proposal.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** se déclare encore une fois opposée à cette inscription pour les raisons déjà invoquées. De son point de vue, il faut respecter les règles du Comité du patrimoine mondial et l'Etat partie devrait revenir à la 36e session du Comité en 2012 avec les réponses aux questions posées.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its support of the declaration made by the Delegation of Switzerland. It confirmed that the rules had to be respected and reiterated that the State Party should complete the nomination file in all its aspects, as it will provide the basic data on the Outstanding Universal Value in the future. It concluded by requesting that the State Party should therefore come back with the completed file at the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee in 2012.

The Delegation of **Estonia** agreed with the declarations made by the Delegations of Switzerland and Sweden.

La Délégation d'**Egypte** souligne le fait que si les membres du Comité du patrimoine mondial s'étaient rendus sur place, ils auraient un autre point de vue. En effet, cela fait 40 ans qu'elle étudie ce bien. Il faut apporter une compréhension scientifique à ce site et non faire de l'inscription une question administrative et documentaire.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the view of the Delegation of Egypt. It understood the concerns about respecting the spirit and procedures of the *Convention* and declared that their countries respected them as well. However, the States Parties supporting the inscription understood that Jordan would fulfill its commitments after the inscription.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** soutient la déclaration de la Délégation d'Egypte. Elle dit comprendre le souci du respect de l'esprit et de la procédure de la *Convention*. Elle respecte la position des Etats parties opposés à l'inscription de ce site et le fait qu'ils veillent aux règles mais déclare qu'il faut aussi respecter son point de vue. Elle soutient qu'elle est certaine que l'Etat partie satisfera aux engagements après l'inscription.

The Delegation of **Sweden** requested to vote on this Decision and specified that it would not necessarily have to be a secret ballot.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** propose de mettre cette inscription au vote à main levée.

The **Chairperson** noted the support of the Delegation of **Switzerland** on the proposal by **Sweden** to put the decision to a vote. The Committee proceeded with the vote by show of hand.

The Chairperson declared that the majority was in favour of the inscription of the property on the basis of cultural criteria (iii) and (v). Therefore the Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.15** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** then asked the Delegation of Jordan for the permission to suspend the consideration of its statement until the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was clarified and available, including both cultural criteria (iii) and (v), and natural criterion (vii).

The Delegation of **Egypt** agreed on this proposal.

A.2 ASIA / PACIFIC

A.2.2 Extension of properties already inscribed on the World Heritage List (Continuation)

Property	Phong Nha - Ke Bang National Park
Id. N°	951 Bis
State Party	Viet Nam
Criteria proposed by State Party	(x)

The **Chairperson** noted that the full text of Draft Decision **35 COM 8B12** for this suspended Item was now available. She added that this text was agreed to by the State Party and IUCN, and opened it for discussion.

IUCN explained that the Draft Decision had been re-worked with the Secretariat, and consisted in a reorganization of the paragraphs. In reference to the debates, there had been two elements of concern: referral to face certain short term issues that were obstacles to inscription under criterion (x), and the potential to continued work and consider an extension and a trans-boundary work. Concerning paragraph 3, sub-paragraphs a) and b) were taken from former paragraph 4 relating to a referral. IUCN informed that the chapeau refers in general to what the State Party should do with regards to the protection and management issues. Paragraph 4 now referred not to a revised submission but to the extension of the property, 4 a) and 4 b) points are taken from former paragraph 5. It also indicated that the second addition concerned previous paragraph 5 and the requirements for a new nomination. So the new text established a referral as per the position of the Committee and corrected the order of the paragraphs. It concluded by saying that the text should thus be ready to be decided on.

The **Chairperson** reminded that paragraphs 1 and 2 had already been adopted earlier and proceeded with the adoption of the following paragraphs. Paragraph 3 with sub-paragraphs 3 a) and b) were adopted as amended. She then proceeded with consideration of paragraph 4, the un-amended sub-paragraph 4 a) was adopted.

IUCN explained that referral allowed for 3 years and that two paragraphs related to the site as currently inscribed. Even though deferral would be the more flexible decision, there was no logical obstacle to a referral.

The **Chairperson** continued with the adoption of paragraphs 4b, and the un-amended paragraphs 5, 6 and 7.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.12** was adopted as amended.

B.3 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

B.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Blue and John Crow Mountains National Park
Id. N°	1356
State Party	Jamaica
Criteria proposed by State Party	(vi)(ix)(x)

IUCN explained that the property comprised 48,000 ha and was proposed for inscription under criteria (ix) and (x) for its natural values. A letter of factual errors was received with two minor comments on IUCN evaluation, which the Advisory Body was ready to accept. The ecosystem was a National Park with a high range of fauna and endemic flora. Criterion (x) related to the range of remaining rain forests with important species such as a certain kind of pigeons. However there were issues of integrity such as deforestation.

Thus IUCN was concerned on whether this area was properly protected and pointed out that other areas would have the potential for inscription under natural criteria, e.g. under criterion (viii), which was not considered in this file. It noted that the file did not contain any comparison with other important areas in Jamaica e.g. Cockpit area, which was an important birds reserve. It highlighted the geological values of higher and lower elevations of the property, which were used as agricultural lands. Even though there were highly committed organizations in the area whose work was commended, it stated a lack of clarity in the overall coordination and effectiveness of management. In addition it expressed its concern that some threats were not fully under control. It further noted that allocated resources were not sufficient.

The recommendation was a non-inscription because criteria of integrity, and protection and management requirements were not met. It however encouraged the State Party to consider a single inscription related to biodiversity in Jamaica as the most appropriate way forward in this case. In conclusion it stressed the potential for a future natural inscription in Jamaica and offered IUCN's assistance in this undertaking in line with the upstream process discussed.

ICOMOS explained that there were cultural values in the property relating to the association of the Maroons of indigenous and non-indigenous people, of people deported from Africa who developed their own culture. It outlined the areas of cultural

significance to the Maroon people that could be found within and outside the property. It indicated that historically the first colonies stemmed from the 10th century, which then further developed into independent communities with the arrival of escaped slaves. Tangible and intangible legacy remained up until today. As tangible aspects it referred to various towns. It underlined that ICOMOS had documentation solely on Nanny Town, which was the only one excavated and documented extensively but that there existed other important locations (Dayan, Moli). Maroons were given land and autonomy by the United Kingdom at the end of the 18th century.

The Western part of the area is different from the Eastern part as it showed more influence of the Western world. It added that it is marked by coffee plantations run by Spanish colonizers and their slaves. The intangible heritage is predominantly influenced by African culture also with regards to language. The mountains were sacred places with burial sites. ICOMOS further mentioned religious rituals, medicine, dance and music as intangible heritage aspects, which were inscribed on the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity in 2008. The comparative analysis was not considered sufficient. ICOMOS declared that the association of the cultural values to the property has not been sufficiently clarified and the proposed boundaries as well as the legal protection related foremost to the natural values.

The cultural values were neglected, and the requirements of authenticity and integrity had not been met. ICOMOS' recommendation was to defer the nomination. In conclusion it recommended that the State Party revises its nomination dossier to better justify the Outstanding Universal Value with regard to cultural values, undertakes a more in-depth comparative analysis, and elaborates a strategy for its cultural resources.

The **Chairperson** thanked IUCN and ICOMOS for their presentations and opened the discussion on the proposed Decision.

The Delegation of **South Africa** commented that some States Parties misjudged other States Parties in thinking that they did not understand the difference between referral and deferral. However, the question of referral and deferral should not be taken wrong. It referred to the fact that ICOMOS recognized the property's potential for inscription and that the issue lay in the delimitation of the site. It noted a lack of coherence in the role of buffer zones and that in this particular case, the buffer zone was protected. With the current legal instruments in place, it asked the State Party how it intended to address and respond to ICOMOS' concerns.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** pointed out that the inscription of aspects of the Maroon Culture in the Representative List of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of Humanity already expressed an international recognition of the continuity and strength of the Maroon community. It questioned IUCN's evaluation with regard to its considering the comparative analysis as a too weak as it includes 31 sites, with 28 for cultural and 4 for cultural aspects. It asked IUCN for clarification on this specific point. The Delegation further asked the State Party how it intended to deal with the challenge and whether new scientific discoveries had been made since drafting the nomination dossier.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed that it understood the difficulties. It noted that the Advisory Bodies corrected the factual errors and that the link between the Maroons and their environment was clear. There has been agricultural activity ever since the 18th

century. The Delegation asked ICOMOS to further detail its request for a more in-depth comparative analysis.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked the State Party for the presentation of the nomination of this property which reflected a significant stage in human history, referring to the Maroon people in many places of the world who fought for their right to live in freedom. It made reference to Le Morne in Mauritius which was inscribed under criterion (iii) standing for the resistance to slavery and the hidden places in forests that served as fortresses and shelters for escaped slaves. The Delegation asked ICOMOS whether it considered that the property had any intangible aspects to stand totally or partially as an attribute to the Outstanding Universal Value of the property as a symbol for resistance against slavery in the Caribbean region.

The Delegation of **Brazil** drew the attention to the natural aspects of the property concerning threatened species. It asked IUCN for clarifications on this aspect, in particular with regard to a certain kind of butterfly, considering that the report was too short and insufficient in justifying criterion (x).

The Delegation of **China** pointed out that with this nomination file the State Party showed great respect towards the Maroon people and culture, which is key to the sustainability of the site. It then asked the State Party to provide more information with regard to the management of the property in order to reassure the Committee that it will be well preserved and protected in the future. As this would be the first Jamaican property inscribed on the World Heritage List, the Delegation stated that it was important to encourage this inscription in line with the policy of a balanced representativeness of the World Heritage List and with the *Global Strategy*.

The Delegation of **Australia** agreed with the representativeness argument formulated by the Delegation of China. It requested the State Party to clarify if all of the 34 sites of significance for the Maroon Culture were actually included in the nominated property.

The **Chairperson** referred to the State Party asking it to respond to the many questions raised with regard to the cultural and natural values of the property. This would allow the Committee to come to an informed Decision.

The Observer Delegation of **Jamaica** thanked the Advisory Bodies for having traveled to its country.

With regard to IUCN proposal to seek a serial nomination with Cockpit country, it explained that the main reason for the choice of the Blue and John Crow Mountains to be presented for inscription on the World Heritage List was that the elements for the Declaration of the Outstanding Universal Value and the management were ready at this stage. Cockpit Country still had management and protection issues to deal with at the moment but should be considered later for another nomination file.

Blue and John Crow Mountains property already have had a management plan since 2005 when the State Party made a first attempt to nominate the property for its inscription on the World Heritage List. The development of the plan involved the Maroon communities and despite economic challenges of a developing country like Jamaica, financial resources were made available for the implementation of the management

plan. Concerning the Outstanding Universal Value, the State Party highlighted that the Maroons still live in the area. After the Peace Treaty signed with the United Kingdom in 1740, Maroons settled in the area within the buffer zone. For what concerns laws and protection of the areas, the Delegation mentioned that there are several agencies involved: natural resources conservation, forestry, the National Heritage Trust and others.

In response to ICOMOS, the Delegation stated that 34 sites were included in the inventory and the details on the locations were sent. Thanks to the support of the Maroons, more sites could be identified. However a number of sites remained secret for the Maroons and this represents the unique nature of the property. In 2003, UNESCO declared the intangible cultural heritage values of the area as Representative Heritage of Humanity.

In response to the Delegation of Australia, it mentioned that so far, 34 sites have been identified most of which are in the core zone of the property, others are outside, in the buffer zone. With the 1995 Heritage Act, an inventory process has started, which is still ongoing, and a significant amount of inventoried properties has since been declared.

ICOMOS replied to aspects related to the location of attributes located within and outside the protected area and the buffer zone and aspects related to the comparative analysis. ICOMOS recognized that the State Party had provided additional information during the process and clarified issues about cultural attributes within the protected area, which were not completely clear at the beginning. In order to retain the proposal as a mixed property, boundaries for cultural aspects and attributes of the Outstanding Universal Value should be enlarged to include the link between the Maroons communities and the mountains. ICOMOS stressed that buffer zones were an element of protection of the property. It added that the analysis between natural and cultural elements in the buffer zone had been difficult. The comparative analysis should be made more in-depth in respect to the expression of the association between the Maroon people and the site. The State Party should also consider criterion (iii) to justify the Outstanding Universal Value and seek an example of and the comparison with Le Morne Cultural Landscape in Mauritius, instead of only criterion (vi). ICOMOS mentioned that the factual errors had been taken into account in the presentation.

IUCN answered the Delegation of Nigeria concerning the inadequacy of the comparative analysis, stating that the State Party had clarified the main aspect about the relationship of the property with other areas within Jamaica, which were hindered due to problems of management and integrity. However, Jamaica should identify the core areas of its biodiversity values at national level.

The Delegation of Barbados' question on whether the two minor factual errors made a difference to IUCN's judgment was denied, as these concerned incomplete marking of the boundaries and zoning.

With regard to the Delegation of Brazil's question on criterion (x), about threatened species, IUCN outlined major challenges concerning a high degree of encroachment and the impact of agricultural land use in the lowlands in comparison to the high lands where forest are seven times higher in density.

Finally, in answer to the Delegation of South Africa, IUCN reiterated that the Advisory Bodies agreed on the potential of cultural and natural values of the property but that the nomination file did not address the best arguments to reflect these. A referral would be a poisoned gift because Advisory Bodies then would not be able to go to the property, while a deferral would be the right way forward.

The **Chairperson** noted the remaining 21 nominations in need of the Committee's careful consideration. In order to save time she recommended going with provisional Statements of Outstanding Universal Value to be adopted at a later point of time as done in the past.

IUCN commented that, in the case of inscriptions, Statements of Outstanding Universal Value need to be discussed as they concern the very substance of the inscription as outlined in paragraph 154 of the *Operational Guidelines*. In cases of deferral / referral, the Advisory Body further requested that Delegations proposing amendments indicate which criterion they are referring to.

The Delegation of **Barbados** requested from the Advisory Bodies a statement on the treatment of factual errors.

ICOMOS recalled that the boundaries of the nominated property and its buffer zone need revision as it is currently unclear whether the boundaries of the nominated site can be considered adequate with regard to the expression of cultural significance of Blue and John Crow Mountain National Park. Moreover, the Advisory Body indicated that places with cultural significance might extend far beyond the designated boundaries and that systematic research in this regard is needed. ICOMOS further noted that the comparative analysis has been carried out by examining the experiences and main tracts of different Maroon societies, but has not been extended to investigate how, and to what extent, the properties with which these Maroon communities are associated express the associated values. ICOMOS explained that its evaluation of the site was not contradictory if read as a whole.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur to present the amendments to the Draft Decision.

Le **Rapporteur** informe que la Délégation du Nigéria a apporté des amendements aux paragraphes 2 et 5 du projet de Décision.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** asked ICOMOS whether the invitation of a mission to the site would help clarify the issues raised.

IUCN stated that both Advisory Bodies identified the site's potential and recommended its deferral in order to allow for sufficient time for the State Party to rewrite the nomination file.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** supported IUCN's point as most favorable for the State Party of Jamaica.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** withdrew its amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegations of **South Africa** and **Jordan** supported the argument for deferral as brought forward by the Delegation of Bahrain.

The Delegation of **Sweden** considered IUCN's argument convincing and supported the site's deferral.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed that a deferral would allow for the development of further studies on the biodiversity of the site and requested printouts of the Decision to follow the discussion more easily and have an overview of the entire Decision.

The Delegation of **China** subscribed to the view of the previous speakers for the reasons mentioned before.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported a deferral and requested information from the Rapporteur on the content of the amendments submitted.

The Delegation of **Estonia** supported a deferral for both the cultural and natural components of the site to allow the State Party to further elaborate the nomination file.

The Chairperson proceeded with examination of the Draft decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 was adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** felt that paragraph 2 was incomplete.

The **Secretariat** suggested that Brazil might have intended to include information on what the State Party of Jamaica needs to provide for the site's inscription in paragraph 2.

IUCN suggested some text in line with the Secretariat's intervention.

Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** suggested the inscription of the site on the basis of criterion (vi).

The Delegation of **Brazil** insisted on the deferral of the site as a whole pointing out that criterion (vi) is usually used in combination with other criteria and not alone.

The Delegation of **South Africa**, on a more general level, remarked that the Advisory Body's view on the applicability of criterion (iii) was rather strong.

The **Chairperson** inquired whether the Delegation of South Africa referred to criterion (iii) in the context of inscription, referral or deferral.

The Delegation of **Sweden** supported the deferral of the site.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne qu'elle reste en faveur de différer le site proposé. Elle considère qu'un renvoi mettrait l'Etat partie dans une situation difficile car l'Etat partie doit avoir la possibilité d'apporter des changements aux points requis du dossier

de proposition d'inscription dans le délai requis. Se référant à l'option d'inscrire le site proposé, elle la décline comme une possibilité non-recevable.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** recalled ICOMOS' evaluation in that the site demonstrates Outstanding Universal Value, integrity and authenticity and, therefore, meets the requirements for inscription. The Delegation of Nigeria referred to the suggestion of the Chairperson to go with a provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and simply inscribe the site.

ICOMOS clarified that criterion (iii) was not proposed by the State Party in the nomination file. There might be potential in this regard, however this needs to be demonstrated.

The **Chairperson** recalled objections to the inscription as brought forward by the Delegations of Sweden, Estonia, Switzerland and others.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** protested against the Chairperson's statement in the conviction that the majority of the Committee Members would not oppose the inscription of the property, especially since ICOMOS confirmed that the site has Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** countered that the majority of the Committee Members supported the site's deferral.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** asked for ICOMOS' comments regarding the site's Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS.

ICOMOS clarified that, while there might be potential, it has not identified Outstanding Universal Value - neither in connection with criterion (iii) nor with criterion (vi).

The **Chairperson** declared once again the adoption of paragraph 5.

The Delegation of **Sweden** suggested reverting to the original text of paragraph 5 that did not mention any cultural criteria.

The **Chairperson** concluded that the deliberation amongst the Committee Members pointed at including criterion (iii).

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested including any amendments in paragraph 6 and leaving paragraph 5 as already adopted.

The **Chairperson** announced the deletion of the reference to cultural criteria as suggested by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested including a recommendation for the State Party in paragraph 6 to consider criterion (iii) when revising the nomination file.

The Draft Decision **35COM 8B.16** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **South Africa** did not object the adoption of the Decision, however, it asked for confirmation that paragraph 5 did not contain a reference to criterion (vi) as this criterion cannot stand alone.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that criterion (vi) usually is used in combination with other cultural criteria. She elaborated that it is up to the State Party's discretion upon which criteria they will base a revised nomination file. The cultural aspects of a revised nomination will be evaluated by ICOMOS.

SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY, 25 JUNE 2011

ELEVENTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 6.30 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

**ITEM 8B
(Continuation)**

NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

C.5 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

C.5.1 New Nominations

Property	Bridgetown and its Garrison
Id. N°	1376
State Party	Barbados
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the nomination of cultural properties to the World Heritage List and announced that she would be handing over the Chair responsibility to Cambodia, Vice-President, for the consideration of the next site nomination from the Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked the reason why the order of consideration of new nominations had changed and was no longer in line with what appeared in the working documents.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** explained that due to accumulated delays, the consideration of new nominations had been affected. Thus changes made to the agenda are in response to the special request expressed by some Delegations who had to leave but whose nominations had been delayed. He concluded indicating that these special requests emanated from the Delegations of Barbados and Japan whose Ministers are present at the Committee and have to travel in the evening.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed conceding to the special requests expressed by the Delegations of Barbados and Japan. It also requested returning to the original timetable as shown in the working documents.

ICOMOS made its presentation on the evaluation of the site under consideration.

The Delegation of **Brazil** drew the Committee's attention to the factual errors submitted by the State Party, in which fundamental errors in the ICOMOS evaluation of the site

were pointed out. The name of the site, as indicated by ICOMOS, did not correspond to the name submitted by the State Party of Barbados in its dossier. The factual errors document further pointed to other inaccuracies in the ICOMOS evaluation (page 348, paragraph 1). It further noted that the error in that paragraph would have no doubt had substantial effect on the interpretation of the site values and called for the response of the State Party to the issues raised.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie l'ICOMOS et félicite la Délégation de la Barbade pour le dossier de proposition d'inscription. Elle considère que l'ICOMOS critique l'analyse comparative soumise par l'Etat partie dans le dossier de proposition d'inscription mais qu'il faut tenir compte de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle qui est démontrée par ce dossier précisément. Elle demande aussi à l'Etat partie de répondre à l'ICOMOS à ce sujet.

The Delegation of **China** congratulated the Delegation of Barbados on this first nomination. It acknowledged ICOMOS' proposal while stating that it understood from the presentation made by ICOMOS that only the Garrison constituent of the proposed property proved to have the Outstanding Universal Value. It thus requested the State Party to explain the relationship between the Town and the Garrison, as a response to the observation made by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its appreciation of the ICOMOS presentation and called on the State Party to present to the Committee the status of the management strategy that had been put in place for the site.

The Delegation of **Barbados** reported that with respect to the factual errors, on the condition of the Port and its surrounding buildings, the Port and wharves remain unaltered allowing for authentic interpretation. Less than 10% of the buildings have been altered over the past 200 years. It thanked the Delegation of France for its question on the comparative analysis and expressed its estimation that the site is an outstanding example of a historic port city. It had carried a comparative analysis which consisted in comparing its property to other port cities such as Boston, a number of World Heritage properties, as well as Dutch and Spanish examples. It further explained that there is no similar example on the World Heritage List, demonstrating the typology of a fortified colonial mercantile town in colonial Britain. It noted ICOMOS comments and fully endorsed some of the recommendations especially for what concerns the management plan that had been adopted and was already being implemented on the ground.

The Delegation of **Mexico** recognised the work accomplished by ICOMOS and congratulated the State Party of Barbados on the nomination, noting that it would help improve on the representativeness of that part of the world. However it expressed doubts about the evaluation made by ICOMOS, especially for what concerns the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It called on the State Party to clarify the issue of the Outstanding Universal Value, in relation to criterion (ii) and to cultural interchange, observing that there seemed to be a divergence between the State Party's position and the interpretation of Outstanding Universal Value made by ICOMOS.

ICOMOS responded that it had carefully examined the justification of criterion (ii) as presented by the State Party in its dossier, which would require a two-way interchange between cultures. It further mentioned that its evaluation acknowledged the position of

the State Party of Barbados and that it does not consider that the nomination file clearly showed this interchange. It felt that criterion (ii) applies only to a small part of the nominated property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** congratulated the State Party on its dossier and further noted that this inscription if decided would put the Caribbean on the World Heritage map. It asked the State Party for updates on the state of conservation report.

The Delegation of **Barbados** responded to the question raised by the Delegation of Mexico on cultural interchanges, showing how this is manifested in the urban fabric of the site. It reported that this had been effectively addressed in the nomination file. It further pointed out that the number of buildings in the Port concerned mainly with trade represents 90% of the existing buildings. It added that the Carnegie Library in Bridgetown, still in use today, is the first public library in colonial Britain. The House of Parliament in Bridgetown, established in 1834, is still fully functional, unlike its British counterpart. The Delegation made it clear that the cultural exchanges at the site had been both tangible and intangible. Concerning the Garrison, its designation as a monument is at national level. The evaluation made by ICOMOS on the justification for criterion (iv) shows a misconception about the importance of the Garrison on its own. The Garrison was built to protect trading and military interests in the town from the late 17th Century and the Delegation saw no reason why the Garrison should be dissociated from the town, as suggested by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **South Africa** acknowledged ICOMOS and the State Party for their respective presentations and pointed out that the United Nations, in its celebration of the Year of People of African Descent, had recognised the importance of this town. It asked ICOMOS if it had taken this into consideration in its evaluation. It expressed its belief that the comparative analysis that had been carried out at regional and international levels had been extensive. If indeed ICOMOS acknowledged the role of the town in history, it failed to understand its position with regard to criterion (ii). The Delegation of South Africa felt that the State Party had proven the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and that the property deserved to be inscribed.

ICOMOS responded to the Delegation of South Africa pointing out that in its assessment of the justification of criterion (ii) it had reported that it was difficult to observe this intercultural mix/fusion in the town's urban fabric. It accepted the importance of the town as an example of the British raj but maintained that it was difficult to read the commercial, military and intellectual exchanges within the town's urban fabric.

The Delegation of **Egypt** remarked that the property deserves to be inscribed and joined its voice to that of the Delegation of South Africa to request its inscription.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que l'Etat Partie a bénéficié d'assez de temps pour s'exprimer sur cette nomination. Elle note que la cohérence urbanistique et l'authenticité manquent.

The Delegation of **Jordan** acknowledged the difficulty of working on historical towns, observing that this one in particular, as a port city, had been a hub for the exchange of ideas. It further went on to note that the monuments and the port have retained their authenticity and that this has not been damaged by over shipping. It asked the State

Party how it planned to manage the site in view of the existing habitation and port activities.

The Delegation of **Iraq** remarked that the site meets the requirement for Outstanding Universal Value and represents the evolution in the townscape with the current population. It further appreciated the State Party's efforts.

The Delegation of **Thailand** pointed out that the site has tremendous Outstanding Universal Value in terms of urban development and supports the site's inscription.

The Delegation of **Mali** stated that the site is unique both for the history and also for its culture. The Outstanding Universal Value can be identified. It's an alive and dynamic site; we must pay attention to different aspects and avoid falling in any pure conservationism. This property deserves to be included in the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** remarked that the State Party has proven the Outstanding Universal Value of the site and supported the Delegation of South Africa to propose the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported the inscription of the site.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft decision paragraph by paragraph.

The **Rapporteur** read out the amendments that have been made by the Delegation of Brazil on paragraphs 2, 4, 5 of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that the dossier reflected criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Mexico** made a point to the Secretariat that the English version mentions 'inscribes' and 'still inhabited' which do not appear in the French version. Therefore it asked what the correct version to consider was.

Le **Président** confirme que la version anglaise est la version correcte.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte**, soutenue par la Délégation de la **Jordanie**, approuve l'inscription du bien et réaffirme qu'une inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial œuvre à la préservation d'un site. Elle souhaite procéder à l'examen du projet de Décision puisque la majorité est acquise.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** was concerned about the point raised by ICOMOS on the evidence or the manifestation of the interaction between the site and the indigenous African culture. It further stated it was not averse to inscribing the property but that it wished the State Party to provide answers to this issue raised by ICOMOS first.

ICOMOS stated that it believes the question was initially put forward by the Delegation of South Africa as to how the African dimension was manifest in the town. The justification of criterion (ii) was used in this analysis. The State Party mentioned various multi ethnic groups such as slaves and freed slaves; however no exceptional evidence is present in

the historic urban fabric of the interchange between people over time within the town. It deemed that this is what the Delegation of Nigeria was asking the State Party to clarify.

The Delegation of **Barbados** explained that the process of creolization and the evidence with regards to the input of the African dimension was made manifest through the site. It added that the location for the creolization process to have taken place is to be found in the architectural expression and the development of certain types of particular urban architecture such as the chattel houses. These were built by those who were enslaved and free colored and not permitted to own land. They were built for removal. The science and technology around the construction of these houses was tied to African expressions, lived experiences of those enslaved, labour, ideas and cultural expressions of those who owned nothing. The existing urban fabric of all types of buildings, with the exception of those built post 1831, was built by enslaved labour. After 1831 they would have been built by those who had developed the skills and the knowledge and would have generated their own working lives as a result of their involvement in the construction of these buildings. These laborers were not architects with glorious names, but were unidentifiable and nameless. These buildings represent monuments to African labour, cultural expressions and ideas.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that after hearing the State Party's explanations, it associated itself with the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil for inscription and that the property should be inscribed.

Le paragraphe 2 est adopté tel qu'amendé. Le Président décide d'adopter la Déclaration de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle de manière provisoire, le temps que la traduction soit vérifiée, et indique que la Décision finale sera adoptée à la fin de la session.

The Delegation of **Brazil** confirmed that the rationale of paragraph 3 was already explained and indicated that it had nothing to add.

Les paragraphes 3 et 4 adoptés tels qu'amendés.

Le **Président** déclare les paragraphes 4 et 5 adoptés et ainsi le projet de décision **35 COM 8B.42**. Il félicite l'Etat partie de la Barbade en soulignant qu'il s'agit de la première inscription de cet Etat partie sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed its delight on behalf of the people of Barbados. It acknowledged the team whose hard work resulted in this first inscription. The Delegation of Barbados noted that it was touched by the expressions of the Delegations of the World Heritage Committee in their confidence in the integrity of the site. Barbadians greet this with a celebration of humility. The site represents a significant addition to the World Heritage List. The site is unique and outstanding in many ways and occupied a key role in slave trade. Furthermore it was a source and destination of enslaved persons captured in Africa and as a key element of the slave route, it joins other sites such as Cape Verde, Mauritius, Greater Accra. Thus this decision is important in this Year set aside by the United Nations for the Recognition of Peoples of African Descent. Not only has Historic Bridgetown retained its ancient street layout, but it is the home to the only surviving dry dock. Besides, the Garrison is the largest military defense in the British Caribbean and one of the largest intact military sites in the Region. The Government of Barbados in adhering to its commitment under the *World Heritage*

Convention and has formulated a comprehensive management plan for the conservation and management of the site. It is committed to being a beacon of heritage conservation values across the world. The Delegation of Barbados issued an invitation to the World Heritage Committee members to visit the property at their earliest convenience.

C.3.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Hiraizumi – Temples, Gardens and Archaeological Sites Representing the Buddhist Pure Land
Id. N°	1277 Rev
State Party	Japan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(vi)

Le **Président** annonce que le site n'a souffert aucun dommage lié au tremblement de terre ou au tsunami du 11 mars 2011. Il demande aux organisations consultatives de présenter le site.

ICOMOS in giving its introduction stated that the nomination was deferred by the World Heritage Committee to complete a comparative analysis particularly for the Pure Land Gardens, and for the revision of the boundaries to include landscape elements of the Outstanding Universal Value. A brief description of the site was given that it was built by the Oshu Jujwara family. Its layout reflects the cosmology of Pure Land Buddhism. Relating to the category of the property – the name was changed by the State Party and there is a reduction in the serial nomination from 9 to 6 sites, unified by a buffer zone. Near to the temple, sixty nine excavations have been carried out since 1953. There are plans to reinstate and restore the gardens. The management plan indicates that this restoration will start in 2012. The second temple dates back from the mid-12th century; buildings were lost to fire in the 13th and 16th centuries. The Gardens were restored.

The property also includes archaeological remains of the third temple, built in the late 12th century, and also destroyed by fire. There are plans to reinstate and restore these gardens and the other buried one. Also included are Mount Kinkeisan which is the reference point for the plan and development of the city. At the Yanaginogoso Iseki site excavations have been done. The comparative analysis has justified all the sites with the exception of the administrative area. Criteria (ii) and (vi) have been satisfied. ICOMOS recommended the inscription of the site and indicated that additional recommendations have been made regarding visual links, major road improvement and buried archaeology. The State Party has submitted factual errors, and these have been accepted and commended.

Le **Président** invite le Comité à examiner le projet de Décision.

The Delegation of **China** requested the Observer Delegation of **Japan**. Finally it requested the State Party to explain about the exclusion of the Administrative buildings part in the nomination for inscription.

The Delegation of **Australia** acknowledged the State Party for this nomination and noted that it was previously deferred. It was of the view that this is an excellent example of how the State Party has produced an excellent work using the time for deferral. The additional work done with regard to boundaries and management is an example of the advantages of deferral. It welcomed the proposal to inscribe the property. However it noted that there were scarce details in the previous evaluation regarding the six components of the site. It disagreed with the recommendation for a change of name, as there are archaeological sites included in the nomination. It concluded by congratulating the State Party on the nomination.

Les Délégations de l'**Egypte** et de la **Jordanie** félicitent l'Etat partie et se réjouissent de cette inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated the State Party for its work in addressing outstanding issues and its going from deferral to inscription.

In response to the Delegation of **China**, the Observer Delegation of **Japan**, stated that in an effort to follow the recommendations that were made previously, it had selected these six components following recommendations made by ICOMOS and the World Heritage Committee previously. It believed that the Administrative Offices have a close association which differed from ICOMOS' evaluation in this and its view of the Outstanding Universal Value. It believed that the Administrative Offices are an integral part of the property and that therefore it is difficult to separate them from the other components. It expressed the opinion that ICOMOS' definition of Outstanding Universal Value is narrow.

The Delegation of **Barbados** joined in congratulating the State Party for this site coming forward, for the fusion of cultural values. It commented on the way the Outstanding Universal Value is interpreted. It added that it is important to demonstrate how one understands the Outstanding Universal Value of the property. It was of the view that one needs to ensure how the scope of the Outstanding Universal Value of the site is comprehended. It agreed with the explanations of the State Party and believed it helps with the analysis.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** appreciated the work of the Advisory Bodies and congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Japan** for having proposed this spectacular site for inscription. It asked for clarification on the change of the name of this property as raised by the Delegation of Australia, as it is the second time the name of the property is changed.

The **Secretariat** responded by indicating that the change in the name of a property can be done directly at the World Heritage Committee session instead of doing it on the Tentative List.

The Delegation of **Mexico** joined other Delegations in congratulating the State Party for this nomination.

The Delegation of **China** thanked the Observer Delegation of **Japan** for its clarification regarding the Administrative Buildings.

La Délégation de la **France** félicite l'Etat partie et soutient l'inscription.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** congratulated the State Party and questioned the cultural landscape element as mentioned in previous evaluation analysis as there seems to be a change. It requested some clarification from the State Party on this issue.

ICOMOS stated that the inclusion of the Government Administrative Offices was done through their link with Mount Kinkeisan. In the first nomination there was a much larger area to be considered which included how the city had been laid out according to Pure Land principles. It added that the recommendation is consistent with what was enounced in the first evaluation. The exceptional features of the property are to be found in the remains of the Pure Land Gardens and the associated temples which are outstanding. However the Administrative Offices were not key components to establish the Outstanding Universal Value. When the property was first nominated it was as a cultural landscape, however this could not be sustained thereafter. The buffer zone unites the sites and protects the visual link, but ICOMOS was of the opinion that one should not inscribe anything wider than the six nominated elements.

Le **Président** passe à l'examen du projet de Décision paragraphe par paragraphe. Le paragraphe 1 est adopté. Il présente le paragraphe 2 tel qu'amendé par la Délégation de la Suisse. Il s'agit d'un nouveau paragraphe.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** explique vouloir exprimer à travers cet amendement le succès de la procédure prévue par les *Orientations*, à savoir de voir inscrit dans un délai de moins de trois ans un site qui avait été différé à une précédente session du Comité du patrimoine mondial. La procédure peut être positive puisqu'elle permet aux Etats parties d'approfondir leurs dossiers.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** félicite la Délégation de la Suisse pour son amendement ainsi que le Comité car il est toujours positif d'inscrire un site sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, cela participant à la préservation des sites. Néanmoins, elle souligne que tous les Etats parties, particulièrement ceux du sud, n'ont pas toujours les moyens de revenir dans les trois années consécutives avec un dossier d'inscription révisé. Par ailleurs, elle conclut en notant qu'il est parfois urgent d'inscrire un site pour en assurer sa préservation.

La Délégation du **Mali** questionne l'opportunité de féliciter un Etat partie dans ce sens, tel que proposé par la Délégation de la Suisse.

Les paragraphes 2 à 4 sont adoptés tels qu'amendés.

The Delegation of **Australia** does not think that paragraph 5 is necessary and therefore proposes its deletion.

Ne notant aucune objection, le **Président** déclare les paragraphes 5 et 6 adoptés.

ICOMOS stated that it is not quite clear whether the Administrative Offices Building was included, whether the name of the property is unchanged and should appear as included. According to information on these two clarifications, it believed that the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value may have to be amended.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** répond qu'il n'y a pas d'amendement à ce paragraphe puisqu'il s'agit du paragraphe tel que proposé par l'ICOMOS et dit ne pas comprendre l'inquiétude de l'ICOMOS.

ICOMOS stated that if the Administrative Offices Building element is to be included in the name, it should also be mentioned in the brief synthesis of the statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Australia** understood that the Committee adopted paragraph 2 unchanged, however it raised the attention to the fact that the Committee did not adopt the Administrative Offices Building as indicated by ICOMOS.

Le **Président** confirme l'adoption du paragraphe 5. Le projet de décision **35 COM 8B.30** est adopté tel qu'amendé.

Le **Président** félicite l'Etat partie, en particulier le Gouverneur d'Irati au nom de tous les membres du Comité, et adresse sa profonde sympathie au peuple japonais qui a fait preuve d'un courage remarquable dans l'épreuve qu'il vient de traverser Il les félicite et espère que cette inscription leur apportera un courage supplémentaire.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** acknowledged the Chairperson and expressed its sincere appreciation on behalf of the Government of Japan for the inscription of the property. The site is located in the Prefecture of Irati which is where the earthquake and tsunami hit the hardest. It then gave the floor to the Governor of Irati who expressed his acknowledgements for the help extended. He thanked the World Heritage Committee for inscribing the site, built in the 12th century AD. He expressed the view that World Heritage inscription is a great encouragement. He concluded by expressing the fact that the task ahead is not easy, however he will succeed with help and encouragement from outside of Japan and expressed thanks to the World Heritage Committee, its Chairperson, the States Parties and ICOMOS.

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ASIA-PACIFIC

Temple of Preah Vihear (Cambodia) (C 1224rev)

The **Chairperson** announced that the Committee would now examine Decision **35 COM 7B.62** which is now ready was distributed to the Committee. She invited Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki to join the podium with respect to the presentation of this Item.

M. Mounir Bouchenaki rappelle que la Directrice générale lui a demandé de travailler sur une proposition de texte concernant le bien du patrimoine mondial du Temple de Preah Vihear. Il explique que ces quatre derniers jours ont fait l'objet d'importantes et longues négociations, toujours dans un esprit de compréhension et d'ouverture de la part des Délégations de la Thaïlande et du Cambodge pour essayer de trouver une formulation acceptable en accord avec les principes de la *Convention*. Il indique qu'aujourd'hui il existe une proposition de texte de négociation mais qui n'a pas abouti à un consensus. M. Bouchenaki propose que ce texte soit soumis à l'examen du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** informed that the Delegation of Thailand raised its plate and requested the Committee's agreement for giving the floor to the Delegation. Having no objection, she gave the floor to the Delegation of Thailand.

The Delegation of **Thailand** opened by stating while appreciating the efforts of the Secretariat and the Director-General of UNESCO or the agreed text, however, it noted that it does not agree on the text. It requested the postponement of the Agenda Item 7B.62 until there is a consensus.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the preoccupation of Thailand with this matter but underlined that addressing this issue was at the direct request of the Director-General. She confirmed that the Committee Members have before them the text of the Draft Decision and noted that it is not a consensus text. The Chairperson underlined that it is the responsibility of the Committee to seek to address the issue with respect to the conservation of the property.

The Delegation of **Thailand** expressed its sincere appreciation to the Director-General for trying to work together with Thailand to try to find the best solution that would be agreeable by both parties. The Delegation indicated that it would like to bring to the Committee members the problem and the sensitivity of the issue that we are facing. Due to the time limitation, the Delegation regretted that the Chairperson decided to open this agenda item now, as she was informed that the Thai Delegation was trying to contact the Director-General to have a conversation and a discussion with her. The Delegation

underlined that its capital wanted to have a communication with the Director-General before this item would be considered. The Delegation expressed its deep concern about an immediate discussion on this item. It wondered if the Chairperson had been informed of this fact. The Delegation requested again to postpone the agenda item until communication is possible with the Director-General.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Minister, acknowledged the sensitivities of the issues and conveyed that the Committee needs to advance the work with respect to taking responsibility for the protection and conservation of the property. She reiterated that the Director-General has encouraged and insisted that there should be in depth deliberations with the Parties concerned, and that one should move forward with the process. She turned to the Committee Members and asked them how to proceed with the draft text.

The Delegation of **Thailand** requested the Committee members to consider the adjournment of this Item without debate.

The **Chairperson** noted the request from the Delegation of Thailand and underlined that an adjournment would require at least one other Delegation to support the position. She called for at least one other Delegation to speak in favour of the proposed adjournment. She recalled Rule 31 regarding adjournment of debate:

During the discussion of any matter, any State member of the Committee may move the adjournment of the debate on the item under discussion. On moving the adjournment the State member shall indicate whether he moves the adjournment sine die or to a particular time which he shall specify. In addition to the proposer of the motion, one speaker may speak in favour of, and one against, the motion.

She asked the Committee Members whether they were for or against the motion. She acknowledged that there was no support for the adjournment.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** fait référence à l'intervention de la Délégation de la Thaïlande concernant une communication téléphonique qui devait avoir lieu entre le Premier Ministre de la Thaïlande et la Directrice générale de l'UNESCO, et souhaiterait savoir si cette conversation a eu lieu, et le cas échéant quel en a été le résultat.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that the telephone conversation had not taken place, and that the Director-General was not contactable by telephone at this time.

The **Chairperson** reiterated her request for any Delegation who was in favour of the adjournment of the Item to raise its plate.

The Delegation of **Thailand** indicated that it was informed that this telephone conversation would be at 5:30 p.m. local time, and was later informed by the Assistant of the Director-General that the Director-General would be available only at 7:30 p.m. local time.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** stated that he is not in the position to confirm the information and has not received instructions from the Director-General in this respect. He said that it was not guaranteed that he could have this information in the coming minutes.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that the request for adjournment having not received any support from any one State Party, she stated that the Committee would need to consider the contents of Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.62**.

The Minister of Natural Resources and Environment of Thailand, Head of the Thai Delegation, pronounced the following statement:

I have the honor to refer to note no. 106.5/1531 and no. 106.5/1886 dated 18 June 2009 and 26 July 2010 respectively, which addressed to Mr. Koichiro Matsuura, the Director-General, and to Mme Bokova, on the subject of inscription of the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List. I would like once again to register our great concern on the afore-mentioned subject and refer to Decision 32 COM 8B.102 which was adopted by the World Heritage Committee at the 32nd session in July 2008, in Quebec (Canada). I want to also place on the record the following statements:

1/ It is a great pleasure for me and the Thai Delegation to have had meeting with the Director-General during 25 and 27 May 2011 at UNESCO Headquarters in Paris in France. I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the time to facilitate the discussions between the two States Parties of Thailand and Cambodia. Particular thanks must also be extended to you for dispatching Mr. Koichiro Matsuura as a special envoy to Thailand and Cambodia in February 2011 in view of encouraging the resumption of dialogue between the two parties.

2/ Thailand deeply regrets that the World Heritage Committee was unable to recognize the sensitivity and gravity of the issues. The Decision which inscribed the Temple on the World Heritage List has proven to have led to prolonged tension and confrontation between the two neighboring countries and several armed clashes which resulted in the loss of life on both sides and the disruption of the normal way of life for people residing in and around the border area. In addition, the World Heritage Committee also overlooked the fact that the Decision can never be realistically implemented because the issue involves boundary and the territorial sovereignty of Thailand.

3/ This Decision did not only breach UNESCO's Rule of law but also severely undermined the spirit of the World Heritage Convention and Constitution of UNESCO; both of which enshrine the notion of promoting peace and security.

4/ The process of inscription of the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List was incomplete. The World Heritage Centre and the World Heritage Committee really neglected to observe the basic principles and required procedures as defined in the Operational Guidelines for the implementation of the World Heritage Convention. Most importantly, it failed to observe and restrict the inclusion of the property situated in territory, sovereignty or jurisdiction of

Thailand. As Thailand has consistently pointed out that the Nomination dossier submitted by Cambodia did not meet the overall requirement as prescribed by paragraphs 103, 104, 108, 132, 135, 140, 141, 148 of the Operation Guidelines because it did not provide the adequate buffer zone and management plan, which would ensure the accountable and transparent management of the Temple as a World Heritage site. Despite Thailand's strong protest, the World Heritage Centre still considers the said Nomination dossier was adequate for the purpose at hand and transmitted to the World Heritage Committee. In adopting the said Decision at that time, the World Heritage Committee overruled the elements of the Operational Guidelines and inscribed the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List.

5/ In order to rectify the above-mentioned oversight, Thailand would like to propose that the Temple of Preah Vihear and its adjacent area be a trans-boundary property on the territory of the State Party having adjacent borders, and therefore must be inscribed in conformity with paragraph 135 of the Operational Guidelines. In this regard, Thailand has repeatedly proposed such a solution both formally and informally in order to allow effective cooperation and sustainable protection and conservation of the Temple. Furthermore, Thailand wishes to reiterate that as the boundary of the area remains unresolved, any decision relevant to such property should be deferred until the completion of the survey and the demarcation works under the existing Thai Cambodian joint boundary Commission, so as to avoid a creation of suspicion and mistrust between people of the world, and their differences have all too often broken into war, as stated in the preamble of the Constitution of UNESCO. Thailand wishes to further reiterate that the decision to inscribe the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List and any activities related to implementation of the said Decision shall in no way prejudice Thailand's legal position, its territorial integrity and sovereignty and the survey and demarcation of land boundary in the area that remains to be completed. Furthermore, any activities by Cambodia and the World Heritage Committee, UNESCO, or any other parties in the area adjacent to the Temple which is part of Thai territory cannot be carried out without a prior formal consent of the Royal Thai Government.

6/ Thailand is perplexed by the lack of transparency and professionalism displayed in several occasions by the Secretariat of the World Heritage Committee and its failure to handle this delicate and sensitive matter. In several occasions leading up to the 34th session of the World Heritage Committee, Thailand repeatedly requested to obtain the working document of the Agenda Item on the state of conservation of the Temple of Preah Vihear, but the document was only handed to the Thai delegates 24 hours before the Agenda Item was scheduled to be considered, falling far short from six weeks requirement stated in the rule 45 of the Rules of Procedure.

7/ Thailand always values the principles of good neighborliness and reaffirms the commitment to strengthen good relations with our neighbors. Moreover, Thailand has every intention to resolve the boundary issue peacefully and amicably, including the area adjacent to the Temple of Preah Vihear. Thailand, as a long-standing member of the United Nations, is never an advocate of the use of force as a means to settle dispute. Accordingly we have consistently and continuously

made known to UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee of the incompleteness of the process of inscription of the Temple of Preah Vihear on the World Heritage List, as well as the need to avoid further problems that might be caused by any relevant activities, pending the final demarcation of the land boundary through existing bilateral mechanisms, as these will only aggravate undesirable tension and lead to repeated confrontations. Despite several appeals and meetings between Thai delegates and the officials of UNESCO and the World Heritage Committee, it is now obvious that our efforts have come to no avail, as were evident by repeated discussions to postpone the management plan at the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee and the unresolved differences. Taking into account the above-mentioned considerations and the authorization of the Thai cabinet, the Thai Delegation attending the 35th session of the World Heritage Committee meeting in Paris, France, have no choice but to denounce the 1972 Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage in accordance to Article 35. The instrument of denunciation will be forwarded to you in due course.

So in this regard, I wish to reassure you that the decision to denounce the 1972 World Heritage Convention is an overreaching issue in the overall relations between Thailand and UNESCO as well as other international organizations which Thailand is a member. I would also like to take this opportunity to reaffirm that Royal Thai Government is firmly committed to be a good member of the international community with full respect for justice and rule of law. We will continue to work closely together with UNESCO and other international organizations for the benefit of all.

Madame Chairman, sincere distinguished colleagues, dear friends and colleagues, I am very sorry to denounce the Convention and I will have to leave the Committee and the plenary, so I hope that the Committee and the members of the World Heritage Convention understand our situation and the sensitivity of the issues and our decision. Thank you very much Madame Chairman.

The Delegation of **Thailand** left the Room.

The **Chairperson** expressed the regret of the World Heritage Committee upon receiving the news, and subsequently notified the Members of the Committee of the consequences of the Thai decision. She stated that under Article 35 of the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*:

- 1. Each State Party to this Convention may denounce the Convention.*
- 2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.*
- 3. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation. It shall not affect the financial obligations of the denouncing State until the date on which the withdrawal takes effect.*

She confirmed that the Committee would take note of the statement of the Minister of Thailand *in extenso* as part of proceedings. She expressed the necessity to finalize the Item today, and therefore requested the Committee to consider the text of Decision **35 COM 7B.62**.

She requested the Committee to advise which text to advance. As there were no interventions from the Committee, she proposed the deletion of paragraph 6 in its entirety if there was no objection. Draft Decision **35 COM 7B.62** was adopted as amended. She expressed her appreciation to Mr. Bouchenaki for his efforts in this regard.

The Chairperson closed Item 7B of the Agenda.

SIXTH DAY – SATURDAY, 25 JUNE 2011

TWELFTH MEETING

7.30 p.m. – 10.30 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

B.2 ARAB STATES

B.2.1 New Nominations (Continuation)

Property	Wadi Rum
Id. N°	1377
State Party	Jordan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi)(vii)(viii) + CL

The **Chairperson** asked for Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.15** to be put on the screen and proceeded with the adoption of paragraphs 1 and 2 as amended. She mentioned that some work on paragraph 3 had been completed already and the brief synthesis was adopted. Subsequently, also the paragraphs on criterion (vii), Integrity and Protection and Management Requirements were adopted. The Chairperson proceeded with the adoption of paragraphs 4 and 5, both with minor amendments, before arriving at paragraph 6, stating that to her recollection it had been adopted already.

The Delegation of **Brazil** asked if a Statement of Outstanding Universal Value had been developed, in particular with regard to natural criteria.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that it had provided the Secretariat with the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, which was confirmed by the Chairperson, who then proposed to suspend the consideration of this item for the moment.

C.5 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

C.5.1 New Nominations

Property	Coffee Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1121
State Party	Colombia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS presented the nomination of the Coffee Cultural Landscape under criteria (v) and (vi).

The Delegation of **Sweden** opened the debate by stating that it had carefully read the evaluation report, which recommended a revised nomination, but asked ICOMOS whether the proposed property, if inscribed after revision of the nomination dossier, would be sustainable in view of its comments concerning the farming traditions that were slowly changing.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked ICOMOS for its work and remarked that it was interesting to see that the category of Cultural Landscapes, until previously only applied in fragmented terms, seems to have come to full recognition now with this nomination. The Delegation questioned the completeness of the comparative analysis, and the justification for site selection; secondly it wished to obtain an explanation on the boundaries of the selected areas; and thirdly it requested information on the implementation of an appropriate protection and management system was needed. It proceeded with commenting that the nomination file contains a detailed overview of the places of coffee production in the world, including Ethiopia, after which it read out an expert's opinion on the unique characteristics of the Colombian Coffee Cultural Landscape. It further stated that a rigorous analysis was made that focused on the Outstanding Universal Value, the organisation of coffee growing, the production units, as well as other elements that all resulted in the selection of the sites as proposed, which was to be considered innovative. Finally it asked the State Party whether it could provide extra information as regards the implementation of appropriate measures for protection and management.

The Delegation of **Brazil** commended ICOMOS and stated that there were many similarities between Colombia and Brazil on this matter, including the challenges of establishing public policies for the protection and management of heritage properties, and ensuring public participation. As regards the comparative analysis, Brazil had knowledge to share and commented on the uniqueness of this property, in terms of the landscape characteristics of the Cordilleras Mountain Range, and the socio-economic and cultural context, referring to human adaptation to the environment. In concluding it recognized that the Colombian Coffee Landscape is an example of landscape shaped by culture and asked the State Party how this was showed in the nomination file.

The Delegation of **Barbados** congratulated the State Party on the fine dossier brought forward and on the evaluation made by the Advisory Body. It commented on the obvious

interchange between people and their environment. It asked the State Party if it could elaborate on the system of protection and management, with involvement of local communities and the determination of boundaries.

The Delegation of **China** commented on the six components with potential Outstanding Universal Value. Following the Delegation of Mexico it also requested the State Party to provide more explanations.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie l'ICOMOS pour la qualité de son travail et l'Etat partie pour la qualité du dossier de proposition d'inscription. Elle demande quels sont les éléments matériels qui expriment la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle et s'il existe un inventaire des fermes et des ensembles urbains.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** est d'avis qu'un tel paysage culturel pourrait avoir sa place dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Toutefois, la délégation souhaite savoir comment s'est effectuée la sélection des éléments composant le bien et comment en ont été définies les limites. Elle souhaite également obtenir des informations sur la méthodologie et la logique qui sous-tendent le dossier de proposition d'inscription, car elles n'y sont pas mentionnées. Enfin, elle souhaite savoir s'il existe des activités minières dans le bien ou aux alentours et s'il existe une protection légale dès à présent pour pouvoir protéger ce bien à l'avenir.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested clarification on the involvement of local communities in the selection of the components of the nominated property.

The Delegation of **Iraq** commented that serial nominations were the most complicated and asked about the criteria used for selection of the proposed municipalities.

The **Chairperson** turned to the Observer Delegation of **Colombia** asking to address specifically the questions that had been put forward by the various Members of the World Heritage Committee.

The Observer Delegation of **Colombia** addressing the question of the Delegation of Mexico as regards protection and management of the property, explained that a detailed management plan had been prepared and approved, which comprehensively dealt with the matter. It stated that the small farmer population was fully involved in the property's management, as well as the national association of coffee growers, four local Governments and four local municipalities. As part of a process of capacity-building, it stated that training programmes had been put in place. Furthermore, it mentioned that protection of the property was ensured under the law for national parks as well as the law for cultural heritage, which was amended in 2008 to include protection for cultural landscapes. In the management plan four attributes were distinguished, including farming traditions, the institutional organization, the relationship with traditional technologies and the optimal production territory (1,400-1,800m) where 60% of the land is dedicated to coffee growing.

In addressing the questions about the comparative analysis, the Delegation explained that the techniques of human adaptation to the land were authentic demonstrations based on social sustainability, also mentioning the institutional structure of the national association of coffee growers in place since 1927 which is keeping alive cultural

traditions, festivals, poetry, music and other activities related to the culture of coffee growing, all of which knows no parallel in the world.

It further mentioned that the federation of coffee growers has established a Geographical Information System that includes all farms and their cultivation of coffee trees. The selection of the six areas has been a complex process from a technical and scientific perspective and the best of the best were identified to comprise the nominated property. It explained that the criteria for selection involved exceptional characteristics of the cultural heritage, both tangible and intangible, including farms, rural areas and towns of production and commerce located in the optimal range of coffee growing, which is between 1,400 and 1,800 metres above sea level that produces the highest yields and the best quality of coffee in these areas. As regards the boundaries of the six selected areas, the Observer Delegation of **Colombia** explained that they were thoroughly studied in order to respond to the specificities of the areas.

A point of order was put forward by the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** estime que beaucoup de temps a déjà été accordé à ce dossier et qu'il convient de répondre aux questions posées.

The **Chairperson** remarked that the State Party was responding to the many questions raised by Committee members. She added that perhaps she should have gathered less questions.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that it was of the same opinion as the Chairperson.

The **Chairperson** asked Members of the World Heritage Committee if sufficient information had been provided by the State Party in order to consider Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.43** and asked the Rapporteur if any amendments had been brought forward.

Le **Rapporteur** informe que les Délégations du Brésil, du Mexique et de la Barbade ont soumis des amendements portant sur les paragraphes 2 et 3.

The **Chairperson**, taking note of the proposals for amendments, moved to paragraph 1, which was adopted; then to paragraph 2, with an amendment by the Delegations of Brazil, Mexico and Barbados, which was adopted; then to paragraph 3, with an amendment proposed by the Delegations of Brazil, Mexico and Barbados, with a brief synthesis to be adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** informed that in consultation with the State Party the name of the property should be changed into "Coffee Cultural Landscape of Colombia", as well as an adaptation to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value to include an extra "C" to the acronym.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the brief synthesis as amended, which was adopted.

ICOMOS clarified that technically speaking integrity and authenticity should be separated.

After the section had been separated into paragraphs with new headings on Integrity and Authenticity, the related were adopted. Paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique vouloir renforcer cet amendement et propose “demande à l’Etat partie de ne pas autoriser toute activité minière au sein du bien et aux environs du bien”.

The **Chairperson** indicated that ‘not to authorize any mining activities’ would be more appropriate. She wished to know if the Delegation of Switzerland wishes to replace the preceding paragraph with this sentence.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** confirme ce point.

La Délégation de la **France** confirme cette règle grammaticale : « Demande à l’Etat partie de n’autoriser aucune activité minière... ».

The Delegation of **Mexico** showed no objection to the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland.

The Delegation of **Brazil** pointed out that the French version was not in accordance with the English version of the text.

The **Chairperson** suggested the wording “not to authorize any mining activity within the property and its immediate surroundings” and she asked for help from the Delegation of France which agreed with the translation offered.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.43** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Colombia**.

The Delegation of **Colombia** expressed its pride about this inscription. It stressed the importance of the site and stated that half a million people live in the site and its buffer zone. More than 8 years of work passed by before this site could be listed. It talked about traditions and founding techniques around the coffee area which are still practiced. It further stressed that the characteristics of this productive area are recognized around the world. The listing entails many benefits to the country as sustainable tourism. Finally, it expressed its deepest gratitude and invited every Member of the Committee and everyone present to visit Colombia where the best coffee in the world is found.

The **Chairperson** reiterated her congratulations. The Chairperson informed the Committee Members that the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** had to leave soon. Therefore she proposed to move forward to the examination of the nomination of the Archaeological Sites of the Island of Meroe (Sudan) to the World Heritage List.

C.2 ARAB STATES

C.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Archaeological Sites of the Island of Meroe
Id. N°	1336
State Party	Sudan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)

ICOMOS presented the Archeological Sites of the Island of Meroe. The nomination comprises three of the Kushite sites: the Royal City of the Kushite Kings at Meroe, near the River Nile, the nearby religious sites of Naqa and Musawwarat es Sufra. It was the seat of the rulers who notably occupied Egypt for almost a century and features, among other vestiges, pyramids, temples and domestic buildings as well as major installations connected to water management. ICOMOS highlighted conservation problems of the wall paintings due to poor ventilation. It expressed concern about the erosion on the roof in the Lion Temple. ICOMOS proposed to include the archeological remains North of the Royal City and enlarge the boundaries. ICOMOS regretted that the choice for these three sites had not been justified. It wondered why other sites around it have not been mentioned in the comparative analysis and asked for further analysis. The port for both Musawwarat es-Sufra and Naqa was Wad ben Naqa directly on the River Nile. This has not been included and there is no description of it or justification for its absence. If the nominated property is to reflect fully the wealth and influence of the Kushite Kingdom and the way it functioned, then consideration should be given to including this port. Finally, ICOMOS talked about the justification of the criteria, the boundaries, which they considered as adequate, the physical protection and other requirements. It informed the Committee Members about the agreement for a conservation plan and the management plan. The latter is in progress and should be a priority in order to protect and monitor the site. In conclusion ICOMOS' recommendation is to defer the inscription of the site in order to extend the buffer zone, create a database of the site and its management and monitoring.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged ICOMOS for its presentation.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** appreciated and commended the efforts of the State Party. It thanked ICOMOS for the evaluation and stressed the well-known archaeological importance of the property and its regional value. It asked the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** why it has not considered the inclusion of the rivers Port "Wad ben Naqa" in the nomination file.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked ICOMOS for its presentation and its work. It underlined the archaeological importance of the nomination. This site was a part of the Kushite Empire. The City of Meroe, situated on the East bank of the River Nile, was the most important capital of this Empire and has one of the greatest temples in this region. The Delegation evoked the greatness of the temples and the association of different

gods and goddesses as well as of the importance of old manuscripts found in this area. It expressed its surprise that this important and extraordinary site was not on the World Heritage List yet. It said that it would be a deed of honor, not only for UNESCO or the World Heritage Committee but for all the present Delegates to inscribe this property on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** appreciated the remarks and thanked the Delegation of Egypt for sharing its knowledge on the property.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** for its remarkable nomination. It stated that although the inscription has been recommended for deferral by ICOMOS, the nomination meets criteria (iii) and (iv). It expected a clear statement from ICOMOS whether it is necessary to include other sites at the nomination stage or if they could be added later as extensions.

The Delegation of **Jordan** talked about the long pace of history of this magnificent site, its archaeological features and it recommended inscribing the site on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** thanked ICOMOS and asked the Advisory Body whether the inclusion of the river Port “Wad ben Naqa” in the nomination dossier was of primary importance or not.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked ICOMOS for its report and the Delegation of **Egypt** for its brilliant description. It wanted to have clarification from the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** concerning the choice of these specific three elements for inscription.

The Delegation of **Barbados** thanked ICOMOS for a well presented evaluation and the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** for a comprehensive document. It stressed the importance of the property, which constitutes the best remains of the Kushite Kingdom. It wished to receive more information on the management plan.

The **Chairperson** wished to listen to the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** regarding the questions raised until this moment.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** thanked ICOMOS and the Committee Members for their questions. Concerning the question from the Delegation of Ethiopia about the Wad Ben Naqa Port it replied that there were only very limited excavations and the listing of the site would make it easier to undertake further studies. It also added that at this time there is no evidence of the archaeological importance of this port. Concerning the limitation to three elements in the nomination, it indicated that these were the best preserved sanctuaries, cemeteries, temples, writing that has not been yet deciphered and craftwork that dates back to the early years of African settlement. These three elements reflect the importance of the culture and art of the Kushite Kingdom; demonstrate the adaptation of Kushite people to the environment and the climate in which they lived. Traditional lifestyles can still be found on the Island today. To the question concerning the management system it stated that the property is run by responsible authorities and experts and to face up to the human resources deficit on the site, this year additional jobs will be created. It confirmed that the Sudanese Government will provide the necessary funding to develop the region. Finally, the Observer

Delegation of **Sudan** stressed that it has the capacity to manage the property and that harmonious restoration work is going on and ensured that visitors will have access.

The **Chairperson** invited ICOMOS to take the floor.

ICOMOS confirmed that with the aim of a more complete nomination dossier, the addition of more elements to the three nominated ones should be considered to better illustrate the wider context of the Kushite Kingdom. Nevertheless, it confirmed that it has no doubt concerning the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** wondered if the same approach used in evaluating the site “Hiraizumi – Temples, Gardens and Archaeological Sites Representing the Buddhist Pure Land” would apply here. It stated that, according to ICOMOS, it seemed that the basis for not meeting the criteria for nomination is the non inclusion of the Port. It wished to have clarity about the contribution of the inclusion of the Port to the Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Mali** demande à l’Etat partie plus de renseignements concernant le plan de gestion.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par la Délégation d’Australie, sollicite l’ICOMOS sur les raisons de sa demande d’élargissement des limites du bien, compte tenu du fait que les vestiges du Port n’ont pas encore été fouillées et que leur valeur archéologique n’a pas encore été démontrée.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thought that the State Party met the conditions of protection, integrity and authenticity. Nevertheless it noted that ICOMOS expressed concerns and therefore wished to hear the State Party in particular about the efforts being put in place considering basic infrastructures (water, electricity, etc.).

The Delegation of **Iraq** supported the Delegation of Egypt to inscribe the property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** said that after listening to the State Party the necessity of the Port as an important element for inscription was not obvious. The question of the North-South highway had been addressed, but would involve long term interventions. This would delay the inscription for many years. It wished to know from ICOMOS if these issues should be resolved prior to inscription. In its view the State Party showed that it is determined to deal with these long-term issues.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that according to a Professor at the Sorbonne and to other specialists in Cairo, the Port of Wad ben Naqa is not a port at all. It had discussed the excavation with the person who had discovered only some storage buildings far away from the Nile. It stated that the expert who had written the ICOMOS dossier had not seen the site. Concerning the highway, the Delegation stated that the Sudanese Government had completely halted the hotel constructs. With its interventions the Delegation spoke against the two main arguments for deferral.

The **Chairperson** requested the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** to address exclusively the explicit questions.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** stated that there is no Port built on Meroe and that it would not add much value to the property. It said that once it would receive the instruction of the Minister it would divert the highway. It addressed questions about the boundaries of the buffer zone, indicating that the site was inhabited but that the Government would pay indemnities to the inhabitants of the site who have been moved. It stated that its proposed buffer zone is sufficient, as the area recommended by ICOMOS is a reserve, consisting of a string of hills which is protected by law. The listing of the property would provide assistance to the Antiquities Association. Answering to the Delegation of Bahrain, it said that it was originally intended to build a hotel on the site, but that after recommendations of the World Heritage Centre, a presidential decree was signed to put a halt to the planned construction.

ICOMOS clarified that the proposed deferral was not based on one single issue but on a range of issues also concerning management and protection, missing inventories and database, monitoring, etc. It appreciated that the mentioned zones are protected by law but was of the opinion that this protection should be extended. A comparative analysis should be carried out. It clarified that it did not say that the highway should not be build but that it is necessary to provide a timetable to reroute the highway and deal with the power lines. It noted the willingness of the State Party and the discussion on the Port of Meroe. It requested considering the setting of these three elements within the corpus of the site and envisioning a nomination for the future.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commended on the comments of ICOMOS and stated that seeking international assistance is an overall objective of the *Convention*. It reminded that the Committee is called to inscribe properties and not files.

Le **Rapporteur** annonce des amendements portant sur les paragraphes 2 et 3 du projet de Décision **35 COM 8B.22** présentés par les Délégations des Emirats Arabes Unis, de l'Egypte, de l'Ethiopie, du Nigéria, du Mali, de la Jordanie, de la Chine, du Brésil et de l'Iraq.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested the Secretariat to distribute amendments when they are comprehensive in order see the Draft Decision in its entirety with the amendments, as well as the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation de la **France** déclare que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du site ne fait aucun doute et que les perplexités de l'ICOMOS ne paraissent pas fondées. Elle rappelle que les inscriptions des biens en série peuvent être effectuées à plusieurs reprises et que la France appuie les amendements qui vont dans la direction de l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Brazil**, supported by the Delegation of Switzerland, proposed that paragraph 2 needs more work in order to be adopted and underlined the need to identify criteria and Outstanding Universal Value. It requested the suspension of the examination of the Draft Decision pending a consolidated text.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and criteria proposed for the inscription.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.22** was adopted as amended. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Sudan** thanked the Chair on behalf of Sudan and the local community of Meroe. On behalf of the Sudanese community it acknowledged all the experts and those who have helped in the preparation of the nomination dossier.

B.2 ARAB STATES

B.2.1 New Nominations (*Continuation*)

Property	Wadi Rum
Id. N°	1377
State Party	Jordan
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi)(vii)(viii) + CL

The **Chairperson** referred to the consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.15** which was suspended.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested time to examine the proposed text in order to make an intervention.

ICOMOS pointed out that in a mixed site there is one Statement of Outstanding Universal Value and the Brief Synthesis covers both the natural and cultural attributes, followed by the justification of criteria, therefore there is only one statement.

Paragraph 3 was adopted.

IUCN proposed an amendment to the statement of integrity to encompass its status as a mixed property.

ICOMOS added to IUCN's intervention to amend the text further in accordance with a mixed site.

IUCN proposed amendments to the final paragraph to specify the type of mission and to report back to the World Heritage Committee at its 38th session in 2014.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.15** was adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its acknowledgement for the inscription and underlined that the property is one of the most significant sites in the Region for its pristine conservation. Furthermore it is an excellent example of man shaping and human interaction with the environment.

C.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1 New Nominations

Property	The Longobards in Italy. Places of the power (568-774 A.D.)
Id. N°	1318
State Party	Italy
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(vi)

ICOMOS explique qu'il s'agit d'un bien en série qui représente la quintessence du patrimoine bâti et de l'art des Lombards subsistant aujourd'hui en Italie. Il s'agit de l'une des racines majeures de la naissance du monde médiéval européen et de l'établissement de la chrétienté occidentale. Tous les biens proposés pour inscription bénéficient du plus haut niveau de protection légale. Il s'agit d'un bien complexe dont nombre d'éléments importants sont intrinsèquement fragiles et délicats à conserver, comme les vestiges archéologiques, les peintures et les stucs. Toutefois, des mesures de conservation appropriées sont mises en place par l'État partie. Il existe un système de gestion propre à chacune des sept composantes constituant le bien. Le réseau associatif Italia Langobardorum s'est transformé en une autorité transversale propre à assurer l'harmonisation et le suivi de la série. Un ensemble très complet de projets sont inscrits dans le plan de gestion. Outre les risques naturels sismiques ou l'érosion fluviale liés à certains des sites, la pression du développement touristique pourrait menacer les composants du bien les plus vulnérables à la présence humaine. ICOMOS recommande l'inscription du bien sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (ii)(iii) et (vi).

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.33** was adopted. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Italy** addressed the Assistant Director-General for Culture and the Director of the World Heritage Centre. It thanked the World Heritage Committee for the inscription and the assistance and advice of the World Heritage Centre and ICOMOS in the preparation of the nomination.

Property	Fagus Factory in Alfeld
Id. N°	1368
State Party	Germany
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)

ICOMOS explique que l'usine Fagus à Alfeld, conçue au début des années 1910, présente un ensemble architectural annonçant le mouvement moderniste en architecture. Construite par Walter Gropius, elle comprend en particulier l'usage novateur des murs verrières combinés à une structure porteuse épurée. Elle témoigne d'une rupture importante des valeurs architecturales et décoratives de l'époque, se tournant résolument vers une esthétique industrielle fonctionnaliste. Elle constitue un ensemble territorial et bâti homogène, complet et rationnel au service du projet industriel. Les éléments décoratifs et fonctionnels intérieurs sont accordés à l'architecture et au projet social. Ils forment l'une des premières manifestations abouties du design industriel.

L'ensemble des dix bâtiments composant l'usine Fagus a été intégralement conservé, dans son plan et dans ses formes architecturales initiales. D'importantes réparations et restaurations ont eu lieu entre 1985 et 2001. Elles ont été effectuées dans un souci de respect du bien en tant que témoignage exceptionnel de l'architecture industrielle du XXe siècle, ce qui a contribué au maintien des conditions d'authenticité tant en termes architecturaux que décoratifs.

La gestion du bien est sous la responsabilité de son propriétaire, la société Fagus-Grecon Greten GmbH & Co.KG. Elle agit en concertation avec les autorités régionales et locales de la conservation des monuments historiques, notamment à travers le Comité de pilotage du bien qui exerce l'autorité de contrôle des projets et de concertation des différents partenaires impliqués. ICOMOS recommande que l'État partie envisage un ou des scénarios possibles dans le cas où un changement de propriétaire et/ou d'affectation des bâtiments interviendrait et propose l'inscription sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (ii) et (iii).

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B. 31** was adopted; on behalf of the Committee the Chairperson congratulated the State Party.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** expressed the Federal Republic of Germany's happiness for the Committee's Decision for inscription and noted that it would do its utmost to preserve this unique modern heritage.

The **Chairperson** announced that there are still 15 sites for consideration which will be addressed on Monday 27 June 2011. She also announced that there would be a full day of work on Tuesday 28 June 2011.

The **Secretariat** provided logistical information for the following day, announced the launch of two publications, and the availability of the revised documents for the Working Group for the Future of the *Convention*.

SEVENTH DAY – MONDAY, 27 JUNE 2011

THIRTEENTH MEETING

10 a.m. – 1 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

The **Chairperson** opened the meeting and explained modifications in the working methods of the Committee which would be shortened so that it could terminate its work by 6p.m. She stated that there was need to shorten all interventions as well as a timeframe for nominations. She also proposed that the Committee deals exclusively with the four properties that received approval for nomination. The Chairperson informed that working methods would be modified for the External Auditor's presentation due today under Item 9A (Global Strategy and PACT). She also informed the Committee Members that they would not engage in a debate on this Item which would be left for the 18th General Assembly of States Parties in November 2011. Therefore, she reiterated that Committee Members would have to conform to the constraints of this tight timeframe. Furthermore, she announced the shortening of the lunch break to one hour so that the meeting could commence at 2 p.m. sharp. She realized that these new working methods would affect the agenda and timetable of the Subsidiary Bodies and therefore asked the Delegation of Australia to take the floor on this matter.

The Delegation of **Australia** thought that their meeting on the Future of the *Convention* could be held with interpretation during the one-hour lunch break. However, in its opinion, as there would not be sufficient time for lunch *and* discussion, the Delegation of Australia therefore suggested holding this meeting from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. even though it understood that no interpretation would be foreseen in this case.

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

C.1 AFRICA

C.1.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Konso Cultural Landscape
Id. N°	1333 Rev
State Party	Ethiopia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS recommended deferral of this property so as to reconsider the situation of the extended boundaries.

The **Chairperson** requested the Rapporteur to inform the meeting on amendments proposed to the Draft Decision.

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that amendments to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 were received from the Delegation of Mali.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Mali, followed by the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

La Délégation du **Mali** souhaite interroger l'Etat Partie sur les raisons pour lesquelles la mission n'a pas été réalisée par l'ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Mali and gave the floor to the Delegation of the Russian Federation followed by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** stated that it was a bit confused concerning the comparative analysis requested by ICOMOS. In 2010, ICOMOS informed the State Party that the association of terraces and towns was unique. Now ICOMOS noted that there was too much focus in the definition of this property on terraces. This was not clear for the Delegation who wished to obtain some clarification. It believed that the State Party had done a considerable amount of work as requested by the Committee at its last session and that the property presented the attributes of Outstanding Universal Value for at least part of the landscape. Therefore, it could not understand why the comparative analysis continued to create a problem for ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** replied that she had understood that ICOMOS wanted attributes of Outstanding Universal Value for a combination of terraces and towns.

The Delegation of **South Africa** felt that there was a communication breakdown between the State Party and ICOMOS. It observed that ICOMOS' evaluation stated that the property had not met criterion (iv) and noted that it must meet criterion (vi). Furthermore it indicated that ICOMOS was unable to assess the new extended area of this property. It wished that the State Party be allowed to provide the reasons for this extension. It concluded by wishing that ICOMOS informs on what is the exact size it wishes this property to have.

The **Chairperson** wished to first hear from other Delegations before passing the floor to ICOMOS. She therefore gave the floor to the Delegation of Nigeria.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** referred to Decision **34 COM 8B.11**, paragraph 3 wherein the World Heritage Committee considered that the international community should be invited to support "this extraordinary landscape to ensure that its communities can meet the challenge of establishing a sustainable future". It stressed that this referred to the Outstanding Universal Value of this property. It recalled that in 2010 ICOMOS stated that criterion (v) could be justified based on new boundaries. The Delegation of Nigeria wished to obtain information on whether the State Party had done the necessary work to allow justification of criterion (v).

The Delegation of **Jordan** wanted to know how ICOMOS reached its decision to refer in absence of a mission to make its evaluation. It requested the Chairperson to ask the State Party to reply on what ICOMOS had asked it to implement.

The **Chairperson** informed the Committee Members that the original proposal had called for referral and that in such a case a mission was not allowed by the procedures for nomination. Therefore, it was not a question of ICOMOS not being able to undertake the mission. She then passed the floor to the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that this was a perfect example of the confusion caused by the Decision to change from deferral to referral. It was in agreement with the views of the Delegation of South Africa. It referred to page 7 of ICOMOS' evaluation stating that "*knowledge of the Konso landscape comes from oral traditions ... but so far no reliable dates have been obtained*". The Delegation of Brazil pointed out that it was a methodological mistake on how to approach a cultural site. It asked whether one should consider that oral traditions were not a source of reliable information. It felt that there was tendency for evaluations of cultural properties to be biased. The Delegation of Brazil was against this attitude and wished to know what was the rationale of the State Party for requesting an extension of the boundaries and whether the State Party would accept to consider minor modifications in the future together with ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** asked the State Party to take note since a number of questions overlapped, for example the rationale of boundaries, the background for criteria (v) and (iv), and other questions such as the lack of mapping and presentation of data on new information. She gave the floor to the Delegation of Ethiopia.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked the Secretariat and ICOMOS for their support. It indicated that it had conducted a further survey of the Konso Cultural Landscape property to complete the missing data and prepare a new map of the agricultural landscape area of 230 square kilometers which was forged by the Konso people. It

mentioned that the wholeness and integrity of the property were thus reinforced. The Delegation explained that in its work it took into consideration the geo-morphological, geographical, visual, social and cultural aspects of the property to ensure its coherence. It stressed that data relative (a terrace distribution map) was submitted to the World Heritage Centre and that new photographs of the new property area were also taken. It continued that further information on the 12 walled towns was included in the revised nomination file and that consultation and participation of the local communities had taken place beforehand. It reported that concerning the town of Gume it was in the old mapped area. The Delegation of Ethiopia recognized that more inventory work needs to be done in the future. It referred to ICOMOS report (8B.1add page 9.) which states that “the boundaries do now respect geographical features but from the information provided ICOMOS is not able to say how far the new boundaries can be said to be aligned with the cultural traditions that created the towns.” The Delegation of Ethiopia informed the Committee that the walled towns were located in the East of the landscape property and that the new boundaries extended to the South and to the West of the property with mainly terraces and no walled towns. Therefore, it pointed out that the new area was less relevant to towns as there were only a few hamlets as indicated in the nomination file.

The **Chairperson** asked ICOMOS to reply to questions addressed by various Committee Members.

ICOMOS addressed the question raised by the Delegation of the Russian Federation on the comparative analysis. It pointed out that a comparative analysis was not included in the dossier. It stressed that in the revised document additional information is given on why a combination of walled towns and terraces makes this landscape exceptional. Concerning the question raised by the Delegation of Nigeria on the desirable size of the extension of this property, ICOMOS replied that the initial boundaries were rectilinear and rather random. It wanted a smooth adjustment of the boundaries relevant to geographical features. It further added that these boundaries should reflect clearly the people who live in the area with appropriate boundaries around particular towns in respect of the morphology of the area and its cultural and social aspects. It had not expected such a large extension.

To respond to the question raised by the Delegation of Brazil about oral traditions, ICOMOS was in agreement with the views of this Delegation. It only suggested that all sources of information were sought out for inscription of a property including those obtained from oral traditions. For ICOMOS, a mission was not a feasible option as the dossier was received at the end of January 2011. It pointed out that although it was a bit frustrating, it was obliged to follow the existing rules.

The **Chairperson** pointed out to the Committee that after these explanations, any further questions should be on significant issues exclusively as the Committee had to move on. She gave the floor to the Delegation of Egypt.

The Delegation of **Egypt** supported the views of the Delegation of Mali and requested that the property be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Australia** acknowledged the State Party and also ICOMOS for its clarification. It understood the work constraints. It considered that this property was a

remarkable landscape and recognized the great amount of work undertaken by the State Party. It also believed that these sorts of changes made by the State Party required a mission for evaluation of the extended property. The Delegation of Australia supported deferral of this nomination.

The Delegation of **Barbados** requested that the State Party indicate the additional work undertaken since the last Committee session, notably regarding the management plan.

Concerning the question raised by the Delegation of Barbados, the Delegation of **Ethiopia** replied that the management of the whole area would be the responsibility of a newly-created Konso Cultural Landscape Management Directorate. This body is part of the regional government in charge of the monitoring and protection of the property.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph. Paragraph 1 was adopted.

La Délégation de la **Suisse**, soutenue par la Délégation de la Suède, partage l'opinion générale sur la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien. Elle s'oppose toutefois à l'amendement proposé par la Délégation du Mali. En effet, le site n'ayant pas pu être évalué par les Organisations consultatives, il ne peut être accepté pour inscription. Elle souligne que cette situation résulte de la décision de la dernière session du Comité (Brasilia, 2010)] de transformer le différé en renvoi.

La Délégation de la **France** indique que le rapport des organisations consultatives atteste de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien en tant que paysage culturel vivant. L'Etat partie et les communautés locales ont pris les mesures nécessaires pour le préserver. Elle soutient donc l'inscription du bien pour manifester le soutien du Comité aux communautés locales.

La Délégation du **Mali** rappelle que les éléments d'information sollicités par l'ICOMOS ont bien été fournis par l'Etat Partie à l'organisation consultative qui les a appréciés. L'incapacité de vérifier les informations ne constitue pas un argument suffisant pour justifier la non inscription du bien. En réponse aux requêtes formulées par le Comité, l'Etat Partie a élaboré un plan de gestion et pris des mesures réglementaires, par conséquent, le site mérite d'être inscrit.

The Delegation of **Brazil** was convinced that it was perhaps not the best situation but that the attributes for (criteria (iii) and (v)) were provided for inscription. It was convinced that the State Party had done everything that was requested of it. It supported this inscription and the recommendation of the Delegation of Mali and wished the State Party to consider the minor boundary modification.

ICOMOS indicated that minor boundaries mentioned by the Delegation of Brazil were a modification of the property. It stressed that since there was no mission, it would be difficult for it to assess the degree of modification of the property which it had not seen.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** said that from its understanding of the 1972 *World Heritage Convention*, the international community was called on to protect properties regardless of the capacity of the State Party. It underlined that the State Party of Ethiopia had

provided adequate information on the boundaries and on the management plan. It therefore supported the recommendation made by the Delegation of Mali.

The Delegation of **Sweden** stressed its position for referral of this property and requested a vote by secret ballot on this matter.

The **Chairperson** pointed out that the Committee Members first needed to consider the proposal further to the initial text of the Decision and noted the objections put forward by the Delegations of Switzerland and Sweden.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the Delegation of Switzerland's support of the Delegation of Sweden's request and indicated that the Committee will proceed with a vote by secret ballot.

The Delegation of **South Africa** underlined the need for greater consistency in evaluating nominations in terms of referral, deferral and missions.

ICOMOS stated that it was not aware of any missions in the case of referrals, and made reference to the rules and regulations of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The Delegation of **South Africa** pointed out the irregularity of combining a referral with a mission in the same Decision, with direct reference to the nominated property, The Causses and the Cévennes (France).

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested suspending the examination of this Item while the Secretariat prepares the ballots.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** demande que les Délégations de la Suède et de la Suisse acceptent, pour gagner du temps, de voter à main levée plutôt qu'au scrutin secret.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** requested clarification from the Legal Advisor on whether the voting procedure will be a two-thirds majority or a simple majority.

The **Legal Advisor** reiterated the practice of the Committee in the case of referral or deferral of a site that it is of a procedural nature, and confirmed that the process of a secret ballot would be simple majority. She pointed out that if the Committee decides that this is a matter covered by the *Convention* - and is of a substantive nature - there is the right to proceed to a vote.

The **Chairperson** reiterated that there has been no objection as to whether the matter is covered by the *Convention*, and that the issue of whether a two-thirds majority is required or not has been responded to.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported the request of the Delegation of Egypt to proceed with an open ballot.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the Legal Advisor's advice and that possible inscription is a matter covered by the *Convention*. It requested the Legal Advisor to provide the number of votes required for the motion, considering that the Delegation of Thailand is not present.

The **Legal Advisor** confirmed that the matter concerns inscription and therefore a two-thirds majority is needed. She stated that all the members would need to be present and voting, and thus providing the number of votes needed is hypothetical at this stage and would be counted at the end.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested that a table on the screen be provided for clarity should the case arise in the future, and that a summary of the process is provided following the final tally of results.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that there is no request from the Delegations of Switzerland and Sweden to withdraw their proposal and proceeded with a secret ballot. She concurred that the Secretariat is ready to distribute the ballots and that the Delegations of Mexico and Bahrain have offered to act as tellers.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the members will be voting on paragraph 2 as amended calling for the inscription of Konso Cultural Landscape on the World Heritage List under criteria (iii) and (v). She decided to proceed with the secret ballot. The Chairperson announce the results of the vote: 19 valid votes have been received and that a majority of 13 is needed. She read out the results of the ballot: one abstention, 5 negative, 14 affirmative. She declared paragraph 2 adopted as amended and thus the Konso Cultural Landscape was inscribed on the World Heritage List.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** souligne qu'au vu du résultat, le vote à main levée aurait été bienvenu puisqu'il permet de gagner du temps et que les membres du Comité ont le courage de s'exprimer sans se soumettre aux pressions.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the secret ballot was the decision of the Committee. She requested the provisional adoption of paragraph 3 with reference to adopting the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value.

The Delegation of **Brazil** noted that if the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value is provisional then it should be reflected in the text.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the text reads 'provisionally adopts'.

The **Secretariat** confirmed that the text should read 'takes note of the provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value'.

The **Chairperson** opened for review paragraph 3 as amended.

ICOMOS referred to the paragraph on integrity and authenticity, and requested that these elements be separated in concordance with previous Statements.

The **Chairperson** concurred that adjustments to the Statement on Outstanding Universal Value could be made later as it is a provisional Statement. The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.18** was adopted as amended. The Chairperson, on behalf of the World Heritage Committee, congratulated the State Party.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** thanked the World Heritage Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the World Heritage Centre, the Christensen Fund USA and the African World Heritage Fund. It reiterated the commitment of the Konso people in safeguarding and conserving the property.

The **Chairperson** announced that there has been some conclusion on Item 7A.22, Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, and invited Mr Mounir Bouchenaki to present this Item.

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan)

Item 7A.22: Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls (site proposed by Jordan) (C 148 rev)

M. Bouchenaki, Médiateur désigné par la Directrice générale, informe que la Directrice générale l'a chargé de travailler sur le texte de Décision concernant l'état de conservation de la Vieille ville de Jérusalem et ses remparts. Il n'est malheureusement pas arrivé à obtenir un consensus à propos du texte de projet de décision qui est présenté à l'attention du Comité. Il mentionne que le Secrétariat a déployé tous les efforts possibles pour travailler dans un esprit de dialogue et reste à la disposition du Comité sur le sujet.

The Delegation of **Jordan**, supported by the Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Iraq and Bahrein** requested a vote by show of hands without discussion.

The Delegation of **Mexico** requested to defer discussions on this Item.

The Delegation of **Australia** expressed its appreciation for the efforts of Mr. Bouchenaki and supported of the intervention by the Delegation of Mexico with regards to allowing more time for agreement on this matter. It emphasized the objective of operating by consensus and supporting the States Parties to come together.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the proposal of the Delegations of Australia and Mexico in favour of the postponement of the point.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte**, prenant la parole par point d'ordre, considère qu'il n'est plus nécessaire d'accorder davantage la parole aux membres du Comité puisque les positions sont assez claires à présent selon elle.

The **Chairperson** requested clarification from the Delegation of Egypt as to whether its intervention entails a question to the Legal Advisor.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** rappelle qu'il n'y a que deux choix possibles, à savoir soit examiner le projet selon l'ordre du jour, soit le reporter à plus tard. Elle considère qu'il n'y a pas besoin de demander l'avis de la Conseillère juridique.

The **Chairperson** recapitulated that the interventions involved two proposals to address the Item now, and at least two proposals for further postponement. In view of this, she proposed to proceed to a vote. She gave the floor to the Legal Advisor for any comment.

The **Legal Advisor** stated that she has nothing to add.

The **Chairperson** requested all Committee Members in favor of proceeding to the consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.22** at this stage to raise their name plates.

The Delegations of Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, China, United Arab Emirates, Cambodia, Nigeria, Ethiopia and Mali voted in favour of an immediate consideration of the Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.22** .

The Delegations of Brazil, Mexico, Australia, Switzerland, Sweden and Estonia voted against the consideration of Decision **35 COM 7A.22** now.

The Delegations of France, the Russian Federation and Barbados abstained.

The **Chairperson** stated that the vote constitutes a simple majority, and noted the results of the vote: 3 abstentions, 6 in favor of postponed consideration and 11 in favor of present consideration. She requested to move forward with the consideration of the Draft Decision which was distributed to the members of the Committee. .

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.22** was redistributed again to everyone in the room and requested the consideration of the Draft Decision put up on the screen for the adoption of each of its paragraphs beginning with paragraph 1.

La Délégation de **Jordanie** soutenue par les Délégations d'Irak, d'Egypt et des Emirats Arabes Unis, introduit un point d'ordre et demande l'adoption du Projet de Décision dans son ensemble.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.22** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** recognized the unique cultural, historical and religious significance of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls, in particular to the Islamic, Christian and Jewish faiths. It regarded the question of the sovereignty of Jerusalem as unresolved. It recognized that if the status of Jerusalem is an issue it should be addressed in the context of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. For this reason it had abstained when the Old City of Jerusalem and its walls was inscribed on the World Heritage List in 1981. It noticed the practice consisting for Decisions on the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls to be negotiated in this Committee and agreed between the relevant Parties and then adopted by consensus without debate. It strongly believed that it was the best approach and regretted that this was not possible on this

occasion. It proposed to address the points in the Decision that have not been agreed upon through mutual discussions as this was previously the case.

It concluded that the State Party of Australia would continue to strongly support all efforts to treat mutually agreed outcomes to preserve the authenticity and integrity of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls. [The Statement of the Delegation of Australia can be found *in extenso* in **Annex III** of this Document]

La Délégation de **Mexique** indique être en accord avec la Délégation de l'Australie.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that following extensive negotiations over the past days conducted through the able mediator Mr. Mounir Bouchenaki, it had presented an amendment by taking into consideration recent understandings with the State Party of Israel regarding non unilateral actions including non-unilateral actions in UNESCO itself.

It regretted that the Israeli authorities had presented a unilateral design for the access to the Mughrabi gate to the World Heritage Centre in May, even subsequent to the understanding between Jordan and Israel not to undertake any unilateral action on the ground or in UNESCO itself. The Delegation of Jordan indicated that it tried to coordinate positions through presentation of an amended draft based on the consensus language of the 34th session in Brasilia, 2010 and regretted that it could not succeed in coordinating positions. It therefore urged the support from the Committee Members in the adoption of this Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Brazil** regretted that despite commendable efforts of the Secretariat and particularly Mr Bouchenaki's, these negotiations did not reach a consensus between all Parties concerned. It believed in fostering dialogue between Parties and it regretted that this was not the case as compared to in the 34th session (Brasilia, 2010). It dissociated itself from parts of this Decision that were not in agreement with all Parties concerned but would, in its view, not be an obstacle to the adoption of a consensus Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** déplore le fait qu'un consensus n'a pas été trouvé comme en 2010 à Brasilia. Elle souligne le fait que la Suisse a toujours travaillé vers un consensus et a essayé de dépolitiser les débats au sein du Comité du patrimoine mondial. Elle soutient donc la déclaration de la Délégation de l'Australie.

The **Chairperson** declared that the speakers' list has come to an end and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Israel**.

The Observer Delegation of **Israel** said that it had tried to the best of its capacity to negotiate through the mediation services of Mr. Bouchenaki. It further added that the latter could attest that the Arab States Parties had refused to negotiate from the first day of this process. It further stated that on 21 June 2011, the States Parties of Israel and Jordan signed an agreement regarding the construction of the new Mughrabi Ascent. It underlined the fact that this clause is absent in the Decision. It said that it was not worth the time talking about the importance attached to the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls as a World Heritage property. It wished to affirm that politicized propaganda style resolutions would not affect the important conservation work. It confirmed that this conservation work would continue to be carried out in the Old City of Jerusalem and its

Walls for the benefit of Muslims, Christians and Jews alike. It stated that this would affect neither its cooperation with the State Party of Jordan according to the signed agreement nor its cooperation with the World Heritage Centre. It regretted that the Decision threatened the credibility of the *World Heritage Convention* and said that it wished that this could be avoided in the future.

The **Chairperson** then gave floor to the Observer Delegation of **Palestine**.

L'Observateur de la **Palestine** précise qu'il est extrêmement injuste de prétendre que la partie arabe et les parties palestinienne et jordanienne n'étaient pas disposées à négocier. Il exprime un sentiment d'amertume car aucune disposition, aucun article parmi les 1.100 promulgués après 5 ans d'efforts n'a trouvé d'application. Il demande instamment d'arrêter d'utiliser le terme de « politisation des débats » qu'il considère comme un terme d'accusation gratuite. Il insiste pour que l'on regarde de plus près la situation réelle car les populations locales sont confrontées quotidiennement dans la Vieille Ville de Jérusalem et ses Remparts, à des violations des conventions et des règles de l'UNESCO

The Delegation of **Jordan** wished to be very brief and reiterated the comments of the Observer of Palestine on being open for discussion. Furthermore, it also acknowledged the mediation efforts during the past days made by the Secretariat and the Ambassador of the United States of America to reach a consensus of all Parties but regretted that it failed. Despite efforts made by the Delegation of Jordan it was not the choice of Jordan to present a unilateral design of the Mughrabi Ascent, even after the agreement concluded on March 2011 to coordinate positions at UNESCO itself. The Delegation of Jordan had striven hard to pursue the State Party of Israel to withdraw its unilateral plans. It added that this was not only the decision of its country.

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

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

AFRICA (*Continuation*)

C.1.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	Fort Jesus, Mombasa
Id. N°	1295 Rev
State Party	Kenya
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)

ICOMOS introduced the Item as a referred back nomination to the State Party by the World Heritage Committee at its 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) to further develop the nomination dossier and expand its comparative analysis. It informed that the background information was available in Document WHC-11/35 COM/8B.Add. It pointed out the areas which still needed improvement and clarifications. In conclusion ICOMOS recommended that the examination of the nomination of Fort Jesus, Mombasa, Kenya should be deferred for similar reasons as those presented in the previous session.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendments to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 had been received from the Delegation of Nigeria.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs.

The Draft Decision **35COM 8.B.19** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson**, on behalf of the World Heritage Committee, congratulated the State Party on the inscription of the property and gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Kenya**.

The Observer Delegation of **Kenya** thanked the Committee.

ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Citadel of the Ho Dynasty
Id. N°	1358
State Party	Viet Nam
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS presented the information on the property nominated under criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv) and concluded that the nomination of the Citadel of Ho Dynasty should be deferred.

Le **Rapporteur** indique avoir reçu des amendements des Délégations de la Fédération de Russie, du Brésil, de la Jordanie, de l’Egypte, de la France, du Cambodge, des Emirats arabes unis, du Mali, de l’Irak, du Niger, de l’Ethiopie, de l’Afrique du sud, et de la Thaïlande. Il indique que ces amendements portent sur les paragraphes : 2, 3, 4 et 5.

La Délégation de la **France** reconnaît la grande qualité de ce bien et demande une clarification quant à ce qui constitue la singularité de la Citadelle de la Dynastie Hô par rapport aux autres structures similaires dans la région.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** demande davantage d'éclaircissements à propos de l'étude comparative.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** stated that the State Party had produced a work of quality and met certain criteria, in particular criteria (ii) and (v). It wished to receive additional information from the State Party in order to justify this.

The **Chairperson** then invited the Observer Delegation of **Viet Nam** to address the questions with respect to the comparative analysis and management plan, to be followed by ICOMOS to address these questions in turn.

The Observer Delegation of **Viet Nam** provided details with reference to the two questions addressed by the Delegations of France and Nigeria respectively on comparative analysis and management plan. It said that it had addressed all the issues concerning ICOMOS.

ICOMOS spoke on the main issues raised in its report, namely on the management plan, the development of a risk preparedness management strategy, which needed further clarifications from the State Party. Also, it informed that other features that revealed and conveyed the Outstanding Universal Value of the property were not included in the nomination file. It stated that therefore the management plan should also have been amended in view of that inclusion.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation**, according to its wish expressed previously, was invited to present its amendments. It stated that after having heard the position of ICOMOS, also after studying the materials submitted by the State Party of Viet Nam and the explanations it provided concerning the elimination of one paragraph, its Delegation submitted an amendment. It added that it believed that given the current status the integrity and authenticity of the property were fully met.

According to the Delegation of the Russian Federation, the only difference that remained with ICOMOS' requirements concerned the inclusion of boundary modifications proposed by ICOMOS in order to include the Imperial Way. It was of the view that this modification could be provided by the State Party at a later date. Its Delegation believed that the State Party and local authorities had satisfied all the criteria and conditions required to meet the recommendations of ICOMOS. Thus it was of the opinion that the property cannot be prevented from inscription on the World Heritage List. It therefore proposed the amendment submitted to the Secretariat.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraph 1 and Paragraph 2 were adopted.

Concernant le Paragraphe 3, la Délégation de la **Suisse** souligne l'insuffisance des éléments composant le bien et demande à ce que l'inscription soit différée.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that according to the wish expressed by the Delegation of Switzerland, its objections made to this draft decision would be recorded.

The Delegation of **Australia** spoke in favor of deferral, and stated that the Outstanding Universal Value of the property in the relationship with the nominated elements still remained to be demonstrated.

With respect to comments made by the Delegation of Switzerland, the Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that the message of the Committee to ICOMOS was very clear this time: ICOMOS reporting could be more in depth and its quality could be improved. Furthermore it insisted that sometimes ICOMOS recommends the inscription of certain nominated properties which do not fulfill the criteria. At the same time ICOMOS recommends the deferral of other nominated properties which perfectly comply with the criteria. Hence the message of the Committee to ICOMOS is very clear. In its report ICOMOS recognizes the importance and Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property and yet its report is not clearly demonstrative. It believed that the Committee should inscribe the nominated property and not decide a deferral. If taken a decision in favour of inscription would on the contrary accelerate the process to fulfill the requirements put up by ICOMOS experts.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its regret on the time constraints that limited a true debate on the amendment proposed. This point of view was supported by the **Chairperson**.

The Delegation of **Brazil** then proposed that the Committee session should extend from 10 to 15 days in the future. It was fully convinced that the property met with the criterion (iv) and had requested more debate on criterion (ii). Based on the report and recommendations from ICOMOS and the commendable work carried out by the State Party, it had expressed its intention, that this Decision should be discussed. However the Delegation of Brazil expressed the fact that it was not wishing to be an obstacle to the approval of the Decision. It concluded by supporting the amended paragraph .

The Delegation of **Estonia** quoted paragraph 78 of the *Operational Guidelines*. It further added that this text had to be applied at the time of inscription and not at a later date in the future. Conservation reports of premature inscriptions, not always against the advice of the Advisory Bodies, revealed that the monitoring of those sites continued for several years, and resulted in increased workload both for the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat. The Delegation of Estonia supported the position of the Delegation of Switzerland, namely in favour of a deferral.

La Délégation de l'**Egypte** approuve l'inscription de ce bien.

The **Chairperson** asked Committee Members for consideration of adoption of paragraph 3 as amended by the Delegation of the Russian Federation. Paragraph 3 was adopted. Paragraph 4 was revised with the same wording as read by the Secretariat earlier. The Chairperson then introduced the consideration of paragraph 5 as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B 29** was adopted as amended.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated the Observer Delegation of **Viet Nam**.

The Observer Delegation of **Viet Nam** thanked the Committee.

SEVENTH DAY – MONDAY, 27 JUNE 2011

FOURTEENTH MEETING

2 p.m. – 6 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST

The **Chairperson** moved to the adoption without debate of the following Draft Decisions concerning minors boundaries modifications:

Decision 35 COM 8B. 47	The Wadden Sea (Germany / The Netherlands)
Decision 35 COM 8B.48	Islands and Protected Areas of the Gulf of California (Mexico)
Decision 35 COM 8B.49	Kakadu National Park (Australia)
Decision 35 COM 8B.50	Le Morne Cultural Landscape (Mauritius)
Decision 35 COM 8B.51	Old City of Damascus (Syrian Arab Republic)
Decision 35 COM 8B.52	Melaka and George Town, Historic Cities of the Straits of Malacca (Malaysia)
Decision 35 COM 8B.54	Pilgrimage Church of Wies (Germany)
Decision 35 COM 8B.55	Abbey and Altenmünster of Lorsch (Germany)
Decision 35 COM 8B.56	Historic Centre of Naples (Italy)
Decision 35 COM 8B.58	Humberstone and Santa Laura Saltpeter Works (Chile)

These Decisions on minor boundary modifications were adopted.

The Chairperson announced the examination of the Draft Decisions **35 COM 8B. 46** and **35 COM 8B.59** concerning **Selous Game Reserve (United Republic of Tanzania)** and the **Maya Site of Copan (Honduras)** respectively will be examined at a later stage.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Australia who introduced Mr. Lee, an Aboriginal traditional owner, who expressed his happiness about Decision **35 COM 8B.49** on a minor boundary modification which led to the inclusion of the Koongarra project area into boundaries of the World Heritage property of Kakadu National Park (Australia).

Mr. Jeffrey Lee, senior traditional owner of the Djok (Gundjeihmi) gave his statement to the World Heritage Committee which was translated into English:

“I would like to thank the World Heritage Committee for inscribing Koongarra, my country, on the World Heritage List. Thank you for talking about this and for listening to my words. I have waited a very long time for this to happen and it comes as a very happy feeling for me to see all of us looking after this place.

I am supported by all the Bininj clans of Kakadu and most particularly by neighbouring clans such as the Mirarr people, through their representative body the Gundjeihmi Aboriginal Corporation, representatives of which are here with me at this meeting.

I want to ensure that the traditional laws, customs, sites, bush tucker, trees, plants and water at Koongarra stay the same as when they were passed on to me by my father and great-grandfather. Inscribing the land at Koongarra as World Heritage is an important step in making this protection lasting and real”.

The **Chairperson** showed herself humbled by the trust Aboriginal People to share the protection of this area with the Committee. She thanked them for their presence and for addressing the Committee in their traditional language.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

C.2 ARAB STATES

C.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Pearling, testimony of an island economy
Id. N°	1364
State Party	Bahrain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)

ICOMOS presented the property as the best-known source of pearls since ancient times. It is a serial nomination of 15 components consisting of three Oyster Beds, Bū Māhir Seashore & Qal’at Bū Māhir Fortress and Muharraq City consisting of 17 buildings. ICOMOS illustrated each of the components and offered some detailed information of some houses as Al-Alawi House, Fakhro House, Murad House, Siyadi complex and others. It stated that buildings have been poorly maintained since the collapse of the pearl industry in the 1930s. It appreciated the detailed nomination dossier, but regretted that it had not been shown how the property is specific in the region. The authenticity has been met, but there is a threat to authenticity. ICOMOS confirmed that criteria (iii) and (v) are met but indicated that further details on conservation analysis are needed. It was impressed by the collaboration with the local community, but however considered that further details are needed on the proposed conservation work.

Its recommendation is to defer the nomination in order to allow the State Party to address the points raised on conservation, provide a more detailed comparative analysis with sites that have tangible heritage elements of pearling in the Gulf Region and to consider the possibility of a trans-boundary, serial nomination.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that there were amendments from the Delegation of Sweden on paragraphs 2 and 3 and from the Delegation of Australia on paragraphs 2, 3 and 4.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** sought clarification from the State Party as regards the perimeter of the boundaries of the nominated property. It asked whether these boundaries would include all archaeological remains.

The Delegation of **Brazil** acknowledged ICOMOS for its report and presentation. It asked the State Party about its management strategy, including the relation with the local community. It wish to obtain information from ICOMOS on whether a mission will be needed. It concluded by asking the Delegation of Bahrain if a serial nomination was envisaged, gathering consensus with other countries in the region.

The Delegation of **Jordan** recalled that the nomination proposed for inscription counts a great number of important buildings, which not only have Outstanding Universal Value but are also particularly significant of the rich social diversity of the pearl industries. While fully supporting the inscription of the proposed property, it asked the State Party whether an inventory of the buildings had been prepared and sought clarification on the calendar of restoration works.

The Delegation of **Sweden** acknowledged the Delegation of Bahrain for this highly interesting nomination. It asked the State Party if the comparative analysis was taken in consideration when selecting this centre of pearling. It wished to obtain information from ICOMOS on whether a trans-boundary nomination is necessary at this point or if it could be nominated later as an extension. It was of the opinion that the referral of this nomination is the right decision and that this file would easily pass on the next session.

The Delegation of **Egypt** emphasized the fact that pearling was historically very important and influenced the Arab community. It supported the inscription of the nominated property.

The Delegation of **Australia** asked the State Party whether a comparative analysis and a positive conservation approach would be acceptable in the framework of a referral. It supported a referral.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** acknowledged both the Delegation of Jordan and ICOMOS respectively for the questions and for the evaluation report. It clarified that the conservation and restoration works have been conducted along three main axes of intervention: the preservation of the original broader urban fabric; the architectural restoration of all relevant buildings; and the renovation of the stucco and other decorative elements. It also confirmed that all planned works are being finalized. To respond to the questions raised by the Delegations of Sweden and Australia about a comparative analysis, it stated that it had collected many data about the oyster activity, boats and the pearling centre as well as data about the exports, etc. The Delegation acknowledged the recommendations made by ICOMOS, although it had started comparing the buildings with other cities in the Gulf. The selected houses represent the

whole community that lived there over the whole period of the oyster industry. It added that it is difficult to witness this in any of the living cities in this region. Concerning the extension of Bū Māhir Fort site, it stated that it had arranged the inclusion of this into the nominated property and therefore is following ICOMOS' recommendation precisely.

ICOMOS answered the question raised by the Delegation of Brazil about a mission, which was not considered as necessary, if it would only concern the minor boundary modifications. ICOMOS had proposed a deferral because it considered that the Outstanding Universal Value had not been proven. The pearling industry had several centres and Muharraq was representing only one phase in its history. If there are different phases, perhaps a serial nomination would be more appropriate and would put the ensemble of Muharraq compared to other buildings in other parts of the region. It recognized that work had been undertaken in this respect. As the buildings under consideration are fragile, there is a need for a conservation report on how the interventions would be made. Answering the question raised by the Delegation of Sweden, ICOMOS was of the opinion that the deferral of this nomination could be seen as a first step to a more solid nomination. It confirmed that in its view further analysis is needed at this stage.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph Paragraph 1 was adopted.

The Delegations of **Jordan, Egypt, United Arab Emirates** and **Iraq** indicated they were in favor of the inscription of this unique site.

The Delegation of **Egypt** clarified that it is supporting the inscription with some reasons. It could talk at length about the history of Bahrain and the importance of this site with regard to connections between India and Mesopotamian countries. It was of the opinion that this is one of the greatest sites and that the pearling industry is going back to the history of this site.

The **Chairperson** thanked for these clarifications and moved to consideration of the amendment proposed by the Delegations of Egypt, Jordan, the United Arab Emirates and Iraq. She wished to know under which cultural criteria the site should be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that although it felt a great temptation to inscribe the property, on the nomination of which they had worked on for the last years, with all support from the community and stakeholders from Bahrain, it felt that ICOMOS did a great job to evaluate the property. The Delegation informed that it received instructions from the Minister of Culture, Her Excellency Sheikha Mai bint Mohammed Al Khalifa, who was of the view that the State Party of Bahrain needs to do extra work on the nomination file. It added that this will show its respect to the *Operational Guidelines* and reinforce the credibility of the *World Heritage Convention*. The Delegation will take the nomination file back and promises, with the help of the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies, that it will come back with a complete nomination file at the next Committee session.

The **Chairperson** showed its great support for this decision and commended the courage and commitment that the State Party of Bahrain had shown. She looked forward to receive the nomination file next year.

Paragraphs 2 was adopted as amended. Paragraph 3 was adopted.

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections for the adoption of paragraph 4.

ICOMOS clarified that if it concerns a referral it is not possible to recommend an expert mission, but an advisory mission would be possible. This was accepted by the Delegations of **Sweden** and **Bahrain**.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.20** was adopted as amended.

Property	Ancient villages of Northern Syria
Id. N°	1348
State Party	Syrian Arab Republic
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(iv)(v)

L'ICOMOS explique qu'il s'agit d'une nomination en série d'une quarantaine de villages antiques, au nord-ouest de la Syrie qui ont été abandonnés au cours des VIIIe-Xe siècles. Ils possèdent toujours une grande partie de leurs monuments et constructions d'origine, dans un remarquable état de conservation : maisons d'habitation, temples païens, églises et sanctuaires chrétiens, monuments funéraires, thermes, édifices publics, bâtiments aux fonctions économiques et artisanales, etc. Regroupés au sein de huit parcs archéologiques, l'ensemble forme une série de paysages culturels reliques uniques et exceptionnels. L'intégrité architecturale s'exprime de manière satisfaisante et les biens ont une extension suffisante ; toutefois, la tendance récente d'une réoccupation agricole du massif calcaire pourrait affecter l'intégrité du bâti de certains villages ainsi que les paysages associés. Les biens et leurs paysages ont gardé un haut degré d'authenticité et la dynamique de la protection légale est bien orientée. L'ICOMOS recommande l'inscription des Villages antiques du Nord de la Syrie (République Arabe Syrienne) en tant que paysage culturel sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial sur la base des critères (iii), (iv) et (v).

The **Chairperson** opened the discussion on Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.23** was adopted.

The Observer Delegation of the **Syrian Arab Republic** thanked the Committee for its professionalism, neutrality and conscientiousness. It stated that as per now the Syrian Arabic Republic has 7 sites inscribed in the World Heritage List. It considered this day as an historic day for the communities living in the sites. It recalled the exceptional history of the country and the fact that the inscription was the result of major efforts led by experts from France, ICOMOS and UNESCO.

On behalf of the Committee the **Chairperson** asked the State Party to transmit to the people of the 14 villages its great pleasure of having joined the celebration and conservation of the World Heritage of Humanity.

ITEM 9A EVALUATION OF THE GLOBAL STRATEGY AND THE PACT INITIATIVE

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/9A*
 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.9A

Decisions: **35 COM 9A**

The **Chairperson** asked the States Parties to refrain from debating on this Item and to send in writing their comments to the Secretariat before 1 August 2011, in order to integrate them into the report that will be presented and debated during the 18th General Assembly. She then gave the floor to the Representative of the Cour des Comptes, the External Auditor of UNESCO.

M. Hervé-Adrien Metzger (Cour des Comptes) présente le rapport final de l'Audit de la Stratégie globale et de l'initiative PACTe [*la présentation complète de Mr Metzger figure en **Annexe I** du présent document*]

The **Chairperson** thanked the team of Auditors for the rigor of their analysis and the explicit indicators for the improvement of the organization of work and the reach of the objectives of the *Global Strategy*.

No objection was made regarding adoption of the Draft Decision **35 COM 9A**.

The Delegation of **Australia** requested to make public the comments sent by the States Parties before the 18th session of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** transmitted the message of the Director of the World Heritage Centre regarding the availability of the documents four weeks before the General Assembly.

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

ARAB STATES

C.2.1 New Nominations

Property	Cultural Sites of Al Ain (Hafit, Hili, Bidaa Bint Saud and Oases Areas)
Id. N°	1343
State Party	United Arab Emirates
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(iii)(iv)(v) + CL

L'ICOMOS explique que les sites culturels d'Al Aïn (Hafit, Hili, Bidaa Bint Saud et les oasis) est un bien en série témoignant d'une très ancienne sédentarisation à partir du Néolithique dans un milieu désertique présentant des vestiges de nombreuses cultures protohistoriques. Parmi ces vestiges, on trouve des tombes circulaires en pierre (vers 2.500 avant J.-C.), des puits et une série de constructions en terre crue : des constructions résidentielles, des tours, des palais et des bâtiments administratifs. Hili présente par ailleurs l'un des plus anciens exemples d'aflaj, un système sophistiqué d'irrigation datant de l'Age de bronze. Le bien apporte un important témoignage de la transition dans la région, passée d'une culture de la chasse et de la cueillette à la sédentarisation. L'ICOMOS propose de différer l'examen de la proposition d'inscription afin de permettre à l'État partie de premièrement revoir la définition du bien et la sélection et l'identification des éléments formant la série afin de permettre la détermination de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien; deuxièmement d'étendre l'analyse comparative des sites protohistoriques aux Émirats Arabes Unis, à Oman et à la région ; troisièmement de clarifier la situation de la propriété publique au sein du bien ainsi que celle de la propriété privée ; quatrièmement de promulguer la nouvelle loi sur la protection, la conservation, la gestion et la promotion du patrimoine culturel. ICOMOS considère que toute proposition d'inscription révisée devra être étudiée par une mission qui se rendra sur le site.

Le **Rapporteur** présente les amendements des Délégations de l'Égypte, de la Jordanie, de l'Irak et du Nigéria qui portent sur les paragraphes 2 et 3.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** expressed its acknowledgements to the State Party of the United Arab Emirates for the comprehensive nomination file and pointed out the diversity of components in this site and its exceptionality. It recognized that the management of the property is a challenge and that the State Party has put a huge effort on this matter. It also asked the State Party to clarify and update the work done in relation to the management plan of the property.

The Delegation of **Jordan** stated that a prominent Jordanian archaeologist has studied this property and recognized the value of the property. It explained that local and international teams worked on the uncovering of these important archaeological remains which increase the understanding of the fourth and third millennium B.C. in the region. It also pointed out that the property is an excellent example of a new phenomenon which includes notably the development of water systems. The Delegation recognized the accomplishment of the State Party regarding the training of local people, the management, and the restoration projects. It also pointed out that this is the first nomination submitted by this State Party and invited the Committee to encourage it.

The Delegation of **Brazil** congratulated the State Party for the work accomplished and asked about the status of the management system.

The Delegation of **Egypt** pointed out that this property is a very important site with different cultural layers starting at the early Bronze Age. It also expressed its admiration for the tombs which were constructed at the same period as the Egyptians ones and are unique in their design and inscriptions. The Delegation stated that the only protection to be provided to this site is to inscribe it on the World Heritage List and ensure that the State Party is willing to conform in every way with the requests formulated by ICOMOS.

The Delegation of **Mexico** mentioned the excellent water management system derived from the Persian qanaat system which was first brought to the Arab region and then later transmitted to the Americas. It was of the view that this property would certainly enrich the World Heritage List. It concluded by asking the State Party to clarify a few issues regarding the recommendations made by ICOMOS, in particular public property.

The Delegation of **Estonia** was in favour of keeping the original Draft Decision consisting in the deferral of this nomination.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** acknowledged the recommendations made by ICOMOS. It was of the opinion that the couple of issues raised by ICOMOS can be resolved easily. Besides it believed in the undeniable Outstanding Universal Value of this property and added that Bronze Age and Iron Age had continuity until today.

It set both a legal and an institutional framework to adopt the approach with the cultural landscape definition. It informed that the efforts towards this legal and institutional framework began in 2003 in the definition of the protected area and the management of this property. The Abu-Dhabi province government is strongly committed to its protection through the mechanism put forward for this purpose. Besides the overarching strategy, it informed that each archaeological site counts a management and conservation plan. Public and private property, all of the important archaeological sites are owned by the government. Private properties are governed by management plan and this management plan is incorporated into the master plan.

L'**ICOMOS** indique que son évaluation se veut constructive. Il indique que la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle est dans le cas présent dispersée et peu claire. Néanmoins, il existe une chance de prouver cette Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle dans les éléments appartenant à la préhistoire et la proto-histoire. L'un des problèmes est le lien qui doit

être fait entre ces deux périodes de l'histoire, qui est cependant un attelage important dont la preuve doit être apportée.

C'est dans ce sens qu'il est recommandé de différer de la proposition d'inscription, tout en reconnaissant qu'il s'agit d'un vrai sujet de recherche dans lequel l'Etat partie est encouragé à s'investir. L'ICOMOS conclut en recommandant à l'Etat partie à faire de l'attelage protohistoire –préhistoire un noyau pour la recherche complémentaire à apporter au dossier d'inscription.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commented that in relation with comments made by ICOMOS, it had a good knowledge of the nominated property and therefore wished to draw the attention that there are indeed archaeological remains in this property dating back to the Pyramids period in Egypt.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** ne conteste pas le potentiel de ce bien, mais indique qu'elle ne peut pas encourager cette inscription en l'état. Elle soutient donc la conclusion de l'ICOMOS de différer l'inscription.

The Delegations of **Australia** and **Sweden** supported the deferral

The Delegation of **Egypt** noted that the recommendation of deferral is based on the integrity of the property. According to this recommendation, the nominated property has the integrity. Thus it deemed that the integrity issue was perhaps not sufficiently demonstrated. It concluded by suggesting that the Committee enquires about the methodology used to evaluate this property.

The **Chairperson** explained the new amendment received from the Delegation of Egypt which proposes criteria (iii), (iv) and (v) and deletes criterion (i). She asked whether there is any objection to adopt the Draft Decision as amended.

The Delegations of **Estonia and Sweden** expressed their objection to this proposal.

The **Secretariat** pointed out that currently there is no Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for this property

The **Chairperson** proposed that while preparing the proposed Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, the Committee moves on to adopt this Decision.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.24** was adopted as amended. The Chairperson, on behalf of the Committee congratulated the State Party of the United Arab Emirates on the inscription of its property on the World Heritage List.

The Chairperson then gave the floor to the State Party.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** stated that it is an honour for the United Arab Emirates to have received the trust of the Committee. The inscription of the Cultural Sites of Al Ain (Haft, Hill, Bidaa Bint Saud and Oasis Areas) provides the opportunity to acknowledge all Committee members. It also appreciated the position of certain States Parties that considered premature to inscribe the property on the World

Heritage List. It concluded by recognizing that the inscription represents a great responsibility which will lead to multiple changes for the State Party in its conservation policy.

ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1 New Nominations

Property	The Persian Garden
Id. N°	1372
State Party	Iran
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(vi)

The **Chairperson** requested ICOMOS to present the nominated property.

ICOMOS proceeded with the presentation of the nominated property submitted under criteria (i),(ii),(iii),(iv),(vi).

The Rapporteur indicated that several amendments were received regarding the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.26** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of the **Islamic Republic Iran** expressed its gratitude to the Committee, ICOMOS and the Secretariat. The Persian Garden shows masterpieces of human evolution and represents a physical and symbolic paradise made by humans in harmony with nature. It concluded by noting that the integrity of the property has been maintained through its continuous use.

The **Chairperson** agreed that it is the privilege of the Committee to examine such wonderful properties.

Property	Yapese Stone Money Sites in Palau and Yap
Id. N°	1340
State Party	Micronesia / Palau
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

L'**ICOMOS** présente le bien proposé pour inscription sous les critères (i), (ii),(iii) et (iv)

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that this nomination is the first in its kind. It added that it is all the more appreciated as the nomination comes from tiny islands such as

Micronesia and Palau. It concluded by adding that it wishes to listen to the Observers Delegations to explain their views on the inventory issues, which are questioned by ICOMOS in its presentation.

The Delegation of **Brazil** questioned about the boundaries of the nominated property.

The Delegation of **Barbados** considered that the nomination dossier is well prepared. It wished to obtain additional information regarding the management plan and concluded by asking some information on what the State Party is doing to address the various issues raised by ICOMOS.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Micronesia**.

The Observer Delegation of **Micronesia**: explained that various inventories were made, in particular a significant one in the region of Yap. However, it admitted that there is still a lot to be achieved. It informed that the management plan is being elaborated and that within this exercise it would see whether there would be need to revise the boundaries or not. It concluded by informing that a number of activities are being carried out currently to provide additional protection to the elements of the nominated property.

L'**ICOMOS** note avec satisfaction que les inventaires sont en cours et encourage vivement l'Etat partie car ceux-ci sont indispensables. L'**ICOMOS** prend également note de l'évolution en ce qui concerne les limites. En revanche, il est d'avis que la question de la preuve de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle demeure à établir. L'**ICOMOS** conclut en proposant son aide à l'Etat partie s'il le souhaite.

La Délégation de la **France** souhaite s'associer à la proposition d'aide proposée par l'**ICOMOS**, sachant que c'est le premier dossier de proposition d'inscription de l'Etat partie de la Micronésie. Elle se dit disposée à promouvoir ce type de coopération dont le but est l'inscription des biens sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the Delegation of France for its encouraging words to States Parties.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.27** was adopted.

Property	Petroglyphic Complexes of the Mongolian Altai
Id. N°	1382
State Party	Mongolia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii) + CL

The **Chairperson** informed that the amendment from the Delegation of Brazil was not translated yet. The Chairperson decided to suspend the consideration of this nomination to allow the translation of the amendment proposed.

C.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.1 New Nominations

Property	Cultural Landscape of the Serra de Tramuntana
Id. N°	1371
State Party	Spain
Criteria proposed by State Party	(ii)(iv)(v)(vi) + CL

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nominated property submitted as a cultural landscape under criteria (ii) (iv) (v) and (vi). **ICOMOS** indicated that it had asked about an extension of boundaries. Thus it wished to listen to clarifications from the State Party. In particular it wished to know where are the areas of the extension and why do they need to be included.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** interroge l'ICOMOS sur l'extension du périmètre qui serait nécessaire aux yeux de l'organisation consultative pour pouvoir y inclure les éléments hydrologiques. Elle ajoute qu'elle souhaite savoir quels sont ces éléments et pourquoi ils devraient être inclus dans le périmètre de ce bien.

The Delegation of **Brazil** shared its reflection from a State Party's perspective. With regard to criteria (iv) and (v), it asked whether the State Party could elaborate more especially with regard to the issues linked with the hydrological elements.

The Delegation of **China** wished to know if the State Party believed it will be able to meet the requirements in order to evaluate the evolution of the irrigation systems.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that cultural landscapes should be protected by international cooperation. It also wished to raise the issue of urban development

threatening the fragility of the site and uncontrolled property speculation. It congratulated the State Party to have drawn the attention of the Committee on these issues. The Delegation of Mexico felt that this is an opportunity for the Committee. It concluded by indicating that it is convinced about the evidence of the Outstanding Universal Value of the nominated property.

ICOMOS indicated that the studies were not convincing to attest the Outstanding Universal Value. It wished to know more about the conclusions drawn from the State Party following its comparative analysis.

The Delegation of **Jordan** asked whether there was scientific evidence about the hydrological elements from the Arab period.

La Délégation du **Mali** interroge l'ICOMOS à propos des impacts éventuellement mesurés dûs aux changements d'activités économiques sur ce site.

The Delegation of **South Africa** questioned the agricultural activities of the site and wished to know from ICOMOS about the agricultural aspects of this site.

The Observer Delegation of **Spain** first thanked the Advisory Bodies for their work. It wished to inform the Committee that it had prepared the work to present this site in cooperation with four universities from four different countries. It added that the nomination dossier had been elaborated together with ecological organizations and local communities. It was of the opinion that this Cultural Landscape needs to be protected. It reiterated that the nomination dossier was based on studies from the scientific community. It informed that the boundaries of this property could be extended according to the recommendations of ICOMOS. However it was of the view that the current boundaries seemed appropriate since they included elements from both Islamic and Christian influences. The protection of the property can be extended even beyond the boundaries and could include the orchard areas. It agreed with the recommendations expressed in the Draft Decision and thanked ICOMOS before confirming that additional information can be made available.

La Délégation poursuit en confirmant que pas moins de 29 sites avaient été comparés, ce qui à son avis confirme la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Un consortium pour la protection du site a été mis en place, des plans de gestion et d'aménagement du territoire, des routes touristiques et d'aménagement de toute l'île ont été créés et mis en place. En Espagne, la déclaration du site comme étant d'intérêt culturel a été rendue possible grâce à la forme du site qui répond à un système en mosaïque. Ce découpage en petits lots démontre l'influence islamique sur ce bien. La délégation indique que cette documentation a été mise à la disposition de l'ICOMOS et qu'elle pourrait l'être aussi pour le Comité.

ICOMOS could not understand from the information delivered why these elements are included. The map that was provided refers to other hydrological elements. It believed that the arrangement of the land, the articulation of the dossier and the role of the Islamic civilization are not clearly related to the area presented. It acknowledged the information received but was of the opinion that it did not clearly conduct to justify the criteria. It concluded by stating that in the nomination dossier, some areas are used for agriculture but that buffer zone areas are used for tourism.

The **Chairperson** indicated that, in paragraph 2, the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Jordan is to inscribe the site while the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Egypt is to refer the nomination. The Chairperson asked if the Committee was prepared to consider the adoption of paragraph 2, on the basis of criteria (ii), (iv), (v) and (vi).

The Delegations of **Australia** and **Sweden** expressed the opinion that the State Party has not addressed the fundamental issues raised by ICOMOS. Thus the Delegation of Australia stated that it was not in favour of adopting paragraph 2 as amended by Jordan.

The Delegation of **Mexico** stated that it is in favour of the inscription. It requested to strike out criterion (vi) and informed that clarifications on criterion (vi) are needed. The delegation supported by the Delegation of Jordan, confirmed that it propose an amendment to exclude criteria (vi).

The **Chairperson** asked if there were any objections in adopting the criteria (ii), (iv) and (v). As there was none she declared, the Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.34** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** indicated that with regard to this Decision the full description of the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value was available in English but not yet in French. Hence for the moment it announced that the text would remain in brackets until it is adopted during the 36th Committee session in 2012.

Property	Prehistoric Pile dwellings around the Alps
Id. N°	1363
State Party	Switzerland, Austria, France, Germany, Italy, Slovenia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v)

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the nomination which was submitted under criteria (iii) and (v).

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.35** was adopted.

La **Présidente**, au nom du Comité, félicite le groupe d'Etats parties ayant soumis cette proposition d'inscription.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie la Présidente, le Comité et les personnes qui sans relâche ont travaillé sur cette proposition d'inscription.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie la Délégation de la Suisse de l'avoir associée à ce projet. Elle se déclare heureuse de cette inscription.

Property	Selimiye Mosque and its social Complex
Id. N°	1366
State Party	Turkey
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of this nomination submitted under criteria (i), (ii), (iii) and (iv).

ICOMOS présente les informations relatives à la proposition d'inscription au Comité. Il souligne par ailleurs que, alors que les critères (i) et (iv) sont pleinement satisfaits, il n'en est pas de même pour les critères (ii) et (iii). ICOMOS propose donc d'inscrire le bien sur la base des critères (i) et (iv) uniquement.

The **Chairperson** requested consideration of the Draft Decision on the basis of criteria (i) and (iv). The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.37** was adopted. She then gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Turkey**.

The Observer Delegation of **Turkey** informed that its country was very pleased. It explained that this Decision was recognition of the work of the renowned architect Sinan. It ensured that all issues raised by ICOMOS would be addressed with utmost care. The site manager took the floor and said that he would continue cooperating with the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies to ensure the preservation of the site.

On behalf of the Committee, the **Chairperson** congratulated the States Parties on this inscription of this amazing site and the commitment of the site manager to ensure that all the requirements would be met.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that there were still five nominations to consider on the next day.

EIGHTH DAY – TUESDAY, 28 JUNE 2011

FIFTEENTH MEETING

10 a.m. – 1.30 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

New Nominations

Property	Residence of Bukovinian and Dalmatia Metropolitans
Id. N°	1330
State Party	Ukraine
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)

ICOMOS presented its evaluation of the site. It concluded that the comparative analysis needed to be further developed, including by looking at other works from the architect. It concluded that the requirement for integrity has been met and that the conditions of authenticity could be met, but that there is a lack of description. It also stated that criteria (i), (ii) and (iii) had not been demonstrated and that criterion (iv) could also be met if the comparative analysis was developed in this regard. It concluded that the requirements for boundaries and protection were sufficient and also that the management system was adequate. It recommended to further develop visitor facilities and tourism management, to include this as part of the management plan and finally to defer this nomination.

Le Rapporteur indique que des amendements ont été proposés par les Délégations de l’Egypte, l’Ethiopie, la Jordanie, les Emirats Arabes Unis et la Fédération de Russie sur les paragraphes 2, 3 et 4.

The Delegation of **Estonia** referred to the importance of the 19th century architecture, which is currently underrepresented in the World Heritage List. It recommended to look at this architecture in Central Europe. It mentioned that a large part of this architecture was demolished during World War II. It referred to another important example in Romania, which could be interesting for the World Heritage List in the future. It noted the evaluation of ICOMOS which concluded that the Outstanding Universal Value was not demonstrated and that the comparative analysis had not been sufficient. It agreed with the proposal for deferral of the nomination.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia**, supported by the Delegation of **Switzerland**, did not support the proposed amendments on paragraph 2.

The Delegation of **Estonia** objected the use of criterion (i), which was not even included in the initial nomination file. It also did not agree with the other amendments proposed to paragraph 2.

Paragraph 2 , 3 and 4 were adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.38** was adopted as amended.

The Chairperson informed that she received a provisional Statement of Outstanding Universal Value which was being included in the Draft Decision. She added that there had been a proposal for a brief synthesis, statements for criteria (ii), (iii) and (iv), integrity and authenticity and a text on the management and protection requirements.

The **Chairperson**, on behalf of the Committee, congratulated the State Party and requested it to convey the congratulations of the Committee to the People of Ukraine.

La Délégation de l'**Ukraine** (Observateur) se réjouit de cette décision. Elle remercie l'ICOMOS, le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les experts pour le travail réalisé au cours des quatre dernières années. Consciente des responsabilités qui lui incombent désormais, elle s'engage à mettre en œuvre cette Décision et remercie les Etats parties pour leur soutien et leur confiance.

C.3 ASIA / PACIFIC

C.3.1 New Nominations

Property	Petroglyphic Complexes of the Mongolian Altai
Id. N°	1382
State Party	Mongolia
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii) + CL

ICOMOS presented the nomination, consisting of three sites, all of which are cultural landscapes. It mentioned graffiti, unplanned roads and mining to be the main threats to the site and referred to the lack of information (inventory). It concluded that the comparative analysis was adequate and that conditions of integrity and authenticity had

been met. It also concluded that criterion (iii) had been met, but criteria (i) and (ii) were not. It agreed with the proposed boundaries, but added that the protection of the site needs to be strengthened. It recommended deferral of the nomination, mainly in order to address mining issues and the need for a detailed inventory. It concluded by indicating that this recommendation did not mean that the property had no Outstanding Universal Value.

The **Chairperson** called to proceed with the consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.28**.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that amendments were received from Australia for paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5. Another amendment had been proposed by the Delegation of Brazil regarding paragraphs 2, 3 and 4.

The Delegation of **Brazil** clarified that its proposal was for inscription based on criterion (iii) and not on criteria (i) and (ii). It requested that its amendment be presented as such. It congratulated the State Party and ICOMOS. It referred to the report by ICOMOS which states how the nomination fulfills all criteria as set out in the *Convention* as well as those requirements specified in the *Operational Guidelines*, including boundaries, management and protection. It requested the State Party to clarify what is being done with regard to management and conservation, and how it is addressing the mining issues.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** stated that according to ICOMOS these three sites are the largest, oldest and least damaged collection of rock art in the region. It referred to rock art being one of three thematic areas of the Prehistory World Heritage thematic programme. It confirmed that prehistoric sites are underrepresented in the World Heritage List. It also referred to the recommendation expressed by ICOMOS to prepare a database and suggested to provide International Assistance for this, as well as to search partnerships with international research centres specialized in rock art.

With regard to management, it referred to the geographically isolated location of the property, which lowered the risk. It also said that the State Party could continue to improve management provisions by next session. It asked the State Party when it was planning to ratify management agreements and how it would deal with the mining issue. It asked which of the possible Decisions by the Committee would be the best to help the State Party with preserving this property.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the proposal submitted by the Delegation of Brazil to inscribe the property. It also requested more information from ICOMOS regarding its evaluation that criterion (ii) had not been met. It also referred to the management issues. In conclusion it was of the opinion that the property should be inscribed.

The Delegation of **Egypt** said that such collection of rock art drawing representing hunting scenes is very important for human history. It added that these can be found everywhere in the world but that it had never seen a collection as significant as this one in Mongolia. It recommended inscribing the property. .

The Delegation of **Australia** endorsed the comments made by the Delegations of Egypt and Bahrain with regard to the significance of the property. It clarified its proposal to refer the nomination explaining that it was due to its exceptional character. It also requested further clarifications regarding management issues raised.

The Delegation of **China** referred to the evaluation made by ICOMOS which concluded that the site meets criterion (iii) and requires more work on integrity, authenticity and boundaries. It recommended the inscription of the property.

The Delegation of **Jordan** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Egypt for inscription of the property. It referred to rock art being a way of documenting before the existence of writing and telecommunication technologies. It said that ICOMOS was in its view falling into the trap of inventories and requested the State Party where it stands about its inventories.

The **Chairperson** requested the Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** to address the issues raised regarding management, mining and the establishment of a database on inventory.

The Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** clarified with regard to management that there is a management plan made by the relevant authorities which ICOMOS considered satisfactory. It said that mid and long term objectives for the conservation of the site had been included in the nomination file and that a management authority would be established under the Ministry of Culture, Education and Science. In the long term a panel of stakeholders was envisaged with governmental and non-governmental partners, and this possibility should be ratified in the near future. It also mentioned the strong support at the local level. It further referred to the new cultural heritage law which had been approved by the government prior to its adoption by the parliament which was still pending. It referred to new elements included in this law with regard to the protection of World Heritage, the protection of properties on the Tentative List for World Heritage and the provision for financing for protected properties. The Delegation further mentioned the USD 30,000 International Assistance Request which was allocated for the preparation of a database of inventory. With regard to unplanned roads and mining activities, it stated that a large part of the proposed property has been declared a National Park. In this case the national law forbids any unplanned roads or mining activities. It said that an extension of this national protection to cover the entire property would solve the issue. ICOMOS responded to the request with regard to its evaluation of criterion (ii) that it found it difficult to justify the property as an interchange of human values. It said that this had not been clearly enough demonstrated. It added that it did not consider that this aspect of the property made it stand out from similar sites in the region. It did say that it considered criterion (iii) to be fully met and that inscription only required one criterion. With regard to the threats to the property, it took note of the clarifications made by the State Party and its plans to extend the protection as National Park to the entire property.

ICOMOS also stressed that the area is very large and remote and that there was a big difference between having the necessary laws in place and implementing them. It thereby referred to most of the mining activities being illegal. It informed that it was aware of the International Assistance provided for the creation of the database, but stressed that this was a huge task, which would require more funds, and that this should be linked to other efforts in the Region. It also recommended that local communities

should be fully involved. It also referred to a large amount of data on the site being available outside of Mongolia which should be made available within Mongolia as well.

The **Chairperson** referred to the two proposed amendments to the Draft Decision. She summarized that the Delegation of Australia had proposed to refer the nomination and the Delegation of Brazil had proposed to inscribe the property. She said that the procedures required her to first consider the proposal furthest away from the Draft Decision, which in this case was the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil. She proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 was adopted.

The Delegation of **Australia** said to have outlined its position. However, it said not to be willing to vote, and added that if the Committee wanted to adopt the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil, it would withdraw its proposed amendment.

The Delegations of **Switzerland** and **Sweden** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.28** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Mongolia** after expressing its gratitude to the World Heritage Committee, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies explained that since ratifying the *World Heritage Convention* in 1990, Mongolia had devoted itself to its implementation. Therefore the inscription of the Petroglyph Complexes of the Mongolian Altai was important for Mongolia. It concluded by extending its invitation to visit the Altai region and experience the exceptional landscape and the hospitality of the Mongolian people.

On behalf of the World Heritage Committee the **Chairperson** also thanked the people of Mongolia for sharing the richness of their culture and environment with the rest of the world.

EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

C.4.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	The Causses and the Cévennes
Id. N°	1153 Rev
State Party	France
Criteria proposed by State Party	(iii)(v) + CL

ICOMOS presented the site and concluded by proposing referral to allow for a mission to the property to review the revised boundaries.

The **Rapporteur** informed the World Heritage Committee that he had received amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated ICOMOS and the State Party for having presented this marvelous site and pointed out that in France traces of all stages of human history can be found from Prehistory to the late Paleolithic. Therefore in its view this property should also be inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Delegation of **Mexico** also thanked the Advisory Body for the details provided and asked for clarification on the number of pending issues raised in the 2006 and 2009 referrals. It also shared the opinion that this property is outstanding, illustrating agro-pastoralism in a land which was not very fertile and which can be traced back to the Middle Ages. The Delegation asked the State Party to explain how it had reduced the boundaries and what were the criteria that allowed for this change.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that in its evaluation report, ICOMOS had considered the boundaries as satisfactory. Therefore it wished to know why ICOMOS proposed a mission to the property.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** also commended France on the amazing beauty of this agro-pastoral landscape which in its view would merit inscription on the World Heritage List. It asked to clarify the lack of integrity mentioned by ICOMOS report.

La Délégation du **Mali**, fait référence aux commentaires de l'ICOMOS concernant l'intégrité et la conservation du bien tels que mentionnés dans son rapport ; elle demande d'entendre le point de vue de l'Etat partie de la France sur ces questions.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** referred to the evaluation report of ICOMOS which does not recommend inscription without an expert mission to the property. The objective of this mission being the verification of the boundaries it asked the State Party to clarify which changes had occurred at the site in the last 5 to 6 years since the boundaries had been reduced.

The Delegation of **Jordan** wished the State Party to further clarify the issue on comparative pastoral landscapes.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** remercie l'ICOMOS pour son analyse. Elle considère que le site représente un exemple pertinent d'agropastoralisme dans le monde. Elle appuie l'inscription du site et indique que rien n'empêche la mission proposée par l'ICOMOS d'avoir lieu *après* l'inscription du bien. Cette position est appuyée également par la Délégation du Brésil.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** also concurred that the mission should not be a reason not to inscribe the property and felt that the State Party should not be deprived of this joy.

While echoing the observations made by the previous speakers the Delegation of **Barbados** asked the State Party to reply on the question already posed by the Delegation of Mexico regarding the boundaries and the management plan.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie l'ICOMOS pour la présentation de son rapport. En réponse à la question soulevée par la Délégation du Mexique, la Délégation de la France répond qu'il convient de noter en premier lieu que le point 5 du rapport de l'ICOMOS est plus positif puisqu'il estime que « les délimitations de la zone proposée pour inscription et de la zone tampon sont satisfaisantes ». Elle précise que la zone proposée pour inscription a été réduite de moitié par rapport aux propositions précédentes. Cette proposition résulte d'une analyse approfondie de la partie des Causses-Cévennes dans laquelle les paysages sont les plus représentatifs de la relation existant entre les systèmes agropastoraux et l'environnement biophysique local. C'est aussi celle dans laquelle les attributs du système agro-pastoral sont les plus denses, qui comprennent les drailles ou routes de transhumance. La Délégation de la France note que les zones où l'intégrité a été compromise, en particulier celles dans lesquelles de nouvelles constructions ont eu un impact négatif sur le paysage de l'agropastoralisme, ont été exclues du périmètre du bien. Elle précise par ailleurs que, dans un souci de bonne gestion, la zone proposée pour inscription couvre des parties du Parc national des Cévennes, du Parc naturel régional des Grands Causses et du Centre permanent d'initiatives pour l'environnement des Causses méridionaux, qui sont tous trois des organismes publics associant l'ensemble des autorités publiques concernées. Elle ajoute que le périmètre proposé correspond à cette double préoccupation de forte densité des attributs de l'agro-pastoralisme d'une part et de l'existence d'aires protégées d'autre part. Les limites précises du périmètre du bien sont systématiquement appuyées sur des voies de communication, en particulier des drailles, ou sur des éléments de relief fortement significatifs. Elle note que cette délimitation a été vérifiée et ajustée par une concertation avec les parties prenantes locales afin d'en garantir le bien fondé et la capacité de bonne gestion de la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle du bien.

En réponse à la question soulevée par la Délégation du Mali, la Délégation de la France mentionne que le rapport de l'ICOMOS conclut qu'il « considère que le bien proposé pour inscription remplit les conditions d'intégrité et d'authenticité », ce qui reflète une analyse plus positive de l'intégrité et l'authenticité du bien proposé. Elle précise que l'inventaire des attributs montre qu'ils sont de deux natures : les uns sont des attributs matériels, construits ou gérés par l'homme ; les autres, plus immatériels, sont liés étroitement à l'activité agropastorale. L'authenticité des premiers est attestée et leur intégrité garantie par les systèmes de protection en place dans le périmètre du bien, notamment les chartes des deux parcs, le Parc national des Cévennes et le Parc naturel régional des Grands causses. Des mesures de protection légale du patrimoine naturel et culturel ont été mises en place. La Délégation de la France ajoute que l'intégrité des attributs directement liés à l'activité agropastorale est assurée par des mesures spécifiques qui permettent de reconquérir des espaces et des milieux.

En réponse à la Jordanie, la Délégation de la France répond que l'agropastoralisme méditerranéen produit des paysages culturels dans tout le bassin méditerranéen, chacun possédant à la fois une familiarité et des singularités vis-à-vis des autres formes de pastoralisme. Elle ajoute qu'afin de permettre aux Etats parties concernés de mieux appréhender l'aspect patrimonial du pastoralisme, la France a organisé deux rencontres thématiques internationales d'experts, auxquelles le Centre du patrimoine mondial et les organisations consultatives ont participé. La première s'est tenue à Meyrueis (France) en 2007 et la deuxième à Tirana (Albanie) en 2009. Les recommandations de la rencontre de Meyrueis ont été présentées à l'occasion de la 33e session du Comité (Québec, 2008). Elle annonce qu'il est prévu d'organiser avant la fin de 2011 une

troisième rencontre. Le but de cette rencontre est justement de développer une meilleure connaissance et une appréciation globale des attributs et caractéristiques des paysages pastoraux, de leur diversité, et des composantes socioculturelles qui ont contribué à façonner les paysages des pourtours de la Méditerranée. Elle ajoute que l'inscription des Causses et des Cévennes sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial pourra ouvrir la voie à d'autres candidatures relatives aux paysages culturels de l'agropastoralisme portées par les Etats parties intéressés.

In response to the questions raised about the mission, **ICOMOS** replied that it was technically bound to evaluate what it can see. It was of the view that while the State Party had gone to great length to respond and address all the recommendations made by the World Heritage Committee, it was however technically difficult to evaluate solely on paper changes which have occurred over the past six years. Therefore a mission would be required.

The Delegation of **China** commended the State Party for the high quality of the nomination. It further noted that a mission would not be necessary before the inscription and therefore proposed that a paragraph should be added which invites a mission after the inscription on the World Heritage List.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

The **Chairperson** noted the discrepancy between the text proposed by the Delegation of Brazil and the original text prepared by ICOMOS concerning the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value. This Statement should be checked for concordance and amendments made if and when necessary. She also noted that the Statements of authenticity and integrity should be separated.

Paragraph 3 was adopted. Paragraph 4 was adopted as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.39** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie, au nom du gouvernement français, le Comité et les organisations consultatives d'avoir accompagné et conseillé la longue élaboration de la candidature des Causses et des Cévennes, considérant que l'agropastoralisme a sa place sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle ajoute que la France est particulièrement heureuse de l'inscription des Causses et des Cévennes, paysage culturel de l'agropastoralisme méditerranéen, affirmant que cette inscription est à la fois un honneur et une responsabilité. L'honneur est celui d'appartenir désormais au patrimoine mondial, famille de l'excellence et de l'exigence. La responsabilité est celle de protéger et gérer la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle des Causses et des Cévennes de manière exemplaire. Il s'agit aussi de mettre à la disposition de tous les États parties qui le souhaiteraient les acquis du dossier de proposition d'inscription afin que le pastoralisme trouve sa juste place dans la Liste du patrimoine mondial. Elle conclut en déclarant qu'en inscrivant les Causses et les Cévennes sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial, le Comité a donné enthousiasme et élan aux autorités locales qui s'impliqueront collectivement dans la protection et la gestion de ce vaste territoire.

La Délégation de la France demande l'autorisation de la Présidente d'accorder la parole à M. Jean Puech, ancien Ministre, représentant les autorités locales et régionales.

M. Puech se dit très heureux et touché par cette inscription. Il remercie la Présidente et les membres du Comité et continue en ajoutant que les habitants de ce territoire expriment leur profonde gratitude au Comité qui les a accompagnés dans leur démarche de reconnaissance. Ils en seront toujours reconnaissants. Il indique avoir une pensée profonde pour les générations qui nous ont précédés depuis des siècles et qui nous ont confié ce patrimoine reconnu de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle. Mr Puech souligne la nécessaire reconnaissance générations d'éleveurs dont la vie ne fut pas très facile. Il renouvelle l'engagement de la France, sa mobilisation pour que ce patrimoine soit une valeur de référence grâce à une gestion exemplaire et sa disposition à partager son expérience.. Mr Puech invite finalement le Comité à visiter le site.

The **Chairperson** also thanked the French authorities on behalf of the World Heritage Committee and asked the representatives to convey to the farmers who have protected and preserved this landscape for centuries her heartfelt congratulations for the inscription on the World Heritage List.

Property	Architectural work of Le Corbusier, an outstanding contribution to the Modern Movement
Id. N°	1321 Rev
State Party	France, Argentina, Belgium, Germany, Japan, Switzerland
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(vi)

ICOMOS explained its evaluation of the property and indicated that the property does not have the Outstanding Universal Value as a serial nomination and therefore recommends that the site is not inscribed as a serial property on the World Heritage List. ICOMOS noted that there might be a potential for an Outstanding Universal Value of the component parts of Villa Savoye and Gardener's House, Poissy, France, Unité d'habitation, Marseille, France and of the Chapel Notre-Dame-du-Haut, Ronchamp, France and encouraged the State Party of France to consider nominating these component parts as individual and separate sites.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that it followed the nomination of this property with great interest for two reasons. Firstly, because of the many links between Le Corbusier and well-known Brazilian architects like Lucio Costa and Oscar Niemeyer. The former was involved in the design of the UNESCO building where this meeting is being held. Secondly, because of the challenges a serial, trans-boundary nomination holds and the beauty of international cooperation it amplifies. It was indicated that ICOMOS should also include interest in the Region where the works were built. It was further noted that paragraph 137 of the *Operational Guidelines* indicates that a serial nomination should be first evaluated on the Outstanding Universal Value for the serial nomination as a whole,

not the individual parts, and asked ICOMOS why it deviated from this practice with this nomination.

The Delegation of **Estonia** noted that for the property under consideration the human genius was rejected while during the previous day discussion on the human genius for the Selimiye Mosque and its Social Complex (Turkey) was recognized. It was questioned whether the evaluation was not too descriptive, why ICOMOS was suggesting for the inscription of three sites out of the whole, and whether it should not be left to the States Parties to compose themselves the nomination dossier.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that Le Corbusier is one of the top architects, very well known in the Russian Federation and part of the Russian Federation's school programme. Therefore it found it surprising that no site of this architect has yet been added to the World Heritage List. The Delegation questioned why ICOMOS has a different position in this serial nomination than it has had with previous nominations such as the fortifications of Vauban.

The Delegation of **Iraq** congratulated the Delegation of France with this exceptional file and asked to the Delegation of France if it would consider inscription of the three sites ICOMOS identifies as having the Outstanding Universal Value.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** souligne la présence et l'importance de l'œuvre de Le Corbusier dans le monde et son influence sur des générations d'architectes. Elle demande à l'Etat Partie pourquoi certains pays n'ont pas été inclus, comme regretté par l'ICOMOS et demande à l'ICOMOS des clarifications sur sa méthodologie d'évaluation de l'approche en série.

The Delegation of **Mexico** congratulated the Advisory Body for all additional information to this file, including information on buffer zones. It was recognized that this file addresses an underrepresented category on the World Heritage List. The Delegation asked how ICOMOS came to the recommendation that the individual parts of the nomination had the Outstanding Universal Value but not the serial nomination as a whole. The Delegation proposed to differ the nomination.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated ICOMOS for its exceptional work in reviewing this nomination and supported its evaluation. It was noted that it should not become standard practice to have three sites out of a serial nomination stand out and be discussed for inscription.

The Delegation of **Barbados** congratulated the State Party for this exciting and extensive nomination and supported the questions raised by the Delegations of Brazil and Estonia. It was noted that this is an important nomination because it challenges the limits of the *World Heritage Convention*. It was recommended that this nomination deserves full attention and should not be dismissed even after a 2nd or 3rd effort.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the Delegation of France is the spokesperson on behalf of the States Parties submitting this nomination.

La Délégation de la **France** remercie l'ICOMOS pour sa présentation. En réponse à la question posée par la Délégation de l'Iraq sur sa disponibilité à accepter une inscription

de trois sites (Villa Savoye à Poissy, Chapelle Notre-Dame-du-Haut – Ronchamp, l'Unité d'habitation de Marseille), elle déclare la proposition inacceptable parce qu'elle considère qu'elle ne respecte pas l'intention initiale du projet du dossier d'inscription. La conception de la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* a évolué, du chef d'œuvre individuel, on a progressivement pris en compte d'autres types de biens, comme par exemple le concept de paysage culturel qui a été développé dans le cadre des réunions du Comité du patrimoine mondial.

La proposition d'inscription représente une sélection, mais c'est l'ensemble de la série qui a la Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle, qui constitue le chef d'œuvre. Le Corbusier a initié un changement radical dans l'architecture au plan mondial et donc le dossier est mondial.

Pour répondre à la question portant sur le nombre des sites composant la série, la Délégation de la France reconnaît que cette série est incomplète, il manque par exemple des éléments d'urbanisme. Aujourd'hui, les conditions ne sont pas réunies pour tous les pays concernés (l'Inde pour Chandigarh, par exemple). Elle insiste sur la vocation de la série à devenir complète en plusieurs étapes, d'autres Etats parties pouvant se joindre au dossier en série plus tard.

ICOMOS responded to the question of the Delegation of Brazil. First it considered that the Outstanding Universal Value of the series as a whole was evaluated and that it was concluded that the series as a whole does not have an Outstanding Universal Value. Therefore, in a next phase, the individual parts were evaluated and three of these were rated positively in the sense that they do have the Outstanding Universal Value. It was further indicated that the Fortifications of Vauban were a very different nomination in the sense that the link and consistence between the individual parts of the serial nomination were more than just on the architect himself. In the nomination considered here, Le Corbusier is the link between the sites.

ICOMOS further explained that criterion (i) is used very sparingly and is clearly defined. It is commonly used for a property at the peak of a certain style. In this respect, some parts of this serial nomination do have Outstanding Universal Value and some do not.

Answering to the Delegation of Cambodia, ICOMOS underlined the interest of serial nominations, especially when trans-boundary, having the huge benefit of bringing countries together. But ICOMOS considered that each element has to justify the Outstanding Universal Value, and that this was not the case here. Therefore, it was suggested to allow consideration of some of the individual parts to move forward.

The **Chairperson** thanked ICOMOS for the extensive and detailed presentation.

The **Rapporteur** explained that amendments to the Draft Decision had been submitted by the Delegations of Mexico and Estonia on paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5.

The **Chairperson** proceeded with the examination of the Draft Decision paragraphs by paragraphs. Paragraphs 1 and 2 were adopted.

The Delegation of **Brazil** indicated that "20st century" is not a category on the World Heritage List. Therefore it suggested a new wording for paragraph 3, and invited ICOMOS to help drafting an improved text.

ICOMOS proposed the sentence "...that the nomination of 20th century architecture reflects an under represented category..."

The Delegation of **Mexico** proposed "modern heritage" instead of "20th century architecture".

The **Chairperson** invited to defer the nomination as suggested in the amended Decision proposed by the Delegation of Estonia.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated the need to continue the discussion and therefore suggested indeed to defer the nomination. The Delegation also asked the Delegation of Estonia what the basis for deferral is.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that its intention is to leave room for the States Parties involved to reconsider the entire nomination.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 were adopted as amended.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated that the word "serial" should be deleted from paragraphs 5 and 6 to leave room for the inscription of individual components.

The Delegation of **Australia** suggested deleting paragraph 6, particularly because of the budget that it would require to implement the task proposed.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that the Draft Decision should not mention "trans-boundary property" because it suggested there is already a transnational property in place which is contradictory to the decision of deferral.

The Delegation of **Mexico** asked for clarifications on the proposal made by the Delegation of Australia to delete paragraph 6.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** indicated that paragraph 6 should be retained because it reflected the common spirit that is embodied in this nomination.

The **Chairperson** indicated that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Australia made the paragraph more general which is likely useful for other similar nominations in the future.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** suggested retaining the notion of "serial" in the Draft Decision since it might support ICOMOS towards developing a better method to review serial properties.

The Delegation of **Brazil** emphasized the importance of "serial" and called upon the States Parties concerned to make this a serial nomination because of the beauty of international cooperation involved in this type of nominations.

The Delegation of **Australia** responded to the suggestion of the Delegation of the Russian Federation by indicating that work on improving methods for evaluation of serial properties is already underway.

The **Chairperson** announced the retention of paragraph 6 and indicated that Delegates might wish to broaden the scope of it so it is not just specific to this nomination.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that it would make more sense when such broader paragraph would come at the end of the Draft Decision.

The **Chairperson** confirmed that this suggestion made more sense and asked the Delegation of the Russian Federation whether the proposed amendment was acceptable.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** accepted the amendment.

The Delegation of **China** indicated the wording of "a site" should be used instead of the current draft "a property".

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** asked the Chairperson for clarification of why paragraph 6 was deleted.

The **Chairperson** explained that the paragraph was deleted because it did not refer specifically to the site of the Draft Decision after broadening the scope of it.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.40** was adopted as amended.

La Délégation de la **France**, soutenue par la Délégation de la **Suisse**, accepte la position des organisations consultatives, tout en la considérant sévère. Elle remercie les Etats parties concernés de continuer à faire vivre ce dossier en décidant de le différer. Ce dossier est important pour la *Convention du patrimoine mondial* pour une meilleure définition des biens en série. Un jour, l'œuvre de Le Corbusier aura sa place sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial.

The **Chairperson** thanked the State Party for the statement and recommended looking forward to reconsider the nomination in the near future.

Property	The Triple-arch Gate at Dan
Id. N°	1105 Rev
State Party	Israel
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iv)

The **Secretariat** indicated that this site has been under consideration since the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Québec City, Canada, 2008). At the request of the World Heritage Committee, the Secretariat contacted the United Nations Department of Political Affairs and the latter stated that it was not in a position to treat

the question of boundaries. Pending settling of this question, the Secretariat proposed to postpone the discussion on this nomination until the question of boundaries is settled, in particular since ICOMOS has confirmed the Outstanding Universal Value of the property.

The Delegation of **Bahrain**, supported by the Delegation of **Iraq**, stated that it is time to go with the proposal of the Secretariat.

The Draft Decision **35COM8B.41** was adopted.

LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

C.5.2 Properties deferred or referred back by previous sessions of the World Heritage Committee

Property	León Cathedral
Id. N°	1236 Rev
State Party	Nicaragua
Criteria proposed by State Party	(i)(ii)(iii)(iv)(v)(vi)

ICOMOS provided a short overview of its evaluation and concluded that the nomination should be referred to allow the State Party to officially approve and implement the Cathedral management plan, complete and start implementation of the municipal development plan and amend the boundaries of the buffer zone.

The **Rapporteur** explained that amendments had been received by the Delegation of Brazil for paragraphs 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6.

The Delegation of **Brazil** stated that it has consulted extensively with other States Parties, received the management plan for the site and letters from dignitaries in Nicaragua and therefore suggested inscription of the site as stated in the proposed amendment.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the amendment of the Delegation of Brazil to inscribe the site under criteria (ii) and (iv).

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to change paragraph 3 to "adopt the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value" considering that it came from ICOMOS itself.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.45** was adopted as amended.

The Observer Delegation of **Nicaragua** thanked all States Parties for their support to this nomination and indicated that despite the huge time difference, the bells of Leon Cathedral are now heard all over the city. It was explained that this cathedral represents great architectural, religious and symbolic values to the nation and is associated with various great figures in the history of Nicaragua. The Observer Delegation indicated its satisfaction to see the site inscribed after five years of work.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the State Party and stated that it was well worth the wait. She further announced that the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value from the States Parties of Sudan and the United Arab Emirates were not received by the World Heritage Centre and urged both States Parties to bring them forward as soon as possible.

NINTH DAY – TUESDAY, 28 JUNE 2011

SIXTEENTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

ITEM 8B NOMINATIONS TO THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

EXAMINATION OF MINOR BOUNDARY MODIFICATIONS OF NATURAL, MIXED AND CULTURAL PROPERTIES ALREADY INSCRIBED ON THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST (Continuation)

B.1 NATURAL PROPERTIES

B.1.1 AFRICA

Property	Selous Game Reserve
Id. N°	199 Bis
State Party	United Republic of Tanzania

The **Chairperson** called the meeting to attention, inviting IUCN to present the item.

IUCN indicated that it had recommended not to approve the request, and for the sake of keeping the presentation short, directed the Committee to the document in question. It noted that an amendment to the Draft Decision had been prepared and was under discussion, and suggested that it be presented to the Committee prior to making further comments.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Rapporteur.

Le **Rapporteur** a mentionné avoir reçu deux amendements de la part des Délégations de l'Afrique du Sud, soutenus par la Délégation de Bahreïn qui concernent le paragraphe 2 et la proposition de nouveaux paragraphes 3, 4, 5 et 6.

IUCN indicated that it had the permission from the Delegations of South Africa and Bahrain to speak on the proposed amendments and noted that the language was not its own, but that it had been consulted in the drafting. It explained that the proposal was to refer the request for a boundary modification, giving time for an advisory mission and for the completion of an Environmental Impact Assessment. It made reference to the possibility of establishing an ecological corridor with nearby protected areas and concluded with remarks on further aspects of the proposed amendment in relation to how it related to the *Operational Guidelines*, and thanked the Observer Delegation of the **United-Republic of Tanzania** for its willingness to discuss this issue.

The Observer Delegation of the **United-Republic of Tanzania** indicated that it was in agreement with the proposed amendments.

The Delegation of **China** commented that it noticed that the proposed modified area was small (less than 1%). Therefore it did not think that the minor change would generate much adverse impact. It noted the efforts made by the State Party for seeking a balance between conservation and utilization and supported the proposal for referral.

The Delegation of **Iraq** expressed its support for the proposed amendment, recognizing the need for countries to use their natural resources for the benefit of their communities, and thanked IUCN for its involvement in this report. It expressed its satisfaction at the information provided by the State Party and also expressed its confidence that the property would be well conserved.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Committee members focus exclusively on the proposed amendments at hand.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** emphasized the need to marry conservation and sustainable development.

The Delegation of **Jordan** expressed its support for the adoption of the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** noted that paragraph 7 as amended did not appear to be pertinent to the case at hand. It felt that it was more of a general comment and not relevant to this specific situation.

The Delegation of **Estonia** quoted the paragraph 163 of the *Operational Guidelines*, and noted that the proposal for the boundary modification did indeed fall under paragraph 163. Thus, it requested that Paragraph 7 be kept.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** approuve le paragraphe tel que proposé par la Délégation de l'Australie et soutenu par les Délégations de Bahreïn et de l'Estonie.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** supported keeping the paragraph as amended.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.46** was adopted as amended.

B.3 CULTURAL PROPERTIES

B.3.4 EUROPE / NORTH AMERICA

Property	Renaissance Monumental Ensembles of Úbeda and Baeza
Id. N°	522 Bis
State Party	Spain

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS to present the item.

L'ICOMOS rappelle que les deux petites villes d'Úbeda et Baeza représentent un témoignage remarquable de la période mauresque et de la renaissance. Il indique que l'État partie propose d'ajouter en extension un nouveau monument, la Cathédrale de l'Assomption située à environ 40 km au sud-ouest des deux villes. L'ICOMOS considère que le bien proposé pour modification mineure est un nouveau monument, dans une ville distincte par rapport aux deux villes d'Úbeda et Baeza. Une étude beaucoup plus documentée serait donc nécessaire quant à l'apport spécifique du bien proposé en extension.

Pour l'ICOMOS, il s'agit d'une proposition d'extension d'un bien, et non d'une simple modification mineure, d'où la nécessité d'un nouveau dossier, d'un système de gestion clairement établi et d'une mission d'expertise. L'ICOMOS recommande que la modification mineure proposée de la délimitation du bien *Ensembles monumentaux Renaissance de Úbeda et Baeza, Espagne*, ne soit pas approuvée.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.57** was adopted.

B.3.5 LATIN AMERICA / CARIBBEAN

Property	Maya Site of Copan
Id. N°	129 Bis
State Party	Honduras

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to ICOMOS to present the item.

ICOMOS indicated that the nomination had been examined the previous year and referred back to the State Party.

The Draft Decision **8B.59** was adopted.

STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE OF THE FIVE PROPERTIES INSCRIBED AT THE 34TH SESSION (BRASILIA, 2010) AND NOT ADOPTED BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that last year it had inscribed 5 properties which had originally been recommended for deferral and, as a result, the required Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for these properties had been prepared without the needed care. The Committee in Brasilia had only taken note of the 5 provisional texts put forward on the assumption that these Statements of Outstanding Universal Value would come back for final adoption at its following session. The five Statements concerned the following properties:

- Saudi Arabia: At-Turaif District in ad-Dir'iyah;
- China: China Danxia;

- Kiribati: Phoenix Islands Protected Area;
- Viet Nam: Central Sector of the Imperial Citadel of Thang Long – Hanoi;
- Brazil: São Francisco Square in the Town of São Cristóvão.

The Secretariat indicated that the Statements had been refined with the cooperation of the Advisory Bodies and the concerned States Parties and they were now ready for adoption.

Le **Rapporteur** mentionne avoir reçu un amendement de la part de la Délégation de la Jordanie.

ICOMOS précise que le terme *Wahhabisme* a été utilisé car il existe dans le dossier d'inscription et propose à l'Etat partie de le remplacer par un autre terme si elle le souhaite.

The Delegation of **Jordan** had no objection to the explanation made by ICOMOS.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.60** was adopted.

IN COMPLIANCE WITH PARAGRAPH 61 OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES, EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE MECHANISM THAT PUTS LIMITS TO THE EXAMINATION OF NOMINATIONS BY THE COMMITTEE [AKA “CAIRN-SUZHOU DECISION”]

The **Chairperson** drew the attention of the Committee to Part IV of Document **8B.Add**, and called on the Secretariat to present the *Cairns Suzhou Decision* proposal.

The **Secretariat** presented the item, reviewing the numbers in question.

The **Rapporteur** indicated that the amendments were proposed for paragraphs 3 and 4.

La Délégation de la **France** a exprimé son désaccord sur la disposition qui concerne la notion de paysage culturel.

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated its support for the spirit of this Decision but suggested an amendment that would have it implemented with a slight delay, in recognition of nominations being prepared by other States Parties under the existing framework.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to adopt the Decision on a paragraph by paragraph basis.

The Delegation of **Brazil** expressed its support to the Draft Decision as amended, and suggested other ways of improving the number of nominations to be considered by the Committee, indicating that the lack of balance between Europe and the rest of the world had not been resolved.

La Délégation de la **France** propose d'ajouter dans le paragraphe 4, à la suite du terme *bien naturel* le terme *ou paysage culturel*

The Delegation of **Australia** indicated that it did not support the proposal from the Delegation of France. It also noted that other elements of the *Global Strategy* were not taken on board through the Decision.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** conteste l'amendement proposé par la Délégation de la France pour le rajout du terme *ou paysage culturel* dans le paragraphe 4, car la priorité est donnée pour les paysages culturels ou mixtes.

The Delegation of **China** expressed its support for the amendment proposed by the Delegation of France.

The Delegation of **Estonia** indicated its support for paragraph 3 in its original drafting.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of France, indicating that Cultural Landscapes were underrepresented on the World Heritage list.

The Delegation of **Egypt** indicated that it was supportive of the amendment proposed by the Delegation of France.

The **Chairperson** requested a show of hands to vote on the proposed amendment.

The **Chairperson** declared that the majority of voters were in favour of the amendment to paragraph 3, and moved to the following paragraphs of the Decision, to which there was no further discussion.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8B.61** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Saint Lucia**.

The Observer Delegation of **Saint Lucia** indicated that the amendment in the previous Decision would be contrary to the intent of the *Global Strategy* in that it would make it easier for countries already with many properties to nominate even more.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8B of the Agenda.

ITEM 8D CLARIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDARIES AND SIZES BY STATES PARTIES IN RESPONSE TO THE RETROSPECTIVE INVENTORY

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/8D*

Decisions: **35 COM 8D**

The **Secretariat** explained that in 2004, research conducted by the World Heritage Centre had shown that approximately 80% of the properties inscribed on the World Heritage List between 1978 and 1998 had been inscribed without clear boundaries or had not presented a good quality map showing them. In response to this issue, a Retrospective Inventory Project had been established by the World Heritage Committee, with the objective of identifying missing geographic and cartographic information and working in cooperation with States Parties in order to obtain it.

Retrospective boundary clarifications for more than 200 World Heritage properties have been submitted by States Parties since the beginning of the Project.

The Secretariat explained that Document 8D presented nineteen boundary clarifications submitted by eleven States Parties between April 2010 and March 2011.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8D** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8D of the Agenda.

ITEM 8E REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RETROSPECTIVE STATEMENTS OF OUTSTANDING UNIVERSAL VALUE

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/8E*

Decisions: **35 COM 8E**

The **Secretariat** reminded the Committee that in 2007, it had requested all States Parties “to prepare all missing Statements of Outstanding Universal Value for properties in their territory” (Decision **31 COM 11D.1**), retrospectively, as a key requirement for the preparation of the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in each Region.

The Secretariat explained that out of the 807 retrospective Statements of Outstanding Universal Value expected, 81 had been adopted by the World Heritage Committee in 2009 and 2010, adding that 31 additional Statements, concerning World Heritage properties in all Regions, were being presented to the World Heritage Committee in Document 8E.

It continued, indicating that 303 additional Statements had been submitted by States Parties and were currently in the review process. It proceeded to remind all States Parties concerned that 1st February 2012 was the deadline for the submission of the missing Retrospective Statements.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8E** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** invited the Observer Delegation of **Sudan** and the Delegation of the United Arab Emirates to produce a text for the Statements of Outstanding Universal Value as remaining items to be considered under Item 8D.

La Délégation du **Soudan** (Observateur) informe le Secrétariat qu'il va soumettre le texte immédiatement.

The **Chairperson** reiterated the need to submit the Statements as soon as possible so that they could be integrated into the final Decisions.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8E of the Agenda.

ITEM 9B PRESENTATION AND ADOPTION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE STRATEGY FOR CAPACITY BUILDING

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/9B*

Decisions: **35 COM 9B**

La Délégation de la **Suisse** considère que la question de la Stratégie de renforcement des capacités est essentielle pour la *Convention*; c'est pour cela que le point 10 A devrait être discuté en priorité, avant le point 9B.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Switzerland for its comments, and indicated that it had no intention of limiting the time allocated to Items 9B and 10A, and further suggested that the Committee deals with Item 9B now and that it would then deal with Item 10A.

ICCROM made its presentation on the Capacity Building Strategy.

The **Chairperson** thanked ICCROM for the presentation of Item 9B and invited comments from the members of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Sweden** expressed its satisfaction over the importance given to Periodic Reporting in the World Heritage Strategy for Capacity-Building. It supported the paradigmatic foci of the Strategy to (a) step beyond conventional training to embrace a capacity-building approach and (b) change treating natural and cultural heritage actors separately by creating joint capacity-building opportunities. The Delegation of Sweden commended that this approach is in line with the framework used for discussions concerning the future of the *World Heritage Convention* and noted that the Strategy, due to its participatory nature, allows for sufficient flexibility in its implementation.

Le **Rapporteur** remercie l'ICCROM pour le travail fourni et insiste sur l'importance du renforcement des capacités qui est fondamental pour le patrimoine mondial. Il remercie également tous les partenaires et sollicite le Comité à soutenir cette Stratégie.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie et félicite, à son tour, l'ICCROM, l'UICN et l'ICOMOS pour le travail fourni et leur contribution à l'avancement du projet. Elle lance un appel pour que les membres du Comité participent de manière concrète à la mise en œuvre de cette Stratégie.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 9B** was adopted.

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

**ITEM 9C RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
EXPERT WORKING GROUP IN THE CONTEXT OF WORLD
HERITAGE NOMINATIONS**

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/9C*

Decisions: **35 COM 9C**

The **Chairperson** reported that this Item was presented at the 32nd session of the World Heritage Committee (Quebec City, Canada, 2008) and acknowledged the thematic studies that were conducted subsequently. She further noted that the Working Group on the *Operational Guidelines* did not consider the recommendations contained in Decision **32 COM 10A**. The Chairperson added that Poland had offered to host a workshop on this topic as stated under a different item.

The Delegation of **Sweden** acknowledged Poland's commitment to hosting a workshop on science and technology in the context of World Heritage nominations.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 9C** was adopted.

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

**ITEM 10 A REPORT ON THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING
IN AFRICA**

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/10A*

Decisions: **35 COM 10A**

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Secretariat to introduce the Item.

Le **Secrétariat** présente les résultats du second cycle de soumission des rapports périodiques pour la Région Afrique. Il a rappelé qu'un des principes adoptés par les Etats parties de la Région Afrique consiste à s'assurer de la participation et de l'implication totale des Etats parties et des experts africains, à chaque étape du processus. La stratégie permettant cette implication et appropriation de l'exercice, a consisté en la désignation d'un Coordonnateur régional, ainsi que quatre mentors sous-régionaux, chargés de faciliter l'exercice dans les différentes sous-régions. Il informe du fait que, sur les 45 Etats parties de la Région, 44 ont fait l'effort de compléter le

questionnaire. Cela s'explique par la ratification récente de la *Convention* par la Guinée équatoriale. Toutes les 67 Déclarations de Valeur Universelle Exceptionnelle manquantes des biens de la Région ont été soumises pour révision par les organisations consultatives. L'année dernière déjà, 14 déclarations avaient été approuvées par le Comité, et 19 sont proposées pour adoption lors de cette session au point 8E de l'agenda. L'exercice a également permis au Centre du patrimoine mondial de mettre à jour sa base de données sur les 78 biens qui ont été considérés pour cet exercice.

The **Regional Coordinator for Periodic Reporting in Africa** recognized that the Periodic Reporting exercise has provided valuable information on the state of conservation of African World Heritage properties and noted that insights gained helped contribute to the debate on the Future of the *World Heritage Convention* and the preparation of the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the *World Heritage Convention*.

He further stated that local communities are not sufficiently involved in the protection – an issue that needs to be addressed in order to ensure the long-term conservation of World Heritage properties. Moreover, he suggested analyzing and documenting traditional management systems as African communities have sufficient knowledge to maintain their properties.

The Regional Coordinator also expressed concern over the existing development pressure in Africa and suggested this issue to be addressed at a policy level fostering synergetic exchange between stakeholders. Furthermore, he addressed increasing threats posed to World Heritage by civil and military conflicts and stressed the need to establish and implement suitable programmes in coordination with political bodies. He concluded by announcing the development of a comprehensive and implementable Action Plan including sub-regional analysis as well as further research and analysis of the main issues identified in the current report. Finally, the Regional Coordinator thanked the different institutions and States Parties for their financial, logistical and technical support.

Le **Secrétariat** mentionne que toutes les informations nécessaires sur cette question sont disponibles dans le Document 10 A.

The **Chairperson** invited comments from the floor.

La Délégation de la **France** félicite le travail entrepris pour la réalisation de ce rapport et affirme le soutien et la disponibilité de la France pour le renforcement des capacités pour le patrimoine mondial.

The Delegation of **Sweden** congratulated on the completion of the Periodic Report and strongly supported the development of an action plan as well as the further refinement of the Periodic Report process in general. It recognized the involvement of category 2 centres such as the Nordic World Heritage Foundation (NWHF). The Delegation of Sweden expressed confidence that the contents of the report on the Second Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the African Region are relevant to World Heritage properties all over the world. Finally, the Delegation of Sweden acknowledged Denmark's financial support and invited comments from the Observer Delegation of **Denmark**.

The Delegation of **China** stated that the results of the Periodic Reporting mechanism will contribute to the conservation of World Heritage properties and to the implementation of the *World Heritage Convention* in general.

La Délégation du **Brésil** remercie le Centre pour cette présentation, en insistant sur l'importance de la coopération et affirme son engagement auprès de l'Afrique.

The Delegation of **Egypt** thanked the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF) for its commitment and commended its performance at the regional workshop on the harmonization of World Heritage Tentative Lists in North Africa (Cairo, 2010). The Delegation of Egypt expressed interest in financially supporting the AWHF.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** félicite les auteurs de ce rapport et insiste sur le fait que l'exercice du rapport périodique est un outil unique pour renforcer les capacités et affirmer les valeurs du patrimoine mondial. Elle encourage la coopération à tous les niveaux.

IUCN acknowledged the commitment shown by the site managers in the Periodic Reporting exercise and the strong cooperation with the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF), which was also vital for the inscription of new African properties on the World Heritage List. It noted the successful use of the electronic tool and the ensuing pertinent documentation gathered in the World Heritage Centre database for future monitoring and follow-up. In conclusion, it recommended enhancing management effectiveness and collaboration in the region.

ICCROM noted that the state of conservation of African properties seems to have improved since the first Cycle of Periodic Reporting in the African region and hoped for further improvements in the future. ICCROM pointed out that the Africa 2009 programme is clearly interlinked with the Periodic Reporting exercise in Africa since most of those involved were former participants, researchers or trainers of the Africa 2009 programme. It envisioned continuing its collaboration with States Parties and institutions such as the African World Heritage Fund (AWHF).

ICOMOS recognized the involvement of local communities, including indigenous people, in the management of cultural and natural heritage properties in Africa and also requested that research programmes on African World Heritage properties should also focus on the involvement of local communities in their implementation and derivation of direct benefits.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 10A** was adopted as amended

Le **Rapporteur** a mentionné avoir reçu deux amendements de la Délégation de la Suède pour le paragraphe 9 et pour un nouveau paragraphe 10.

The Observer Delegation of **Denmark** acknowledged the comprehensive work of the second Cycle of Periodic Reporting and expressed its pleasure to support this meaningful undertaking. It recognized the need to involve local communities and draw on local management systems.

La Délégation de **Djibouti** (Observateur) félicite tous les pays dont les sites ont été inscrits et exprime sa joie quant aux progrès enregistrés par ce rapport. Il indique également qu'il reste plusieurs obstacles à résoudre d'où la nécessité d'élaborer un plan d'aide pour la Région.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10A of the Agenda.

ITEM 10B PROGRESS REPORT ON THE FIRST CYCLE OF THE PERIODIC REPORTING AND LAUNCHING OF THE SECOND CYCLE OF PERIODIC REPORTING IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/10B*

Decisions: **35 COM 10B**

The **Secretariat** reported the organization of one regional and 3 sub-regional Periodic Reporting meetings in Latin America and the Caribbean since November 2009 and pointed out the instrumental role of the category 2 centres in this connection. The Secretariat further informed that the results of the meetings were integrated in the Region's action plan. The Secretariat thanked the States Parties of Mexico, Brazil and Barbados for having hosted the sub-regional workshops in preparation for the launching of its second cycle. Moreover, the Secretariat referred to Decision **31 COM 11D.1**, paragraph 7 according to which a total of 116 draft Statements of Outstanding Universal Value were requested from the States Parties by July 2010. Accordingly, the World Heritage Centre took measures for coordinating the drafting process with the States Parties. By March 2011 the World Heritage Centre had received a total of 95 (82%) Statements, 82 of them were considered "complete" and evaluated by the Advisory Bodies. The Secretariat commended this collective effort and added that the exchange of the thematic groups was supported by an e-platform.

The Delegation of **Brazil** applauded the efforts in connection with the Periodic Reporting exercise in Latin America and the Caribbean and was impressed by the networks, online tools and the concrete dialogue between the different stakeholders of the process.

The Delegation of **Barbados** commended the efforts in the Region and considered the UNESCO Meeting on Small Islands Developing States and the Periodic Reporting Exercise of the Caribbean Sub Region of Latin America and the Caribbean (Bridgetown, Barbados, April 2011) very useful.

The Delegation of **Mexico** took note of the significant progress made thanks to the sub-regional meeting for Mexico and Central America held in Zacatecas (Mexico) in September 2010 at the Antigua Convento Franciscano de Propaganda Fide (Old Franciscan Convent for the propagation of the Faith), currently the Museum of Guadalupe, which coincided with the inauguration of the category 2 centre at Zacatecas. The Delegation of Mexico agreed on the point made by the Delegation of Switzerland earlier and pointed out that the Periodic Reporting exercise enhances the credibility of

the *World Heritage Convention*. It emphasized that conservation is an urgent matter which cannot be postponed – a point that needs to be taken aboard by all States Parties. It concluded by stating its intent to work hand in hand with others on such important issues.

ICOMOS stated that the Advisory Bodies support the Periodic Reporting exercise in the regions and considered the collaboration with the World Heritage Centre and category 2 centres very productive. It voiced its intention to continue this collaboration.

The Draft decision **35 COM 10B** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10B of the Agenda.

ITEM 10C PROGRESS REPORT ON PERIODIC REPORTING IN ALL OTHER REGIONS

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/10C*
 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.10C

Decisions: **35 COM 10C.1, 35 COM 10C.2, 35 COM 10C.3**

The **Secretariat** presented the report on the progress of the Periodic Reporting Exercise in the Asia and the Pacific Region.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the Draft Decision be considered after all the reports on the Item had been made. She invited the Secretariat to report on the follow up to the first cycle of Periodic Reporting Exercise in the Europe and North America Region.

The **Secretariat** reported that States Parties in the Europe and North America Region have held information meetings to prepare for the launch of the second cycle in 2012. They had also reached consensus to hold the exercise over two years on account of the large number of properties and countries in the Region, and had agreed on the distribution of the States Parties over this period. To this effect, the Secretariat had prepared a revised Document taking into account the expressed interest to host regional meetings.

The **Chairperson** invited the Secretariat to present the initial findings of the follow up to the Periodic Reporting Exercise in the Arab Region.

Le **Secrétariat** présente le suivi de l'exercice de rapport périodique dans les Etats arabes. Le deuxième cycle s'est terminé en 2010. Le Secrétariat et les Etats parties ont travaillé sur les résultats de ce rapport. La réunion tenue à Rabat a permis d'affiner ces résultats. L'information correspondante se trouve dans le Document WHC.11/35.COM/INF.10C.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Secretariat for its reports and invited the Committee to consider Draft Decisions **35COM 10C.1**, **35COM 10C.2**, **35COM 10C.3**.

The Draft Decisions **35COM 10C.1**, **35COM 10C.2** were adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** made an observation about Draft Decision **35COM 10C.3**, noting that the creation of national Committees for World Heritage did not seem to be reflected in the Draft Decision. It wondered if this could be included as it had been discussed at the regional meetings.

The **Secretariat** responded that this matter was reflected in paragraph 7 of the Draft Decision.

The Draft Decision **35COM 10C.3** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 10C of the Agenda.

ITEM 13 REVISION OF THE OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/13

Decisions: **35 COM 13**

The Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** underlined that the Draft Decision had not been circulated to States Parties which are not Committee members. It stressed the importance of all States Parties to receive this document as they are also signatories.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Observer Delegation of the **United Kingdom** for its observation and invited the Delegation of Switzerland, which chaired the working group on this Item, to make its report to the Committee.

La représentant de la **Suisse**, en tant que Président du groupe de travail, présente le point des travaux qui ont porté sur la révision des *Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Un groupe de travail a été constitué à cet effet, ouvert à tous les Etats parties ainsi qu'aux organisations consultatives. Ce groupe de travail s'est ouvert six fois depuis la 33^e session (Séville, 2009) et la 34^e session (Brasilia, 2010). La section 2 de ce Document a été travaillée dans le respect de la Décision **34 COM 16**. Il avait été demandé au groupe de travail de poursuivre sa mission afin de présenter son document à la 35^e session en 2011. Le Directeur du Centre du patrimoine a invité le groupe de travail le 15 novembre 2010 pour une réunion au cours de laquelle le groupe a ouvert la section 2. Le groupe de travail présente ici son rapport dans le Document WHC/35 COM.13. Le rapport a ensuite été envoyé à tout les Etats parties, il n'y a pas eu de retour de leur part. Le représentant de la Suisse indique espérer que la Décision sera adoptée par consensus. Elle souhaite informer le Comité que la Délégation de **l'Egypte**, qui a présidé le groupe de travail informel, a

demandé de présenter également le travail de son groupe qui figure sous la Décision **35 COM.13.A**.

The Delegation of **Jordan** emphasised that it had made several amendments to the Draft Decision and expressed its concern that the suggested text from the 32nd session (Quebec City, Canada, 2008), to adjourn the consideration of “these matters” to the 34th session of the Committee had been ignored.

It referred to Decision **32 COM 8A** concerning Tentative Lists and the revision of paragraph 2 which called for the technical analysis of Tentative Lists by the World Heritage Centre to ensure consistency in the Tentative Lists and World Heritage List. It stressed that the current Draft Decision under consideration disregarded this previous action and as a result it was not in a position to adopt it as long as the request from the 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) on paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines*.

The **Secretariat** acknowledged the correctness of the remarks expressed by the Delegation of Jordan as it had been pending since the 32nd session. It referred to page 18 of the English document that addressed paragraph 68, and reported that it was proposed by the working group and not by the World Heritage Centre. It asked for clarification from the Chairperson of the working group on the *Operational Guidelines*.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** informe qu’effectivement les 15 et 16 novembre 2010, le paragraphe 68 tel qu’il est écrit dans sa version présente a été discuté et adopté par consensus. Aucune objection à cette formulation ni remarques n’ont été exprimées de la part de la Jordanie jusqu’ici à ce propos.

The Delegation of **Egypt** expressed its support for the Delegation of Jordan. It remarked that the way forward would be to take action on its position.

The Delegation of **Mexico** recalled that the work accomplished during the 34th session (Brasilia, 2010) did not quite cover the concerns expressed by the Delegation of Jordan. It however reported that it would be willing to adopt the present Draft Decision. It suggested that a working group could be constituted after adoption, to address the points raised by the Delegation of Jordan.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** thanked the working group for its report and expressed its support to the Delegations of Jordan and Egypt.

The Delegation of **Estonia** pointed out that the working group had met several times and put in considerable effort to achieve compromise. The Draft Decision should remain while further deliberations should be postponed as it was not possible to constitute a drafting committee on the spot. It recognised that there was immense pressure to insert every issue in the *Operational Guidelines* and this was not possible. It however suggested that some of these issues could be introduced within the framework of other guidance materials, other than the *Operational Guidelines* which is binding on the States Parties.

The Delegation of **Egypt** gave the option of adding the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Jordan to the Draft Decision in order to move forward.

The **Chairperson** addressed the Delegation of Egypt saying that she was not sure that its option could be implemented in view of the mechanisms of the working group. She however suggested a means of fitting in its suggestions.

The Delegation of **Jordan** thanked the working group for the successful completion of its task. It recalled the 32nd session (Quebec City, Canada, 2008) and requested the institution of a working group and the production of the Draft Decisions that had not been examined at the 33rd and 34th sessions (respectively Seville, 2009 and Brasilia, 2010).

The Delegation of **Iraq** expressed its support to the Delegations of Egypt and Jordan.

The Delegation of **Australia** congratulated the working group and observed that amendments would definitely continue to emerge. It noted that it also had amendments to make to the paragraph on outstanding universal value but had yet to bring this forward. It supported the Delegation of Mexico and the constitution of a new working group to consider new issues.

The Delegation of **Brazil** observed that it would be difficult to take an informed position if the proposed amendment remained unknown.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the point raised by the Delegation of Brazil. She recalled that the proposal made by the Delegation of Jordan is multilateral and does not correspond to the consultative framework as it proposed a completely new wording for paragraph 68. In view of the present division in the room, concerning this matter, she noted the opposition expressed and how these issues need to be taken forward in line with the concern of the Delegation of Mexico. She stressed that the Committee needed to agree on the formation of a new working group at the 36th session to address the new issues raised.

The Delegation of **South Africa** supported the suggestion to reconstitute the working group.

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider the reconstitution of the working group at its 36th session, taking into account the concerns about paragraph 68 of the *Operational Guidelines* and any other matters. She called for the expression of any objections to this proposal. As there was none, she requested that this be reflected in the current Draft Decision that was under consideration.

The Delegation of **Egypt** interrupted to seek clarification on what was being considered.

The **Chairperson** clarified her proposal saying that as it was not possible to examine the amendment made by the Delegation of Jordan at the present moment, it could be considered by a working group to be constituted at the 36th session of the Committee in 2012.

The Delegation of **Jordan** agreed to the suggestion of the Chairperson but insisted that the working group be set up immediately with a clear mandate.

The **Chairperson** further explained that the proposal was for the working group to be constituted at the 36th session of the Committee with paragraph 68 as its main focus. She read out the new paragraph in the Draft Decision that reflected this intention.

La Délégation de la **France** demande à savoir sur quelle base serait formé ce groupe de travail et quels en seraient les membres.

The **Chairperson** responded that it would be carried out as usual with similar issues.

La Délégation de la **France** veut tout simplement savoir quelles seront les modalités de formation de ce groupe, c'est l'objet de sa question.

The **Chairperson** stressed that the working group would be open-ended and all States Parties to the *Convention* would be welcome to contribute to it.

The Delegation of **Jordan** attempted to define the basis of the working group as “to amend paragraph 68 taking into consideration the concerns of the Delegation of Jordan”.

The **Chairperson** responded that the terms of reference of the working group could be explicit on this but also needed to ensure flexibility so as to address other concerns. She called for the inclusion of the concerns of the Delegation of Jordan in the new paragraph of the Draft Decision and asked the Delegation of Jordan if the formulation on the screen would be acceptable for it to adopt Draft Decision **35 COM 13**.

The Delegation of **Jordan** replied that it would.

The **Chairperson** called for the adoption of Draft Decision **35 COM 13** as amended.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested the replacement of the words “spring 2012” with a specific timeframe as the climatic conditions in different parts of the world are different.

The **Chairperson** suggested the replacement of the word “spring” with “first quarter”.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** observed that the tradition is to establish the working group ahead of the next session.

The **Chairperson** clarified the issue explaining that this was applicable in the case where the membership is limited but this rule does not apply to open-ended groups.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 13** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 13 of the Agenda.

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

CULTURAL PROPERTIES

EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA

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

The **Chairperson** called on the Assistant Director-General for Culture to present the results of the ongoing consultations on this Item.

The **Assistant Director-General for Culture** reported that no consensus had been reached on the text of the Draft Decision and that it had been agreed to adjourn the debate on this agenda item until the next ordinary of the Committee, in 2012.

The **Chairperson** asked for the text of Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.31** to be read out and asked for comments. In the absence of comments, the Draft Decision **35 COM 7A.31** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Serbia**.

The Observer Delegation of **Serbia** recalled that the debate on this matter had been postponed for three consecutive Committee sessions. It called upon the Committee to help protect this heritage and informed that this state of affairs was regrettable and might impact on the implementation of the Russian Federation funded project for the protection of the property.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** expressed its concern at the lack of progress in discussing this Item, while however underlying that in the current circumstances, the decision adopted was not the worst solution. She indicated that the Russian Federation will follow closely future developments in this matter.

The meeting rose at 7 pm

TENTH DAY – WEDNESDAY, 29 JUNE 2011

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

10 a.m. – 13.30 a.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Alissandra Cummins (Barbados)

**ITEM 8C UPDATE OF THE WORLD HERITAGE LIST AND THE LIST OF
WORLD HERITAGE IN DANGER**

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/8C*

Decisions: **35 COM 8C**

The **Secretariat** provided a summary of the Decisions: The Committee inscribed 25 new properties on the World Heritage List, 3 natural, 21 cultural and 1 mixed, and approved the extension of 1 transnational property already inscribed on the List. Following the debates on Item 8B, 4 properties were referred and 4 deferred. At this session, in 22 cases the Committee changed the Advisory Body recommendation which was presented in the Draft Decision.

3 referrals became 3 inscriptions.

4 deferrals became referrals.

12 deferrals became 11 inscriptions and 1 approved extension.

3 non inscriptions became 2 deferral and 1 referral

The new overall figures of the World Heritage List indicate a total of 936 properties of which 725 are cultural, 183 natural and 28 mixed. The Committee allocated approximately 20 hours of discussion to examine 35 nominations, this results roughly in an average of 35 minutes for the discussion of each nomination.

The breakdown of inscribed properties by region is as follows:

- Africa: 4 properties
- Arab region: 4 properties
- Asia-Pacific: 7 properties
- Europe/North-America: 7 properties
- Latin America/Caribbean: 3 properties

The States Parties of Barbados and the United Arab Emirates had their first properties inscribed on the World Heritage List.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 8C.1, 8C.2 and 8C.3** were adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 8C of the Agenda.

**ITEM 13A PROGRESS REPORT OF THE INFORMAL WORKING GROUP ON
THE WORLD HERITAGE EMBLEM**

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/13A
 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.13A
 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.13B

Decisions: **35 COM 13A**

La Délégation de la **Suisse** aborde le chapitre des *Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial* portant sur l'utilisation de l'Emblème du patrimoine mondial et la création du groupe de travail, à la suite de la Décision **32 COM 13** (Québec 2007). Elle explique au Comité que le groupe de travail a tenu deux réunions en 2009 et qu'un texte révisé des *Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial* (Chapitre VIII) sur l'utilisation de l'Emblème a été soumis à la 33^e session du Comité (Séville, 2009).

Dans sa Décision **33 COM 13**, le Comité a demandé au groupe de travail de continuer à travailler sur ce sujet. A la fin de l'année 2010, le groupe de travail a tenu sa troisième réunion au cours de laquelle il a été décidé qu'il était prématuré de réviser le Chapitre VIII des *Orientations devant guider la mise en œuvre de la Convention du patrimoine mondial*. Le Document WHC-11/35.COM/13A apporte davantage de détails sur cette dernière réunion. Fin janvier 2011, le Secrétariat a demandé aux membres du groupe de travail de soumettre leurs commentaires et suggestions sur la révision des *Orientations*. Même si la plupart des membres ont considéré qu'il était prématuré de réviser les *Orientations*, ils ont admis la nécessité d'apporter plus de précisions sur l'utilisation, les modalités, le public et les procédures.

Par la suite, le Secrétariat a organisé une réunion avec le Secteur des relations extérieures et de l'information du public pour aborder ce sujet. Un projet de matrice a été préparé, proposé et diffusé par courriel en 2011 aux membres du groupe de travail. Le Document WHC-11/35.COM/13A recommande que le Groupe de travail soit consulté avant la soumission d'un tableau expérimental d'utilisation de l'Emblème.

The **Chairperson** noted the reflections expressed by the Delegation of Switzerland and proceeded to consideration of Draft Decision **35 COM 13A**.

La Délégation de la **France** suggère d'ajouter les mots "si nécessaire" dans le projet de décision.

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed a timeline to get proper feedback after circulation. It suggested giving either 30 days or 3 months to comment/review.

The **Chairperson** asked the Delegation of South Africa for clarification on the timeframe, namely whether it was suggesting 3 months or 30 days.

The Delegation of **South Africa** responded that it was asking for adequate time.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the information would be circulated 6 weeks before; this is in line with the Secretariat's established procedures. She then gave the floor to the Delegation of Mexico.

The Delegation of **Mexico** supported the amendments proposed by the Delegations of France and South Africa.

The Decision **35 COM 13A** was adopted as a whole as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 13A of the Agenda.

ITEM 11 PROTECTION OF THE PALESTINIAN CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/11

Decisions: **35 COM 11**

The **Secretariat** provided a summary of the report on Palestine.

The Delegation of **Australia** commented that it supports the Decision and ongoing technical assistance to the Palestinian Authority and highlighted the advantage of the Joint Technical Committee.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 11** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Israel** indicated its support for the decision in principle and pointed out that a consensus was reached by the Joint Archeological Committee. It reiterated its support for Bethlehem as a World Heritage Site and encouraged the Palestinian Authority to activate the Joint Archeological Committee soon.

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

ITEM 14 EXAMINATION OF INTERNATIONAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/14
WHC-11/35.COM/INF.14

Decisions: **35 COM 14**

The **Secretariat** informed the Committee that as mentioned in the Document, there was no request to be approved. Nonetheless, this Document reported the status of implementation of the International Assistance Request for Atsinanana Forests of Madagascar approved in 2010. The Secretariat also referred to Document WHC-11/35.COM/INF.14 which provided an update on the available budget for International

Assistance. It informed the meeting that currently there were US\$ 43,853 available for International Assistance requests and US\$169,540 earmarked under Italian funds in trust for International Assistance Requests. Since the preparation of the Document, five additional requests were approved and it is expected that the next panel would consider a further 15 requests. The Secretariat stressed that it was important to take note that without voluntary funding from Italy in 2008, it would have been impossible to approve many other requests during the current biennium.

The **Chairperson** noted the fragile state of the World Heritage Fund and also took note of the reflections of the discussion that had taken place in the Budget Working Group.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 14** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 14 of the Agenda.

ITEM 16 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATES PARTIES TO THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION* (UNESCO, 2011)

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/16*
 WHC-11/35.COM/INF.16

Decisions: **35 COM 16**

The **Secretariat** presented the provisional agenda of the General Assembly. It informed the Committee of some new items on the provisional agenda as it requested including the External Auditors Report, the report on category 2 centres and the Future of the *World Heritage Convention*.

The Delegation of **Brazil** requested to be informed on whether there should be an agenda item on the Report of the 17th General Assembly and about the exact dates when the General Assembly would take place.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** indicated that a report from the Rapporteur will be added to the agenda and that the dates for the General Assembly were 7-9 November 2011 (9th afternoon only)

The Draft Decision **35 COM 16** was adopted.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 16 of the Agenda.

ITEM 15 REPORT ON THE EXECUTION OF THE 2010-2011 BUDGET AND PREPARATION OF THE 2012-2013 BUDGET

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/15*

Decisions: **35 COM 15A, 35 COM 15B**

The **Chairperson** turned to Item 15 for consideration indicating that the Delegation of Mexico had chaired the Working Group and that a revised Draft Decision was being distributed presenting the conclusions of the Working Group.

The Delegation of **Mexico** provided a summary of the findings of the Working Group

The **Chairperson** asked for comments or questions and noted that the Item was extensively discussed. She indicated that a consensus had been reached.

The Delegation **South Africa** commented that a balance was needed with regard to resources.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 15A and 35 COM 15B** were adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** thanked Mr. Hernandez for the excellent work, the members of the Committee, the Advisory Bodies, the Secretariat and in particular the new Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 15 of the Agenda.

ITEM 12 REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION*

12A. Reflection on the Future of the *World Heritage Convention*

12B. Report of the experts meeting on the decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention*

12C. Progress report on the reflection concerning the upstream processes

12D. Progress report on the preparation of the 40th Anniversary of the *Convention*

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/12A*
 WHC-11/35.COM/12B
 WHC-11/35.COM/12C
 WHC-11/35.COM/12D
 WHC-11/35.COM/12E

Decisions: **35 COM 12A, 35 COM 12B, 35 COM 12C, 35 COM 12D, 35 COM 12E**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to proceed with the consideration of Item 12 on the reflection on the Future of the *World Heritage Convention* and invited Mr. Greg Terrill from the Delegation of Australia who chaired the working to give his presentation on the matter.

The Delegation of **Australia** gave a general presentation on Item 35COM12, including Draft Decisions **35 COM 12A**, **35 COM 12B**, **35 COM 12C**, **35 COM 12D**, and **35 COM 12E**. A consultative committee had been established by the Committee as per Rule 20 of the *Rules of Procedure*, and had thus been open to all Observer States Parties, Advisory Bodies and other observers.

Six consultation meetings were held, all of which were well attended with at times over 100 participants and a good representation from across regional groups. The mandate was to develop draft decision 12 A, B, C and D, and consider information document 7C in relation to state of conservation challenges. It was based on Decision 10 of the 17th General Assembly, draft decisions were structured accordingly. The challenges of addressing such grand mandate concerning complex issues in a short time were highlighted. This came along with overall concerns of funding implications for the needed work as that the focus of the working group enlarged on measures for an improvement of the work linkages between the Committee, the General Assembly and the processes of the *World Heritage Convention*. Item 12 in general contained draft texts related to the five areas of the mandate, and despite the length, recommendations were laid out in the decision for transparency reason.

Key points of Draft Decision **35 COM 12A** concerned the Action Plan and the vision of the *Convention*. The decision arose from a 3 years process, throughout which issues had been considered by several Committee sessions, the General Assembly and a series of meetings of Advisory Bodies and experts. 16 written submissions had been received from States Parties. The Advisory Bodies had noted that the however powerful instrument of the *Convention* was subject to a continuous interpretation process which made further work necessary. Draft Decision **35 COM 12A** reflected this evolution yet needed further development by the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for presentation at the General Assembly and should further define a vision of an implementation plan for specific action for the next decade.

Draft Decision **35 COM 12B** stood as an outcome of the 17th meeting of the General Assembly to consider further decision-making processes of the statutory organs of the *Convention*. For this, a workshop had been organized in 2010 in Bahrain discussing policy issues in relation to the State of Conservation reporting and nominations, and developing recommendations of how to improve this, in terms of guidance and tools and workload planning. Key points of the workshop informed Item 12B, and in particular the key issue concerning the need for an improved transparency of meetings and an opening to the media, was highlighted.

Draft Decision **35 COM 12C** concerned a progress report of the upstream process, which should help to avoid difficulties in the nomination process and ensure that States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the Secretariat work closer together. The cooperation in the framework of the pilot project was designed to provide assistance but did not guarantee an inscription.

Draft Decision **35 COM 12D** was devoted to the 40th anniversary of the *Convention* in 2012, with the themes, events and recommendations with regard to the planned activities, highlighting the possibility of measures to recognize best practices and introduce an international World Heritage Day, which both needed further investigation.

Draft Decision **35 COM 12E** outlined the results of the expert meeting in April 2011 in Dakar on the State of Conservation Report process, the report of which was included in information Document INF7C. The meeting considered operations of the Committee against challenges of protecting sites. Several recommendations arose from the meeting concerning traditional management practices, environmental and heritage impact assessment, and measures for protection and management, and the idea to group challenges rather by themes than by regions. As a final note the Delegation of Australia mentioned that paragraph 13 in Draft Decision **35 COM 12A** transmitted a series of input documents to the General Assembly, to be put online in order to avoid translation costs into 6 languages.

Reflection on the Future of the *World Heritage Convention*-

The **Chairperson** noted that the text has come out as a result after a series of extensive discussions between the working group and the States Parties throughout several Committee sessions and asked whether the Committee was therefore in a position to adopt the Draft Decision without debate.

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed to add “as well as priorities for international assistance as outlined in paragraph 235 of the *Operational Guidelines*” after “draft strategic action plan and vision” in paragraph 12 of Draft Decision **35 COM 12A**.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 12A** was adopted.

Progress report on the reflection concerning the upstream processes-

Considering the amendments received for Draft Decision **35 COM 12B**, the **Chairperson** proposed to move forward with the adoption of Draft Decision **35COM 12C** and **35 COM 12D**.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 12 C** was adopted.

Progress report on the preparation of the 40th Anniversary of the *Convention*-

The Draft Decision **35 COM 12D** was adopted.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** noted that it would host an event in 2012 for the 40th anniversary of the *Convention*.

Report of the expert meeting on decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Manama, Bahrain, 15-17 December 2010)

The **Chairperson** invited the Rapporteur to read out the amendments proposed by the Delegation of France and referred to the Delegation of China whose proposal would be heard afterwards.

Le **Rapporteur** reflète les amendements demandés par la Délégation de la France sur l'ajout aux paragraphes 9 et 14, notamment sur l'ajout au paragraphe 14 « [Demande aux membres du Comité de s'abstenir de présenter de nouvelles propositions d'inscription] susceptibles d'être débattues, [pendant leur mandat au sein du Comité], sans préjudice des dossiers déjà déposés ou de ceux différés ou renvoyés lors de précédents Comités. »

The Delegation of **Bahrain** agreed with the proposal from the Delegation of France with regard to paragraph 14, and stressed that this should not be applicable to States Parties which do not have yet a property inscribed on the List.

In response to the Delegation of Mali, the **Chairperson** clarified that the Draft Decision did not concern Tentative Lists.

The Delegation of **China** proposed to add after the amendment proposed by the Delegation of France a draft text whose wording was to be refined: « this decision be implemented on an experimental basis and be reviewed at its 38th session ».

The Delegation of **South Africa** proposed deleting paragraph 14 as today's geographical representation on the World Heritage List and given the history of the *Convention*, capacity was still un-balanced and the *Convention* therefore not yet ready for such step.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed, for the sake of consistency, to harmonize the reference to the World Heritage Centre in paragraphs 5, 6 and 7 and delete references to the Director of the World Heritage Centre.

The **Chairperson** considered the proposed minor amendments with the agreement of the Director of the World Heritage Centre, and proceeded with the adoption of paragraphs 1 to 7 as amended.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** soutient l'amendement présenté par la Délégation de la France.

The **Chairperson** put paragraphs 8, 9 as amended, and 10 to 13 forward for consideration and thence declared them as adopted. She then invited the Delegation of France to take the floor.

La Délégation de la **France** demande à la Présidente si elle pouvait proposer maintenant ou plus tard son amendement sur les partenariats en expliquant que l'amendement concernait l'ajout d'un paragraphe.

The **Chairperson** suggested that the new paragraph was not adequate at this place of paragraph 14.

La Délégation de la **France** déclare qu'elle laisse à l'appréciation de la Présidente où inclure le paragraphe demandé, à la toute fin de la Décision serait peut-être le meilleur endroit.

The **Chairperson** proposed that the placing of the paragraph could be considered once the Delegation of France had proposed the wording of the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Brazil** proposed to change paragraph 14 as to recommend instead of “request that Committee members refrain from further nominations during their mandate”.

The Delegation of **Estonia** welcomed the spirit contained in the proposal of paragraph 14 raising the issue of a conflict of interest between membership at the Committee and nominations. It referred to statistics presented at the Bahrain 2010 meeting showing that member of the Committee achieved a higher number of inscriptions than other States Parties. These indicators had been further confirmed by external auditors and stakeholders and damaged the credibility of the *Convention*. It therefore supported the paragraph as amended by the Delegation of France.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** explique que le Comité est justement au cœur du débat. C’est une question de déontologie qui se pose. Elle accepte l’amendement français et a ajouté qu’il ne fallait pas juste « recommander » mais « exiger » que les Etats parties s’abstiennent. Elle propose de rester sur le texte de compromis tel que convenu au sein du groupe du travail avec l’ajout proposé par la Délégation de la France.

La Délégation de la **Jordanie** propose de supprimer complètement le paragraphe 14 car elle y voit une grande injustice pour un grand nombre d’Etats parties.

The Delegation of **Brazil** declared that it would insist on keeping the paragraph as amended and pointed out that the wording proposed by the Delegation of Switzerland would go too far and make a reassessment of the *Rules of Procedure* in the General Assembly necessary. It expressed its support to the amendment brought forward by the Delegation of France and further proposed to extend the experimental phase proposed by China until the 38th session.

La Délégation du **Mexique** déclare que ce débat est au centre de la *Stratégie globale pour une représentation plus équilibrée de la Liste du patrimoine mondial*. Elle déclare également qu’il faudrait être plus prudent et se dit d’accord avec la proposition de la Délégation du Brésil. Elle recommande le compromis en employant le terme « recommandant » plutôt que « demandant », cette restriction pouvant entraîner certains Etats Parties à ne pas se présenter en tant que membres du Comité.

La Délégation des **Emirats Arabes Unis** souligne que cette décision aura un impact sur beaucoup d’Etats parties. Elle indique avoir confiance dans les organisations consultatives et vouloir que les opportunités soient équitables pour tous les Etats parties. Elle approuve la proposition de la Délégation du Brésil.

The Delegation of **South Africa** questioned the intention of this paragraph which in their view only sanctioned States Parties with little or few sites inscribed on the List.

The Delegations of **Iraq** and **Ethiopia** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of South Africa to delete paragraph 14.

The Delegation of **Australia** noted that many States Parties concerned could not express their views and that this discussion should be referred to the General Assembly. As per the Delegation of Brazil's proposal to assess the experimental approach proposed by the Delegation of China at the 38th session, the issue of this matter concerning all States Parties should be kept in mind.

La Délégation de la **France** engage les Etats parties à faire fonctionner la *Convention*. Etre membre du Comité et présenter une nouvelle inscription sont deux modalités différentes qui ne devraient pas être confondues. La Délégation soutient la proposition de la Délégation du Brésil.

The Delegation of **Egypt** stated that it took note of the necessity to include considerations for a balanced World Heritage List and that the matter should also be discussed at the General Assembly. It also supported the amendment proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

The Delegation of **Mali** mentioned that the Tentative Lists should also be considered in this light, although it acknowledged this was outside of the discussion of this amendment. It further stated that the proposed amendment by the Delegation of Switzerland should only be applicable to countries with "enough" sites already inscribed on the World Heritage List, and therefore supported the deletion of the paragraph as proposed by the Delegation of South Africa.

The **Chairperson** reported back to the Committee members that there was a convergence of opinion expressed so far on this amendment. She reminded the Committee that if the amendment was deleted as proposed by the Delegation of South Africa the Item would move for consideration to the General Assembly. The Chairperson noted that the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Australia introducing the paragraph by "recommend" seemed to be a compromise as it would not be an operational amendment for the benefit of the fairness of the States Parties and the *Convention*. She reiterated her wish to achieve a consensus on this matter and asked the Committee whether there were any further amendments to the Draft Decision.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** asked for clarifications on whom this paragraph would apply to exactly and whom should the recommendation be addressed to.

The **Chairperson** clarified that the recommendation would be valid for all States Parties to the *Convention*.

The Delegation of **South Africa** expressed its comprehension of the amendment proposed by the Delegation of Brazil but underlined that this would work on moral grounds. Therefore it agreed with the Delegation of Australia to take the issue for consideration of the General Assembly.

The **Chairperson** suspended the consideration of paragraph 14 until a consensus among the Committee would be achieved and invited the Committee to consider paragraph 15.

The Delegation of **Brazil** put forward its interpretation of paragraph 15 concerning the state of conservation examination process with the first deadline of submission of the State Party report on 1 February and the publication of the working documents 6 weeks prior to the Committee session. It underlined that a lot of progress could be made within 6 weeks leading to new information that should be considered by the Committee. It therefore proposed to use the word “recommend” and delete the paragraph part from “and notesmeeting.”

The **Chairperson** proposed to suspend consideration of the section “Working methods of statutory organs of the *Convention*”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** further proposed amendments to paragraph 16, namely regarding the difficulty of understanding the notions of deferral and referral and the need to elaborate adequate mechanisms in this regard. It suggested adding to paragraph 16 c “and give consideration to elaborate a proposal for a draft amendment to paragraph 159/160 of the *Operational Guidelines*.”

The **Chairperson** proposed to move to the adoption of the remaining paragraphs, and declared paragraphs 16 a-b, 16 c-d as amended by the Delegation of Brazil, 17 a-c, 18a-c, 19 (with minor amendments of the deletion of “Director of”, leaving only the “World Heritage Centre”) and paragraphs 20-22 as adopted.

La Délégation de **France** indique que concernant les partenariats le lieu le plus adéquat pour les inscrire serait la section 12E. Après le paragraphe 17, car cela intéresse l'ensemble des Etats parties, il conviendrait d'indiquer une mention telle que : « Demande de traiter les aspects concernant les partenariats après l'examen du rapport de l'Auditeur externe sur PACTe lors de l'Assemblée générale par les Etats parties à la *Convention* ».

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Draft Decision **35 COM 12E** “*II. Global State of Conservation challenges of the World Heritage properties*” and asked whether the Committee wished to make amendments.

The Delegation of **Brazil** suggested an amendment to paragraph 8 in view of the long discussions during Item 7.B in order to make room for better dialogue between the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre. It proposed to introduce the words in the sense of “in particular” or “above all”, thereby highlighting the need for a better dialogue. It further proposed to separate paragraph 8 into 8a and 8b and to add in the second part a provision that the World Heritage Centre should formally notify the States Parties which state of conservation reports would be opened for discussion during the Committee.

The **Chairperson** proposed to make linguistic amendments and use the words “will be subject to examination by the World Heritage Committee”.

The Delegation of **Brazil** underlined that the notification should be a tool for dialogue between the States Parties and the World Heritage Centre, if the Committee members are willing to adopt the paragraph.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 12E** was adopted as amended.

Report of the expert meeting on decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention* (Manama, Bahrain, 15-17 December 2010)

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to resume its consideration of Decision **35 COM 12B**, namely paragraph 14. The Chairperson reiterated her recommendation to go forward with the notion of “recommend” as proposed by the Delegation of Brazil in consideration of those States Parties with fewer sites inscribed on the World Heritage List. She also reminded the Committee about the amendment proposed by the Delegation of China to undertake this on an experimental basis for evaluation by the Committee at its 38th session. The Chairperson asked the Delegation of South Africa for its comments.

The Delegation of **South Africa** noted that during this session of the World Heritage Committee it became clear that there are States Parties who also carry the interests of other States Parties and noted the experimental basis proposed by the Delegation of China.

The **Chairperson**, in consideration of the work of the working group, proposed to the Committee more time for reflection and asked those concerned to elaborate a proposal.

The Delegation of **Australia** supported the amendment concerning the experimental basis proposed by the Delegation of China which would allow the Committee members to close the Item at this session and to return to its consideration at future session.

The Delegation of **Switzerland** agreed with the Delegation of Australia and wished to support the amendment proposed by the Delegation of China.

The **Chairperson** expressed her doubts that the Committee had come to an agreement whether it is to be undertaken on an experimental basis or whether it is a matter for consideration by the World Heritage Committee or the General Assembly. She proposed to keep the paragraph 14 in brackets.

The **Chairperson** replied that in this case the exact number in favour of the “experimental basis” would also have to be known and for reasons of time consideration she proposed to move on with the consideration of the remaining agenda Items until the Committee finds a consensus on this paragraph.

ITEM 17 OTHER BUSINESS

Decisions: **35 COM 17**

The **Chairperson** reported that the Secretariat had no proposals for consideration by the Committee and asked if there were comments from the Committee members.

The Delegation of **Barbados** proposed to introduce a new Decision concerning the formal notification, as soon as possible, by the Secretariat to the States Parties of the evaluations and recommendations on the nominations.

The Delegation of **Brazil** supported the Delegation of Barbados and stated that this would contribute to a better dialogue between the States Parties, the Advisory Bodies and the World Heritage Centre.

It was decided to suspend this item to allow the drafting of the draft decision.

The Observer Delegation of **Japan** stated that it was its great honour to host the closing event of the celebrations of the 40th Anniversary of the *Convention* with almost universal coverage. Japan had a keen interest in establishing a Committee for the organisation of the closing event and extended the invitation to visit Japan in November 2012.

ITEM 18 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 36TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2012)

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/18

Decisions: **35 COM 18**

The **Chairperson** invited the Committee to consider Item 18 and reported that according to the Bureau meeting held earlier on 29 June 2011 there were several proposals for the consideration of the Committee.

La Délégation de la **France** soutenue par la Délégation d'Estonie indique qu'en ce qui concerne la présidence, la France propose la ville de Saint-Pétersbourg, Fédération de Russie, pour accueillir la 36^e session du Comité.

The Delegation of **Bahrain** reported that the States Parties of Bahrain and Mali intended to introduce a new initiative for discussion in order to bring different regions together and enable countries to chair the session regardless of the fact whether they are able to host the World Heritage Committee or not in order to make the chairmanship more balanced throughout the regions. It further stated that the two States Parties had however considered the obstacles including the understanding of the *Rules of Procedures* and would not wish to divide the Committee on this matter. Thus after consultation with their respective Foreign Ministries and the Ambassador of the Russian Federation, it had decided to withdraw the joint initiative of Bahrain and Mali. It expressed the hope that one day such a joint initiative might be accepted by the Committee.

The **Chairperson** thanked the Delegation of Bahrain for its forward-looking initiative.

The Delegation of **Brazil** thanked the Delegation of Bahrain for its international spirit expressed in this joint initiative and also for the spirit of cooperation to reach a consensus during the Committee session.

La Délégation de la **France**, soutenue par la Délégation de l'**Estonie**, salue la déclaration qui vient d'être faite par les Délégation de Bahreïn et du Mali. Elle salue l'esprit de consensus et les propositions courageuses. Concernant la prochaine session du Comité, elle propose l'Ambassadrice de la Fédération de Russie, S. Exc. Madame Elena Mitrofanova comme Présidente de la 36^e session.

After no objections from the Committee, the **Chairperson** declared H.E. Ms Elena Mitrofanova new Chairperson of the 36th session of the World Heritage Committee.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** thanked its colleagues from the Committee for their support and stated that it will be glad to welcome the Committee members in St Petersburg, the Cultural Capital of the Russian Federation which had also been the capital of Russia for almost 300 years.

The Delegation of **Jordan** proposed the United Arab Emirates as Vice-Chairperson for the Arab Region.

The Delegation of **Brazil** wished to propose Mexico as Vice Chair for the Latin America and the Caribbean Region.

The Delegation of **Iraq** said it supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Jordan.

The **Chairperson** congratulated the United Arab Emirates for its proposal for Vice Chairperson for the Arab region.

The Delegation of the **United Arab Emirates** supported Mexico for Vice-Chairperson.

The Delegation of **Barbados** supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Mexico** indicated that it would carry out the task with the responsibilities that it entailed.

La Délégation de **Suisse** propose, pour le Groupe I, la France pour la Vice-Présidence.

The Delegation of **Sweden** said it supported the proposal made by the Delegation of Switzerland.

La Délégation de **France** indique qu'elle est très honorée par la proposition et qu'elle accepte.

Chairperson congratulated France and noted that the proposals by the regional groups from Africa and Asia and the Pacific still needed to propose names.

La Délégation du **Cambodge** indique qu'elle n'a pas eu le temps de consulter son gouvernement et demande à quel moment elle pourrait obtenir la liste des différents Etats parties organisateurs. Elle conclut en demandant s'il est possible de savoir quel Etat partie va organiser la 37^e session en 2013.

The **Chairperson** insisted on the necessity to conclude this matter at this session.

The Delegation of **South Africa** said it would come back to the Committee regarding the Draft Decision asap.

The **Chairperson** indicated that paragraph 14 would remain in square brackets for the time being.

**ITEM 19 PROVISIONAL AGENDA OF THE 36TH SESSION OF THE WORLD
HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2012)**

Documents: *WHC-11/35.COM/19*

Decisions: **35 COM 19**

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique à propos de l'ordre du jour qu'elle souhaite rajouter le point 9B s'agissant du renforcement des capacités qui méritent un suivi constant par le Comité.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** indique qu'elle aimerait fournir quelques explications sur l'ordre du jour de la prochaine session et notamment en ce qui concerne les séances de nuit. Elle indique aussi la nécessité d'avoir des séances informelles, des pauses café par exemple en plus des séances formelles, pour avoir le temps de discuter de certains points. Elle conclut en expliquant son amendement au paragraphe 3 de la Décision **35 COM 19**.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 19** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed item 19 of the Agenda

TENTH DAY – WEDNESDAY, 29 JUNE 2011

SEVENTEENTH MEETING

3 p.m. – 7 p.m.

Chairperson: H. E. Ms. Mai Bint Muhamad Al Khalifa

ITEM 18 ELECTION OF THE CHAIRPERSON, VICE-CHAIRPERSONS AND RAPPORTEUR OF THE 36TH SESSION OF THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE (2012) (Continuation)

Coming back to item 18 of the Agenda, Concerning the election of Vice-Chairs from the Asian and the Pacific and the African Regions, the **Chairperson** requested the World Heritage Committee to indicate the names for these positions.

La Délégation du **Cambodge**, soutenue par la Délégation de la **Chine** propose que l'Australie reste Vice-Président, pour le Groupe IV, provisoirement jusqu'à l'Assemblée générale.

The Delegation of **Australia** underlined that it believed in the rotational system but agreed to take on the position as Vice-Chair until the General Assembly and recalled that the suspension of Rule 13.1 would have to be agreed upon by the World Heritage Committee.

The **Legal Advisor** cited the Rule 13.1 of the *Rules of Procedure* of the General Assembly of States Parties to the *World Heritage Convention*, which foresees the election at the end of the ordinary session of the World heritage Committee elections from amongst the Members of the Committee for Chairperson, Vice-Chairs and the Rapporteur. She noted that this Rule would have to be suspended in the case where offices are not elected.

The **Chairperson** turned to the African Members of the Committee and asked for their proposal for Vice-Chair.

The Delegation of **Ethiopia** proposed South Africa for the office of Vice-Chair which was supported by the Delegation of Barbados.

The **Chairperson** decided to move for suspension of Rule 13.1 to enable the election of Australia, on an interim basis, until the General Assembly of States Parties to the *Convention* has elected the new Committee Members from amongst which the appointment of a Vice-Chair shall made.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 18** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 18 of the Agenda.

ITEM 12 REFLECTION ON THE FUTURE OF THE *WORLD HERITAGE CONVENTION* (continuation)

12B. Report of the experts meeting on the decision-making procedures of the statutory organs of the *World Heritage Convention*

The Chairperson indicated that she received an amended text for paragraph 14.

Le **Rapporteur** indique qu'un amendement au paragraphe 14 recommande aux membres du Comité d'envisager de s'abstenir d'avancer de nouvelles propositions d'inscription qui pourraient être discutées durant leur mandat au Comité, sans préjudice pour les dossiers d'inscription déjà déposés ou de ceux qui ont différés ou renvoyés lors de précédentes sessions du Comité ou pour des propositions d'inscription provenant d'Etats parties les moins représentés. Il ajoute que cette disposition serait mise en application à titre expérimental et réexaminée à la 38ème session du Comité.

The Draft Decisions **35 COM 12A, B, C, D and E** were adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 12 of the Agenda.

ITEM 17 OTHER BUSINESS (continuation)

The **Rapporteur** informed the Committee that upon request of the Delegation of Barbados, supported by Brazil, a proposed new decision was introduced under this Item.

The Delegation of **Brazil** apologized for not having provided the French text and explained that the proposed amendment was to capture the spirit of the Committee's deliberations and to strengthen the dialogue between the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies and the States Parties with regard to nominations.

IUCN endorsed the idea of enhancement of dialogue but underlined that the timelines needed to be reviewed in order to be feasible which is currently not possible in the inscription process. Concerning paragraph 4 of the Draft Decision **35 COM 17**, IUCN proposed not only resources but also timelines to be reflected in the paragraph.

The Delegation of **Brazil** agreed that the suggestion of the Advisory Bodies should be reflected.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** asked for one amendment to be included in paragraph 5 underlining that according to the *Operational Guidelines* the Director-General reports to the World Heritage Committee in consultation with the Advisory Bodies.

The Draft Decision **35 COM 17** was adopted as amended.

The **Chairperson** closed Item 17 of the Agenda.

ITEM 20 ADOPTION OF DECISIONS

Documents: WHC-11/35.COM/20

The **Chairperson**, Mrs Ms Mai Bint Muhamad Al Khalifa (Bahrain), presented document 35 COM 20 and congratulated the Rapporteur and the Secretariat for the document on Decisions which was available at this point in 5 volumes.

Le **Rapporteur** indique que c'est avec plaisir qu'il a eu le privilège de travailler en coopération avec les Etats membres durant la 35ème session. De nombreux amendements ont été soumis. Il indique que sa tâche a été facilitée par un Secrétariat dynamique et soudé. En termes de méthodologie, le travail a été effectué sur des amendements soumis en version électronique ou sur des formulaires bleus prévus à cet effet. Par ailleurs, le Rapporteur indique avoir travaillé avec le Secrétariat pour s'assurer que toutes les modifications ont bien été intégrées. Il souligne que tout a été affiché sur écran en anglais et en français.

Il indique que neuf jours de session ont été tenus dont deux sessions de nuit et que 272 décisions ont été examinées. Des groupes de travail sur le Futur de la *Convention* et sur le budget ont effectué des recommandations.

Il indique que le Rapport des décisions se présente en deux parties, Partie I et Partie II : Le Rapporteur informe avoir vérifié avec le Secrétariat la concordance des textes dans les deux langues et que la 35e session a enregistré des avancées significatives. Le Rapporteur termine en remerciant les Etats Parties, les Groupes consultatifs, les techniciens, les interprètes, les ONGs, ainsi que le Secrétariat, etc.

La Partie I des décisions est soumise à l'approbation du Comité. La Partie I du rapport des décisions est adoptée.

Avant de considérer la Partie II du Document, le **Rapporteur** indique que les petites modifications proposées et que les ajustements linguistiques dans les versions anglaises et françaises du Rapport des décisions seront intégrées rapidement avant publication finale.

La Partie II des décisions est soumise à l'approbation du Comité. La Partie II du rapport des décisions est adoptée.

CLOSURE OF THE SESSION

The Delegation of **Egypt** congratulated the Chairperson for the exceptional work and considered this session as very important in the history of the *World Heritage Convention*. In the name of its colleagues and in its personal name, it expresses his acknowledgements and esteem for Ms Alissandra Cummins as Vice-Chair of the Committee. It thanked her for all her efforts and expressed its consideration, respect and pride for her performance.

The **Chairperson** wished in turn to thank Ms Alissandra Cummins as Vice-Chair for her achievement throughout the 35th session.

La Délégation de la **Suisse** remercie la Présidente pour son indulgence et se joint aux déclarations de Délégation de l'Égypte. Elle considère que le travail qui a été fait est remarquable. Néanmoins, elle prononce une déclaration générale qu'elle souhaite voire reflétée *in extenso* dans le résumé des discussions du Comité. [La déclaration générale de la Délégation Suisse se trouve en **Annexe III** du présent document.]

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of the Russian Federation.

The Delegation of the **Russian Federation** acknowledged the wise chairmanship of Ms Cummins and thanked her and the World Heritage Centre for their work. It wished to thank also the Legal Advisor and all services of UNESCO who supported this session. It wished to share some ideas that join the statements made by the Delegations of Egypt and Switzerland. *[As the Chairperson of the forthcoming 36th session of the Committee, it offered bunches of flowers to both the Chairperson and the Vice-Chair of the 35th session of the Committee.]*

The **Chairperson** thanked warmly the Chairperson of the 36th session of the Committee for her generous gift which symbolizes the generosity of the Russian people. She concluded by looking forward to the 36th session in Saint-Petersburg in 2012.

The Delegation of **Jordan** reiterated its thanks to the Chairperson for her tolerance and patient work. It turned to the Vice-Chair to acknowledge her and the entire devoted team for the work achieved which ensured that all objectives were reached. It looked forward to the 36th session in Saint-Petersburg.

The Delegation of **Mexico** thanked the Chairperson and the Vice-Chair, the World Heritage Centre, the Advisory Bodies, all members of the Committee, the interpreters and technical staff for their work to ensure the success of this 35th session of the Committee.

The Delegation of **Australia** informed that this was its last session as Committee member after four years of mandate. It foresaw a positive future for the *Convention* and wished to acknowledge the World Heritage Centre, the Committee members and the Advisory Bodies. It indicated that the work was not complete and noted the opening of future Committee sessions to the media as one of the significant achievements of this session.

It recognized Decision **35 COM 12B** as an attempt to show some restraint for States Parties which are well represented on the List that could be beneficial for those with no property inscribed.

It noted with satisfaction some positive developments such as the wisdom showed by the Delegation of Bahrain to accept a referral for its nomination. It concluded by acknowledging the Vice-Chair for her work during the session.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Delegation of Brazil.

The Delegation of **Brazil** commented on the development of concepts and ideas expressed during the session, on the reflection on the future, on adapting to changes. It noted that this was the last year of Brazil's mandate in the Committee and thanked the Vice-Chair for her patience with the Delegation of Brazil.

The **Chairperson** then gave the floor to the Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe**.

The Observer Delegation of **Zimbabwe** was impressed by the Vice-Chair's leadership and considered this session as a major achievement as it is the second cycle of Periodic Reporting exercise in Africa. This exercise has showed vast improvement in terms of content and conservation. It is a fully consultative framework. It acknowledged both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies for making the Periodic Report a major capacity-building exercise. It concluded that issues dealing with nominations and conservation could be solved within the framework of the Decisions Report.

The Delegation of **South Africa** thanked the Chairperson and the Vice-Chair, the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies. It congratulated the Delegation of the Russian Federation for hosting the 36th session of the Committee. It expressed its pride about Africa in the 2nd cycle of the Periodic Reporting exercise and hoped that the *Convention* would continue to evolve. It concluded by saying that developing countries needed help to develop and hoped that both the World Heritage Centre and the Advisory Bodies understood this view.

The Delegation of **Nigeria** thanked the Delegation of South Africa and acknowledged the Vice-Chair for her good conduct of the session. It congratulated all States Parties for their wonderful contributions during the session and wished them a safe journey back home.

The Delegation of **Barbados** expressed positive compliments on the occasion of its final year as Committee member. It considered important to have the CARICOM and Caribbean sub-region better represented on the List and build capacities through nominations as the inscription process is also a learning process.

The **Chairperson** gave the floor to the Vice-Chairperson, Mrs Cummins (Barbados).

The **Vice-Chair** expressed her appreciation of how much she learned through interaction during the session. She considered it as an opportunity to share, learn and develop knowledge through dialogue. She offered her own appreciation for friendship with the Secretariat, the Advisory Bodies and the interpreters. She considered serving the Chairperson as a privilege. She concluded by mentioning that two Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) were coming to an end of their mandate in this Committee.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the Vice-Chair for making the success of this session.

The **Director of the World Heritage Centre** acknowledged for the wise leading of this session through the excellent facilitation of the Vice-Chair. He considered the session to have been trouble free and as smooth as possible. He also acknowledged the 2nd Vice-Chair (Cambodia) for leading the Committee while the nomination from Barbados was under discussion. He expressed his appreciation to the Rapporteur and to the two

Chairs of the working groups on the Future of the *Convention*, Mr. Greg Terrill and on the Budget, Ms Beatriz Hernandez.

He recalled that the Committee worked hard, had two night sessions and adopted some 270 Decisions. It informed that the real work would start now for the Secretariat and the Advisory Bodies. On a personal standpoint, he considered the 22 cases when the Advisory Bodies' recommendations were changed as the fact that something was wrong in the nomination process.

He informed that the upstream process studied in the framework of the reflection on the Future of the *Convention* could be a path opener. He looked forward to finding ways to have a smoother decision-making process for nominations and state of conservation reports. He concluded by acknowledging Mrs Mechtild Rössler and her team, as well as colleagues from other units of the World Heritage Centre, the technicians and the interpreters.

The **Chairperson** informed that initially the session was to be held in Bahrain and that without the help of this amazing team, the session would not have been held so successfully.

The Observer Delegation of **Germany** congratulated the Director of the World Heritage Centre for his recent appointment.

The Delegation of **Egypt** commended the Kingdom of Bahrain, the Vice-Chair, the Director of the World Heritage Centre and his team for their excellent work, comparing them with an orchestra led by a remarkable conductor. He considered the Rapporteur as perfect as he was simple and efficient. He concluded by looking forward to the 36th session in the Russian Federation.

The **Chairperson** acknowledged the efforts accomplished and informed that for personal reasons, she could not chair except during the Bureau meetings. She considered the outcome of this session as very important although she had some issues of concern such as the credibility of the *Convention*. She appreciated the work of the Vice-Chair and the Committee and recognized that the chairmanship of the Committee is teamwork. She concluded by thanking the Vice-Chair for having handled the major part of the work in an exceptional manner. She considered that Bahrain was the first Small Island Developing State to organize a Committee session and that this was an honour to draw better attention on SIDS.

She congratulated all States Parties with newly inscribed properties and recalled that inscription on the World Heritage List is a major responsibility. It is the beginning of an adventure in which the Advisory Bodies have the role of guidance. She believed that her role as Chairperson was an exceptional source of inspiration even if at times it was difficult to make decisions. She expressed her thanks for the monumental task represented by the transfer of the venue from Bahrain to Paris. She expressed her appreciation for being supported by great professionals such as the Vice-Chair.

She then called the Chairperson of the 36th Committee session on the podium for her to take up her duties.

The **Chairperson of the 36^e session** of the World Heritage Committee presented the projection of a video on Saint-Petersburg and welcomed all participants present in the room to the 36th session.

The 35th session of the World Heritage Committee was declared closed.

ANNEXE I

Présentation des Rapports d'évaluation sur la Stratégie globale de la Liste du patrimoine mondial et de l'initiative PACTe – Présentation par le Représentant de la Cour des Comptes.

Madame la Présidente,
Mesdames et Messieurs les ambassadeurs
Mesdames et Messieurs les délégués,
Mesdames et Messieurs,

Je vous remercie de m'avoir invité, au nom de M. MIGAUD, Premier Président de la Cour des comptes française et commissaire aux comptes de l'UNESCO, à vous présenter, en application de l'article 12 alinéa 12.6 du règlement financier de l'UNESCO, les conclusions des deux rapports d'évaluation de la stratégie globale pour une liste du patrimoine mondial équilibrée, représentative et crédible et de l'initiative de partenariat pour la conservation, autrement appelée PACTe.

Votre agenda est très chargé et je sais votre temps précieux. Pour cette raison et sachant que les documents d'information détaillés sont à votre disposition et que vous avez pu prendre connaissance du rapport final, je m'efforcerai d'être synthétique dans cette présentation.

Sont présents avec moi à cette tribune quatre collègues qui ont participé aux travaux qui vous sont rapportés aujourd'hui : Mesdames Eve Darragon et Michèle Froment-Védrine pour la mise en œuvre de la Stratégie globale ; Mme Nicole Turon-Cherrat et M. Jérôme Véronneau pour l'initiative PACTe.

Avant d'en venir à nos conclusions je voudrais également, à travers vous, adresser à l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties à la convention du patrimoine mondial des remerciements tout à fait spéciaux : la Cour des comptes est sincèrement honorée de la marque de confiance que lui a montré l'Assemblée générale en lui demandant, en supplément à son mandat statutaire d'auditeur externe de l'UNESCO, de conduire cette évaluation externe indépendante auquel elle a, au surplus, trouvé un très grand intérêt intellectuel.

Je dois en effet rappeler que cette évaluation a été décidée par l'Assemblée générale lors de sa 17^e session ; votre comité, mandaté par la résolution 17GA9 paragraphe 16, a adopté le cahier des charges détaillé de cette évaluation lors de sa 34^e session tenue à Brasilia.

Cette dernière précision est utile : elle explique que la rédaction des documents d'information de ce point de l'ordre du jour suit strictement la structure détaillée du cahier des charges que vous nous avez donné. Ma présentation, synthétique, sera quant à elle organisée plutôt sur les groupes de recommandations que nous vous proposons (26 pour la Stratégie, 9 pour l'Initiative PACTe).

Bien entendu les deux volets de cette évaluation sont étroitement liés. Depuis la convention de 1972, la protection du patrimoine mondial est un objectif majeur de l'UNESCO. Elle a conduit au classement d'un peu plus de 900 sites de catégories de plus en plus diversifiées. Le succès de la liste est tel que le classement devient aujourd'hui un enjeu considérable : le risque est alors grand que la protection et la conservation deviennent des objectifs secondaires une fois le classement décidé.

J'en viens à notre évaluation de la Stratégie globale, premier volet de ce travail ; elle a été replacée dans le cadre plus large de la convention de 1972.

Vous comprendrez donc que j'évoque en premier lieu les difficultés que pose l'absence de définition précise des objectifs de la stratégie sachant que les termes et les concepts de « représentativité, d'équilibre et de crédibilité » n'ont jamais été définis par le Comité du Patrimoine mondial ; et cela en dépit des définitions possible proposées par les experts. Faute d'avoir repris formellement ces propositions expertes dans les Orientations pour la mise en œuvre de la Convention, on fait face à des divergences d'interprétation des critères, voire des contestations plus vives, parfois fondées sur une approche plus géopolitique que patrimoniale, qui conduit à faire oublier que la « valeur universelle exceptionnelle » reste la condition-clé de l'inscription d'un bien sur la liste du patrimoine mondial.

Nous voyons que cette situation est entretenue par l'absence d'indicateurs objectifs permettant de suivre les résultats de la Stratégie globale. Les comptes-rendus statistiques présentés à chaque session, fondés sur des critères simplificateurs tel le nombre de biens par zones patrimoniales mondiales offrent une vision réductrice et biaisée des résultats qualitatifs de la liste. Ces outils ne s'appuient sur aucun critère scientifique ; le découpage en cinq grandes zones patrimoniales n'est pas pertinent au regard des critères culturels comme naturels ; le bilan par nombre de biens reste grossier au regard des critères dont il est censé rendre compte.

Bien entendu l'évaluateur ne saurait, seul, et sans le concours d'une expertise scientifique élargie et approfondie, pallier ces insuffisances ni actualiser l'analyse des lacunes mises en évidence en 2004 par les organisations consultatives.

Désormais la quasi-totalité des Etats membres de l'UNESCO a ratifié la convention du patrimoine mondial et les critères d'inscription ont été largement diversifiés notamment à partir de 2005.

En ce qui concerne le patrimoine culturel et mixte, la modification des critères a permis d'inscrire de nouvelles catégories de biens (villes historiques, paysages culturels, routes du patrimoine, patrimoine industriel, patrimoine moderne). Des biens culturels not été inscrits en Afrique (2/3 des inscriptions de biens en Afrique de 1995 à 2007 sont des biens culturels) continent où auparavant les sites naturels prédominaient.

S'agissant de l'équilibre entre patrimoine culturel et naturel, l'analyse en nombre de biens (les biens naturels représentent 33 % des biens inscrits) reste simplificatrice compte tenu de l'étendue de nombre de biens naturels et mixtes.

Malgré une progression relative significative sur les quinze dernières années, la représentation du patrimoine naturel demeure donc assez peu avancée. Ce constat peut être mis en perspective avec deux ensembles de causes possibles :

- En premier lieu, nombre d'Etats manquent d'administration spécialisée en ce domaine ; le Centre du patrimoine mondial lui-même, dont la majorité des représentants régionaux sont des experts de la culture ou de l'éducation, n'emploie pas un nombre suffisant d'experts scientifiques pour faire face à la tâche ;
- il est ensuite significatif que les Etats parties peuvent parfois éprouver quelques réticences à demander une inscription de biens naturels lorsque celle-ci pourrait contrarier le développement économique des régions concernées.

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

Pour rester sur le plan des résultats constatés il apparaît enfin bien difficile d'évaluer l'équilibre géographique des inscriptions tant le zonage actuel paraît arbitraire et éloigné non seulement des réalités physiques naturelles mais aussi des cohérences culturelles.

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

Tout d'abord le risque lié à une extension potentiellement illimitée de la liste du fait de l'extension de critères d'inscription mal définis : ce risque c'est celui d'une possible dérive par rapport au critère fondateur de la convention qu'est la valeur universelle exceptionnelle au sens de la déclaration de Kazan, ou à tout le moins une difficulté croissante à décider sans équivoque de la conformité des inscriptions à l'esprit de la Convention de 1972. Il en résulte une complexité des dossiers à laquelle le Centre du patrimoine mondial, comme les organisations consultatives, ne peuvent faire face sans difficultés, notamment financières puisque, comme je le redirai le dispositif doit être désormais financé majoritairement par des ressources extrabudgétaires.

Il conviendrait sans doute de réserver l'inscription sur la liste aux biens les plus exceptionnels dans l'esprit de la convention de 1972 et d'explorer des outils complémentaires tels les listes régionales, thématiques ou les conventions de paysage

Le second risque qu'encourt la Stratégie est de voir affaiblir la crédibilité de la liste par la prise en considération de critères de décision plus géopolitiques que scientifiques.

Nous avons constaté par exemple que les décisions du Comité s'écartaient de plus en plus fréquemment des avis scientifiques des organisations consultatives ; que les décisions rendues étaient, tendanciellement, plus favorables aux Etats représentés au sein du Comité ... Lorsque certains biens considérés comme dépourvus de valeur universelle exceptionnelle au dire des organisations consultatives sont néanmoins inscrit en tenant compte « à titre provisoire » de la déclaration des Etats, comme le comité l'a fait lors de sa 34^e session, le risque est grand de voir le caractère universel de la valeur exceptionnelle requise perdre significativement de sa portée ...

Mais le risque le plus préoccupant reste toutefois celui que la priorité accordée aux nouvelles inscriptions, que l'extension sans limite du nombre de sites inscrits (bientôt 1000, sans doute 2000 en 2045 au rythme actuel), que cette extension devienne une fin en soi au détriment de l'objectif pourtant central de la convention de 1972 qu'est la conservation des biens.

Les rapports périodiques et les rapports sur l'état de conservation dans le cadre du suivi réactif dressent régulièrement des tableaux très préoccupants. La pression anthropique mais aussi les effets des changements climatiques associés à l'absence de mesures de protection adaptées en sont les causes connues ou vraisemblables. Il est patent et préoccupant de constater que le nombre de biens dont la mauvaise conservation ou la dégradation est régulièrement signalée soit sans commune mesure avec le très faible nombre de biens inscrits sur la liste des biens en péril. Le fait que cette déclaration de péril ne puisse se faire concrètement et en pratique sans l'accord de l'Etat partie concerné renforce notre appréciation du contexte évoqué précédemment...

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

La clé de ces questions reste toutefois les financements : si les financements étaient sans limites, l'extension de la liste pourrait évidemment l'être aussi, la conservation serait assurée et les objectifs de la convention seraient idéalement servis. Tel n'est pas le cas aujourd'hui. Les financements disponibles pour assurer le suivi efficace des biens inscrits sont insuffisants et contingents : soumettre la conservation, pourtant le principal objectif de la convention, à des ressources extrabudgétaires fait de l'atteinte de cet objectif une entreprise aléatoire : aujourd'hui ce sont près de 70 % des moyens de la conservation qui sont ainsi financés. La conservation reste donc encore le parent pauvre de la Stratégie en dépit des pistes de financement explorées lors de la 34^e session. Alimenter des financements stabilisés, hiérarchiser les priorités des actions de conservations réactives, planifier les besoins pour les biens inscrits sur la liste en péril, autant de voies que votre Comité devrait sans doute explorer plus avant.

Au total nous avons émis 26 recommandations en conclusion à ce premier volet de l'évaluation. Je ne vais pas les détailler ici. Elles sont intégralement reprises dans le rapport de synthèse distribué ; nous accueillerons volontiers les questions que ces recommandations appelleraient de votre part.

Pour conclure sur ce premier volet permettez moi de rappeler que dans la lignée des Chartes d'Athènes et de Venise, de la conférence de Stockholm sur l'environnement et des grandes campagnes internationales lancées par l'UNESCO pour la sauvegarde de monuments emblématiques, la convention de 1972 reste toujours l'instrument juridique novateur visant à protéger les biens qui (je cite la convention) « présentent un intérêt exceptionnel qui nécessite leur préservation en tant qu'élément du patrimoine mondial de l'humanité toute entière ... ». Devant l'ampleur et la gravité des dangers nouveaux qui les menacent la convention affirme « qu'il incombe à la collectivité internationale toute entière de participer à la protection du patrimoine culturel et naturel de valeur

universelle exceptionnelle » ; qu'elle entend « mettre en place un système efficace de protection collective, organisé selon des méthodes scientifiques et modernes pour compléter l'action des Etats ».

Oui, on peut dire que La Stratégie globale a contribué incontestablement à accroître la notoriété de la convention de 1972. L'augmentation du nombre d'Etats parties est un succès également significatif.

Pourtant, alors que le seuil des 1000 biens inscrits est en passe d'être atteint, il reste indispensable de réfléchir à l'avenir de la convention. La Stratégie globale a conduit, de facto, et en l'absence d'une définition concomitante d'une stratégie et des moyens de la conservation, à donner la priorité à la quête de la représentativité, au détriment du suivi et de l'assistance à la préservation des biens, s'écartant ainsi de la lettre comme de l'esprit de la convention.

Force est aujourd'hui de constater que des biens de très grande valeur disparaissent dans l'indifférence de la communauté internationale, que nombre de biens inscrits se dégradent, que les mécanismes comme les financements manquent pour des actions concrètes de conservation ou de restauration.

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

Ces dernières observations m'offrent la transition pour vous exposer les grandes lignes de l'évaluation de l'initiative PACTe que l'Assemblée générale nous a également confiée.

Guidée par le cahier des charges arrêté par la 34^e session du Comité, cette évaluation, nous a conduit à étudier les conditions de mise en oeuvre de l'initiative par les services de l'Organisation, notamment le Centre du patrimoine mondial, et à analyser 33 des 59 partenariats.

Deux observations préliminaires doivent être faite afin de remettre en contexte les observations et recommandations que nous faisons dans nos conclusions.

Je rappellerais d'abord que le Comité du patrimoine mondial avait accueilli, en juin 2002, l'initiative de partenariat du patrimoine mondial dite « IPPM » sur une base expérimentale et, je cite, « comme un moyen de parvenir à une approche plus systématique des partenariats »; le cadre réglementaire a été ensuite tracé définitivement en juillet 2005 IPPM devenant PACTe. Dix ans après, la portée de l'initiative reste encore très limitée : fin 2010, 59 partenariats avaient été conclus ; 35 d'entre eux ne comportent pas d'engagements financiers au profit de l'UNESCO, ce qui ne veut pas dire pour autant qu'ils sont dénués d'intérêt pour l'Organisation ; mais pour prendre la mesure des moyens drainés au profit de la conservation du patrimoine mondial il faut rappeler que PACTe n'a réuni qu'un peu plus de 4 millions de dollars des Etats Unis en six années d'existence.

Ma seconde observation liminaire concerne la faiblesse générale de la tenue des dossiers de partenariat par le Centre du patrimoine mondial. Ce constat ne remet en rien en cause la bonne volonté des équipes du Centre dont nous pouvons ici même attester ; mais cela fait inévitablement obstacle à la traçabilité des ressources collectées et surtout, au-delà, contrarie sérieusement le suivi comme l'évaluation des partenariats, partant, de l'initiative elle-même.

Nos premières observations de fond concernent en effet d'abord le mode de gestion adopté par le Centre du Patrimoine mondial : contrairement aux objectifs affichés par le Comité en 2002 l'approche adoptée à ce jour reste bien peu systématique.

Quelles que soient les lacunes, notamment en termes de normativité et d'applicabilité, du manuel administratif de l'UNESCO dans le domaine des relations avec le secteur privé, il demeure que les principes fondamentaux du cadre réglementaire adopté pour PACTe en 2005 ne peuvent être tenus pour servis de façon optimale : plusieurs accords restent rédigés de façon vague et confuse ; les clauses d'obligations redditionnelles et de mesure des résultats sont souvent imprécises.

Une des causes en est certainement que le Centre du Patrimoine mondial a manqué à correctement définir le dimensionnement, les profils de compétence et le positionnement de l'équipe PACTe. Sans même parler de l'expertise des organisations consultative qui n'est jamais sollicitée, la coordination avec les spécialistes de programme du Centre du Patrimoine mondial et avec les autres secteurs et services de l'Organisation souffre d'importantes lacunes qui nuisent fatalement à son efficience.

Faute d'avoir, avant la fin de l'année 2010, mis en place des moyens et une organisation efficaces le Centre du Patrimoine mondial est resté dans une attitude passive à l'égard des partenaires potentiels agissant plus de façon réactive que proactive. L'initiative vient généralement jusqu'à présent du secteur privé. Cela explique sans doute que nous n'ayons généralement pas trouvé, dans les dossiers évalués, de trace d'analyse de la situation, du potentiel et de la stratégie des partenaires, ni d'une analyse coût/avantages du partenariat envisagé puis conclu. Comme les partenariats proposés par les entreprises ne sont pas généralement ceux auxquels l'Organisation pourrait attacher le plus d'importance il existe un risque d'accumulation de petits projets à faible impact dont la mise en place est aussi coûteuse pour l'UNESCO que celle de plus grands projets.

Au final l'impact de l'initiative PACTe sur la conservation du Patrimoine mondial reste limité.

Certes plusieurs partenariats, notamment avec des entreprises de presse ou des médias, font mieux connaître la Convention et contribuent ainsi à l'un de ses objectifs stratégiques. L'objectif de sensibiliser au patrimoine mondial en vue de sa conservation est toutefois souvent une clause de style des partenariats et les résultats concrets restent souvent modestes. L'initiative reste globalement peu connue, y compris au sein de l'UNESCO. Alors même que la plupart des partenariats sont aujourd'hui rattachés à l'objectif de communication, les conditions de l'utilisation de l'emblème de la Convention restent souvent imprécises voire critiquables : les partenariats examinés montrent rarement une étude précise de la compatibilité de l'utilisation de l'emblème avec les règles et principes de l'Organisation ; les conditions d'utilisation et les obligations redditionnelles des utilisateurs de l'emblème ne sont pas généralement précisées, la

procédure restant largement informelle : il en résulte un risque d'image pour l'Organisation et une incertitude quant à l'impact obtenu par la concession de l'usage de l'emblème.

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

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

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

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

En gardant à l'esprit le niveau, en général, relativement modeste des partenariats conclus jusqu'à présent sous l'égide de PACTe, l'évaluation fait ressortir un triple risque :

- un risque de dégradation du partenariat pour la conservation par la recherche prioritaire de financements pour le fonctionnement du Centre du Patrimoine mondial, lequel ne contribue qu'indirectement à la conservation ;
- un risque de banalisation de l'emblème de la convention et du logo de l'UNESCO par une utilisation surtout commerciale,
- un risque de perte de sens si la recherche de la visibilité devait l'emporter durablement sur le souci de la conservation.

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

Avant d'en finir je voudrais remercier toutes les personnes qui ont contribué à permettre la conduite efficace de ces deux volets de l'évaluation globale souhaitée par l'Assemblée générale des Etats parties. En particulier le directeur et les personnels du Centre Mondial du Patrimoine, les personnels des secteurs de la culture, des relations extérieures et de l'information du public, du bureau de la planification stratégique, du bureau de la gestion financière et du bureau de la gestion des ressources humaines.

Madame la Présidente, Mesdames et Messieurs je vous remercie de votre attention.

ANNEXE II

Statement by the Representative of the Delegation of Jordan regarding Item 8A.

At each session of the meetings of this committee, an Arab State member of the Committee draws the attention to the fact that the presence of a site under the name of "Jerusalem" on the tentative list of Israel does not conform with the articles of the World Heritage Convention and the Operational Guidelines for its Implementation. Article 11 of the Convention states that "Every State Party to this Convention shall, in so far as possible, submit to the World Heritage Committee an inventory of property forming part of the cultural and natural heritage, situated in its territory.. ". Jerusalem is in a territory occupied by Israel according to international law.

As to the footnote appended to the name "Jerusalem" on the fore mentioned tentative list, which reads as follows: "this concerns the property entitled "Jerusalem the Old City and Ramparts to include Mount Zion", I would like to remind of the following:

It was mentioned in the report of the meeting of the Bureau of the Committee, held in Paris on June 2001, that UNESCO requested legal advice from the United Nations Secretary-General regarding whether Israel might lawfully nominate Mount Zion for inclusion in the list consistently with the terms of the World Heritage Convention and that this advice will be examined by the 25th session of the committee meeting in Helsinki.

UNESCO received the advice signed by Mr. Hans Corell, Under Secretary- General for Legal Affairs- The Legal Counsel, on 7 December 2001, yet it was not submitted to the committee meeting held in Helsinki between December 11-16, 2001.

The Director of the World Heritage Center circulated it to the member states of the Committee on 14 January, 2002.

The legal advice addressed to the Assistant Director-General of UNESCO, states the following:

" I also note that you state that it is the wish of Israel that Mount Zion be included in the List as an "Extension" to the existing World Heritage Site that is constituted by the "Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls".

The response of Mr. Corell to this statement was as follows:

"..... If and in so far as Mount Zion may eventually be nominated for inclusion in the List, it will be nominated as a property in its own right, distinct from the "Old City of Jerusalem and its walls"

On this basis, Mr. Corall concluded that according to the World Heritage Convention Israel could inscribe the site of Mount Zion on the World Heritage List, but neither under the name of "Jerusalem" nor as an extension to the site of Jerusalem inscribed on the list and proposed by Jordan in 1981. He also said that inscribing Mount Zion on the list

does not in anyway affect the legal status of the area on which the site is located and the right of sovereignty on it.

Consequently, Jordan is presenting an amendment to the draft decision of Item 8A of the agenda.

Madam chair,

Jordan requests that this statement presented by its representative to the 35th session of the Committee be added to the records of this session and included in thy report of the Rapporteur

Thank you.

ANNEXE III

Statement by the Delegation of Australia regarding Item 7A.22

Australia recognises the unique cultural, historical and religious significance of the Old City of Jerusalem, in particular to people of the Islamic, Christian and Jewish faiths.

Australia regards the question of sovereignty over Jerusalem as unresolved. We recognise that the status of Jerusalem is an issue to be addressed in the context of negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians. For this reason, we abstained in this Committee when the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls was inscribed on the world heritage list in 1981.

We note that the practice has been for decisions on Old Jerusalem in the Committee to be negotiated and agreed between the relevant parties and then adopted by consensus without debate. Given the unresolved status of Jerusalem, we strongly believe this to be the best approach and regret that this has not been possible on this occasion.

We note there are a number of elements in the decision just adopted which have not been agreed between the relevant parties. Australia wishes to disassociate itself from these aspects of the decision, as we consider these complex and sensitive issues are best resolved through discussion, negotiation and agreement between the relevant parties, as has been the case in the past.

We note and reaffirm the decision adopted by consensus by the Committee last week on the reinforced monitoring mechanism.

We wish to conclude by underlining that Australia will continue to strongly support efforts to achieve mutually acceptable outcomes which preserve the authenticity and integrity of the Old City of Jerusalem and its Walls.

ANNEXE IV

Discours final de M. l'Ambassadeur Rodolphe Imhoof, Délégué permanent de la Suisse auprès de l'UNESCO

Madame la Présidente,
Excellences,
Mesdames, Messieurs,

Je souhaiterais faire, à ce stade de nos travaux, une déclaration générale que j'aimerais voir reflétée dans le résumé de nos travaux.

J'aimerais tout d'abord remercier le rapporteur dont je partage bien des conclusions. Nous avons réalisé, comme il l'a si bien dit, « certaines avancées significatives ». Néanmoins, la délégation suisse reste, à bien des égards, sur sa faim.

Bien évidemment nous sommes conscients de l'évolution du monde depuis l'adoption de la Convention de 1972, argument souvent avancé pour justifier des positions à coloration politique. Pour notre part, nous sommes d'avis que cette évolution même devrait nous imposer de rester fidèles aux fondamentaux, ou plutôt d'y revenir. Pour le bien de la crédibilité de la Convention, pour la crédibilité de nos gouvernements, pour celle de l'UNESCO.

Il devient urgent de reconsidérer les méthodes de travail pour l'application de la Convention. Nous avons tenté quelques timides avancées vers la fin de cette session, en privilégiant une remise en question de certaines habitudes malsaines – je ne veux pas seulement parler des séances de nuit, en lançant un appel à une meilleure collaboration et concertation avec les organisations consultatives, en essayant de développer le Consensus au sein du Comité et en travaillant à une meilleure gestion du temps.

Néanmoins, nous avons toujours encore la propension de nous écarter dangereusement des fondements de la Convention qui a permis d'ancrer la préservation du patrimoine de l'humanité dans le droit international public.

J'aimerais ici, comme je l'ai déjà fait à Brasilia, d'abord dénoncer la pratique des feuilles de signatures qui conduit automatiquement à vider la discussion de sa substance au profit du spectacle. La remise en cause presque systématique des mécanismes, des procédures et des avis consultatifs qui s'en suit ne rend pas service à la coopération internationale et à l'UNESCO, encore moins aux gestionnaires de sites et aux communautés locales qui doivent bénéficier de notre appui.

Nous portons l'entière responsabilité des « cadeaux empoisonnés » que nous distribuons généreusement par des inscriptions prématurées. Nous portons la même responsabilité quant à la confection de la liste du patrimoine mondial en péril diabolisée à tort – ce n'est pas une punition –, point essentiel rappelé à bon escient par le rapporteur. A-t-on donc oublié que dans ces cas le principe d'assistance internationale est dûment prévu par la Convention ?

La Suisse continuera à s'investir sans relâche pour le respect de la lettre et surtout de l'esprit de la Convention et pour la protection du patrimoine de l'humanité que nous avons été chargés de transmettre aux générations futures.

Merci, Madame la Présidente, pour votre indulgence.